

Committee on Governance Meeting Minutes
Meeting #6 (2016-17)
Monday, October 3rd, 2016, 12:00 noon – 1:00 pm
Faculty Governance Conference Room (SL 225)

Members present: Leonard Albano, Provost Bruce Bursten, Tanja Dominko (Chair), Glenn Gaudette, Eleanor Loiacono, Mark Richman, Elizabeth Ryder (Secretary), Suzanne Weekes

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:03.

2. The agenda was accepted as distributed.

3. Announcements

Prof. Dominko will meet with Prof. Hansen of COAP to decide how best to move forward to work jointly on revising promotion procedures.

Prof. Richman is waiting to hear back from six nominees willing to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean of Arts & Sciences. He will get the ballot out upon getting all responses.

Provost Bursten reminded COG of the need to recommend two full professors to serve on the Academic Planning Committee. The Board of Trustees will choose one of the two to serve.

4. The COG meeting minutes #5 from September 26th, 2016 were approved as amended.

5. Job descriptions for academic Deans

Prof. Dominko suggested that the Provost set a timeline to provide clear job descriptions for the academic Deans. Prof. Gaudette also asked for a clarification of the role and responsibilities of the VP for Academic and Corporate Engagement within the academic dean structure.

Descriptions should identify the roles and responsibilities, lines of authority, budgets, and outline interface between Deans and the Vice Provost for Research, as well as overlaps and synergies of responsibilities. This is particularly important in light of WPI's strategic plan. Understanding the roles and responsibilities of the deans within the academic structure can then guide recommendations for their integration into processes governed by the Faculty Handbook, including academic administrative searches, tenure, and promotion.

Understanding the Deans' responsibilities will also be helpful in designing questions for faculty evaluation of administrators.

Provost Bursten will seek to provide COG with a draft document by the end of February. COG will provide input as needed.

6. Strategy on growth of the Faculty

Prof. Dominko suggested that the Provost set a timeline to present a strategy for growth of the Faculty to achieve institutional goals: We need to address how to achieve institutional goals (including credit delivery and research funding), and consider what resources are available, as well as current obstacles and constraints, and strategies for overcoming these. COG needs to report to the faculty each year on data on the credit delivery by TTT / NTT faculty. It would make sense to combine this with thinking about the strategic plan for growth. We need to get input from the Board of Trustees on these issues as well.

Prof. Gaudette suggested forming a COG sub-committee to work with the Provost on this subject. Profs. Gaudette, Loiacono, and Ryder volunteered for the sub-committee. This work should be completed in time to be incorporated into COG's TTT/NTT report to the Faculty at the March Faculty meeting.

7. 2016-17 Faculty evaluation of administrators (Most recent format and questions, and procedures for dissemination of results,)

If a normal rotation were followed, this year's (2016-17) evaluations would be for the Provost, the Senior VP for Institutional Strategy, the Dean of Business, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Engineering, and the Vice Provost for Research. The new Dean of Engineering, Dr. Wole Soboyejo, started at WPI on September 1st and will not be evaluated this year. The Dean of A&S is stepping down, so there is no point in evaluating her. Prof. Dominko spoke with Prof. Vernescu, Vice Provost for Research. He feels that since most of his time so far has been as VPR *ad interim*, he would prefer to be evaluated next year.

For academic year 2017-18, if we remove evaluation of the CFO, Jeff Solomon, and make space for the Dean of Engineering and the VPR, the evaluation would be as shown below.

| 2016-17 | 2017-18 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Provost | President |
| Dean of School of Business | Dean of IGSD |
| Senior VP (Tichenor) | Dean of Undergraduate Studies |
| Dean of Arts and Sciences | Dean of Graduate Studies |
| Dean of Engineering | Dean of Engineering |
| | Vice Provost for Research |

COG discussed whether the faculty should also evaluate the Vice President for Academic and Corporate Engagement but did not reach a conclusion.

Questions used in previous evaluations are shown in Appendix I. COG members volunteered to compare the questions to those used by other schools, and suggest adjustments as necessary. COG will approve these questions at our next meeting, and then request input from President Leshin as well as from those administrators who are to be evaluated. Prof. Loiacono will work on questions for Dean of School of Business; Prof. Albano on questions for the Senior VP, and Prof. Dominko on questions for Provost.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Liz Ryder, Secretary

Appendix I

WPI Faculty Evaluation of Administrators – AY 2016-17

PURPOSES:

1. To give the Faculty the opportunity to provide input on the performance of administrators who have a strong influence on academic programs and faculty work.
2. To provide administrators with constructive feedback about their performance as viewed by the Faculty, including identification of strengths and areas for improvement.
3. To provide the President and the Board with an indication of an administrator's performance as viewed by the Faculty.

CURRENT SURVEY FORMAT AND MOST RECENT JOB-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS USED:

1. Please rate the overall performance of the [Position Title]:

Poor (1)/Fair (2)/Good (3)/Very Good (4)/Excellent (5)

2. Rate the effectiveness of the [Position Title] with respect to the following specific components of his/her administrative position:

Poor (1)/Fair (2)/Good (3)/Very Good (4)/Excellent (5)

“Specific Components” for the Provost (2012/13):

1. Provides leadership for the academic programs and directs academic strategic planning
2. Ensures strong and consistent performance by Deans, Department Heads, and Program Heads
3. Effectively advocates for faculty interests in support of academic programs
4. Promotes and secures adequate resources for implementation of academic programs
5. Actively promotes external recognition of academic programs and faculty members

“Specific Components” for the Dean of Business (2012/13)

1. Provides leadership for and ensures the quality and effectiveness of Business School programs
2. Effectively advocates for faculty interests in support of Business School programs
3. Secures internal funding and resources for the Business School.
4. Works constructively with the Department/Program Heads and faculty members
5. Actively attracts external recognition and external funding for the Business School.

“Specific Components” for the Senior VP (2014/2015)

1. Achieves undergraduate enrollment goals of quality, quantity, and diversity
2. Effectively communicates with the faculty and other internal and external constituencies
3. Provides leadership in the areas of admissions (undergraduate and graduate), Registrar’s Office, and financial aid
4. Effectively leads WPI’s institutional visibility efforts, including marketing and communications
5. Supports faculty efforts to enroll graduate students

6. Provides leadership in the area of student affairs

“Specific Components” for the Senior VP (2012/13)

1. Achieves undergraduate enrollment goals of quality, quantity, and diversity.
2. Effectively communicates with the faculty and other internal and external constituencies.
3. Provides leadership in the areas of admissions (undergraduate and graduate), Registrar’s Office, financial aid, and marketing and communications.
4. Effectively leads WPI’s institutional visibility efforts.
5. Supports faculty efforts to enroll graduate students.

3. Please comment on any areas of strength of the [Position Title]. What should s/he keep doing?

4. Please comment on any areas of improvement for the [Position Title]. What should s/he do differently?

5. What is your level of confidence in evaluating the [Position]’s performance? (e.g., based on extent of interaction)

Low (1)/ Medium (3)/ High (5)

Appendix I (cont.)

Method to Disseminate Results of Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Revised Spring 2012

Dissemination to Administrators:

- Each administrator receives results of his or her own performance evaluation
Results include numerical data and original comments
- President receives results for all administrators evaluated.
Results include numerical data and original comments for each administrator
- Chair of the Board of Trustees receives results for all administrators evaluated
Results include numerical data and original comments for each administrator

Dissemination to Faculty:

- Secretary of the Faculty (SOF) announces at a Faculty meeting that the evaluations have been collected.
- SOF posts numerical data for each administrator .
- Accessible to all those eligible to have completed the survey and to the administrators evaluated.

Faculty/Administration / Trustee Collaboration:

- SOF and Chair of COG invite to meet with each administrator to discuss the results of his or her evaluation.
Discussion should focus on strengths and concerns as identified by the survey results
- SOF and Chair of COG invite to meet with the President to discuss the results of any results forwarded to him or her.
Discussion about any administrator (including the President) should focus on strengths and concerns as identified by the survey results.
- SOF and Chair of COG invite to meet with the Chairman of the Board of Trustees to discuss the results of any results forwarded to him or her.
Discussion about the President (and any other administrator) should focus on strengths and concerns as identified by the survey results

Record keeping:

- Each year records are kept in the Faculty Governance office for evaluations of each administrator that took place according to procedures above.
- Numerical data kept on file.
- Log kept on file of meetings (if any) between SOF, Chair of COG and:
Chair of Board of Trustees
President
Individual administrator.