

Committee on Governance Meeting Minutes
Meeting #10 (2016-17)
Monday, November 7th, 2016, 11:30 – 1:00 pm
SL 226

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

Members absent: Glenn Gaudette

1. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
2. Announcements

The Board of Trustees endorsed the recommendation of COG that Prof. Weekes be the Faculty representative to the APC for one year, with possible reappointment for a full term.

3. The minutes of COG meeting #9 (October 31st) were approved as amended.
4. Prof. Richman and Prof. Dominko reported that the President's and Provost's appointments to the Search Committee for the Dean of Arts and Sciences have been made. After some discussion, COG recommended a faculty member for consideration as the COG appointee.
5. Continuation - Procedures for Faculty evaluation of administrators

Discussion centered around two questions.

- 1) Should the Faculty evaluate non-academic administrative positions?

A concern was raised that Faculty evaluation of administrators who are not in academic positions can be perceived negatively by those being evaluated. Faculty are often not familiar with the responsibilities of non-academic administrators, and may not be equipped to evaluate their job performance. On the other hand, administrators should be aware of how they are perceived by the Faculty. Faculty evaluation, while not exhaustive adds a data point about the person's performance. The evaluation should provide a mechanism for the Faculty to voice concerns, but to do so in a constructive way. Before implementation, proposed evaluation questions will be discussed with each administrator.

Professor Richman left during this discussion.

After this discussion, COG agreed that the Senior VP, Enrollment & Institutional Strategy and VP of Academic and Corporate Development should be evaluated this year.

- 2) Formulation of evaluation questions

Prof. Loiacono pointed out that at many institutions, academic administrators are evaluated by questions that address various categories of their performance, such as Leadership, Budgeting, Communication, Management, and Interpersonal Skills. Our current questions address some, but not all, of these areas, and are phrased broadly. Some institutions develop questions that are asked of all administrators, while we have developed more specific questions for each position. To do this really well, we would need measures of reliability and accuracy for these questions, and we should normalize numerical results. COG discussed whether having numerical answers to questions is really helpful, or whether the evaluation should summarize the responsibilities of the position, and ask the Faculty to provide input on what the person is doing well, and what needs improvement. Some members felt that numbers were useful, and that providing a well-developed definition of what each numerical score represents would be helpful in interpretation of evaluations. Regardless, the members agreed that providing written comments should remain a part of the evaluation instrument.

For the current cycle, COG agreed to modify the current questions somewhat, based on work by Profs. Loiacono, Dominko, Gaudette and Albano, in consultation with the administrators being evaluated. Questions will be finalized at our next meeting.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Liz Ryder