

Committee on Governance: Minutes
Meeting #3: September 11, 2018
Faculty Governance Conference Room (SL 225)

Present: Len Albano (CEE); Kris Boudreau (HUA); Tanja Dominko (Secretary of the Faculty, BBT); Mike Elmes (FBS); Mark Richman (Secretary, ME); Sue Roberts (ChE); David Spanagel (Chair, HUA)

Invited: Kent Rissmiller (Dean, IGSD); Kris Wobbe (Assoc. Dean, UG Studies)

1. Prof. Spanagel called the meeting to order at 11:03am; the agenda was approved as amended.
2. The minutes of COG meeting #2 from Sept. 4, 2018 were approved as distributed.
3. Updates on COG appointments:
 - The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) needs a replacement for Prof. Ludwig (ECE), who has been appointed Interim Department Head of the ECE Dept. Prof. Ludwig had been elected to a three-year term (2018-2021). COG will appoint Prof. Faber (HUA), the next runner-up in the COAP election conducted in spring 2018, to serve for one year until a member can be elected to COAP this coming spring for the remainder of the unexpired term.
 - COG appointed Prof. Cowlagi (ME) to the Committee on Information Technology Policy for a three-year term (2018-2021).
 - COG needs to appoint two faculty members to the Campus Appeals Board (one for a two-year term, one for a one-year term). COG will contact the two highest runners-up in the Campus Hearing Board election conducted in spring 2018 to gauge their interest in serving.
4. Roles and Responsibilities of Deans: Prof. Spanagel will contact President Leshin for an update from her on the report on the roles and responsibilities of Deans prepared by Provost Bursten. The report was requested by COG in fall 2016, and COG hopes that it will have an opportunity to provide its input before the report is finalized.
5. Further Consideration of the Proposal to Form a New Academic Global Unit:
(Prof. Rissmiller and Prof. Wobbe joined the meeting as invited contributors.)
Based on discussion at COG's Sept. 4 meeting, the committee had submitted to the Provost specific requests for additional information concerning the administration's proposal to form a new academic global unit. COG received a response from the co-Chairs of the Global Impact Division advisory group, Prof. Rissmiller and Prof. Wobbe, who formulated their own responses to COG's requests and made clear that their responses had not benefitted from recent discussion with more senior administrators. (The requests made by COG for additional information with Prof. Rissmiller's and Prof. Wobbe's written responses inserted are included as an appendix to these minutes.) COG expressed its sincere appreciation to both Prof. Rissmiller and Prof. Wobbe for their prompt written responses to COG's request for additional information, and for their willingness to attend today's meeting.

COG members asked why the proposal was for a school rather than for an academic unit that intersected equally with Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and Business. Profs. Rissmiller and Wobbe explained that the proposed global school would deliver its own curriculum (with majors, minors, and concentrations), and would have advantages for the tenure and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty members in the school. They pointed out that the idea of a global school came from the Global Impact Division advisory committee. With respect to curriculum, COG members were concerned that the proposal

contained no quantitative information about the current and projected numbers of students in academic programs currently and to be administered within the proposed school.

COG members stressed the importance of having a clear administrative organizational chart to evaluate in advance. COG members asked about the status of the job description for the Dean's position. Prof. Rissmiller explained that he had given Provost Bursten a draft, but that incoming Provost Soboyejo would have to review it. In response to COG concerns that a clear vision of the proposed global unit had not yet been formed, Prof. Rissmiller expressed the view that the new Dean should have significant input into the school's future form and functions.

COG members asked about the number of TTT faculty members (beyond the two such faculty searches authorized this year) that the administration was committed to hiring for the school and the number of TTT faculty members who would be affiliated with the school.

COG members asked for an anticipated annual budget (administrative, instructional, and operational) that would be required for the school and expressed concern that no specific expense projections had been provided so far. Prof. Rissmiller explained that the budget would start with what is already provided to IGSD and GPS for its operations, and speculated that growth beyond that level would be incremental. He also pointed out that while no specific commitments had been made, significant fundraising efforts related to the proposed global initiative were underway as part of the new campaign. As an example of one anticipated additional expense, COG members asked if the cost of the new Dean were known. Prof. Rissmiller explained that the current FY 19 budget included funding for the Dean's office, but he did not provide the dollar amount and did not know how those funds might be allocated to address all the costs (i.e. salary, travel, support) of the office.

COG members had collected examples of detailed internal proposals for new schools put forward in the past at other universities and offered to share them with Profs. Rissmiller and Wobbe. While a proposal at WPI need not be quite as detailed, COG members expressed a general concern that there was an absence of specificity in the current proposal with respect to administrative structure, faculty structure, budget, curriculum, and the scale of anticipated growth in these areas.

Prof. Spanagel will contact President Leshin to describe COG's current efforts to act on the proposal and the need to have the administration provide the information requested.

6. The meeting adjourned at 12:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Richman
Secretary, COG

Appendix:

COG's requests for additional information concerning a proposed Academic Global Unit
(with Prof. Rissmiller's and Prof. Wobbe's responses inserted in *italics*)

1) **Requests for critical information:**

a. Describe the Administrative Structure of the Proposed Unit:

- i. Include Deans; Assoc. Deans; Directors; Department Heads; Administrative support staff, etc. What will the structure be at first and how is it anticipated to evolve?

Further discussion is anticipated with the new Provost on this issue.

- ii. Provide job descriptions for any anticipated new Dean's, Director's, or Department Head's positions.

Our immediate plan is to hire someone to replace the interim Dean of the IGSD with the title of Dean of the Global School. That is not a new position. There are no new deans, directors or department heads anticipated at this time. In the longer term, we would recommend a director of global partnerships. A job description will be generated when budget planning will allow us to move forward with this position.

b. Describe the Faculty Structure of the Proposed Unit:

- i. Who are the current faculty members (TTs and NTTs) who will be affiliated with the unit immediately?

The faculty immediately affiliated with the Global School will be those full time faculty currently affiliated with the IGSD and the Great Problems Seminar.

- ii. What is the projection for growth in the number of faculty members affiliated with the unit? How will the opening and addition of TTT and NTT faculty lines within the division be determined?

IGSD has been authorized to search for two TT faculty his academic year. We have added significant adjunct support in the past two years to accommodate our goal of Global Projects for All. We would support additional hiring to be less reliant on adjunct faculty for instruction and advising. Growth of faculty will be determined as it is for any other unit on campus- by need and opportunity as approved through the budget planning process.

- iii. Address the possibility of raising the status of our Continuing NTTs by providing paths to tenure for and long-term commitments to our valued teaching professors.

IGSD has been given two tenure track lines that all the current NTT faculty are eligible to apply for. Their jobs are not at risk and these are not replacement lines. The Global School will continue to receive TT lines as appropriate to its growth and in the same manner as other units.

One item of business that we will need to partner on is ensuring that 'scholarship' in the tenure criteria matches the current definition of scholarship for promotion. The faculty in the Global School, more than the faculty in other units, are likely to be involved in the scholarship of engagement, integration and application and practice. We hope that

COG will work with CTAF to expand the definition of scholarship for this important process.

- iv. By what process and by what criteria will faculty members become affiliated with the unit as it evolves? Will there be the different types of affiliations (i.e. full, partial, etc.) that faculty members can have with the unit?

As with other units on campus, affiliate appointments will be possible and will follow established practice, with both the faculty member and the head of the unit agreeing that the affiliation will be mutually beneficial and the appropriate documentation being prepared.

Will “unaffiliated” faculty members be eligible to advise IQP’s and serve as IQP project center advisors?

WPI will continue to need and value the participation of faculty from across the campus, in all units, as IQP advisors, project center advisors and directors. Additionally, the Great Problems Seminars will also continue to utilize faculty from all units in delivering this foundational piece of our project-based curriculum.

Will anything change with respect to eligibility and involvement in IQP advising?

There will be no changes to either eligibility or involvement in IQP advising for faculty within or outside the Global School.

- v. From which and from how wide a range of academic disciplines will the proposed unit’s faculty be associated?

GPS faculty are associated with the departments of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Biology and Biotechnology, Humanities and Arts and Social Science and Policy Studies. It is likely that the preponderance of faculty in the Global School will have social science, humanities or area studies backgrounds. We would, however, encourage faculty from all disciplines to think about how they might contribute to global learning and the Global School.

With such a wide range of academic disciplines within the division, how would tenure reviews and the tenure process work for tenure-track faculty members within the unit?

Tenure reviews and the tenure process are well established in the faculty handbook and already serve the entire range of disciplines found at WPI. The process used to tenure two faculty within IGSD served WPI well, and will continue to be used until such time as it is appropriate to adopt the mechanism used by all other departments.

- c. Provide a Projected Itemized Budget for the Proposed Division:

- i. Include administrative costs, instructional salaries, and operational expenses. Indicate how this proposed budget compares to the current costs of our global programs.

Expenses for the Global School are currently in the operating budget of the IGSD and the salary lines for the GPS. In the annual budget process, we normally request support for new project centers and faculty. We anticipate hiring an administrative assistant in the dean’s suite in the FIS, when permitted. The salary for the dean was included in the

FY19 budget. The FY20 budget will also be marginally greater due to the two hires already approved.

- ii. Indicate anticipated growth in budget over time.

Budget growth at this time is largely driven by the addition of new project centers, which have been added and proposed to meet demand in the Global Program and to have openings for all students. These include both HUA and MQP opportunities as well as pilot and full IQP centers. Costs have been partially offset by increasing philanthropy in support of project centers and the current Campaign includes fund raising to support project centers.

d. Describe Planned Curriculum to be Administered through the Proposed Unit:

- i. Undergraduate majors, minors, and concentrations – include expected number of enrolled students over time.

Currently there are few degree granting programs that would fall into the Global School: International and Global Studies major and minor, and the Global Public Health minor. These graduate a few students every year. Once the unit is established there are opportunities for several additional programs that have been identified in the GIDIAG report. Any new degree programs would follow faculty handbook procedures for approval.

- ii. Graduate degree programs – include expected number of enrolled students over time.

There are no current graduate programs that would fall into the Global School. Any new programs would be proposed through the standard procedures and require faculty approval. Several have been envisioned and are mentioned in the GIDIAG report as possibilities.

2) Critical Questions to be Addressed:

- a. Why should the proposed division be its own school, particularly when our global programs belong to the whole campus? Are there other academic structures that might be more consistent with our campus-wide ownership of our global programs? And might the academic Head of one of those other campus-wide structures be more analogous to a Dean of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, or to a VPR than to a Dean of Engineering or Arts and Sciences or Business?

Our ambition to offer degree granting programs is the key element that distinguishes this as a school, and dissimilar to the operations of the deans of graduate or undergraduate studies and the VPR. The Global School is also appropriate because the dean and associate deans hire and supervise faculty with expertise to lead the development of the Global Projects Program, the GPS for all students and coordinate the delivery of these programs with participation from the faculty at large. Certainly this will have some differences from the other schools, as the activities will be more broadly shared by faculty outside of the unit. However, there are similarities: the ES courses belong to no department, and faculty from all engineering departments contribute to their delivery. Similarly, units all over campus provide courses that are key elements for the degrees of other departments. WPI is a very cohesive university and our desire is NOT to separate the global activities into a single unit, but rather to better coordinate and leverage the global activities of the all those involved across campus.

- b. If the goal is to coordinate disparate global activities, could this be achieved by a Director of Global Programs rather than a Dean.

The title of Dean carries, for better or worse, weight and authority that Director does not. A dean will be at the table for more decision making, in APBP, for example, ensuring that the global activities get the attention that they deserve, both within and outside the Institute. And more than coordinating, the Dean will provide vision to lead WPI to new accomplishments and greater visibility in the global arena. As our world is increasingly global, WPI is increasingly well placed to produce graduates equipped for the new landscape, serve as an example to other universities and continue our work in supporting communities in their efforts to make progress. It behooves us to provide the person responsible for overseeing these activities the platform they need to best support and promote these activities. A deanship is a better platform (and the "director" title is currently in use).

- c. Provide specific foreseeable examples of how grouping our current global activities and efforts within the proposed division will lead to improvements, new opportunities, and efficiencies?

Grouping our current global curriculum, project work and global partnerships will elevate the visibility and reputation of global learning and the Global Projects Program at WPI which should be a key element of our identity. It will enable better coordination among our programs and activities and will create a forum for the exploration of new programming. The most obvious new opportunities would be the development of degree-granting programs as mentioned above.