

Committee on Governance: Minutes
Meeting #22: Tuesday, March 31, 2020
Via Zoom from our respective bunkers

Present: Kris Boudreau (Secretary, HUA), Tanja Dominko (Secretary of the Faculty, BBT), Tahar El-Korchi (CEE), Glenn Gaudette (BME), Arne Gericke (CBC), Mark Richman (ME), Sue Roberts (ChE), and Wole Soboyejo (Provost).

1. Professor Gaudette called the meeting to order at 2:12. The agenda was approved.
2. The minutes from meetings #20 and #21 were approved.
3. Proposal to stop the tenure clock: Prof. Gaudette received a proposal from CTAF allowing pre-tenure faculty to extend their tenure clock for one year given disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. For guidance, Prof. Gaudette shared AAUP's "Principles for Higher Education Response to COVID-19." CTAF's proposal allows faculty to extend their tenure clock by giving written notification to Department Head, Dean, and Provost by the end of D term 2021. In general, COG members favor the spirit of this proposal. Discussion focused on how best to implement it. Because there might be some stigma attached to requesting an extension, COG recommended an automatic extension with a provision for faculty to opt out (with letters of appointment being automatically changed, giving an extra year before the tenure decision) that allows each faculty member to opt in writing to keep their tenure clock as is, with the written documentation of the faculty member's decision kept in the Provost's office, the faculty member's file, CTAF/Faculty Governance, and the faculty member's glove box. The committee also agreed that faculty who go up for tenure at their originally established time not be considered early candidates for tenure. COG voted to amend the motion and return it to CTAF for their consideration.
4. Proposal to revise Department Tenure Committee membership for faculty whose primary responsibilities are to a program: Resuming the discussion from last week's meeting, COG considered a proposal from CTAF to create Program Tenure Committees (PTCs) to replace Department Tenure Committees (DTCs) for faculty members whose primary responsibilities are to a specific program. The formation of the PTCs would in many ways mirror the process for forming Interdepartmental Tenure Committees (ITCs), but with the difference that in the case of PTCs, both elected members would come from the candidate's home department (rather than coming from two different departments as with ITCs). COG continued its consideration of the implications of drawing both elected members from a single department, particularly in the many cases of interdisciplinary home programs. A possible alternative mechanism was suggested: a PTC comprising the Department Head, Program Director, and the senior member of the DTC. COG reached no consensus about this alternative. Some members were concerned that the current proposal allows a candidate from an interdisciplinary program to be represented by only one person (the Program Director) with input from the

interdisciplinary program, while another worried that the proposed revision would allow a person to be tenured in a given department with only two votes from that department. COG also considered the problems of splitting a single vote between the Department Head from the home department and the Program Director, even though this feature of CTAF's proposal replicates the process in place for ITCs. While COG supports the spirit of the proposal, members need more clarity about the split vote. Prof. Gaudette will invite Prof. Deskins to attend an upcoming COG meeting.

5. Faculty loading model: Prof. Gaudette asked Provost Soboyejo for an update on the effort to develop a faculty load model. The Provost indicated that the Deans and Department Heads are trying to understand the nuances from each department about contributions to teaching, research, and service. The Provost expects their reports next week in order to understand what is meant by a full load in particular disciplines; these reports will help establish loading standards that are appropriate to each department when planning the course grid each year. COG members asked whether faculty have any role in establishing these standards. The Provost indicated his desire that every faculty member would be able to attest that they have been included in these conversations, and his intent to ask every Dean whether that has been the case. He emphasized that Department Heads, the primary contact for discipline-specific loading, would lead the process of gathering information. Several COG members noted that not all departments have had these formal discussions. In view of the profound importance of faculty loads in delivering on our academic mission, several COG members were dismayed that faculty governance has been excluded from this project. The Provost welcomed suggestions about how faculty governance can play a role in this process. The discussion will be resumed at a future COG meeting.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 3:36.

Respectfully submitted,

Kris Boudreau
Secretary, COG