

Committee on Governance: Minutes
Meeting #5 (2019-20)
Tuesday, September 24, 2019, 3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
Faculty Governance Conference Room

Present: Kris Boudreau (HUA, Secretary), Tanja Dominko (BBT, Secretary of the Faculty), Glenn Gaudette (BME, Chair), Arne Gericke (CBC), Mark Richman (ME), Susan Roberts (ChE), Wole Soboyejo (Provost *ad interim*)

1) Prof. Gaudette called the meeting to order at 3:07; the agenda was approved.

2) The minutes of meeting #4 were approved with slight revisions.

3) Nominating Ballot for the Search Committee for the Dean of the Global School:

Given COG's decision (endorsed by entire faculty at the September 5 faculty meeting) to balance both TTT and NTT membership on the search committee, assembling a ballot with both groups introduced new and unanticipated challenges arising from including NTT faculty members for the first time. COG expressed its appreciation to Prof. Dominko for all the extra work required both to coordinate with the Provost's office to ensure that faculty lists were accurate, and to distribute the ballots almost immediately after the September 5 faculty meeting despite these complications.

Consistent with the flexibility intended in the Faculty Handbook to omit certain categories of faculty from the ballot depending on the nature of the position and the search, in this case the ballots did not include any academic administrators. Because the goal was to ensure not only equal membership for NTTs on the search committee, but also their equal voice, the decision not to include academic administrators was made in large part to avoid the possibly uncomfortable position (for at least some NTTs) that the search committee would include one or more NTT faculty member and the academic dean(s) with authority over them.

Nevertheless, the committee was willing to consider the delicate balance that must be struck between allowing maximum choice for voters in a democratic process, on the one hand, and trying to mitigate circumstances that might impede the most open participation by NTTs search committee members, on the other. After a lengthy discussion, in which committee members expressed their understanding of both sides of the balance, COG voted unanimously to issue new nomination ballots that will include all the academic administrators except the President and the Provost

4) Appointments of academic administrators: Professor Dominko asked that this item be placed on COG's agenda because a lack of clarity regarding academic administrative positions and appointments can lead to lapses in protocol regarding faculty involvement in what should be collaborative decisions. Provost Soboyejo suggested forming a COG subcommittee that would work on new language for the *Faculty Handbook* and new operating procedures for Academic Affairs; these new processes and policies would clarify how new academic administrative positions are created and filled. Importantly, these new processes would be arrived at collaboratively. The Provost also suggested that processes be designed to allow meaningful interaction between faculty and those domains beyond Academic Affairs with functions that affect academic operations. COG members observed that some faculty governance committees (i.e., Financial & Administrative Policy) already do engage in this kind of interaction; it was suggested that chairs of these committees might be valuable participants in a COG subcommittee. The process by which leadership opportunities for faculty members are identified and made available is a distinct but related issue that the subcommittee might also address. COG and the Provost will follow up to form a

subcommittee that includes the Provost, Prof. Roberts, Prof. El-Korchi, and the faculty governance chairs who are willing to serve.

The Provost also indicated that some of the nonacademic administrators oversee functions that do interface with faculty, and in these cases he would like to develop an approach that provides meaningful interaction between faculty and these administrators. This would require a different process, whereby COG would identify the elements of these administrative roles affecting academic operations. Noting that how we begin these interactions is critical, the Provost suggested that he would set up initial meetings between a COG subcommittee and these administrative Leaders.

- 5) Faculty review of administrators: COG has spent the past several years revising this process to make it more useful to the people under review. Last year's review of four administrators elicited positive reactions from those people under review. The sentiment was expressed by some COG members that we rely on the time COG has spent in the past several years fine-tuning the review process rather than spend much committee time tinkering further with the process as we carry out this year's evaluations. Following last year's discussion in COG about using faculty reviews of administrators as one component in a 360-degree review administered by the President or Provost, the committee today considered whether COG needs to do anything more than administer the faculty review and forward that information to others, who would see that it is used appropriately into a 360 review. Following the recommendations in the BGWG report, the matter will also be discussed by the JCC. The conversation turned to Department Heads, with some COG members expressing some interest in thinking about how 360 reviews might be used for more complete assessments of Department Heads.
- 6) The meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kris Boudreau
Secretary, COG