

Committee on Governance Meeting #23 (2015-16)
Monday, March 28, 2016, 11:00 am – 12:00 pm
Faculty Governance Conference Room (SL 225)

In Attendance:

Provost Bruce Bursten, Chrysanthe Demetry, Tanja Dominko (the Meeting #23 Acting Chair and Secretary), Daniel Dougherty, Mark Richman, Diane Strong, Suzanne Weekes

Absent: Glenn Gaudette (Chair)

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 am.

1. Consideration of Agenda

Agenda was approved as presented.

2. Review minutes from meeting #22

Minutes from the meeting #22 were approved as distributed.

3. Change in CGSR membership

The committee approved the CGSR Motion to update the CGSR membership description in Faculty Handbook. The motion will be presented for discussion at the April 14 Faculty meeting.

4. Stopping the Tenure Clock motion from CTAF

During the last academic year, CTAF and COG were revising language in the Faculty Handbook in order to clarify the procedures for *Stopping the Tenure Clock*.

Prof. Demetry reviewed a draft proposal (from COG's April 1, 2015 meeting) to modify the language of the provision in the Faculty Handbook concerning stoppage of the tenure clock due to the arrival of a new child. The proposal effectively combined the language of the current policy with the language proposed by CTAF to make it clear that under the conditions specified, tenure track faculty members are entitled to stop the tenure clock and that stoppage of tenure clock will automatically be granted upon written notification by the faculty member to the Provost. The proposal also includes an explicit statement that the tenure review of a faculty member who has had the tenure clock stopped during his or her probationary period will be conducted under the same tenure criteria as a candidate who has not stopped the tenure clock.

Additional modifications included changing the title of the appropriate subsection from the "**Child Bearing**" Provision to the "**New Child**" Provision, in which the definition of "**expecting a (new) child**" would include (for both men and women) **biological and adopted children**. Also, "**child bearing and child rearing**" language was changed to "**parenting**".

Several COG members voiced their concern that the proposed language was too vague in describing the time range within which notification of tenure-clock stoppage should be given, especially in the case of adoption proceedings not concluding with an adoption. These concerns will be addressed before bringing the proposal to the Faculty for approval.

5. Elections for standing faculty committees

COG formulated preliminary ballots for CAO and CAP. The remaining preliminary ballots will be completed at the next meeting for FAP, FRC and CGSR.

6. Report to Faculty on TTT/NTT credits delivered

- a) Review of data: In the most recent academic year (2014-15) to be included in the report to the Faculty, TTT faculty members delivered only 51.5 percent of the total number of the academic credits delivered to all WPI students. Prof. Richman shared additional information about total number of credits delivered by various Divisions (A&S, Eng, Bus, IGSD, other) and Departments in 2014-15, and included the proportion of credits delivered by TTT Faculty within each. Data describing the credits delivered by Corporate and Professional Education (CPE) was presented for the same year. Because the CPE information is available for the first time this academic year, it will be presented separately from academic divisions.

- b) Recommendations for report: Two points were raised last year and were used as starting points for this year's discussion:
 - *Last year, COG expressed its concern that the TTT Faculty were not delivering a significant majority of the academic credit offered to our students.*

 - The Provost asked questions about the history of the Significant Majority statement in the Faculty handbook and commented that an instant analysis would not be appropriate. This will be further discussed at the April 14th Faculty meeting.

 - *Last year, COG asked three questions: How can WPI meet its commitment to increase the TTT Faculty at a rate commensurate with the University's recent growth? And, what is the goal for the size of the TTT Faculty and how will we get there?*

Prof. Richman stressed the importance of not just looking at the past and current credits-data, but also developing an institutional strategy for addressing the appropriate size of TTT Faculty. The strategy should include modeling the size of TTT Faculty body needed to accomplish institutional goals for increased research funding (50% in three years), various possible "majority" percentages (55%, 60%, 65%) of credits delivered by TTT, evaluation and modification of TTT current responsibilities, anticipation of TTT retirements, desired profiles of new TTT Faculty hires, etc. Prof. Dominko agreed that the Academic Affairs Division should develop these models based on the needs to accomplish the above institutional goals. Once models for Faculty growth have been developed, the resources needed for their implementation can be discussed; rather than the other way around.

The Provost said that more detailed data would also be helpful in order to begin to develop strategies to address this question.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM.

Tanja Dominko
Secretary