

Committee on Governance  
Meeting #20, AY 2015/16  
March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
Morgan Room, Rubin Campus Center

In Attendance:

Provost Bruce Bursten, Chrysanthe Demetry, Tanja Dominko, Daniel Dougherty, Glenn Gaudette (Chair), Mark Richman, Diane Strong, Suzanne Weekes (Secretary), Ravi Datta (guest, member of COAP), Peter Hansen (guest, member of COAP), Micha Hofri (guest, member of COAP), Bill Martin (guest, member of COAP), Brian Savilonis (guest, Chair of COAP)

1) The meeting was called to order at 12:07 pm and the agenda was approved as amended.

2. Prof. Gaudette welcomed the members of COAP to the COG meeting. COAP discussed a proposal from the task Force on Promotion, discussed and modified by COAP, for establishing departmental Professional Development Advisory Committees (PDAC) that would be responsible for reviewing tenured Associate Professors, Continuing Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty, and tenured full Professors in a format much like the departmental tenure committees. Inclusion of guidelines in the Faculty Handbook that would describe the mechanism for review and its timing, as well as establish guidelines for the review would ensure that the post-tenure process (like pre-tenure), is a structured and productive system.

3. While some COAP members favor a more prescriptive approach by establishing Professional Development Advisory Committees composed of elected department faculty and the department head, COG believes that substantial differences between tenure and promotion dictate a broader mechanism, a major component of which should emphasize mentoring. Since nominations for promotions may originate outside of the Faculty member's department, a mechanism that would allow each Faculty member to choose a senior mentor who could either be in or outside of his or her department might provide more appropriate flexibility. As a joint review, advice and counseling from the senior mentor and the respective Department Head may be more productive (though without a decision-making responsibility) and might be a way to provide the kind of formal review opportunities suggested by COAP. Annual reviews between the faculty member and the department Head should also be improved to focus on professional development. Prof. Hansen felt that this more individualized approach suggested by COG would not provide enough structure to the process, the lack of which was of major concern in the COACHE survey.

Several concerns were raised about PDACs: it would be difficult to constitute a committee in smaller departments with few Full Professors; some department Heads are themselves Associate Professors; and the opinion or advice of a departmental committee could be biased and would not accurately interpret candidate's activities and aspirations across departments and disciplines. Both COAP and COG agreed however that the department culture in support of faculty development should be strengthened.

Some members of COAP also discussed their concerns about ambiguity of criteria for promotion that remain widely open for interpretation. Both COAP and COG agree that the goal to make the criteria and processes be made clearer.

4. The minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of COG were approved as amended.

- 2) COG will continue developing a recommendation for a mechanism that will address both the composition of an advisory body for candidates for promotions (structure) and advisory and mentoring resources.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Prof. Suzanne L. Weekes  
Secretary of the Committee on Governance