

**WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC
INSTITUTE
February 7, 2019**

To: The WPI Faculty

From: Tanja Dominko
Secretary of the Faculty

The sixth Faculty meeting of the 2018-2019 academic year will be held on **Thursday, February 7th, 2019 at 3:15 pm in Olin Hall 107.**

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Call to Order | T. Dominko |
| • Approval of the Agenda | |
| • Approval of the Consent Agenda and the Minutes from 1-10-2019 | |
| 2. Faculty Governance report | T. Dominko |
| 3. President's Report | L. Leshin |
| 4. Provost's Report | W. Soboyejo |
| 5. Memorial Resolution | |
| • Prof. William D. Hobey | K. Wobbe |
| 6. Committee Business | |
| • Committee on Governance (COG) | |
| Motion to approve new Faculty Conduct Policy | M. Richman |
| 7. Special Reports | |
| • Accomplishments of the Dean of Arts and Sciences | J. King |
| • Accomplishments of the Senior VP | K. Tichenor |
| 8. New Business | |
| 9. Adjournment | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Faculty Meeting Materials, February 7, 2019

	Page
1. Faculty Meeting Minutes: January 10, 2019	3
2. Consent Agenda	6
3. Committee Business	
• Committee on Governance (COG)	
Faculty Conduct Policy (Attachment)	11

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Faculty Meeting Minutes
January 10, 2019

Summary:

1. Call to Order
2. Secretary's Report
3. President's Report
4. Provost's Report
5. Memorial Resolution- Prof. Carlton W. Staples
6. Committee Reports: COG
7. New Business
8. Adjournment

Detail:

1. Call to Order

The fifth Faculty meeting of the 2018-2019 academic year was called to order in Olin Hall 107 by **Prof. Dominko** (BBT). She reminded everyone that the meeting is being recorded for the purpose of accuracy in taking minutes. The agenda and the consent agenda (including the minutes from the December 6, 2018 Faculty meeting) were approved.

2. Secretary's Report

Prof. Dominko reported on recent progress in discussions between the Board Administration and Faculty Governance (**Addendum #1** attached to these minutes). Faculty Committee Chairs and other elected members of Faculty Committees have met several times with the Board of Trustees, the President and the Provost to outline the process and the timeline for revision of the proposed bylaws. The collaboration would assure that bylaws are revised in a manner that will include meaningful Faculty input.

As a consequence, the Board of Trustees met in Executive Session on December 7, 2018, where they approved the Bylaws and Governance Working Group charter and extended the deadline for implementation of revised Bylaws to the end of the academic year. This group was established to develop recommendations to amend subsets of the pending by-laws, in particular Articles IV and XI, as they relate to Faculty and Academic enterprise. The second charge is to develop recommendations for improved collaborative engagement between Trustees, Faculty and the Board. The charter also outlines the process for frequent communication across campus and with all constituencies, providing updates to the progress of the work of the group. The intent, in the end, and before the Board meeting in May, is to agree on a consensus recommendation document that will then be presented to Faculty for discussion in April and for endorsement at the May Faculty Meeting. Updates on the progress will be shared at the February and March Faculty meetings as well. Prof. Dominko listed the eight members of the By-Laws and Governance Working Group (BGWG): President Leshin (Chair), Provost Soboyejo, Profs. Cocola, Dominko, Kmiotek, Richman and Trustees Aberdale and Hall. She announced the two means of expressing concerns and thoughts to the group, and keeping up with current documents regarding the work of the group: by email BGWG@wpi.edu or website: www.wpi.edu/+bgwg. She reiterated the importance of agreeing on a consensus document, and promised on behalf of the group, to honor Faculty concerns with currently proposed Bylaws.

3. President's Report

President Leshin thanked everyone for the kind and positive remarks she had received over the past few weeks and the many opportunities for advancement at WPI, through collaboration between Faculty and Administration. She spoke about the February Board meeting and the five-year integrated institutional plan for increasing the Tenure and Tenure-track Faculty body from 250 to 300. She spoke about the space problem on campus, and the hopes of a new academic building being approved by the Board of Trustees, as well as renovations for Kaven Hall, Olin Hall and Stratton Hall. The President thanked the Faculty members for participating in the annual budget process: Profs. Dominko (Secretary of the Faculty), Burnham (Chair of FAP) and Gaudette (Member of the Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee). She encouraged everyone to contact her with thoughts and concerns, and to contact anyone on the BGWG with thoughts as well, and stated that the committee will meet on Saturday, January 12, 2019 to start their work.

4. Provost's Report

Provost Soboyejo has spent the past month reflecting on the past year and looking forward to the year that lies ahead. He is very excited about the opportunities to work together in teams that will develop our ideas and collective interests in communities of faculty, staff and students with combined interests in purpose-driven research, scholarship, education and service.

Within this context, several meetings were organized over the past few months to bring together potential stakeholders that can help build cross-cutting interdisciplinary group efforts in areas that are of strategic interest to WPI: Materials and Manufacturing, Bio-X, The Smart World, and Global Initiatives.

These groups will be meeting over the next few weeks to solicit inputs into group research, education and outreach activities. The future of work event will be held in March of 2019 for Bio, Smart World, Materials & Manufacturing, Global Initiatives, and Project Based Learning/STEM Education.

Additional activities will be organized and take place over the next few months:

- Research Workshop – with the Deans, VPR, and RSI Research Team.
- Global School Engagement of faculty and key stakeholders over the next few months
- Collaboration of Academics with Faculty Governance and Administration in exciting new projects:
 - Bylaw Working Group
 - Five Year Plan & New Building & Interdisciplinary Programs
 - Sustainability New Global Programs, PBL and STEM Education
 - Celebrating Teaching and Service at WPI & Trustees, President

He looks forward to working with all members of the WPI team in what promises to be yet another exciting year at WPI. He thanked all for their support and wished everyone a happy new year.

5. Memorial Resolution

Prof. Savilonis (ME) read a Memorial Resolution for Prof. Carlton W. Staples who passed away in 2015. (See **Addendum #2** attached to these minutes.) The resolution passed and a moment of silence was observed in Prof. Staples' honor.

6. Committee Reports COG

Prof. Richman (ME), for the Committee on Governance (COG) presented Draft Faculty Conduct Policy (**Addendum #3**, attached to these minutes). Prof. Richman reviewed the changes and improvements that have been made to the policy. **Prof. Samson** (HUA) stated that he hopes there is a system for detecting frivolous cases. Prof. Richman encouraged all wording changes and suggestions be

submitted to the committee. **Prof. Gericke** (CBC) inquired about some inconsistencies in the slides of the presentation. Prof. Richman stated that it was an error in the presentation, but that it was correct in the actual policy. **Prof. Hakim** (ECE) asked that, when this policy is placed in the Faculty Handbook, if Administration had the right to overlook it, and should the Handbook be considered a legal contract for the Faculty members. Prof. Hakim also suggested that there needs to be a process in place if this policy is violated. He stated that there needs to be a balance for those who are powerless, and those with all the power, and asked what the obligations of the institute are. Prof. Richman explained that, to avoid duplication of effort, the Dean will begin the process, and if necessary, appoint three faculty members to assess the credibility of any particular complaint. **Prof. Boudreau** (HUA) added that the working group is dealing with these issues, and that not all the items can be written into the policy. She also stated that, once in the Faculty Handbook, Faculty members should familiarize themselves with this and every other policy, for their own protection. She explained that protections in the policy were not removed, that they were reallocated, as a compromise of everyone involved. **Prof. Demetriou** (ME) asked about a situation involving the Secretary of the Faculty. Prof. Richman stated that it is difficult to write every scenario into the policy, but that it would be taken into consideration. Prof. Demetriou also asked if the Judicial Committee could abstain from voting. Prof. Dominko stated that each member would be obligated to cast a vote. **Prof. Martin** (MA) asked if a charge was brought against a group of individuals, would they be charged together, or individually. Prof. Richman stated they would be charged individually. **Prof. Sullivan** (ME) stated that the President should complete a written report when agreeing with the committee and when disagreeing. Prof. Richman stated that the committee would take that into consideration. **Prof. Mathews** (BBT) asked for clarification on definitions of regular and irregular ties when committee votes are cast. Prof. Boudreau (HUA) spoke about compromises that were made by both Administration/Trustees and Faculty but believes that the proposed language strengthens protections for the Faculty. Prof. Hakim (ECE) mentioned that, along with protection of Faculty with this policy, the Staff should be protected as well. Prof. Demetriou (ME) suggested having an odd number of individuals on the Judicial Committee, instead of an even number. Prof. Richman stated that the even number assure that the responsibilities would be shared evenly.

7. New Business

Prof. Billiar (BME) introduced Assistant Professor H. Zhang, a new faculty member joining BME and Robotics Program.

8. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm by **Prof. Dominko**.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Dominko, Secretary of the Faculty

Addenda on file with these minutes:

1. Addendum #1 Faculty Governance Report, Secretary of the Faculty Dominko – January 10, 2019
2. Addendum #2 Memorial Resolution, Professor Carleton W. Staples – January 10, 2019
3. Addendum #3 Committee Reports: COG, Faculty Conduct Policy presentation – January 10, 2019

Appendix: Consent Agenda Motions

Committee on Academic Operations:

- MS MOTION (remove ML2091)
- MS MOTION (remove ML3023)
- HUA MOTION (remove RE 2724 and RE2723)
- HUA MOTION (add RE 2725)

Date: February 7, 2019
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mattson, Chair)

Re: Motion to remove Leadership Training Course, ML 2091 from the undergraduate catalog, approved by Department Head, LTC Adam Heppe and the Military Science Instructors on November 29, 2018.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move, that the Leadership Training Course, ML 2091 be removed from the undergraduate catalog.

Rationale: *ML 2091 is a course that Cadets may sign up for to receive credit, however it is a military training camp held at Fort Knox, KY. The Registrar's Office has confirmed that there has only been two students registered for this course since 2000; one registration in 2003 and one registration in 2004. There is no reason to believe the removal of this course would impact students.*

Course description: Leadership Training Course (LTC) puts each cadet through 24 days of pushing themselves to the mental and physical limits, while enhancing leadership, problem solving and teamwork skills. Cadets are put through extensive leadership training, which includes leadership reaction scenarios; Land Navigation exercises, first aid training. Cadets must pass the Army Fitness Test (APFT) in order to graduate.

Changes to catalog: removal

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: N/A. This course does not impact distribution requirements.

What term is this course typically offered and is it Cat. I or Cat. II? This course is typically offered in summer term. The course is listed as Category I.

If there is a course to replace this, which one? No.

Are any changes to resource requirements. N/A

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2019-2020 Academic year.

Date: February 7th, 2019
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mattson, Chair)

Re: Motion to remove Leadership Development and Assessment Course, ML 3023 from the undergraduate catalog, approved by Department Head, LTC Adam Heppe and the Military Science Instructors on November 29, 2018.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move, that the Leadership Development and Assessment Course, ML 3023 be removed from the undergraduate catalog.

Rationale: *ML 3023 is a course that Cadets may sign up for to receive credit, however it is a military training camp held at Fort Knox, KY. The Registrar's Office has confirmed that there has only been eight students registered for this course since 2000; five registrations in 2003 and three registrations in 2004. There is no reason to believe the removal of this course would impact students.*

Course description: Leadership Development and Assessment Course (LDAC) puts each Cadet through 32 days of intensive individual, squad and platoon-level training to assess his/her leadership potential. Each Cadet is measured against 17 leadership dimensions in such subjects as physical stamina, technical competence, delegation, decisiveness, problem analysis and several Army values, among others. Instruction and evaluation at LDAC is progressive, building skills in individual subjects like Army Physical Fitness Test, basic military skills and land navigation, followed by such skill-building exercises as Individual Tactical Training.

Note changes to catalog: removal

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: N/A. This course does not impact distribution requirements.

What term is this course typically offered and is it Cat. I or Cat. II? This course is typically offered in summer term. This is listed as Category I.

If there is a course to replace this, which one? No.

Any changes to resource requirements. N/A

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2019-2020 Academic year.

Date: February 7th, 2019
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mattson, Chair)

Re: Motion to remove RE 2724 Religions of the East and RE2723 Religions of the West from the undergraduate catalog

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move to remove RE 2724 Religions of the East and RE2723 Religions of the West from the undergraduate catalog.

Rationale: The designated titles of the two courses reflect an outdated conception of the framing of the field of religious studies. The old titles were problematic both in terms of global realities (for example, Indonesian Muslims, American Buddhists, etc.) In addition, instructors cannot provide adequate or fair coverage of three world religious traditions in a seven-week term. These Cat. II course offerings would be replaced with one new catalog designation: RE 272X Religious and Spiritual Traditions as a single Cat. I course.

Provide course descriptions:

RE 2723. RELIGIONS OF THE WEST. *Cat. II* The purpose of this course is to examine, from an historical, doctrinal, scriptural and philosophical perspective, major Western religions. The course will focus primarily on Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Other religions will be examined. The course will attend to the social context in which these religions developed and will examine their continuing influence on Western society. Suggested background: RE/PY 1731 and RE 2721. This course will be offered in 2018-19, and in alternating years thereafter.

RE 2724. RELIGIONS OF THE EAST. *Cat. II* The purpose of this course is to examine, from the perspectives of history text, practice, and philosophy, some or all of the following religions: Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Shinto. The course will attend to the social context in which these religions began, their relations with their culture, their rituals and their continuing influences in the East and West. Suggested background: PY/RE 1731 and RE 2721. This course will be offered in 2019-20, and in alternating years thereafter.

Note changes to catalog:

Replaced with new course offering RE 272X

Impact on distribution requirements: None

Replacement: RE 272X Religious and Spiritual Traditions as a single Cat. I course.

Resource requirements. No additional facility or faculty resources needed.

Implementation Date: We plan to implement this change beginning with the 2019-2020 academic year.

Date: February 7th, 2019
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mattson, Chair)

Re: Motion to add RE 2725 approved by HUA on October 26, 2018

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move that RE2725 Religion and Spiritual Traditions as described below, be added.

Rationale: This single new course would replace the outdated Religions of the West and Religions of the East titles, which were problematic both in terms of global realities and in coverage expectations during a seven-week term. This single new Cat I course would replace both of these older Cat. II offerings. Suggested offerings include: any particular religion, two religions in a topical/comparative approach. Ie. Religions and Nation-States, Religions of North Africa, Religion and Colonialism, comparative indigenous religions, etc. Various global traditions would be presented in a less systematic, more flexible, and perhaps more relevant way. The aim of satisfying student curiosity about religions that are not their own and the departmental goal of religious literacy would remain the same. Course enrollment projected is 50. Previous iterations of Religions of the East and Religions of the West have enrolled 30-50 students each.

Course/Catalog Description: RE2725 Religious and Spiritual Traditions Cat. I. The primary aim of this course would be student literacy in global religions. The course examines, from historical, doctrinal, scriptural and/or philosophical perspectives, major world religious and spiritual traditions. Attention will be given to the social context in which these religious traditions developed and will examine their continuing influence. Students taking RE2725 should not receive credit for RE2723 or RE2724, since RE2725 replaces them.

Recommended background: None

Anticipated Instructors: Beth Eddy, Yunus Telliell, Rebecca Moody

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2019-2020 Academic year.

Resources Needed: No new faculty, classrooms, or other support will be required in the proposed change.

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: Students may count RE2725 as one of the five required courses leading to the Inquiry Seminar in PY/RE or thematically related humanities seminars. If not used toward fulfillment of the Humanities requirement, the course may also be part of PY/RE credit for a major or a minor.

Date: February 7, 2019
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Governance (Prof. Spanagel, Chair)
Re: Motion to adopt a new WPI Faculty Conduct Policy

Motion: On behalf of the Committee on Governance, I move that the proposed WPI Faculty Conduct Policy (included as an Attachment to this motion) replace the current interim WPI Faculty Conduct Policy (in Part One, Appendix A, Subsection C; and in Part Two, Section 1.E) in the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

The purpose of this motion is to introduce a new WPI Faculty Conduct Policy that contains several *improvements*, and would *reconcile* the difference between the version of the Policy approved by the Faculty in February 2014 and the interim Policy approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2018. The improvements and the reconciliation contained in the proposed Policy are described below:

Improvements:

The proposed Policy improves upon both the version of the Policy approved by the Faculty (in February 2014) and the current interim Policy approved by the Board of Trustees (in May 2018) in the following ways:

- 1) *Greater consistency with WPI's existing Research Misconduct Policy and Sexual Misconduct Policy:* The proposed Faculty Conduct Policy is a hybrid that, to the extent possible and where appropriate, is based on procedures used in WPI's current Research Conduct Policy (approved by the Faculty in December 2017) and in WPI's current Sexual Misconduct Policy (approved by the Faculty in May 2018). As such it aligns better with these two existing policies than does the current Faculty Conduct Policy. In particular, while the initial assessment of the allegations by the Dean and the initial inquiry by a committee of three faculty members chosen by the Dean follows the procedures in the Research Misconduct Policy, the Investigative Phase (including the appointment of an Investigator, and a review – and possible hearing – conducted by a Judicial Committee) is based on procedures in the Sexual Misconduct Policy. In addition, the appeals process in the proposed Policy adopts new elements that are common to the appeals processes in both the research Misconduct Policy and the sexual Misconduct Policy.
- 2) *Greater clarity about the grounds for faculty misconduct:* The proposed Faculty Conduct Policy clearly defines the grounds for misconduct as violations of AAUP's Statement of Professional Ethics, which are explicitly stated ethical responsibilities in five areas: teaching and students; scholarship; the University; colleagues; and the community. For further guidance, the proposed Policy also contains examples of each type of violation. By contrast, the current interim Policy on Faculty Conduct defines the grounds for misconduct in vague terms such as "neglect of duty," "personal misconduct," and "neglect of standards expected in the WPI community."
- 3) *More guidance concerning the range of sanctions:* The proposed Policy does away with the confusing distinction between "minor sanctions" and "major sanctions" in the current Policy, and provides clearer guidelines for imposing sanctions by:
 - a. explicitly listing five factors that should be taken into account when deciding on the sanction; and
 - b. explicitly listing twelve possible sanctions in order of severity.

Although these lists are not intended to be exhaustive, they are critical to the Policy because there is a very high likelihood that the members of the Judicial Committee and even the President will not have had much prior experience in making such decisions. The proposed Policy also clarifies that there is a difference between termination of employment and revocation of tenure, and explains that reduction in rank and revocation of tenure are sanctions that are only appropriate in cases where appointment, promotion, or tenure were obtained by fraud or dishonesty.

- 4) *Greater clarity about the function of the Dean and the Faculty Committee at the initial stage of review:* The current Policy gives little guidance to the Dean and to the Faculty Committee with respect to the scope of the

preliminary investigation each should carry out. It is also vague with respect to the standard of judgment to be used by the faculty Committee. By contrast, the proposed Policy makes clear that:

- a. The Dean should simply review the complaint to determine whether or not it meets the definition of misconduct; and
 - b. If the Dean decides that the complaint does meet the definition of misconduct, then the Faculty Committee should review the written complaint, review the Respondent's response, and interview both the Complainant and the Respondent to check the Dean's judgment and to determine if the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of misconduct may be identified.
- 5) *Reduction of duplicated effort between different stages of the process:* The current Policy directs both the Dean and the Faculty Committee (at the initial stage of review) to, in effect, answer the same questions concerning whether the complaint meets the definition of misconduct, and whether it is credible and substantive. Inevitably, therefore, the Faculty Committee will conduct a preliminary investigation that redoes much of the work done by the Dean. In addition, because there is no explicit limitation on the scope of these preliminary investigations, the fact-finding Committee at the formal investigation phase that follows will inevitably duplicate the work done the Dean and the Faculty Committee. By contrast, by gradually and explicitly increasing the scope of inquiry at each successive phase of review, the proposed Policy minimizes such duplication of effort.
- 6) *Reliance on a qualified, unbiased, professional investigator:* The current Policy relies on a five-member faculty fact-finding committee to conduct the full investigation of the allegations. Depending on the complexity of the case, members of the committee may be ill-equipped to carry out such an investigation. By contrast, the proposed Policy adapts the procedures in our Sexual Misconduct Policy to have the Provost, in collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, appoint a qualified, unbiased investigator to carry out an impartial fact-finding investigation who must remain neutral with respect to questions of responsibility and sanctions.
- 7) *Better use of shared decision making:* In the current Policy, the decision of a fact-finding committee consisting of five faculty members concerning the finding of responsibility and the sanction (if any) can (with certain limitations) be overturned by the Provost. By concentrating the authority for the final decision in the hands of a single administrator, and by allowing for the possibility that the decision of a faculty committee can be overturned by a single administrator, the current Policy leaves doubt about the extent to which the final decision resulted from a good faith collaboration between the faculty and the administration. By contrast, in the proposed Policy, the decision concerning the finding of responsibility and the sanction (if any) is made at once by a committee of six members with equal representation from the faculty and from the administration. And the committee's decision is final (unless the vote is tied or the Respondent chooses to appeal). This is a truer form of shared decision making, not only because it eliminates the possibility of having a faculty recommendation overturned by a representative of the administration, but also because it requires that both the faculty representatives and the administrative representatives participate equally throughout the full extended review and deliberation process.
- 8) *Increased grounds for appeal:* In the proposed Policy, the Respondent can appeal the Judicial Committee's decision concerning the finding of responsibility and/or any sanctions for *any reason*. In most cases the appeal would be made to the President. Furthermore, if the President recommends either termination of employment or revocation of tenure, then the Respondent can appeal *both the finding of responsibility and the sanction* to the Board of Trustees, which will render a final decision only after obtaining a recommendation from a separate five-member faculty committee chosen by the Chair of the Board in collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty.

By contrast, in the current interim Policy, the Respondent can *only appeal to the Board of Trustees, and the appeal can only be with respect to the sanction and only when (the Provost) imposes a sanction of termination and removal of tenure.* (If four members of the five-member investigation committee disagree with the Provost's sanction, then the appeal is automatic. If the investigation committee agrees with the Provost, then

the choice to appeal is made by the Respondent.) Unlike in the proposed Policy, the Board currently renders a final decision without relying on an additional recommendation from a separate faculty-member committee.

Reconciliation:

Finally, the proposed Policy reconciles the difference between the version of the Policy approved by the Faculty in February 2014 and the interim Policy approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2018. In the faculty-approved Policy, a preliminary inquiry committee of three faculty members (appointed by the Dean) could dismiss the case without further consultation with the Dean or Provost if, in their view, there were no substance to the allegations of misconduct. In the Board-approved Policy, only the Provost could dismiss the case at the Inquiry stage, and the Provost can decide to move the process forward against the judgment of the preliminary faculty committee. In one respect, the proposed Policy adopts the Board's approach: It does not permit the preliminary inquiry committee of three faculty members to dismiss the case on their own judgment and allows that the Dean may move the process forward to a full investigation against the judgment of the preliminary faculty committee. However, the final decision concerning a finding of responsibility and sanction (if any) is shared equally in the proposed Policy by the faculty and the administration (see item #7 above) and eliminates the possibility that the Provost could overturn a faculty decision at that late stage of the process. On balance, this trade-off is a fair way to reconcile the difference between the two existing Policies.