

**Committee on Governance Meeting Minutes**  
**Meeting #3 (2017-18)**  
**Monday, September 11, 2017, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm**  
**HUA Conference Room, SL 226**

In Attendance: Leonard Albano, Provost Bruce Bursten, Glenn Gaudette (Chair), Mark Richman, Susan Roberts, David Spanagel (Secretary), and Bengisu Tulu

Absent: Suzanne Weekes

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:38 pm.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The Minutes from AY 2017-18 COG Meeting #2 (August 28, 2017) were approved as distributed, amended by email, and corrected.
4. Prof. Gaudette urged COG to further clarify next steps with respect to reorganizing the Foisie School of Business. His understanding is as follows: when Dean Ginzberg furnishes COG with a proposal involving either the elimination of the Department Head or the creation of an Associate Dean of the Business School (or both), that any such proposal will:
  - outline all proposed structural changes or redefinitions of roles and responsibilities, and
  - identify all sections of the Faculty Handbook that will require some revised language.

COG will then:

- review Dean Ginzberg's proposal
- share it with and gather input from all relevant Faculty Committees
- frame a recommendation to the Administration, and
- present that recommendation to the Faculty for consideration and approval.

Provost Bursten welcomed this opportunity to discuss which levels of decision-making about academic administrative structures do or do not necessarily require COG involvement. COG members agreed that the creation of Area Heads within the Foisie Business School (as currently configured) would not have warranted any consultation with COG. If any Faculty Handbook-specified Department Head responsibilities were to be delegated to Area Heads, however, such changes would require consultation with COG.

Prof. Spanagel suggested that we could think about two distinct thresholds: 1) some proposed administrative changes clearly require COG involvement in decision-making, whereas, 2) other "internal" administrative changes may simply merit advance communication of intentions and the sharing of information with faculty governance leadership. Doing so minimizes misunderstandings and maintains a healthy climate of transparency and trust.

5. Prof. Gaudette updated COG on the formation of a Working Committee (composed of three Trustees and three Faculty members). This group will begin work revising the WPI Conduct policies (such as expanding the scope of the Faculty Research Misconduct policy to cover all research activity) as appropriate. To avoid duplication of effort, other Faculty committees concerned about these matters (see, for example, Item #4 in the Minutes of CGSR Meeting #2 on 09/07/2017) should probably wait to discuss specific recommendations that will come out of the Working Committee.
6. Prof. Gaudette requested that Provost Bursten provide timelines to COG for how soon we can expect to hear back from him about each of the following:
  - a proposed strategy for addressing the TTT/NTT credit delivery ratio, to bring it back into compliance with the Faculty Handbook, and
  - a description and explanation of the roles of Academic Deans, VPs, and other executive positions within the Academic Affairs division.
7. COG members began a discussion about how to approach this year's Faculty evaluations of administrators. The list of administrators due to be evaluated this year includes:
  - the President
  - the Vice-Provost for Research
  - the Dean of Undergraduate Studies
  - the Dean of Graduate Studies
  - the Chief Financial Officer

COG members hope to enhance the formative component of the evaluations. To help us frame questions that might yield more helpful feedback, Prof. Gaudette will invite an administrator who was evaluated in a previous year to meet with COG and share views on how we might improve the process.

8. The meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David Spanagel, COG Secretary