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The Committee on Governance (COG) held its 5th meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, September 30, 2010 in the Chairman’s Room in the Campus Center.

1. Prof. Kinicki called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

2. The minutes of the September 23, 2010 meeting (#3, AY 2010-2011) were revisited and accepted after additional revision.

3. The minutes of the September 30, 2010 meeting (#4 AY 2010-2011) were accepted.

4. The agenda submitted by Chairman Kinicki was approved.

5. The agenda for the October 7, 2010 Faculty meeting was reviewed and discussed.

6. Secretary of the Faculty Richman initiated discussion of the presence of non-committee members at meetings of Faculty governance committees. While non-voting members may present issues to a committee, Robert’s Rules do not give non-voting members the right to be present during the deliberations that lead to voting on an issue. Prof. Richman indicated that he would be discussing this issue with the Faculty committee chairs at their meeting on Monday October 4th. A lengthy discussion followed about what constitutes appropriate membership on certain committees and the need to streamline Faculty committees.

7. COG is in the process of making an appointment to the Fringe Benefits Committee.

8. Prof. Rulfs reported that she and Prof. Kinicki (as a subcommittee of 2) had met regarding the Faculty evaluation of administrators. They proposed adding and removing some administrators from the list of those being evaluated and that evaluation of each administrator be conducted every 2 years. There was discussion of whether the new Deans should be evaluated by all Faculty or just those falling under their purview. Provost Overstrom felt that the new Deans would have campus wide influence and therefore should be evaluated by all Faculty. Prof. Rulfs noted that presently there are no job descriptions for the Deans of IGSD and Undergraduate Studies against which they could be evaluated. There was further discussion of the draft evaluation form that had been developed.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Allen H. Hoffman
Secretary