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The Committee on Governance (COG) held its 4\textsuperscript{th} meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, September 23, 2010 in the Peterson Room in the Campus Center.


1. Prof. Kinicki called the meeting to order at 11:07 AM.
2. The minutes of the September 16, 2010 meeting (#3, AY 2010-2011) were accepted with minor corrections subject to review by Prof. Rissmiller.
3. Prof. Kinicki brought up the topic of Faculty Committee membership. The Fringe Benefits Committee membership is defined as one member of FAP, 2 members appointed by COG and 2 members appointed by FAP. There are currently 2 vacancies, one member to be appointed by COG and one member to be appointed by FAP.
4. Secretary of the Faculty Mark Richman reported that the Faculty Handbook has been updated and is online. He will provide a hard copy of the current version to each member of COG.
5. Prof. Hoffman reported that he has recruited 4 of the 5 members of the subcommittee on the effects of rapidly increasing enrollment and expects an answer from a 5\textsuperscript{th} person shortly.
6. Prof. Kinicki announced that he and Prof. Rulfs will be a subcommittee of 2 to develop a method for faculty evaluation of administrators. He had created a list of issues that need to be resolved in the evaluation process. The list is appended to these minutes. One possibility is to develop a draft form that will be used this year and subject to possible revision. He suggested that only 3 administrators be evaluated this year.
7. Prof. Kinicki distributed a COG document dated 1-21-10 that was circulated to the Faculty last year. COG had put considerable time and effort into developing this document. The origins of the document were reviewed for the new members of the committee. It was decided to send the document to the Department Heads and request comments to be returned to COG by November 1\textsuperscript{st}.
8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen H. Hoffman
Secretary

Appended: Issues to be resolved in the evaluation process for administrators by faculty

\textbf{Issues to be resolved in the evaluation process for administrators by faculty:}

1. How to increase the faculty response rate?
2. Exactly which administrators should be evaluated (given the new recently created Deans)?
3. Who should be expected to do the evaluation? Namely, do we really want or expect ALL faculty to evaluate all the administrators?

4. How frequently should we evaluate? The draft proposal says ‘biennial’. Namely, we divide the set of administrators into two sets and evaluate one set each year.

5. Are non-numeric forms the way to go? The draft recommends this, but practical how does the data get collated without some type of numeric stratification?

6. Who gets the results besides the administrator being evaluated?

7. How do we handle/deal with the problem of “offensive” personal comments by faculty? The draft proposal has committees seeing the comments and insulating the administrator being evaluated from ever seeing any offensive comments.

8. Should there be transparency? Namely, faculty will more motivated to fill out a survey when they can see the results. The old choice was for SecFac to present the results at a Faculty meeting. Maybe we should simply mimic the faculty process and make all summaries of administrators’ evals available on the web visible only to the WPI community.

9. How do we put a process in place which is “efficient” in its implementation and data analysis so as not to further burden faculty committees?

10. The current draft requires an additional written report by the assigned committee. How does this improve the evaluation process?

11. Assuming the sub-committee and COG can put through a prototype, experimental survey to be tested on three administrators in Spring 2011. Can COG move forward on this WITHOUT having the faculty approve the experimental instrument at a Faculty meeting?