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The Committee on Governance (COG) held its 19th meeting of the 2008-09 Academic Year on Thursday, February 5, 2009, in the Peterson Room of the Campus Center.

Present: Provost J. Orr. Professors J. Blandino, K. Fisler, J. Hanlan (Chair), J. O'Connor (Secretary), M. Richman, and H. Vassallo.

Summary: 1. The Committee acted upon the Agenda previously submitted by Professor Hanlan.

2. COG acted upon the Minutes of the meeting of January 29, as previously submitted.

3. Prof. Hanlan updated the Committee regarding the status of the ballot for Secretary of the Faculty.

4. The Committee returned to its discussions re preparation of a draft proposal revising the Faculty's current method of reviewing Administrative offices.

Detail: 1. COG approved the Agenda submitted by Prof. Hanlan.

2. The Minutes of the meeting of January 29 were accepted as submitted, with the exception of one paragraph to be revised by Provost Orr and Prof. Richman.

3. The ballot for the Secretary of the Faculty has been finalized, and will be distributed to the Faculty shortly.

4. Provost Orr conveyed to the COG comments from members of the Administration concerning proposed revisions to the Faculty's current method of evaluating Administrative offices. Issues discussed included whether or not Faculty have sufficient information for evaluating Administrative offices, and whether or not past evaluations of Administrative offices by the Faculty have been constructive. The consensus among COG members was that there is in fact a legitimate basis for the Faculty to evaluate most of the Administrative offices on campus, and that the focus should be on how to improve the process to ensure that it provides constructive feedback to the President and Vice Presidents. These issues were discussed extensively by the Committee.

The Committee then discussed the merits of focusing on the processes related to the revised evaluation method, rather than on the procedures for its implementation. The view was expressed that it would be a better use of the Committee's time to get approval from the Faculty on the proposed processes, before spending time working out the details of its implementation.
Discussions on this topic will continue at the COG's next meeting (2.19.09).

Respectfully Submitted,

J.T. O'Connor, Secretary