Committee on Governance: Minutes
Meeting #12: December 9, 2019
Mid-Century Room

Present: Tanja Dominko (Secretary of the Faculty, BBT) Tahar El-Korchi (CEE), Glenn Gaudette (BME), Arne Gericke (CBC), Mark Richman (ME).

Invited Guest: Jim Cocola (Chair, CITP, HUA)

Uninvited Guests: None

1. Prof. Gaudette called the meeting to order at 11:36. No one liked the way the tables were arranged, so the committee agreed to a giant game of Tangrams, in which the following consensus was reached:

The committee debated where the Chair should sit; the discussion was tabled.

2. The agenda was approved with modifications.

3. The minutes from meeting #10 were approved as distributed. The minutes of meeting #11 were approved with minor modifications.

4. Issues related to the Committee on Information Technology Policy (CITP):

   a. *Academic and Research Computing (ARC) User Account Policy*: In response to previous concerns raised by COG and several other faculty members, the wording in the policy about unethical and unauthorized use of ARC resources had been modified by CITP for consistency with the Faculty Consulting Policy in the Faculty Handbook (Part Two, Section 3.A). There were still some concerns raised by COG over the provision in the policy that "When a user leaves the University, their WPI credentials are deactivated and access to ARC resources are terminated." Prof. Cocola agreed that, in order to complete unfinished projects, it would be desirable to allow departing students, for example, to have targeted access to certain research drives without allowing full network access. With the understanding that CITP would look into that possibility, the policy was approved in its current form for consideration by the faculty at its December meeting.

b. _General Concerns about Security Policies_: Prof. Cocola explained that there is currently an Information Security Risk and Compliance (ISRC) Committee on campus that consists of 16 members, one of whom is even a faculty member. The ISRC was formed 18 months ago, although CITP had only been notified of the existence and the work of the ISRC after the fact and is now gradually assessing the policies that the ISRC has established.   Many of these policies are posted at the following link: https://www.wpi.edu/offices/it/information-security/security-policies . These policies include the following:

- Acceptable Use Policy - AUP
- Administrative Data Backup and Restoration Policy
- Confidentiality Policy
- Camera Policy
- Data Classification and Usage
- Email Systems and Usage
- Email Whitelisting
- Exception Policy
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley
- Identity Theft Red Flag Prevention
- Mail List
- Mobile Device Policy
- Patch Management Policy
- PCI Policy
- Procurement Evaluation Policy for Restricted Use
- Records Retention and Destruction
- Restricted Use Data Clean Desk and Clear Screen

Committee members observed that this was a lotta lotta policies to have been established by a 16-person committee with only one faculty member, even if he or she did show up to most of the meetings. Prof. Cocola indicated that based on a review so far, CITP intends first to address the AUP, the Confidentiality Policy, the Exception Policy, and the Mobile Device Policy. He indicated that the Provost had come to CITP's last meeting to learn more about CITP's interest in the security policies.

Prof. Gaudette reminded COG that the CITP charge in the Faculty Handbook was as follows:

> The Committee on Information Technology Policy (CITP) is a permanent subcommittee of COG that **shall have purview over all Information Technology policies, procedures, and practices that affect WPI's academic and research missions.** The committee works with representatives from the Information Technology Services (ITS) division and other departments, as needed, **on all matters related to computing at WPI**.

COG members expressed concern that CITP had not been included in developing security policies related to computing at WPI, in general, and about the lack of faculty involvement in developing security policies that affect our academic and research missions, in particular. COG members expressed a strong consensus that ISRC or any

other WPI group must collaborate with CITP on such matters, and expressed **תִּקְוֶה**[1] (*Tikvah*) that existing policies would be considered and future policies would be developed in this way.

5. <u>Trustees' Outstanding Teaching Award Committee</u>: COG needs to make two additional faculty appointments to this committee. It makes sense to appoint the two most recent past winners who are still at WPI and who are willing to serve for this year. Falling in this category, Prof. Richman agreed to serve. Prof. Gaudette will contact Prof. Wulf (FSB) to see if she is willing do so, as well.

6. <u>Regular Assessment of the State of Governance at WPI</u>: Describing discussions within the Joint Coordinating Council (JCC), Profs. Dominko and Gaudette reminded COG that according to the Bylaws and Governance Working Group Report (May 2019), both the Board of Trustees (BoT) and Faculty Governance committed to (separately) evaluating the health of their governance processes and activities. In addition, the report calls for the President, in consultation with the JCC to investigate methods that may be used for regularly assessing the health of shared governance between the Board (B), the Administration (A), and the faculty (f).

In order to get some initial but critical input on faculty governance, Prof. Dominko and others agreed that informal surveys of the governance committee Chairs and WPI's AAUP Chapter officers would provide useful insights. In addition, as has been done in the recent past, a compilation of governance accomplishments each year will continue to serve as a measure of both the value and the volume of the work done within the faculty governance industrial complex.

Prof. Gericke will draft a survey to assess the state of faculty governance...

7. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Richman
Acting Secretary, COG

---

[1] תִּקְוֶה (*Tikvah*) is an expectant waiting for a desired outcome. It means to gather together, wait for, hope for or bind (by twisting) together. While the idea of hope in English is abstract, this Hebrew root word offers a more concrete expression of hope as an ever-strengthening rope as its strands are collected and then twisted together.

A thin thread may be faster and simpler to make than a shipyard standard rope, but it certainly would not hold up under pressure. To make a durable, useful rope, the process of binding and twisting many threads together is essential.