Faculty Senate Meeting

March 23, 2016

* Quorum called at 9:05
	+ Present
		- Kevin Adkin
		- Jenny Paturyan
		- Hayk Mamajanyan
		- David Davidian
		- Arto Vaun
		- Varduhi Petrosyan
		- Aram Keryan
		- Tsovinar Harutyunyan
		- Ara Chalabyan
		- Gayane Barseghyan
	+ Absent
		- Irshat Madyarov
		- Mikayel Tovmasyan
		- Don Fuller
		- Simon Clarke
		- Aleksandr Grigoryan
		- Artur Khalatyan
		- Arthur Dolmajian
	+ Guests
		- Provost Randall Rhodes
		- Shari Melkonian
		- Catherine Buon
		- Chris Ray
* Approval of the agenda
* Approval of minutes from the February 23, 2016 meeting
* Reports from Committees:
	+ Executive Committee led by Jenny
		- Items to be covered in AOB, if time permits
	+ Curriculum Committee with Catherine Buon
		- Met twice since last meeting.
		- Approved three new summer courses.
		- Change from “B.S. Computational Sciences” to “B.S. Computer Science”
		- Discussed issues of Extension preparatory courses. Syllabi for math and English courses will be vetted by CC.
	+ Student Advising Committee led by Chris Ray
		- Document sent to Provost for review. Minor, not critical, changes were made.
		- Vote: For: 9 Against: 0 Abstain: 1
		- **Point**: Document approved, now need an action plan.
		- Focus only on undergraduate, not graduate. Graduate advising is a separate charge not for this group. Graduate advising is being handled by graduate programs.
		- Committee can work with deans to address any issues.
	+ Academic Standards Committee (proposed) led by Provost Rhodes
		- To address undergraduate issues that will come up in the next year as the first graduating class comes forward.
		- Provost discussed what the charge of this new committee would be. A document was shared prior to meeting. Outlines: membership, purpose, and procedures of committee.
		- Consolidates responsibilities to this new committee, most of which were previously controlled by CC. This will allow CC to focus on curriculum and this new committee would work on this other issues and grievances.
		- Outlines the responsibilities and options available of the students in this process.
		- With approval, this committee would begin in the fall semester (Aug/Sept).
		- Probation, dismissal, transfer credits, and right to appeal policies (and perhaps other procedural documents) would need to be rewritten to align with the role of this new committee.
		- Senate raised that we need to know which policies and procedural documents would be affected by this new committee before final approval. Shari said her office can help
		- Need to see how this committee would affect the Faculty Senate bylaws as a new standing committee. Parliamentarian would need to review the bylaws and address how this new committee would affect everything.
		- **Point**: Bylaws seem to only note the Curriculum Committee and Ethics and Grievance Committee. Do all standing committees need to be added to the bylaws?
		- Vote of favor of moving forward (not final vote): For: 9 Against: 0 Abstain: 1
	+ Ethics & Grievance Committee led by Arto Vaun
		- Nothing to report.
	+ Extension Committee led by Aram Keryan and Jenny
		- The charge of the committee was altered.
		- Historically it was to “oversee” Extension, now it is set to “advise”. Discussion of this structure. Curriculum Committee can be used as an example of how to “oversee”.
		- Extension now offering “diploma programs”. Is there oversight and quality assurance with such programs? We don’t want such programs to undermine AUA reputation and quality.
		- Discussion of the unclear relationship of Extension and AUA. Oversight, quality assurance, degrees/diplomas, courses, faculty, administration, collaboration, and so on.
		- **Point**: Perhaps we need to invite the leaders of AUA and Extension to a Faculty Senate meeting, or another possible meeting, to address some of this issues and potential issues so that the two groups can integrate better.
		- No vote at this time due to potential issues.
	+ Student Learning Committee
		- No members present to report.\*
	+ Faculty Package for Recruitment and Retention led by Arto Vaun
		- At this point, set for a final discussion for the next FS meeting.
* Standing Committee on Student Conduct and Ethics Procedure Regulations led by Shari
	+ Student Code of Conduct committee has been operating without a procedure. The proposed procedure was developed and distributed via email for this meeting.
	+ The charge right now is only related to the Student Code of Conduct. There is an understanding that AUA Execs would like the Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics to be merged in the future. And therefore this committee’s charge would then be modified again to consider conduct and ethics, but for now focuses on conduct.
	+ Linked with Ethics and Grievance Committee who will take up appeals.
	+ Vote: For: 9 Against: 0 Abstain: 1
* Faculty evaluations - revising the procedures (Forms A and B attached)
	+ Document was shared via email.
	+ A suggestion was made to the Provost regarding standardized faculty evaluations (separate from course evaluations).
	+ Document that was shared via email is not the same as the policy that is on policies.aua.am.
	+ **Point**: Why is the document FS received and shared different than the website?
	+ **Point**: Why haven’t these faculty evaluations been used in a number of years?
	+ **Point**: Does the form need to be edited/updated/modified? If so, such changes can be raised next FS meeting.
	+ **Point**: If these evaluations have not been used for several years, is then implemented, and a faculty receives a bad evaluation, then what about the previous years when the evaluation was not conducted? Perhaps this needs to be noted/reflected in process that longstanding faculty who have not undergone evaluations need further consideration.
* Guidelines for Research Award (attached for discussion only, no voting)
	+ Document was shared for this meeting.
	+ Faculty have issue with the wording of the Research Award document.
	+ Is it an award for completed research or a grant for research?
	+ The award/grant is $2,000USD.
	+ President and Provost wants it to be a grant, but faculty are concerned that $2,000 is not a significant sum of money for future work.
	+ What is the faculty consensus for this award?
	+ Can it be altered for this year or is it more realistic for next year’s award.
* General Assembly: Scheduling and Topics
	+ **Point**: Ask faculty via email what topics they’d like to have at the General Assembly.
* Ran out of time, tabled for next meeting.
	+ Meeting with BoT in June: Format, Topics, Time, Representatives
	+ AOB
* Meeting ends at 10:30

Minutes taken by Kevin Adkin.

\* Update from Artur Khalatyan sent by email on March 17, 2016: The Committee is “doing a student notes workshop in mid April with Student Center for Success and we have our brown bag discussion on formative assessment and feedback as scheduled.”