Faculty Senate Meeting

June 07, 2016

* Quorum called at 10:05
  + Present
    - Simon Clarke
    - Arthur Dolmajian
    - Aram Keryan
    - David Davidian
    - Hayk Mamajanyan
    - Arto Vaun
    - Jenny Paturyan
    - Don Fuller
    - Mikayel Tovmasyan
    - Irshat Madyarov
    - Artur Khalatyan
    - Ara Chalabyan
    - Varduhi Petrosyan
    - Gayane Barseghyan
    - Tsovinar Harutyunyan
  + Absent
    - Kevin Adkin
    - Aleksandr Grigoryan
  + Guests
    - Provost Randall Rhodes
    - Shari Melkonian
    - Catherine Buon
* Approval of the agenda
* Approval of minutes from the May 18, 2016 meeting. Note from Irshat: unlike what we discussed at the previous FS, according to the bylaws there is no need to re-elect the Secretary. We can just substitute for this meeting (and potentially other small tasks that might come up over summer). So we added a clarification to the minutes prior to this meeting. With this addition, minutes approved.
* Reports from Committees:
  + Executive Committee led by Irshat: minor day-to-day routine
  + Curriculum Committee led by Catherine Buon: nothing of major importance at this stage
  + Ethics & Grievance Committee led by Arto: nothing to report
  + Student Learning Committee led by Irshat (Artur joined later): nothing to report
  + Faculty Package for Recruitment and Retention
    - Update from Randall: the Board of Trustees was impressed and found the information useful. They promised to budget more money to address some of the issues raised, particularly the inability to recruit first choices due to salary offers being not competitive.
    - Discussion. According to Provost the Board wants the emphasis not so much on new programs being offered but on cultivating the university as a place of excellence. Don: it does not mean we can’t do both: add new programs and improve the quality of existing ones. Catherine: if we don’t add new programs we are not responding to the local demand.
* Policies for voting
  + Probation and Dismissal policy
    - Provost: some more explanation of how the faculty can still have a voice during the process of dismissal. Simon: none of that, what Provost just said is in the document. The program should be better represented in the decision on dismissal. Provost: Program Chair is copied on the dismissal letters and can get active. Shari: there will be a procedure document/guideline that should help clarify the Program’s role.
    - Modifications: a typo corrected and “within 10 calendar days”
    - Vote: 12 “in favor”; 1 “against”
  + Grade Policies policy
    - Grade Policies: Shari – explaining the changes and the rationale.
    - Vote: unanimous
  + Course Syllabus Format policy
    - Shari: some of this come from the students; students should be informed if changes are made. The rest of it is about updating the policy according to the template we use. Catherine: pay attention to having the right links.
    - Modification: should say “linked to policies”, rather than the actual links, not to update the policy every time links change.
    - Broader discussion of how faculty should work with students about what is and is not in the syllabus, what does and does not change through the semester and how changes are announced. Not everything can be regulated in the syllabus.
    - Vote: unanimously in favor
* Extension Committee led by Mikayel
  + - Irshat: Advisory role or larger? We had a meeting with the President and Provost, the takeaway was that it should be larger than just occasional advising.
    - Mikayel: did some benchmarking with other similar universities. Summary of how other universities approach the relationship between the faculty and the extension.
    - Discussion. Tsovinar: let the Extension identify the people who should review. Jenny: a suggestion from the President was that an Extension member should be permanently represented on the Faculty Senate (**Point for the future follow-up)**. Hayk: are you changing your own charge? Make it clear that changes proposed should be brought to the FS for approval (**Point for the Extension Committee to follow up)**. Arto: having a formal channel or review and approval creates transparency. That’s the added value of the committee, rather than the Extension asking for feedback from experts as they see fit. Tsovinar: let the Extension propose a revision strategy they think is reasonable.
    - Irshat: do we want to finalize the Charge before the new director comes in? Discussion. Yes. **Action point for the Extension Committee**: work with Shari, because they are supposed to look into how other universities do this. Based on that, rework the charge. Having a stronger role in the review of the courses. Aim to send the draft for e-vote by August 10th.
  + Meeting ends at 11:45

Minutes taken by Jenny Paturyan.