Faculty Senate Meeting

December 6, 2017

Quorum called at 9:07

**Present:**

* Michael Andrews Bashan
* David Davidian
* Hrant Davtyan
* Gagik Gabrielyan
* Christian Garbis
* Aram Keryan
* Irshat Madyarov
* Agassy Manoukian
* Nshan Matevosyan
* Natella Mirzoyan
* Jenny Paturyan
* Fanis Varvoglis
* Arto Vaun

**Absent**

* Gayane Barseghyan
* Mary Boghosian
* Aram Ghazaryan
* Meri Hovsepyan
* Vahe Khachadourian

**Guests**

* Provost Rhodes
* Aleksandr Grigoryan
* Shahan Jebejian
* Simon Clarke
* Melissa Brown
* Knar Khachatryan
* Hourig Attarian
* Varduhi Petrosyan
* Elham Shayegh
* Vardan Baghdasaryan

**Agenda:**

* Approval of the current agenda
* Approval of the previous meeting minutes
* Reports and discussion from Committees:
  + Executive Committee
  + Faculty Affairs Committee; Class Size policy
  + Operations and Facilities Committee
  + Student Affairs Committee; “Transfer Credit” and “Concurrent and Non-Concurrent Policies”
* AOB

**Notes**

* Introduce an item to the agenda: the email from Provost regarding the contract extension. Agenda approved with these modifications
* Approved the minutes
* Reports and discussion from Committees:
  + *Executive Committee.* New way of building the senate agenda. Contacted some of the committees and heard their reports instead of putting them on the agenda automatically. Only committees that have something substantial to report make it on the FS agenda. Budget committee still not functioning properly. The Provost suggested that it needs to work with the Faculty Affairs committee regarding the upcoming proposal (salaries)
  + *Faculty Affairs Committee*; Class Size policy. Arto presents. What about classes/majors that are small but vital for the university. The minimum class size too high. We need more benchmarking on what the minimum is in other universities. There should be a clearer language in the policy that says that the program chair with the teaching faculty have a final say on whether the class that is smaller than minimum should go ahead. What are the financial implications of running small courses? Faculty Affairs committee has to come up with specific written recommendations on how the policy has to be changed. **Action point**: Faculty Affairs to draft its response and send it to Shari
  + *Operations and Facilities Committee*. Aleksand presents. Looked at the survey results. Most issues were ranked as important, so the committee decided to work on all of them. Also they want to add Barsam Suites and the windows. Sahan: can we be specific? When we get specific complains we address them. Discussion about the Barsam. People should not be forced to stay there for a long time. We should avoid fixing issues as they are reported but instead be systematic, e.g. consult someone who understand hospitality business and ask them to create a plan/checklist of what should be done on a regular basis including regular screening of the facilities for issues, so the guests are not the ones to be reporting issues. Back to the committee work. The committee produced a document based on Dec 4th. Recommendations for each of the issues. Need to prioritise? **Action point:** the Committee should meet with Shahan.
  + *Student Affairs Committee*; “Transfer Credit” and “Concurrent and Non-Concurrent Degrees and Waiver of Requirements for University-Level Courses.” Christian presents. The Committee has minor comments but nothing substantial. In favor: 10 (separate vote for each policy, same result)
* The e-mail about the contracts. Randal presents. Timeline of decision-making is being moved. People should get early notifications if their contracts are not being renewed. The intent of the email was to alert the faculty and get them to update the documents they need to provide. The procedure is still the same. The chair and the dean still play the same role. The email might have created a wrong impression about sidestepping the chair and the dean and about the importance of the evaluations. Randal can send another email to discuss the process holistically. Varduhi, if we are changing the faculty evaluation policy in terms of timeline, that should be a formal change in the corresponding policy. Melisa: there should be a difference between the policy and the procedure. Looks like we are talking about the procedures, they should be taken out of the policy. A broader discussion about contracts, faculty evaluations, teaching (student) evaluations and so on. Should the FS take a more active role in promoting student evaluations and addressing the problem of low response rate?
* AOB: Irshat, the work of the Student Affairs Committee on support to the graduate writing. We should add it to the agenda for the next meeting.

Meeting ended at 10:34

Minutes taken by Jenny Paturyan.