A.U.K Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
Friday, March 11, 2016
10:00 – 11:00
Room 401, A.U.K

Members of A.U.K community (staff, faculty and students) are welcome to attend.

Invited: prof. Robert Muharremi

Minutes taken by: Festa Kusari

Welcome/Rules for Guests

- Chair of Senate, Mimoza M., calls the meeting to order and reads the rules for guests.
- Invites Vice President Daniel Cosentino for comments.

Comments from A.U.K President Thompson- Not present

Comments from Vice-President Cosentino-

- Board of trustees has approved the name RIT Kosovo, signed by the president and to be ratified on Monday.
- Identification- will take years until public stops using the A.U.K name.
- Waiting for the approval of the RIT Board of Trustees. It is just the matter of getting them together. The President and Provost of RIT approved it, our Board has approved it, our President signed it.
- Students have more opportunities with RIT, with the new brand name.
  - It will not change the status.

10:10 Approval of minutes from last meeting

- All members in favor of approving the minutes.
- Minutes approved.
10:15 Discussion and approval of Faculty Assessment Peer Review Form

Mimoza M:
- Received only one comment from David E.
- David suggested adding two questions – highlighted in the form.
  1. The instructor has control over the classroom.
  2. The instructor uses the appropriate methods to keep the classroom in control.
- To discuss if we think we should add these two questions in the form.
- Decide together on the final version of Faculty Assessment Peer Review Form.
- 5 sections included for the Faculty Assessment Peer Review Form as decided on the previous meeting.
- Important part the final section of the form on summarizing the suggestions and observation.
- Any comments or suggestions?

Daniel:
- We are doing the Faculty Assessment Peer Review Form because of the Faculty Rank and Promotion Assessment by RIT (strong criticism from RIT for not having an assessment process in place).
  o Have documentation in the files for the work we are doing.
- When reviewing a Faculty member use:
  o + for really good evaluation (strengths)
  o O for satisfactory evaluation
  o - areas for improvement (weaknesses)

Mimoza M:
- What about the 2 questions that David suggested? Should they be there or be merged into one question?

David:
- Perhaps put them under the section: 4. Contact with students

Xhevahir:
- The 1st question is somehow repeating the 2nd one.

David E: Who is going to select the faculty to do the peer review?

Daniel:
- Self-selection. Look for a Faculty Member outside of your area of expertise to conduct the peer review.
- It’s the responsibility of the instructor to select someone.
  o However, the same Faculty Member cannot peer review the same instructor next year.

Mimoza:
- It can’t be quite useful, when someone is observing you, they can point out areas for improvement, strength and weakness

Daniel:
- Only a few sentences describing the instructor and individual.
**Action item:**

1. Merge the two questions suggested by David E. into one question.
2. Add the question under the section 4. *Contact with students.*
3. + for strength, 0 for satisfactory and – for needs improvement.
4. To approve the form pending these minor changes.
5. To make the changes, send it to Daniel and then Daniel will follow-up with faculty.

Mimoza P.:
- How this can be coordinated?

Daniel:
- Only full time faculty is affected by this, part time faculty can choose whether they want to do the Peer Evaluation – it is optional for them.
- Full time faculty can choose not to participate.
  - Faculty Rank and Promotion consequences of refusing.
  - Not getting promoted to a higher position later on.
  - Highly unlikely that they will be considered as model employees, but maybe good teachers.
- Individual responsibility to complete the evaluation within a year.

Mimoza M:
- 1 visit per year, the minimum.
- Eventually decide for next year to organize more than one visit.

Daniel:
- Coordination will go through Lindita.
- Ask Lindita to assist in finding a colleague, if faculty members struggle to find one on their own.
  - Once the evaluation is completed it should be hand it in to her.
- If a Faculty Member wants to be ambitious and have two peer reviews in their file- they can do so, however it is not mandatory
- Maybe visit the same class-2 three times, half a period.

Mimoza P:
- Inform the colleague for the visit.
- Scheduled visit. Specific day and time.

**Action Item 2:**

1. 1 full class session visit/or more than one visit equivalent to one full class session (90 minutes of observation).

**Action item 3:**

1. All members in favor of approval.
2. The Faculty Peer Review Form and procedure approved, pending agreed changes.
10:30 Review the suggestion of MUN Club Faculty Advisor and Academic Director on adding a MUN policy in the Academic Bulletin

Daniel:
- Each year the MUN has been an issue to A.U.K, because it involves a good student resume item and travel- very competitive.
  - The official delegation should be working with academic advisors - all clubs should.
- This year professor Robert Muharremi with 5 other students went to the MUN meeting.
- Problems with selection of students- students not selected or those that did not score well on the MUN selection test went as individuals to the MUN meetings and represented A.U.K without permission.
- Not okay with students representing the institution- they should represent themselves individuals not as a delegation from our institution.
- Members who have never been students at RIT Kosovo- showed up at MUN, saying they representing RIT.
- Not ok students representing the institution without getting approval from institution, in any capacity. They can represent themselves as individuals that attend the university but not as an official delegation.
- What is the penalty if student passes this and represent themselves as a group that are not officially recognized from our institution?
- Do we suspend these students for falsely representing themselves, what’s the process for moving forward?

Anita:
- Potential student candidates had to go through a MUN selection test and make a speech in front of four professors.
  - And then selection for MUN took place.
  - 6 students were assigned to go to Harvard MUN and 6 other students to go to World MUN.
  - The other group was going under European Youth Council.
- Me and 5 other students represented our institution as RIT Kosovo at the meeting.

Daniel:
- Both RIT Kosovo and A.U.K were represented. Though in the other group the invitation was stated the European Youth Council Delegation.

Mimoza M:
- Serious issue- falsely representing our institution in important events.
- Students that were collaborating with them- warn them to not use the A.U.K name, and state their own university.

David E:
- Rather than saying official delegation of MUN, we should have a broader policy saying any delegation. Having broader policy that includes MUN as well.

Daniel:
- I thought to bring this particular policy to the attention of the Academic Senate.
• Suggests that Robert Muharremi address the Senate.

Robert Muharremi:
• It was a rather embarrassing situation; having both RIT Kosovo and A.U.K listed on the official list of Harvard MUN. Having two teams representing the same institution.
• Selection process - for students that don’t make the team, they can try next year.
• Make sure that students who falsely represent the institution get sanctioned.
• Make it clear to students that there are clear rules to follow, and should be reflected in the policy.

Mimoza M:
• Rewrite the paragraph so to include any possible Delegation. This time it happened to MUN, it can happen to other delegations/clubs later.
• It has happened with the sports club in the past.
• Even if students go as individuals- they should have a high GPA and required test points.

Anita:
• Since student can apply individually to MUN events, we considered having the MUN bylaws very specific with regard to selection process, representation of the institution, etc.

Daniel:
• 3 Students that were suspended this year went to the event.
• Students that were not enrolled in courses, academically suspended students went.

David:
• Can we know who those students are?

Daniel:
• I do not want to falsely accuse students
• Delegation of five students
• Perhaps they didn’t know, and went as individuals.
• This is the last year students can get away with this, after this policy is approved things will go different.

Mimoza P:
• Students claim they attend the MUN conference and miss exams and classes.
• Follow up on the procedure.

Daniel:
• Up to the faculty to decide about student absences.

**Action item 4:**
1. Review the paragraph, decide how the paragraph is going to be structured - make it general not only for MUN but for all delegations.
2. Daniel, Robert and Anita to revise it, and then bring it back for review in the senate (if necessary).
3. Revised policy to be added in the Academic Bulletin (no need for Senate approval).
Mimoza M:
• Final exam schedule: was it decided it how we are going to be: as in previous semester or during regular class sessions?

Albina:
• Donjeta (the academic advisor) is working on the Final Exam Schedule.
• Keeping it like last semester.
• Will get circulated for everyone to see if there are any mistakes and then published.

Mimoza M:
• 2\textsuperscript{nd} of May (Monday) is an official holiday, so we need to organize the final exam schedule from Tuesday to Friday.

**Action Item 5:**
1. Keep the Final Exam Schedule Format the same as the previous semester.

Daniel:
• Senior Exit Survey.
• Likely, doing a survey for faculty to review the administration - for the end of the year.
• Administration should be evaluated too.

Anita:
• Students complaining about Public Policy classes.
• Doing the same things in two or three different Public Policy classes- repeating the same material.
• Discuss with faculty teaching Public Policy courses.

Mimoza M:
• Coordination between syllabuses - information on what topics are covered for each class, in order to avoid these problems.
• SG to work closely with Daniel and Public Policy faculty on this.

**11:00 Meeting Adjourned.**