

**A.U.K Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
Friday, February 05, 2016
10:00 – 11:00
Room 401, A.U.K**

Members attended: President Thompson, Vice President Daniel Cosentino, prof. Mimoza Mustafa, prof. Mimoza Polloshka, prof. David Eustice, prof. Xhevahir Kolgjini, Anita Selmani-president of the student government.

Minutes taken by: Festa Kusari

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

Comments from A.U.K President Thompson

- Pleased with faculty ranks and promotion process, integration of those processes with the RIT processes.
- The stronger the relationship with RIT, the more this institution is likely to thrive.
- There are some issues with that regard, still pending with the Board of Trustees.
- Very pleased that Anita and the Vice President of the student government had an opportunity to visit the RIT campus and see what a great institution it is to be associated with AUK.
- Align and identify ourselves with the RIT system.
- Encourage keeping the RIT relationship.
 - Guidelines for promotion related to faculty, public service and everything associated with the faculty development.
- Board of trustees - has to approve the agreement for the RIT Kosovo campus name.

Xhevahir:

- Why do some board members hesitate?

President:

1. Emotional attachments with the AUK name, and to some extent the lost of control.
 2. Sentimental attachment with AUK - independently accredited – but the name American University in Kosovo it is not legal under Kosovo laws.
- Some members can't quite accept the change that has to happen.

Anita:

(comments on the experience from visiting the RIT campus in Rochester, New York).

- It was an official invitation from RIT Student Government, all global campuses were participating.
- Tour of the RIT Campus.
- Privilege of getting an American degree and be associated with RIT.
- Discussed of having a global committee.
- Have meetings with students next week, so that we're in line with RIT.
- Next consortium could be organized in Kosovo, since it was already organized in Dubai and Croatia.
- First time participating as student government in RIT.
- Amazing community - more and more A.U.K students doing exchange semesters/year in RIT.

Comments from Vice-President Cosentino - //

10:10 Approval of minutes from last meeting

All in favor of approving the minutes.

Minutes approved.

10:15 Peer Review Guidelines/Forms

Mimoza M.:

- Part of Annual Review Process is Peer Assessment/Review.
- I met with Daniel, he wanted us to work on some guidelines along with Mimoza P (FDC).
- If faculty from another discipline is to review and do class visit then the evaluator should evaluate teaching techniques rather than content of the lectures.
- While checking some of the materials we collected, we thought to identify key segments we want to focus on, so we have consistency among evaluations.

Mimoza M. distributes prepared sheet with possible questions to look at during class visitations.

- Sheet consists of 5 core components and different questions to look at.
- Only the first draft, discuss with Daniel in the future how the final form should be.
- Modify/add questions, comments, etc.
- Trying to put up questions that are mostly used by other universities worldwide.
 - Questions that are not biased.

Xhevahir:

- We used to have a peer evaluation 5 or more years ago
 - One model/form was very easy, clear and simple.
- Go back and use these forms.
- Previous peer evaluations were not documented.

Mimoza M.:

- Assessment has been done before in A.U.K, but there was no consistency, nothing in the files.

Daniel:

- This is all about quality of programs
- Ranking and promotion: Julie, myself, David and Michael we were promoted to senior rank at RIT, and through this process one main comment was that there is no peer review process.

- The idea is not to create stress for faculty; but to have a one page peer evaluation that goes to each faculty file kept by HR office.
- In the future when Faculty Rank and Promotion starts there are documents in the file to review.
- Having a short 3-4 pages document on Faculty Annual Review.
- So each year each faculty would have an Annual Review filed and would become part of the job.
- Some faculty are very good at their job, but who don't do grants, awards, services, etc.
 - They just want to lecture and because their files are small, won't get ranked to a higher position.

Mimoza M:

- We submit things every year, but there are no files.
- And how we report, do we consider past activities? It could happen that you are not active this last year due to different obligations, but you were very active last three years.
- Does that effect your promotion? When/How do you start measuring the promotion?
- Sometimes faculty contributes a lot for 5 years, and then not at all for during the last year.

Daniel:

- Suggestion: For this first year we can have a point in a policy stating that from spring 2016 we started implementing the Peer Review. And then for a period of one year we could say put together a package that covers activities/services done in the previous years.
- If finally there is a faculty rank and promotion process which has a real meaning, there are real challenges to that, such as: can we afford tenure track system or similar?
- We are aware that we cannot afford more than we currently have.
- But, I think we should not give up.

Mimoza M:

- Even if it doesn't lead directly to promotion, it is good to have the annual review in our files.
- The focus for today is not entire Annual Review, but rather Peer Review specifically.
- We named it "*Class Visitation*" since peer review involves syllabus review, grading system, etc.
- As start, I believe for A.U.K is going to be only class visits
- Suggestion - in the future to have another page of why the Peer Review is done.
- To circulate the form, have a final draft and hopefully to approve it in the next Senate meeting.
- This should be considered as a learning process for all of us.

David (suggestion):

- Have a rating scale 1-5
- Checkbox

Daniel:

- Put in policy with the minimum requirements.
- Have a review process; what things are working and which are not.
- Arrange with Lindita about evaluator. Go there one time and have a page written.
- No surprise visits - may be a quiz day,
 - It should be a lecture or presentation.

ACTIONS:

- During following weeks to set the proper document on Peer Review (Daniel, Mimoza P. and Mimoza

M.)

- Circulate the document to other senate members and potentially approve it in the next Senate meeting.
- Peer Review to start this spring semester.

10:35 Final Exam Schedule

Mimoza M:

- Final exam schedule as in the previous semester, or as in previous years?
- Maybe Daniel to send the survey to faculty, for their preferences.
- Concern - Monday 2nd of May is an official holiday, which might cause some issues with exams for M/W classes (if we go back to exams during regular class times).
- To think it through.

David:

- Multiple sections-some conflicts
- Not carefully scheduled for the rooms, some of the rooms were occupied.

Mimoza:

- These issues can be sorted out.
- Send the schedule to faculty earlier for comments.

ACTIONS:

- Daniel to do the survey for the faculty;
 - If the previous schedule worked and what they preferred more.
- Think of technicalities, so that there are fewer conflicts.

10:50 AOB

Mimoza M:

- There were complaints from adjunct faculty that for Spring Semester they were not asked for their schedule preferences and that caused them problems.
- Academic affair office if possible to send the draft schedule to faculty.
- To try and adjust the adjuncts, since they are usually professionals working elsewhere.

11:00 Meeting adjourned