

**American University of Beirut
Minutes of the University Senate
Meeting of Friday, October 25, 2013**

Present: M. Alameddine, A. Al-Kutoubi, T. Amin, S. Arnaout, I. Bashour, E. Baydoun, J. Chaaban, S. Chahine, N. Dajani, A. Dallal, Z. Dawy, G. DeBin, J. DeJong, A. Dietrich, P. Dorman (chairing), I. Elhaji, J. Ghafari, L. Halaoui, (representing P. McGreevy), N. Hwalla, D. Jaalouk, S. Jabbour-Khoury, A. Jaffa (representing M. Sayegh), D. Jamali, A. Kayssi, V. Khamis, H. Khoury, G. Matar, P. May, F. Moukalled (representing M. Suidan), T. Nizameddin, S. Nouredine, I. Nuwayhid, I. Saoud, M. Salameh, E. Shammass, J. Usta.

Absent:

A. Al-Kutoubi*, R. Brow, S. Chahine*, N. Farajalla*, S. Harb*, H. Huijjer*, P. McGreevy*, M. Sayegh*, M. Suidan*, S. Zeineldine, A. Zenger*

(*= regrets notified before meeting or on leave)

The meeting was called to order at 2 pm.

1. Approval of minutes

Minutes of the September 27, 2013 meeting were approved without any amendments.

2. Voting of degrees, October 2013 graduates

L. Halaoui on behalf of P. McGreevy proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Vote 2014-01: Motion approved (unanimous)**

A. Jaffa on behalf of M. Sayegh proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Faculty of Medicine. Vote 2014-02: Motion approved (unanimous)**

S. Nouredine on behalf of H. Huijjer proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Hariri School of Nursing. Vote 2014-03: Motion approved (unanimous)**

F. Moukalled on behalf of M. Suidan proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture. Vote 2014-04: Motion approved (unanimous)**

N. Hwalla proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Faculty of Food and Agricultural Sciences. Vote 2014-05: Motion approved (unanimous)**

I. Nuwayhid proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Faculty of Health Sciences. Vote 2014-06: Motion approved (unanimous)**

D. Jamali on behalf of S. Chahine proposed a **motion: to grant degrees to all those listed for the Olayan School of Business. Vote 2014-07: Motion approved (unanimous)**

President Dorman congratulated all faculty members and graduates.

3. USFC amended by laws

T. Nizameddin introduced two student representatives, Emily Field and Lama Ghanem, who have been working with others for a year on revision of the USFC by-laws. He referred to the circulated summary of changes made, and explained that their rationale was to increase accountability and efficiency as well as to clarify procedures. One senator welcomed the changes as being long overdue. Issues were raised regarding inconsistencies in wording between 'overall majority' (and what denominator is used – e.g. USFC members or those present) across the by-laws and suggested this needs to be very clear for each instance voting occurs. With reference to article 11, the same senator stated that the wording concerning carryover of funds from previous years should indicate that this would include accrued interest and noted that President Dorman had allowed this. Another senator asked what the rationale was for direct election of students to the USFC as opposed to through SRCs. L. Ghanem clarified both the respective functions of the USFC and SRC and that direct elections also occurred last year, but the difference this year is that USFC members do not need to be SRC members. E. Field noted that from experience it is difficult to serve efficiently on Both bodies given the time and attention needed. Considerable discussion followed the Article III wording of the composition as "to be determined" in the amended by-laws. T. Nizameddin explained that this matter was controversial given varying sizes of faculties and the growth of student numbers in particular faculties; to avoid postponing the elections they had decided to be flexible. He also confirmed that any change in the eventual composition would need to be approved by the Senate as an amendment (at the latest by fall 2014). Concern was also raised about the role of the SRC in the new system. E. Field clarified that neither the role nor responsibilities of the SRC had changed; she noted however that the function of the SRCs needs revisiting as they potentially have a bigger role to play. T. Nizameddin commented that one problem with the SRC is the large number of members and the difficulty of securing quorum. One senator suggested that in Article III there should be a quota of members from the SRC. He also noted that the principle that USFC members can still be SRC members should be clarified in the by-laws. Another suggested that the relationship between the USFC and the SRC be clarified in any revision. In response to concern expressed about non-attendance, E. Field noted that Article VII addresses attendance for both faculty and students. One senator suggested that SRC is where representation and numbers count, but that all SRCs should form a General Assembly and then the USFC would report to them. He expressed concern about the mechanisms of accountability of the USFC to students. T. Nizameddin stated that many such options were being discussed. After some discussion about the wording of the motion, he proposed a **motion: to approve the amended by-laws, with amendments agreed in the Senate meeting of October 25, 2013, for one year pending resolution of Article III on composition. Vote 2014-08: Motion approved (unanimous)**

4. Recommendations to the BOT from the Senate

D. Jamali presented a draft document prepared collectively by the SSC and SCFA members for the academic year 2012-13 at the request of President Dorman, following her presentation on behalf of the Senate to the BOT in June 2013. Specifically the BOT had requested clear and constructive recommendations. After an initial draft was prepared, President Dorman convened a meeting with a core group working on the report and provided some comments and the draft was amended accordingly. One senator congratulated the group working on the report and suggested the Senate

approve the report. President Dorman commented that he was glad his comments had been taken into account and that it was important these concerns be articulated. One senator asked for clarification about the recommendation made about faculty (as opposed to Senate) representation on the BOT. It was noted that the BOT by-laws do not allow for Senate representation on the BOT although once a year an elected Senate representative addresses the BOT on behalf of the Senate. Another senator noted that this should not be seen as a wish-list but rather the beginning of an exchange with the BOT. One senator, although endorsing faculty representation, expressed concern over the recommendation that these be elected and argued that they are more useful if appointed; she further noted that the Senate is not the appropriate body to elect such members. She also questioned the recommendation that there be faculty representation concerning firing decisions. President Dorman noted that faculty members are already represented on search committees, but it tends to be those with a similar level of experience to those being recruited. Another senator commented that there had been some key search committees without faculty representation and cited that of the Chief Operating Officer as one example. Another senator pointed to the importance of reporting back to faculty that was often missing. Provost Dallal provided his own critique of the document and argued with the definition of shared governance in it and that it is not benchmarked against other institutions in which, for example, search committees are universally appointed. He pointed to 42 shared governance policies developed with faculty involvement and approved by the Senate that illustrated that the university had a strong record of moving towards shared governance. He noted that the figures cited in the report on faculty representation on BOT were based on a sample of universities nationally in the US, not all universities. He also commented on the scrupulous attention paid at AUB to the recommendations of the Chair of the Accreditation Committee that were not taken into account in the document, and that 9 out of 11 recipients of honorary degrees were nominated by faculty. Recent search efforts for deans have been among the most thorough and widely consultative he has witnessed. One senator commented in response that the document is not targeting shared academic governance, on which there has been much progress, but rather the focus is on some administrative decisions taken. Several senators also questioned the focus on benchmarking and argued that AUB is in many respects in a unique situation. Another senator commented that he had read the report as positive to initiate dialogue and that the spirit of cooperation needs to be maintained. President Dorman stated that the document needs to recognize the good work that has been done and that there is a clear distinction between the responsibilities of administration and those of faculty. Another senator responded that there should not be an assumption of bad intentions and that the faculty is merely asking to be more involved. Shared governance is not costly. Clarification was also requested about the periodic meetings of the BOT with faculties, and the President clarified that such visits are arranged on a rotating basis. D. Jamali commented that if the document was not endorsed by the Provost, there is no intention of moving forward. President Dorman stated that it is not a document submitted for voting at this time, but that he would discuss the document further and suggest a meeting with D. Jamali. A question was raised as to why this document was being addressed to the BOT and not the administration. The President concluded that it was important to see the document from the perspective of the BOT who have seen progress towards shared governance.

5. Proposed draft privacy policy

Provost Dallal presented the draft privacy policies and noted that all academic institutions have a privacy policy to enshrine privacy and spell out instances when there are valid reasons to violate privacy. President Dorman noted it had been benchmarked with Ivy League institutions and discussed with the Audit Committee. Concern was expressed that the document does not state clearly when such decisions are made. Another senator argued that it needs to be consistent with principles of academic freedom and that both the sender and receiver should be informed. President Dorman concurred that the need to notify is paramount if there is time. It was pointed out that the meeting no longer had

quorum and therefore the document could only be discussed, not voted on. In response to a question about whether Lebanese or US law was the reference, President Dorman clarified that in Lebanese law all data files are the property of AUB, but he noted that there is a need to protect intellectual property. A question was raised whether the policy applies to data files of students, staff of the medical center and to communications within faculty housing. It was suggested that wording be added in reference to misconduct that these measures may not need to be resorted to in practice, and that a “valid request” needs to be clarified. It was further argued that any individual has the right to know if there has been an allegation against them.

Items 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the agenda were not discussed for lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Minutes recorded by J. DeJong, Secretary of the Senate