

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL

MINUTES 17 November 2010 (week 46)

Present :

Nitin Afzulpurkar
Mokbul Morshed Ahmad
Kazi M. Ahmed
Amrit Bart
Izel Ann Dante
Joydeep Dutta
Manukid Parnichkun
Sudip K Rakshit
Jonathan Shaw
Worawaj Onnom

Secretariat :

Karma Rana
Namita Sravat

Apologies:

Said Irandoust
Barbara Igel
Weerakorn Ongsakul
Worsak Kanok-Nukulchai

PAC 10.11.01 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The VPAA, Prof. Joydeep Dutta Chaired the PAC on behalf of the President and welcomed the members attending the PAC meeting. The apologies were noted.

PAC 10.11.02 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the PAC meeting held on 13 October 2010 were **confirmed** with editorial revisions as given below:

- The point 4 on page 2 and point 11 on page 4 were on the same issue with different headings, and thus some repetition was found. The secretary would re-write the point 4 by merging point 11, and also rephrase President's statement regarding recruitment of doctoral students. *[Please note that revised point 4 is included as Annex-1 of these minutes].*
- On page 4, under point 10 the text in the box to read 'The system would be further improved based onthe guidance of the VPAA'.
- On page 7, first sentence of the last paragraph of section on 'AIT Research Strategy' to read as 'A suggestion was put forward to include renewable energy technology andis known.'

Follow-up Issues:

- 1] **Student Advisee Distribution** - A member raised concern regarding some FoS Coordinators not sharing the doctoral students' files. Thus, there is a need for clear policy on this.

The Head-Administration would check the current practice and report to the next PAC meeting.
--

PAC 10.11.03 MERIT PAYMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION/VICE PRESIDENTS

It was deferred for the next meeting, to be discussed in presence of the President. The general principles for the merit payments would be included too for the discussion in next meeting.

Dr. Manukid raised a concern that his FoS was advised to include 50% payment for the School Dean. It was clarified that the guidelines for budget allocation were very clear that the School Dean's cost is budgeted to the Dean's office and not by any FoS. Thus, this needs to be corrected in the budget.

In relation to this issue, the VPR requested the next PAC meeting to also discuss the issue of VPs being evaluated by the concerned Schools for their 50% as faculty and % by administration for the 50% as administrator, while School Deans are only evaluated as administrator by the administration.

PAC 10.11.04 FACULTY WORK LOAD AND HONORARIUM RATES

It was informed that this issue had been resolved with the P&P 'FB-4-2-2: Direct and Indirect Incentives: Undergraduate Programs' finalized upon the discussion between President, VPAA and School Deans held on 1 November 2010, and the P&P is effective 1 November 2009.

In relation to this, the Dean/SET mentioned that the P&P is very useful as it clearly states the honorarium rates for the direct-hire faculty, but there is no clear guideline for honorarium payments to be made to the non-AIT faculty.

It was clarified that for AIT Extension, it's basically full cost recovery and the honorarium is based on the cost of that individual's time. A faculty or staff member requested to provide services in the training programs of AIT Extension is remunerated at a fixed rate normally higher than the actual man-hour rate. However, in most cases, no payroll recovery is required to be credited to the responsibility center of the involved faculty or staff member, especially that most services are for a nominal period of one hour to a whole-day session. A faculty or staff member requested to provide services for more than a day, part of the amount earmarked as honorarium for the involved faculty or staff is credited as payroll recovery to the responsibility center of the involved faculty or staff member.

In case of faculty, the honorarium rates are not based on monthly salary, and Ms. Izel suggested that for staff, hourly honorarium rates for teaching could be based on monthly salary divided by 22 days and 8 hours per day and charge for preparation time, but not to exceed 2,500 baht per hour. The Dean/SET stated that the suggestion is acceptable if it is clarified that out of the 2,000 baht per hour charged for teaching by the Language Center (LC); 1,000 baht is paid as honorarium to the teacher and 1,000 baht is paid to the Center for payroll cost recovery. His understanding from the memorandum he had received from Director, LC was that the teaching staff gets 1,000 baht, and rest 1,000 baht is equally disbursed amongst 4 staff of LC for preparation of the course materials. Furthermore, he suggested that the guiding principle should be that the staff honorarium payment should not be same as faculty honorarium payment, otherwise they should be appointed as Adjunct Faculty.

Dean/SET would send the memorandum he mentioned to Ms. Izel for clarification on the payment made for 'English' language teaching, and to be reported in the next PAC meeting.

PAC 10.11.05 SET'S FACULTY Position and Salary Placement Exercise Outcome

It was deferred for the next PAC meeting. Other two Schools (SERD and SOM) reminded to submit the same as soon as possible.

The PAC members **suggested** that the implementation date - January 2011, should be same for all School's faculty members even if the exercise is completed later by respective School.

PAC 10.11.06 ACADEMIC SENATE REPORTS

The PAC **endorsed** the Academic Senate recommendations made in its meeting held on 25 August and 29 September 2010 that includes as follows:

- approving of the new UG course 'Engineering Drawing';
- Modular Course offering for the AARM FoS in SERD on a trial basis for August 2010 semester;
- allow 'Leave of Absence' from study program without payment of registration fees on a case-by-case basis under special circumstances, with this issue to be revisited again after one year;
- revised course structure of AT81.16: Real Time Systems 3(2-3) that includes practical laboratory session;
- One-year Professional Master's Program in Urban Management to be jointly offered by UEM/SERD/AIT, AIT Center in Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh City University of Architecture;
- The amended regulations for doctoral students as follows:
 - The future publication in the journal *Recent Research in Science and Technology published by Infocality* and *American Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences published by Science Publications* was discouraged due to their very broad scope.
 - In future, aside from the current regulations, additional information on the publishing house and the editor/editor-in-chief needs to be provided in order to facilitate the review of e-journals.
 - Request for pre-evaluation of journal need to be coursed through the Program Committee Chair, and a form for this was also approved which would be circulated by the Registry Officer to all doctoral students along with a note on this.

Regarding the AS requesting administration to consider the policy issue regarding the offering of academic programs by AIT in Vietnam, the issue was taken up as a separate agenda item as given below.

PAC 10.11.07 GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS OFFERED BY AIT CENTERS

It was informed that the proposed amendments ([as given below](#)) and minor editorial revision in the existing P&P on "Introduction to New Programs" were made to reflect the procedures for introduction of new programs when they are outside knowledge area of any schools and to allow collaborative programs.

[Amendments suggested were:](#)

- [In the case when a new degree program is outside the knowledge area of any of the schools, thus cannot be collaboratively offered with any of the schools, an ad-hoc external committee will be formed by the Academic Senate to review the program proposal and](#)

make recommendations. Approval will then be obtained from the Vice President for Academic Affairs and then the Academic Senate through the Academic Development Review Committee (ADRC).

- Wherever possible, the schools will assist in reviewing relevant courses as part of the teaching quality assurance and endorse them for the approval of the Academic Senate.
- Payment terms, which will be borne by the program proponent, for the provision of services, by either a School or external group, as and when required, will be laid out in an internal agreement.

The highlights of the key points raised/discussed were:

- Given the broad area that AIT in Vietnam (AITVN) functions, the Director of AITVN, Dr. Amrit Bart stated that it is like AIT Satellite Center and thus it need to be treated separately then Centers within AIT.
- In the current practice, as per bye-laws, the award of degrees to be conferred is made by the Academic Senate and the awardees are presented by the School Deans. Thus, the AIT Centers or AITVN cannot confer the degree, but can offer program collaboratively.
- Before degrees are recommended by the Academic Senate to the President for conferring, process involves students evaluation which includes recommendation on dismissal, suspension, tribunal appeals etc. and these in absence of regular faculty is not possible.
- Programs could be offered collaboratively with Schools at AIT.

Dr. Bart mentioned that he has some comments/inputs to be made but due to disturbance in video conferencing through Skype, he would send it later through email to Ms. Izel.

Further discussion will be held in the next PAC meeting, upon receiving comments from Director of AIT Vietnam.

PAC 10.11.08 REPORT FROM STUDENT OFFICE

1] New Design for Student ID Card

Design of a new Student ID Card was endorsed with minor changes.

It was also suggested that 'English' translation of the text as addendum to the card could be considered. Also, some thought needed about whether the ID card at AIT head quarter and AIT Satellite Centers should be different or identical.

2] Format of Research Reports

To ensure the format of research reports complies with the Institute standard it was agreed to include a statement specifying that 'The student has followed format' in the existing Program Committee Evaluation form; and also to have form for students to certify "Certificate of Originality'.

It was suggested that only excellent Thesis reports should be retained by the Library, or alternatively the grade level received should be indicated by including a statement '*This Thesis was graded '...'*'.

A member noted that the sanctions on students for plagiarism etc. is clear, but sanctions on faculty advisor is not clear, and unless there are sanctions the problems will continue no matter what forms and checklists are prepared.

3] Thesis Proposals

Also to include 'Extended Abstract' and 'List of Research Publication' in the Appendices section in the thesis/research study reports. The 'Abstract' should indicate 5 keywords. The student would be required to submit the hard copy of the thesis/research study proposal to the Registry including the schedule of proposal examination for recording in SIS not later than one month after the enrollment of thesis/research study credits.

4] Updated Research Load of Faculty

The updated report on research faculty load of regular faculty was circulated for information. This would also be circulated to the Academic Senate members to reflect on it.

It was noted that at AIT the ranks are Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor, but the table indicated a Senior Instructor.

Head-Administration would check the use of position title 'Senior Instructor' and report to the next PAC meeting.

PAC 10.11.09 FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The brief report of the Executive Committee meeting held on 29 October 2010 was circulated to the members to follow-up on the actions required by concerned individuals.

PAC 10.11.10 OTHER MATTERS

A member suggested that since the institute has made surplus, it might be good idea to provide scholarships for doctoral students from it. It was clarified that the institute has made surplus operationally, but after investing in new initiatives and uplifting there is deficit.

VPR informed that AIT Research Strategy workshop was held recently, and there are plans to have institute-wide forum on this in the month of December 2010 or January 2011. He also noted that in one of the next PAC meetings he will report on the 'Low Carbon Society'.

The **next PAC meeting** shall be held on **6 December 2010**.

/ns 2 December 2010

ANNEX-1**Re-edited section of 13 October 2010 PAC minutes**

4] Student Advisee Distribution

The VPAA presented the updated version of the statistics on Student Advisee Distribution by School and Faculty rank/status member's review and to reflect on the figures. The breakdown of number of faculty supervising less than 5 , between 5-10 and more than 10 was indicated for each faculty rank; and also the breakdown of number of students per program (CAS, Masters, Doctoral, and Committees Membership) was also indicated. The data shows that instead of having equal distribution (which ideally should be achieved) it is either extremely high or low in many of the cases.

The Dean/SET referred to an example of Dr. Hadikusumo for whom 73 Master advisees are recorded, however most of them are from Professional Masters Program in Vietnam who are not required to do research thesis. Thus, this kind of bundling creates confusion. Furthermore, there is less number of specialists/senior faculty members available while students feel that they should be allowed to decide their advisors. To address this issue the fields in high demand with greater number of students enrolling should be identified, and as a priority more faculty should be recruited in them.

The President stated that it's especially good for School Deans to reflect on the numbers indicated in the data. In response to comment made regarding less number of, the President mentioned that plans should be in place to recruit new faculty, and if for any reason it is not possible then it might be better to go slowly in admitting doctoral students for a while.

The VPR mentioned that the average of 6-7 students per faculty is still bad for quality purpose. In relation to this issue, he also suggested that while requesting for the funding, it should be negotiated for 4 years instead of 3 years for doctoral students, as in AIT it gets delayed most of the time since doctoral students are required to do coursework also which usually takes one year to complete. The President responded that instead, reducing coursework could be an option; especially in light of students complaint that we do not have doctoral level advanced courses (except few such courses offered by SOM), and since this is additional requirement which is not there in the European system.

<p>The issue would be discussed in the next Academic Senate meeting. The VPAA would write to School Deans to reflect on the data and take necessary steps.</p>
--