

**PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL  
RETREAT**

**MINUTES  
28 February 2011  
(week 09)**

---

**Present :**

Said Irandoust  
Nitin Afzulpurkar  
Kazi M. Ahmed  
Amrit Bart  
Barbara Igel  
Izel Ann Dante  
Joydeep Dutta  
Manukid Parnichkun  
Weerakorn Ongsakul  
Sudip K Rakshit  
Jonathan Shaw  
Worsak Kanok-Nukulchai  
Lawal Umar Kankia

**Secretariat :**

Karma Rana  
Namita Sravat

**Invitee :**

Ajit P Annachhatre  
Sandro Calvani  
Riaz Khan  
Kaisa Pudas  
Leena Woweck

**Apologies:**

Naveed Anwar  
Louis Hornyak

---

**PAC 11.02.13 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The President welcomed the members attending the PAC Retreat and apologies were noted. He mentioned that the Retreat was arranged basically to address current bottlenecks of academic and administrative processes. Out of the issues received (that were reported to the PAC meeting on 16 February 2011), the issues finalized for discussion were included in the agenda for the meeting.

**PAC 11.02.14 UPDATES ON NEW MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE MODEL**

The President briefed members on the updates on the implementation plan of the new management and administrative model. The key points were:

- The Executive Committee Working Group had its first meeting on 17 February, and will regularly meet once a month from now onwards.
- High priority given on the evaluation and update of the AIT Strategy according to new principles.
- Other phases of the plans include: organize the implementation phase, define and implement bye-laws, develop detailed ToRs for management roles, recruit VPs, appoint new management team, and organize schools and their offerings that was planned to be done by 1 July 2011.
- Possible outsourcing of administrative functions such as HR, Finance, marketing and part of ERCO functions, students related services etc. would also be explored. It may be partial or complete outsourcing of functions depending on the recommendations of the team working on it.

A member queried whether in the new administrative structure there will be one Academic Senate or different Academic Senate for each thematic area. The President stated that it is up to the Academic Senate to decide whether they want to follow the current system of one

Academic Senate, different Academic Senate for each thematic area as proposed by the consultant, or both of the system.

#### **PAC 11.02.15                    ADJUNCT FACULTY AS PROGRAM COMMITTEE CHAIR**

The Academic Senate Chair raised this issue that as per the current P&P the Chair of the Program Committee must be a full-time faculty member of the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, and the short-term visiting and adjunct faculty are ineligible; while they or external expert may be appointed as member of the Program Committee. However, due to several practical reasons this P&P was violated and thus there is a need to revisit this issue.

The **conclusions** that followed the deliberations were as follows:

- Possibility of allowing instructors and adjunct faculty to serve as program committee chair if they meet the TOR/expectations in terms of competence and time commitment should be explored by the Academic Senate, and once agreed the ToR of the Program Committee should be defined by the Academic Senate.
- Option for doctoral students to co-teach or co-supervise masters or undergraduate students as part of their education/curriculum.
- Deans were urged to seriously make use of coursework and research evaluations, and arrange face-to-face consultations with faculty members to address results/feedback and plan follow-up actions.
- Online publication of faculty members research interests and areas of expertise for students to consider when deciding their research topics.

#### **PAC 11.02.16                    INTRODUCTION TO NEW PROGRAMS**

It was informed that further to the PAC decision during its meeting held on 16 February 2011, that the proposed amended P&P on 'Introduction to New Program' be reviewed by the Academic Senate to provide its recommendation, the AS on 23 February 2011 has established a Task Force on this issue comprising of ADRC and DPRC Chairs, School Deans and Director/Yunus Center.

The key conclusions from the discussions that followed were:

- Introduction of new academic programs by AIT non-School units, especially AIT Centers should be in collaboration with schools as much as possible, also utilizing the resources available in-house.
- Creation of programs is decided by administration, but the Academic Senate will continue to be responsible for quality assurance following defined criteria/requirements.
- The Academic Development Review Committee (ADRC), standing committee of the Academic Senate reviews the proposals for new programs and they should also use external expertise when needed.
- Closer collaboration between Centers and Schools, for example having School faculty members affiliated with Centers as Fellows.
- Every four years an external review of the programs should be conducted systematically.

**PAC 11.02.17                      PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS**

It was informed that there is a Task Force on Professional Programs lead by the VPAA, which will again meet on 7 March 2011 to finalize the 'Regulations and Procedures for the Professional Program'. The draft that will be discussed in the TF meeting was circulated for member's information and comments. In relation to this, the P&P on 'Professor of Practice' was recently approved by the President.

The VPAA requested that in order to ensure the standard format of new program proposals, it should be prepared using the current P&P on Introduction to New Programs.

The key points of the discussions for the consideration of the TF on Professional Programs were:

- It is important to validate the knowledge of the applicant and as per their career plan individualistic curriculum should be developed for them where faculty's role is to guide and coach.
- A reflective essay which gives insights on both experience and knowledge of candidate, which then could be linked to the internship or action-research type of project.
- The Director of CSRACA, Ms. Leena pointed out that in case of the professional program in CSR, it was developed in executive format following module system of offering courses, but this creates problems of invoicing for students. Thus there is a need to have some flexibility for professional programs as value addition.
- Corresponding fee structure should be allowed, whereby the tuition fees could be for the complete course i.e. as fixed fees for the program, but with a defined time period, beyond which they will should be charged for registration fees per semester same as for regular program.
- Professional Programs have to be distinct from the regular academic programs
- It was suggested that all Professional Programs should be placed under same umbrella with different regulations, and have partners from the concerned professions.
- Aspects such as Knowledge need of professional, Internship etc. are important while designing the curriculum. Also it should be demonstrated that profession related sector has been involved, by having some minimum number of lectures from the concerned sector.
- Parallel sub-committee might be established to review progress of students which could be a standing committee of Academic Senate or Institute-Level Committee.

**PAC 11.02.18                      COMMUNITY SERVICE: DEFINITION, MEASURES AND INCENTIVES**

The Director of AIT Extension raised an issue regarding the lack of clarity in defining community service at AIT, which covers different tasks and responsibilities, from editorial work on academic journals to service on Senate to service on task forces.

A member noted that some tangible measurement of values should to be there for time spent in attending the meetings which a faculty could otherwise spend on his own academic paper or work. The President stated that in terms of both faculty evaluation and financially it is counted. It was also noted by a members that most of the faculty are involved in such community service which includes consultancy, outreach activities, referees for outside papers, referees for

journals, assisting donor agencies for projects, etc. which do not necessarily monetarily affect the faculty but it does help in brand recognition etc.

The President concluded that the Faculty Evaluation Panel (FEP) defines the minimum requirements in each of the three broad areas of research, teaching/pedagogy, and outreach that faculty members are evaluated on. To ensure that quality is not jeopardized, it might also be necessary to define a minimum level for each of these areas. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member should demonstrate this required minimum level of competence and professional accomplishments in all three areas in addition to excelling in at least one. Outreach, which needs to be better defined, covers one's involvement within the local and regional community. The Academic Senate Chair requested that once FEP finalizes its recommendations, they be shared with the Academic Senate for their review and feedback.

The Vice President Research noted that currently the Outreach Council is finalizing the outreach policies.

**PAC 11.02.19                    DELEGATION AND CLEARER LINES OF AUTHORITY, AND  
IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSIBILITY CENTER MODEL (RCM)**

The Director of AIT Extension briefed members on the various approval processes that creates delays while wasting the President's time requiring his signature (please refer to the Paper 4.4 of the Retreat).

Following the discussion, the President concluded to have following expanded delegation of authority to approve financial transactions for immediate implementation:

- All Responsibility Center (RC) heads to be authorized to approve operational expenditures within their approved budgets for the fiscal year.
- During an initial period of six months, all RC heads to be authorized to approve their own operational expenditures within their approved budgets for the fiscal year. At the end of the initial 6-month period, the RC heads will report to the President cases where they feel most uncomfortable to approve themselves.
- It would be the responsibility of the respective RC heads to ensure compliance of Institute policies and procedures. Should there be any deviation from Institute policies and procedures, RC heads to be authorized to grant special approval up to 15% beyond the maximum allowable limits set by the Institute.
- Any deviation beyond 15% of the maximum allowable limits set by the Institute would require the approval of the President.

Cases covered in second and third item above would need to be continuously randomly checked by the Internal Auditor for any pattern of abuse.

- Before implementing above expanded delegation of authority, the internal auditor would be consulted for any legal implications.
- The Responsibility Center Management (RCM) would be implemented from this year 2011. In next PAC meeting, the final RCM Cost Allocation should be presented and approved.
- The Head of Administration was tasked to have the online publication of AIT employees' official travels revived.

**PAC 11.02.20                    AIT POLICY ON AIT VIETNAM**

The Director of AIT Vietnam stated With increasing number of faculty being recruited by AITVN to manage its academic and other programs, it will need policy and procedures for recruitment, contract renewal, introduction of new programs etc not unlike that of any schools. Dilemma is to determine how AITVN is to be defined. We have a definition problem, for example, is AIT Vietnam a School, a satellite center? or a campus? Perhaps, it does not fit any particular mold, but a hybrid (between school and a campus). Thus, it is important that AIT Vietnam be defined clearly to avoid confusions associated with academic governance, ownerships, brand-building etc; which is also a prelude to defining satellite campus in Vietnam and other countries. While AITVN has the characteristics of a campus (with academic and non-academic programs spanning all three schools), it does not have the academic governance system of its own (similar to Schools). It also cannot use Vietnam Ministry of Education system of governance and it must rely on AIT Thailand based system of governance, at least until a full- scale university workforce is in place.

The President clarified that AIT Vietnam is considered as integral part of AIT and once the AIT Satellite Model is approved and implemented, AIT Vietnam and AIT Satellite Campus in Vietnam would in essence be one entity.

**PAC 11.02.21                    REPORTS BY VPS, SCHOOL DEANS AND DIRECTORS**

The Director of AIT Vietnam pointed out that the Directors, Deans, VPs and others are asked to produce reports (responding to 2013 strategy) which are sent to the President and presented to the Board. It would be useful to revisit strategy 2013 and try to create a reporting system where each activity reported responds to the strategic objectives. Some clear and verifiable indicators, which then could be used to measure progress across the institute portfolio should be generated and agreed on. This sort of reporting would be useful for the Executive Board and AIT President, especially for next year when it would be time to start developing AIT strategy 2018. It would also provide reporters some sense of the utility of the reports, as currently there is rarely any comments or feedback on the reports presented.

It was clarified that the after the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees meeting a follow-up actions Report is circulated to the PAC members to do the needful accordingly, which should be considered as outcomes/feedback on the Reports submitted. Furthermore, to have reports in standard format, Prof. Worsak's report was circulated to all members to use an example to prepare the reports accordingly with clear KPI indicators included. The Report has been very useful as during the annual evaluation of the administrators, many requests are received from the administrators to forward them the reports for their reference.

**PAC 11.02.22                    AIT INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL**

The AIT International School (AITIS) Principal, Ms. Kaisa Pudas briefed members on the challenges faced by the AITIS and plans for future to gradually extend its education into secondary and high school sections. The AITIS is considering using the IGSCE curriculum for the secondary and high school sections.

A member suggested that to compete with schools in and around, there is a need for huge resources to upgrade the facilities, and only way is to outsource the school. The President opined that either outsourcing or joint venture could be explored. The Vice President Research suggested that AITIS Principal also reviews the earlier proposal submitted by Malaysian School when the possibility of outsourcing the AITIS was being looked into.

The AIT shall look into assisting the AITIS in pursuing its plans and the Head of Administration will involve AIT Consultants in assisting AITIS in developing business plan for year.

### **PAC 11.02.23            OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1] **Rewarding for Initiatives:** A member raised a concern regarding rewarding the faculty/staff for their various initiatives that are not accounted otherwise. It was agreed that there will be incentives for the new initiatives initiators, especially those not necessarily involved in the implementation.

To be further discussed in next PAC meeting.
--

- 2] **Cap on Faculty Travel:** The faculty travel list is being compiled and will be brought to one of the future PAC meetings for consideration.
- 3] **Systematic Coursework Evaluation:** This needs to be implemented. In one of the PAC meeting it was agreed that the VPAA would come up with a system whereby the results of the Student Faculty Evaluation Forms are considered and appropriate actions taken accordingly, by arranging meetings for problem cases between the student representative not belonging to that particular school, the School Dean and VPAA. Also that the dissemination of the problem cases identified would be done by the VPAA office.

Further suggestion made by a member to include the Student Faculty Evaluation for Peer Teaching Review was well taken

---

/ns 11 March 2011