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I. Introduction

i. Institutional Overview

Established in 1866, the American University of Beirut (AUB) is a private, independent, non-sectarian, non-profit institution of higher learning located in Lebanon’s capital city. It functions under a charter from the State of New York and is governed by an autonomous Board of Trustees. The University has six faculties/schools: Agricultural and Food Sciences; Arts and Sciences; Engineering and Architecture; Health Sciences; Medicine (including the Rafic Hariri School of Nursing); and the Suliman S. Olayan School of Business. It offers one hundred twenty programs leading to Bachelor’s, Master’s, PhD, and MD degrees. With the reintroduction of PhD programs in eight specialties in 2007-08, AUB became the first US-accredited university in the Arab world to offer doctoral degrees. All degrees awarded by the University are officially registered with the Ministry of Higher Education in Lebanon and with the New York State Department of Education. The University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Degree programs in four of its professional schools are further accredited by specialized agencies in the United States (see Section II.i).

In 2010-11, the University’s total student population was 7968: 6425 undergraduates, 1207 graduate students, and 336 medical students (see Table 1). Coeducational since 1922, AUB has a student body that is almost evenly composed of males (50.2 percent) and females (49.8 percent). Incoming students tend to have strong scholastic records, with 33 percent graduating in the top 10 percent of their secondary school classes and 89 percent in the top 50 percent. AUB’s retention rate is 91.6 percent and the graduation rate is 82.9 percent (see Table 2). The University has 744 instructional (undergraduate) faculty which translates into 554.7 full-time equivalents (FTEs), most of whom are full-timers. The student-to-faculty ratio remains steady at about 13:1. Most AUB faculty, students, and staff are Lebanese and constitute a representative cross-sample of the country’s mosaic of confessional backgrounds. English is the language of instruction in all programs, except for coursework in the Department of Arabic and Near Eastern Languages and in the foreign language offerings of the Civilization Sequence Program.

Table 1: Degree Program Enrollment by Faculty/School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>GR*</td>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS)</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS)</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>396+7</td>
<td>2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA)</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>174+17</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine (FM)**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafic Hariri School of Nursing (HSON)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suliman S. Olayan School of Business (OSB)</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6213</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>6399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including doctoral students (FAS and FEA) ** FM also had 319 (08-09), 332 (09-10), and 336 (10-11) MD students, interns, residents, etc. pursuing professional education during the three-year period.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment’s annual published and draft (2010-11) Fact Book.
In configuration, AUB adheres to the American model of liberal education, which consists of a strong core curriculum that exposes students to key areas of the liberal arts, as well as quality major programs that develop proficiency in specific disciplines. In terms of its academic programs and student interest, the University reflects a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Medicine) profile, with most students majoring in these disciplines. Also favored are Arts and Sciences programs that are viewed as being pre-professional or professionally oriented. AUB students enter specialized programs in their sophomore year. The University’s General Education program seeks to broaden their knowledge and cultivate essential skills using a range of courses largely concentrated in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Although courses in natural science, social science, and humanistic disciplines are full and programs are active, the number of humanities majors is relatively low.

ii. Major Changes/Developments since March 2009

A new president, Dr Peter Dorman, was appointed to lead the University in 2008. Since that time, AUB has undergone other changes in leadership as well as the addition of two executive offices.

- **Provost:** Dr Ahmad Dallal of Georgetown University joined AUB as provost in July 2009. Shortly after taking office, Dr Dallal named Dr Nesreen Ghaddar, formerly acting associate provost, as associate provost.

- **Academic Deans:** Also in 2009, Dr Mohamed H. Sayegh of the Harvard Medical School was named Vice President for Medical Affairs and the Raja N. Khoury Dean of the Faculty of Medicine; and Dr Patrick McGreevy, director of AUB’s Center for American Studies and Research, was appointed dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Most recently, in March 2011, the appointment of Dr Makram Suidan of the University of Cincinnati as dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture was approved by the Board of Trustees.

- **Dean of Students:** In November 2010, Dr Talal Nizameddin, formerly associate dean of student affairs, was appointed dean after a formal search prompted by the retirement of his predecessor.

### Table 2: Graduation and Retention Rates by Faculty/School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
<th>Graduation Rate (%)*</th>
<th>Retention Rate (%)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS)</td>
<td>83.02</td>
<td>85.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS)</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>76.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA)</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>89.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>79.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafic Hariri School of Nursing (HSON)</td>
<td>70.73</td>
<td>94.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suliman S. Olayan School of Business (OSB)</td>
<td>88.72</td>
<td>91.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.75</td>
<td>82.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graduation rate is the percentage of the initial cohort which completed the program in six or fewer years.

**Retention rate is the percentage of the cohort of all full-time bachelor (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered the institution as new first-time students in the fall (or preceding summer) semester and were enrolled one year later.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment’s annual published and draft (2010-11) Fact Book.
Vice Presidents: Two major executive offices were created in 2010-11. Ms Rita Khayat-Toubia was recruited as vice president for Information Technology, and Mr Peter F. May as vice president for Legal Affairs. Ms Khayat-Toubia is currently developing an information technology plan for the University. At the Office of Development (soon to be renamed University Advancement), the newly appointed vice president, Mr Richard J. Brow, is working on preparations for a major capital campaign tentatively scheduled to go public after an initial ‘silent’ phase.

Prior to the visit of the MSCHE evaluation team in March 2009, AUB’s Office of Strategy Management (OSM) began working to align the Campus Strategic Plan Overview with a parallel document produced by the University’s Medical Center, and to incorporate major recommendations from the 2008 Institutional Self-Study. During this process, the Overview’s final goal was reformulated to explicitly assert AUB’s commitment to strengthening linkages between three key processes, namely assessment, planning, and resource allocation. Performance management measures were developed to monitor progress in achieving this and other goals. The comprehensive plan was approved by the Board of Trustees. Monitoring is being conducted annually in strategy review meetings attended by senior administrators.

The OSM has also designed a process for a second strategic planning cycle that started in 2010-11. During this cycle, AUB’s academic and administrative units will align the plans that they prepared during the first cycle with the existing Overview. This effort comprises several phases, starting with the training of members of the various strategic planning teams and culminating in a revised Overview.

AUB’s faculties and schools have continued to seek and obtain program accreditation. In April 2009, BBA, MBA, and EMBA programs at the Suliman S. Olayan School of Business were accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Most recently, in August 2010, ABET, Inc. (Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology) accredited BE programs offered by the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture in four fields (Civil Engineering; Computer and Communications Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; and Mechanical Engineering) retroactive to October 1, 2008.

II. Progress to Date and Current Status

i. Assessment of Student Learning: Faculties/Schools with Full or Partial Accreditation

Four of the University’s academic units have achieved full or partial program accreditation with US-based agencies; namely: the Suliman S. Olayan School of Business (OSB); the Rafic Harirri School of Nursing (HSON, which is part of the Faculty of Medicine); the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA); and the Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS). Course and program learning outcomes have been developed for all of the degree programs offered by these units. With the exception of FEA graduate programs and two FEA undergraduate programs (Architecture; Graphic Design), student learning is being regularly assessed according to formal assessment plans and using appropriate direct/indirect, quantitative/qualitative measures. Assessment results are shared at the departmental and faculty levels and lead to minor and major curricular improvements to strengthen teaching and learning. Summaries of assessment activities in these units appear below; they are based on brief, written reports and other data submitted to the provost as well as verbal clarifications.
provided as necessary. (See Appendices A, B, and C for reports and data, including evidence of the use of student learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.)

Suliman S. Olayan School of Business (OSB)
OSB began its first program review immediately upon its establishment in 2001. A more methodical and formal assessment of BBA, MBA, and EMBA programs was completed in 2006-07, almost three years before these programs were accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Prior to the first formal assessment cycle, each program developed program educational objectives and measurable learning outcomes which were aligned with the curriculum to determine appropriate core courses for program assessment. Program learning outcomes are assessed each semester: data are collected, analyzed, and disseminated; and findings are used for curricular improvement. Direct assessment measures include: a) course-embedded rubrics (using primary trait analysis) against case analysis and special assessment assignments carried out in relevant core courses; and b) the CAPSTONE simulation COMP-XM exam to assess discipline-based knowledge. BBA and MBA rubrics were reviewed and updated in Spring 2010; a similar review of EMBA rubrics is currently underway. The CAPSTONE simulation was initiated in the current semester to replace the ETS Major Field Test (MFT) in Business, which was discontinued for use outside of the US two years ago. Indirect assessment measures include course evaluation forms, student exit surveys, career surveys, and focus groups, in addition to studies supplied by AUB’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA).

Teaching faculty are required to participate in the development, review, and implementation of the program rubrics embedded in their courses. Data collected from each course are analyzed by a staff member in the Office for Continuous Improvement, which shares the analysis with the school’s Academic Committee, the track (departmental) convener, and appropriate instructor groups. Dissemination within the track is the responsibility of the convener. In outlier cases, the track generally forms a task force to analyze the data further; investigate possible reasons for the poor performance; and suggest curricular improvements to address any gaps. All proposed modifications must be approved by the Academic Committee prior to implementation. (A summary of OSB’s Assurance of Learning program appears in Appendices A-1 and B.) OSB is the only AUB faculty/school with an office dedicated to accreditation and assessment.

Rafic Hariri School of Nursing (HSON)
In 2007, the BSN and MSN programs at HSON, which is part of the Faculty of Medicine, were granted unconditional accreditation for five years by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). To maintain accreditation, HSON established a Comprehensive Evaluation Plan which identifies Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each program; utilizes specially-designed, indirect assessment tools (student satisfaction, student exit, alumni, and employer surveys) that explicitly address expected competencies; leads to annual, analytical reports shared and discussed by the faculty’s Curriculum and Graduate Studies committees and the HSON director; and generates recommendations for action by faculty members and officers as needed. Due to the low response rate to alumni and employer surveys, HSON is presently discussing alternatives, such as the use of focus groups. The school also maintains KPIs that are direct assessment measures, such as the pass/fail rate on the National Colloquium, a compulsory exam for all nurses planning to practice in Lebanon.

HSON has developed program and course learning outcomes and measurement tools for BSN programs and levels (sophomore, junior, senior) and MSN programs in line with CCNE
criteria. Most undergraduate courses are in clinical nursing where instructors and preceptors use direct observation to ensure that students demonstrate all of the required course competencies. HSON maintains course matrices showing how each of the competencies and assessment methods relates to level and program learning outcomes. Since undergraduate competencies are cumulative to the senior year, a single omission means that the student must retake the course. In the past few years, HSON conducted several retreats and workshops involving expert consultants in clinical evaluation as well as visiting scholars. This led to a major revision in clinical evaluation tools used for nursing courses with a clinical component. Each semester, instructors submit a Course Evaluation Summary to the HSON director: the summary includes feedback from preceptors, students, and other communities of interest; the results of the Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE) conducted by OIRA; and an analysis of the findings. The director monitors the findings and follows up as necessary. All learning outcomes are periodically reviewed by the appropriate faculty committee (curriculum; graduate studies), which also monitors changes to course syllabi to ensure consistency with level and program learning outcomes. (For a copy of HSON’s 2011 report to CCNE and other documentation, see Appendix A-2.)

Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA)
As noted above, FEA received ABET, Inc. accreditation for BE programs in four fields in the summer of 2010. Appendix C contains the Engineering Accreditation Commission’s final statement, which assigns no weaknesses or deficiencies in relation to the assessment of student learning and the use of assessment findings for program improvement. Three new programs, the BS in Construction Engineering and the BS and BE in Chemical Engineering, will be eligible for ABET accreditation in June 2012 and 2013 respectively, after they have graduated their first students. ABET accreditation is a condition of their registration with the New York State Department of Education. ABET has not yet informed the University whether the evaluation of these programs will take place as they become eligible or in conjunction with the next FEA accreditation visit in 2015-16.

ABET learning outcomes a-k are being used to assess student learning in all undergraduate Engineering programs including those that are not yet accredited. After completing a course, students provide input on the achievement of learning outcomes which is evaluated by instructors who add their own assessments based on direct measures. All course changes are overseen by area-specific faculty committees. At the program level, faculty monitor specific indicators in courses for each skill, ability, or understanding that their students are expected to have achieved. Final-year students complete an exit survey on program learning outcomes developed by their department. Other direct and indirect measures include feedback from the supervisors of student interns, external advisory boards, employers, and alumni. All program-level results are evaluated within an accreditation cycle of six years. Minor and major program revisions go to the Academic and Curriculum Committee, which is made up of departmental chairs and representatives of academic programs. Major revisions may be voted at the faculty and/or University level depending on their nature. (A report by the faculty and examples of recent curricular improvements appear in Appendix A-3.)

The assessment, evaluation, and continuous improvement process for graduate programs in Engineering is incomplete. Program educational objectives, program learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes have been developed for these programs; however, they are not yet evaluated according to formal assessment plans. At the Master’s level, the evaluation process will follow the requirements and guidelines established for periodic program review (see
Section II, iv). At the PhD level, assessment plans are documented in the original program proposals, but will not be implemented until 2011-12, five years after program launch.

Since 2009, FEA’s Department of Architecture and Graphic Design has established course and program learning outcomes for its undergraduate professional programs. Currently, it is checking the correlation between the course and program levels to determine if and where courses need to be strengthened. Faculty in the two programs are also seeking to improve alignment with the requirements of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) with the goal of seeking accreditation with these bodies. Until they do, these programs and the department’s Master’s-level programs will be evaluated according to the program review schedule.

Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS)
In 2006, the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) accredited FHS’s four graduate public health programs: the Master’s in Public Health (MPH, four concentrations), which is a professional program; and academic programs leading to the MS in Epidemiology, Population Health, and Environmental Sciences (with a concentration in Environmental Health). The latter is a part of the Interfaculty Graduate Environmental Sciences Program offered by four faculties. FHS is currently seeking reaccreditation and is working on a new self-study which is due on July 13, 2011. The CEPH site visit will take place on December 13-15, 2011.

CEPH requires the identification of learning experiences by which core public health competencies are met by students in all graduate programs. Competencies are linked to learning outcomes for the core program, the concentration areas, and the public health practice experience. CEPH also requires a description of the manner in which competencies are developed, implemented, and made available to students, as well as a description of the procedures for monitoring and evaluating student progress in achieving the expected competencies.

The faculty utilizes specially-designed indirect assessment tools (three student surveys; alumni and employer surveys) that explicitly address all expected learning outcomes. Results are reviewed by the MPH Curriculum Task Force and other standing committees of the faculty (in accordance with the bylaws) and corrective action is taken as needed. FHS has also identified capstone or culminating experiences for each of its graduate degrees and uses the results to indicate the overall achievement of program learning outcomes. Measures are currently being developed for specific learning outcomes. The faculty expects to complete formal assessment plans for its graduate programs by the end of May 2011 and will report on them in the self-study submitted to CEPH. (See Appendix A-4 for the first draft of the assessment plan for the MPH core, as well as other documentation.) The faculty also tracks approximately 120 KPIs, some of which are specific to instruction and job placement, which CEPH monitors closely; these KPIs form the basis of an annual indicators report and related improvement plan.

FHS also offers undergraduate degree programs in Environmental Health and Medical Laboratory Sciences that are not part of its accreditation project. In 2007, at the request of the Provost’s Office, FHS created a learning outcomes committee to work with the relevant departments in developing mission and vision statements and program learning outcomes that correlated to specific courses and culminating experiences. Specific indicators and targets
were set for these programs through formal, three-year assessment plans drafted in Fall 2010. Some data has been collected which will lead to program improvement in Fall 2011.

ii. Assessment of Student Learning: Faculties without Accreditation

Two academic units, the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS) and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), which collectively account for about half of AUB’s student enrollment, do not have accredited programs, although two FAFS’s departments are seeking to accredit undergraduate programs with US-based accreditors (see below). Specialized accreditation projects usually motivate faculty to develop formal assessment processes for the improvement of teaching and learning at the program level. In their absence, universities can point to the requirements of institutional accreditors, such as MSCHE; the institution’s own goals for quality assurance in education; and the structures that it puts in place to support the achievement of those goals.

The structures that AUB established in 2004 to ensure the assessment of student learning across faculties included the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and a University Learning Outcomes Coordinating Committee (ULOCC), which was chaired by a faculty member and included the CTL’s interim and associate directors and representatives of all faculties/schools. The CTL and ULOCC were asked to use their collective expertise to assist FAFS and FAS faculty members in creating and implementing assessment plans for their undergraduate programs and courses. Working in close coordination, they broke their task into manageable steps according to the following timetable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish program learning outcomes aligned with the departmental mission and program objectives</td>
<td>June 2008 (reported in Institutional Self-Study, page 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Devise course learning outcomes that correlate to program learning outcomes</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create sustainable program assessment plans</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify appropriate tools for direct and indirect assessment</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pilot the use of assessment tools to produce an initial assessment report</td>
<td>March 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assess course learning outcomes</td>
<td>Forthcoming (September 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CTL with guidance from ULOCC successfully utilized a ‘train the trainers’ model whereby CTL staff and other faculty at the Department of Education, as well as the director of OIRA, provided selected faculty (including some ULOCC members) with the training needed to accomplish the next scheduled phase. With continued CTL support, these trainers subsequently trained groups of two or three faculty chosen from each FAFS and FAS department by their chairs in consultation with the faculty dean. All faculty were compensated for the time spent in one- or two-day training workshops. As departmental faculty developed new skills and a permanent (if part-time) director was appointed to head the CTL, ULOCC began to play a less prominent role and was gradually replaced by ad hoc task-appropriate committees. Throughout the process, many faculty sought individual consultations with CTL staff members, who also audited the learning outcomes and assessment plans produced by departments. (See Appendix D for a selection of CTL documents and reports on this process.) Departments also formed learning outcomes
committees composed of the chair and the two or three faculty members who had received training to implement the plans.

By the date of this monitoring report, all FAFS and most FAS departments had submitted pilot assessment reports on student learning in at least one departmental program to faculty-level assessment coordinators, faculty deans, and the provost. The FAS assessment coordinator is following up with the chairs of departments in the faculty that have not yet delivered their plans/pilot reports; he expects to receive them according to the schedule provided below. When drafting their assessment plans, departmental faculty ensured the alignment of program and course learning outcomes. Now that plans have been piloted, many of them are also evaluating the suitability of their chosen measures in their reports. Needless to say, it is too early to document that most FAFS and FAS departments are implementing recommendations for program improvement found in the pilot assessment reports. Exceptions in FAFS are noted below.

Processes for the assessment of program learning outcomes in FAFS and FAS will be sustained by the dissemination of assessment reports by chairs to faculty involved in the program; semi-annual and/or annual departmental meetings and/or retreats to discuss assessment results; and oversight of departmental recommendations for improvement by faculty-level committees (administrative; academic and curriculum). The responsibilities of departmental chairs in this connection are clearly stated (see Appendix E, pages 3, 6, 12-13) in a draft Chairs Manual produced by the provost and academic deans and disseminated to chairs in 2009. A draft policy document produced by an institutional assessment committee established in Fall 2010 also specifies unit-level responsibilities (see Section II.v below). Moreover, assessment results will feed into a new process for the periodic review of academic programs (see Section II, iv below) approved by the University Senate in June 2010. The three-year student learning assessment cycle for most FAFS and all FAS undergraduate programs correlates well to the six-year periodic program review cycle. Program review is also expected to motivate departments to develop processes for the assessment of student learning at the graduate level.

From May to September 2011, the CTL will continue to work with FAFS and FAS departments to develop plans for the assessment of student learning at the course level. In the coming academic year, the center will begin offering regularly scheduled workshops on developing program and course learning outcomes, choosing program assessment plans and tools, and writing assessment reports. These workshops will be open to faculty across the University, including those interested in refreshing or deepening their knowledge.

**Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS)**

FAFS is currently seeking to accredit two of its programs. The four-year Coordinated Program in Nutrition and Dietetics, one of three undergraduate programs in the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences (NFS), completed a self-study for the American Dietetic Association’s Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) in 2010. CADE has provided the department with feedback on the self-study and recently committed to a site visit (date not specified) to determine candidacy for accreditation, after initially expressing concerns about sending an evaluation team to the Middle East. CADE only began accepting international candidates in the past three or four years. The Department of Landscape Design and Ecosystem Management (LDEM) is making programmatic changes to its BS of the same name to prepare for eligibility for accreditation with the American Society of Landscape Architects.
Accreditation projects like these have encouraged FAFS faculty to develop and implement three- and four-year (corresponding to program length) assessment plans for all undergraduate degree programs, and to pilot their plans, which include direct and indirect measures, to produce actionable reports. It is not surprising, then, that the two above-named departments are the first to have begun acting on their findings. FAFS has commended LDEM for assessing courses at all levels, developing sophisticated rubrics, and making specific changes to the curriculum and teaching practices in response to assessment results. NFS is also cited as an example of best practices for its comprehensive analysis of assessment results and for triangulating findings from direct and indirect measures to obtain a clear picture of student learning in the department’s three undergraduate programs. (See Appendix F for the FAFS report and documentation of departmental plans/reports.)

The two remaining departments are still at the stage of interpreting assessment data to produce action plans. The baseline or preliminary data collected in Fall 2010 has been analyzed, and chairs have suggested some curricular and pedagogical changes, as well as the refinement of assessment instruments to enhance their validity and their alignment to program learning outcomes. The Agriculture program is considering the reformulation of at least some assessment questions by a departmental committee, rather than relying overly on course instructors. The new Veterinary Science program is considering a longitudinal study over several years if low enrollments persist. All such modifications still need to be discussed by departmental faculty.

FAFS departments have benefited from faculty-level support, with the appointment of an assistant dean for academic affairs and the recruitment of a consultant to coordinate and support the assessment activities of departments. The faculty is planning to hire a full-time assessment officer for 2011-12. As noted above, most FAFS faculty members also received training and advice from the CTL and OIRA.

Table 3: FAFS Undergraduate Programs with Assessment Plans and Pilot Reports (as of March 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>UG Programs</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Pilot Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>BS Agriculture</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Agribusiness</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal and Veterinary Sciences</td>
<td>BS Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Design and Ecosystem Management</td>
<td>BS Landscape Design and Ecosystem Management</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Food Sciences</td>
<td>BS Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Coordinated Program in Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Food Science and Management</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS)
FAS is AUB’s largest faculty in terms of number of departments, programs, faculty members, and students. The faculty comprises 15 departments in fields of the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. All of these departments offer Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees; four of them launched the PhD in 2006-07, but have not yet graduated any students. The faculty is also home to the Civilization Sequence (‘Great Books’) Program, which continues
to be an important component of the University’s General Education program despite the latter’s recent revision (see Section II.iii). FAS has no plans to seek accreditation for any of its programs at this time.

Given its size and diversity, and the absence of accreditation projects, FAS has been AUB’s greatest challenge in terms of introducing processes for the assessment of student learning. Over the past four years, however, faculty departments (as well as the Civilization Sequence Program) have succeeded in developing mission statements and program and course learning outcomes for their undergraduate offerings. As Table 4 indicates, all degree-granting departments, barring one, have developed an assessment plan that uses direct and indirect measures for at least one undergraduate program. The exception is the English Department, which offers two distinct degrees as well as the full range of communications skills courses required by students who are not native English speakers. The department is presently facing numerous challenges, having had four different chairs in the past five years and a relatively high turn-over for faculty of all ranks. During 2010-11, senior faculty and the current chair played a major role in drafting new policies and procedures for the University’s English Language Proficiency requirements and English placement. The department expects to complete assessment plans for both of its undergraduate programs by July 2011 and to pilot the plan in 2011-12. (The Civilization Sequence Program is following the same timeline.)

The three-year assessment cycle reflects the complete educational cycle (sophomore, junior, senior) for students majoring in FAS programs. (Most students enter AUB as sophomores with the Lebanese or international Baccalaureate.) Since sequential learning is less important in certain social science and humanistic disciplines, some departments have plans to assess several program levels on an annual basis. Low undergraduate enrollments in two departments, Arabic and Near Eastern Languages, which has had few majors in recent years, and History and Archaeology, which has few History majors, led faculty there to develop longitudinal studies. Arabic and Near Eastern Languages is also looking at the learning achieved by students taking select courses as electives, while History is tracking graduates as well as current majors. Other departments, such as Political Studies and Public Administration, plan to create specialized surveys with assistance from the CTL and OIRA.

The majority of FAS departments piloted their plans during the Fall 2010 semester, collecting data and producing reports. Two departments, Chemistry and Computer Science, are still analyzing their data, while a third, Philosophy, decided to begin implementation in Spring 2011. The pilot phase was largely seen as an opportunity to re-evaluate program assessment plans and strategies; review the articulation and measurability of program learning outcomes; and test and refine the assessment instruments chosen by departments. This is reflected in analyses appearing in many of the trial reports (see Appendix G for plans and reports, including the coordinator’s report), which frequently offer recommendations for improving the assessment process. A few reports also suggest minor improvements to the curriculum, but most acknowledge that a single semester’s assessment is insufficient to generate meaningful data for such recommendations. Only a few reports (see, for example, the one for the Psychology program in the Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences) have already been shared with departmental faculty involved in the program. FAS plans to discuss findings and any proposed actions (re-evaluation, review, curricular change) with representatives of the CTL before implementation. One of the aims of this step is to ensure that departments maintain momentum and focus, and involve all concerned faculty in the assessment process, which is not yet entrenched. It is overseen, however by one of FAS’s associate deans, who
serves as the faculty’s assessment coordinator. The faculty is also considering the appointment of a full-time academic officer to take up these responsibilities.

As noted in the introduction to Section II.ii of this report, FAS departments were asked to develop and pilot assessment plans for only one of their undergraduate programs, although some departments exceeded expectations. The outstanding programs will be the focus of attention in the coming academic year, with assessment plans due at the end of the Fall semester and pilot reports at the end of the Spring semester. This will permit faculty members to focus on the assessment of course learning outcomes, which the CTL has scheduled for May to September 2011.

It will be a few more semesters, at the very least, before FAS can demonstrate that the assessment of student learning at the course and program level is leading to improvements in teaching and learning throughout the faculty. However, FAS is clearly committed to developing a viable and sustainable assessment process that engages faculty members and results in stronger and more effective programs.

Table 4: FAS Undergraduate Programs with Assessment Plans and Pilot Reports (as of March 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>UG Programs</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Pilot Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and Near Eastern Languages</td>
<td>BA Arabic Language and Literature</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BS Biology</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>BS Chemistry</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BS Computer Science</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>BA Economics</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>BA Education/Elementary</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA English Language</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA English Literature</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts and Art History</td>
<td>BA Studio Arts</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Art History</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>BS Geology</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Petroleum Studies</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Archaeology</td>
<td>BA History</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Archaeology</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>BA Mathematics</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Statistics</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS Statistics</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>BA Philosophy</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>BS Physics</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science and Public Administration</td>
<td>BA Political Studies</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Public Administration</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences*</td>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Sociology-Anthropology</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SBS also submitted an assessment report for its Diploma Program in Media Communication.
iii. General Education Requirement

Implementation of the University’s revised General Education (GE) program, which took effect in Fall 2010-11, has been overseen by a Senate General Education Committee that was first established in January 2009. The committee has nine elected members, four from FAS (one for each GE category) and five representing the remaining faculties/schools; it has met 14 times since its creation, with specialized sub-committees meeting more frequently.

The committee began by developing measurable learning outcomes for the GE program, communication and writing skills, and the four major disciplinary fields of learning (natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, quantitative thought). Its work was informed by a literature (methodology) review and a survey of practices at US universities. Feedback on draft outcomes was obtained from senior students and faculty members.

The committee’s next task was to invite faculty members to propose specific, existing courses for GE designation. It decided to use the Moodle (course management system) platform to permit the online submission of interactive templates for each GE field. The templates required faculty members to describe how the proposed courses would reflect learning outcomes specific to the field, address ethical issues, and assess student learning. The platform also contained information on the revised GE program and, as time passed, answers to FAQs on GE designation raised by faculty. The applications were reviewed by GE Committee members in relevant fields; as the volume increased, selected faculty drawn from the humanities, social sciences, and the communications skills program also assisted in the review process. (See Appendix H for GE documentation. A selection of completed templates may be found in Appendix I.)

The purpose of the review of applications was to determine how well the proposed courses correlated (low, average, high) with GE learning outcomes. Courses with a low degree of correlation were rejected, with faculty given advice on how to revise course syllabi and add missing components. Humanities and social science courses were divided into two categories: those with high and/or average correlation to all learning outcomes for the field (List I); and those correlating to some learning outcomes for the field or with average and/or low correlation to all of them (List II). Students who first enrolled in 2010-11 were permitted to take List II courses to satisfy the GE requirement, but at least half of their courses had to come from List I; continuing students were allowed to choose from either list at will since they entered the University before the new GE requirement took effect. By March 2011, the total number of approved courses was 279 (11 communication skills, 176 humanities, 51 social sciences, 24 natural sciences, and 17 quantitative thought). These figures are expected to increase as more courses receive GE designation. (Approved courses will also be monitored for continued compliance with GE learning outcomes.) An updated list of GE courses is posted on the Registrar’s Office website each semester. Banner, AUB’s student information system, also indicates which courses fulfill the GE requirement.

Information appearing in the front pages of the 2010-11 undergraduate catalogue was revised to reflect the new GE requirement and specify which courses had been approved. Some inside sections provided conflicting instructions, however, so faculties have been asked to delete them and to refer students to the front section when preparing sections for the 2011-12 catalogue. This discovery led to a broader evaluation of AUB major programs for compliance with the revised GE requirement. The committee also reviewed and made minor changes to
the recommended distribution of courses, for example, reassigning Education to the social sciences.

The University has additionally made significant progress in its Writing across the Curriculum initiative. In Spring 2010, the Provost’s Office, the GE Committee, deans, and departments worked with a US consultant, Dr Carol Haviland, and AUB’s Writing Center to develop criteria for writing courses in the majors and to re-envision 20 courses that would satisfy these criteria. Thirteen faculty members taught 10 of the new courses in Fall 2010-11 (see Table 5); another seven new courses, and two of the Fall courses, are currently (Spring 2011) being offered. This initiative is being funded by a three-year, $400,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

**Table 5: Writing Courses in the Majors, Fall 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Tutoring (hrs./sem.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEA</td>
<td>GRDS 325: Graphic Design History and Theory</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EECE 430: Software Engineering</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EECE 421: Computer Architecture</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EECE 460: Control Systems</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MECH 510: Design of Thermal Systems</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>ECON 227: Intermediate Economics</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC 223: Introduction to Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOAN 207: Digital Media Literacy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOL 221: Petrology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSON</td>
<td>NURS 406: Nursing Research</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td><strong>821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009-10, the GE Committee worked with the CTL and OIRA to prepare a draft GE program assessment plan; develop appropriate assessment instruments; and train two GE Committee members on the assessment of program learning outcomes. Although a few details remain to be worked out before the plan is finalized, data collection for the assessment of Humanities outcomes (Fall 2010) has begun.

Some of the main points of the GE program assessment plan are as follows:

- Implementation is over six consecutive semesters in a three-year cycle.
- Direct forms of assessment include a) embedded assessment for 16 required or popular courses; and b) standardized testing using the annual Collegiate Assessment of Academic proficiency (CAAP).
- Indirect forms of assessment include surveys, focus groups, and interviews. Existing AUB surveys suitable for alignment with GE learning outcomes include a) the annual College Outcomes Survey (COS); b) AUB’s Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE), which is administered each semester; and c) the University’s Exit Survey of graduating students.
- Every semester, two GE evaluators with expertise in the field under assessment collect and evaluate embedded assessment data, and report the results to the GE coordinator, who is permanently attached to the CTL.
- The GE coordinator combines these results with survey results provided by OIRA to produce an annual assessment report that is submitted to the Senate GE Committee.
• The GE Committee discusses the recommendations in the coordinator’s report and makes its own recommendations for program improvement to departmental chairs and course instructors.
• The GE coordinator follows up on the implementation of program improvements.
• The CTL trains GE evaluators and the coordinator, and serves as a repository for all GE assessment data.

A job description has been drafted for the GE coordinator. Until the position is filled, the chair of the GE Committee is assuming the coordinator’s responsibilities.

iv. Periodic Program Review

In 2009-10, AUB acted on a key recommendation in the 2008 Institutional Self-Study (Chapter Six, Educational Offerings, MSCHE Standard 11) for the establishment of a periodic review process that included appropriate support systems. Periodic program review (PPR) reaffirms AUB’s commitment to high quality academic programs that meet international standards, and provides a broader context and framework for assessment. It also helps to align curricular revision and development with strategic planning and the allocation of University resources, including funding.

Draft PPR policies, procedures, and guidelines were formulated by the Provost’s Office, discussed extensively by the academic deans, and approved by the Senate’s Academic Development Committee and, subsequently, the full Senate in June 2010. A faculty member was appointed as coordinator for program review in October 2010 and worked with the deans to set the PPR schedule for the next six years. (See Appendix J for the policies, procedures, and schedule for the periodic review of academic programs."

Reviews are scheduled according to the following guidelines:
• Undergraduate and graduate programs and departments without professional accreditation are reviewed at least once every six years. Departments are requested to review all of their degree programs simultaneously and to submit one self-study report.
• Departments that review programs for professional accreditation by external boards, commissions, or other agencies follow the schedule and requirements of that body for the accredited programs.
• The duration of each review is about 21 months from the time of notification to final approval of the action plan.

The review process may be summarized as follows:
• Faculty members conduct a departmental self-study that provides descriptive and evaluative information about the program, the faculty, and the students; and suggests areas and plans for improvement. It also identifies future program needs, directions, and priorities.
• External reviewers, who are acknowledged experts in the discipline under review, visit the campus and prepare a separate report, which may lead to modification of the department’s plan for program enhancement, creation, or termination.
• The dean consults with the departmental chair to ensure that the report is accurate and to review the department’s action plan.
• An internal review committee studies the documents and drafts a final report to the provost.
The provost presents the plan’s financial implications to academic and administrative heads for their input and asks the Senate to consider and approve its educational aspects. The plan thus forms the basis for all future actions related to planning, budgeting, and program improvement.

Implementation of the policy began with the appointment of the PPR coordinator. Four FAS departments (see Table 6) have initiated the review process: program and internal review committees have been formed; external reviewers have been identified; data collection has commenced; and some sections of the reports are being drafted. The Provost’s Office maintains a budget that supports this initiative by funding one course release for two semesters or a one-month summer salary for the faculty member charged with drafting the departmental self-study; and honoraria plus travel and other expenses for two to three external evaluators for each department under review.

Table 6: Departments/Programs Undergoing PPR in Year 1 (2010-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Program/s</th>
<th>Master’s/PhD Program/s</th>
<th>Internal Review Committee</th>
<th>Program Review Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>BS Physics</td>
<td>MS Physics, PhD Theoretical Physics</td>
<td>A. El Hajj, J. Meloy, N. Sabah</td>
<td>Samih Isber(Chair, Report), Malek Tabbal, Leonid Klushin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>BS Chemistry</td>
<td>MS Chemistry</td>
<td>A. El Hajj, M. Tabbal, A. Kayssi</td>
<td>Rabih Sultan (Chair, Report), Dighambara Patra, Houssam El-Rassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>BA Philosophy</td>
<td>MA Philosophy</td>
<td>A. El Hajj, J. Meloy, I. Osman</td>
<td>R.Brandster (Chair, Report), B. Bashour, P. Lewtas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science and Public Administration</td>
<td>BA Political Studies, BA Public Administration</td>
<td>MA Political Studies, MA Public Administration</td>
<td>A. El Hajj, M. Tabbal, J. Chaaban</td>
<td>Inanna Hamati-Ataya (Chair), Waleed Hazbun (Report), Samer Frangie (PS), Thomas Haase (PA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schedule at the end of Appendix J shows that, while FAS programs are the focus in Year 1, the number of participating faculties expands in Year 2, when it will include FAFS, FAS, FEA, FHS, and an interdisciplinary program. With the exception of FHS, reviews will cover both undergraduate and graduate programs. As schools with full program accreditation and continuous quality improvement cycles, OSB and HSON have not been included in the first PPR round.

Student learning assessment data used for self-studies conducted by FAS and FAFS departments during the first few years of the PPR cycle are unlikely to reflect the formal program learning outcomes assessment plans (see Section II.iii) that are only now being implemented. However, the findings of such plans and their use to improve teaching and learning will play a larger role as formal assessment processes mature and become ingrained.

v. Institutional Assessment Committee

In late Fall 2010, the provost created a standing Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) to address several assessment-related recommendations in AUB’s 2008 Institutional Self-Study,
most importantly, the development of comprehensive academic and institutional assessment plans. The IAC is composed of the provost, associate provost, MSCHE accreditation liaison officer, program review coordinator (currently the chair of the Senate GE Committee), and the directors of the CTL, OSM, and OIRA; its membership may expand as it evolves.

One of the first actions of the IAC has been requesting and providing information for this monitoring report; drafting and evaluating the report; and approving it for submission to MSCHE. The committee has also begun drafting a policy document (see Appendix K) that explains the reasons for its creation; its composition and functions; and the roles and responsibilities of various University units in institutional assessment activities. At a later point, this document will be presented to the Board of Deans (which includes vice presidents with executive functions) for their feedback and approval. Although the functions of the IAC clearly indicate that it is charged with institutional assessment broadly defined, its initial focus is on the assessment of student learning and of institutional effectiveness in supporting the educational, research, and service activities of faculty and students.

**III. Conclusion**

AUB continues to make steady progress in the implementation of an organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning. Measurable learning outcomes have been established for all University undergraduate courses and programs, including General Education; they also exist for graduate-level courses and programs in faculties/schools with full or partial accreditation.

Appropriate assessment measures and processes at the program and course levels, as well as the use of assessment findings to make improvements in teaching and learning can be demonstrated for OSB and HSON, the two faculties/schools with professional accreditation for all programs, and for undergraduate Engineering programs at FEA. FEA’s undergraduate programs in Architecture and Graphic Design, as well as its graduate programs, are not currently undergoing formal assessment, although improvements are being made on an ad hoc basis. FHS’s graduate programs meet the assessment requirements of its accrediting agency, however, the faculty is seeking to optimize results by establishing similar processes to those recently instituted for its undergraduate programs.

All FAFS and most FAS departments have implemented pilot assessments of at least one undergraduate program in 2010-11. In many cases, the data have yet to be fully analyzed by departmental faculty and the evaluations acted on at the departmental and faculty levels in order to improve the quality of program content and delivery. Some of these analyses will result in further refinement of assessment instruments. Such refinements are expected to continue for the next few program assessment cycles and during periodic program reviews. Most analyses will also need to be supported by more extensive data collected over multiple semesters if curricular improvements are to be meaningful. FAS programs currently without assessment processes will develop and pilot plans and measures during the 2011-12 academic year. By that time, both FAS and FAFS will also have established processes for the assessment of course learning outcomes with the assistance of the CTL.

The assessment of student learning at AUB is a collaborative effort guided by faculty and supported by the administration. The CTL has played an important role in supporting learning outcomes assessment through training provided to faculty in FAFS and FAS and on the
Senate GE Committee. Such training will become a regular part of the CTL’s schedule for faculty development, and faculty attending workshops on learning outcomes assessment will continue to be compensated.

The formulation of procedures for the periodic review of academic undergraduate and graduate programs, the appointment of a program review coordinator, and the allocation of funds for faculty writing self-study reports and external evaluators demonstrate that the University is firmly committed to quality educational programming and to providing the structures and resources that faculty need to take assessment to the next level. The program review process also provides important support to the University’s goal of strengthening the links between assessment, planning, and budgeting.

The recently appointed Institutional Assessment Committee is expected to help in the identification of gaps – and the processes needed to fill them, as it develops university-wide plans to institutionalize assessment for continuous improvement across academic and administrative units. Although much remains to be done, it is clear that there has been considerable progress since March 2009 and that a holistic approach informs the University’s planning and initiatives.

IV. List of Appendices

Appendix A: Reports and Data Submitted by Faculties/Schools with Full or Partial Program Accreditation
- A-1 Suliman S. Olayan School of Business (OSB)
- A-2 Rafic Hariri School of Nursing (HSON)
- A-3 Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA)
- A-4 Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS)

Appendix B: Additional OSB Data
OSB Matrices

Appendix C: Additional FEA Data
Mechanical Engineering Assessment SSR Addendum on Continuous Improvement
ABET, Inc. Final Statement on FEA Program Accreditation

Appendix D: Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Documentation
- Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes, Implementation Plan, 2009-10
- CTL annual report, October 2009-September 2010
- Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes Schedule for AY 2010-11
- Extract from Interim Report to the Board of Trustees, March 2011

Appendix E: Chairs Manual

Appendix F: FAFS Report and Documentation of Undergraduate Assessment Plans and Pilot Assessment Reports

Appendix G: FAS Report and Documentation of Undergraduate Assessment Plans and Pilot Assessment Reports

Appendix H: General Education Documentation
Extract of Senate bylaws to establish a General Education Committee
Extract of 2009 Evaluation Team report - General Education findings and recommendations
GE mission, goals, distribution
GE program learning outcomes
Guidelines for the submission of courses for GE designation
Interactive templates for the submission of courses for GE designation
Review of templates
List of GE Courses [as of January 2011]
Writing Center – Activities from Summer 2009 to Spring 2011
Draft GE Program Assessment Plan
Proposal for a General Education and Assessment Officer
GE at AUB: Historical Overview

Appendix I: Samples of Templates Submitted by Instructors to Obtain GE Course Designation

Appendix J: Periodic Program Review Documentation
Policies and procedures for the periodic review of academic programs
Internal Review Committee (IRC) guidelines
Program Review Committee (PRC) guidelines
External reviewer guidelines
Guidance for writing the self-study report
Schedule of Review (over six years)

Appendix K: Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) Draft Policy