

American University of Beirut
Institutional Self-Study Design



Submitted to:
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Prepared by:
Self-Study Steering Committee*

*exclusive of Trustee members
***Design Committee 2001*

**Peter Heath, Ph.D., Chair
**Waddah Nasr, PhD, Vice Chair

Kamel Abdallah, PhD
Farouk Abi Khuzam, PhD
**Layal Ammar, Undergraduate
Kamal Badr, MD
John Bernson, MBA
Khalil Bitar, PhD
Saouma Boujaoude, PhD
**Nuhad Dagher, PhD
Said El-Fakhani, PhD
**Karma El Hassan, PhD

**Mohamad Harajli, PhD
Murad Jurdak, PhD
Mustafa Khogali, DM
Hassan Mohanna, Undergraduate
Andre Nahas, BSc
Carol Rhoder, PhD
**George Tomey, MSEE
**Huda Zurayk, PhD
Rami Zurayk, PhD
**Elizabeth Vermey, Editor

May 2002

American University of Beirut
Institutional Self-Study Design
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Table of Contents

1. Nature, Scope, and Context of the Self-Study	1
2. Specific Goals and Objectives of the Self-Study	2
3. Organizational Structure and Responsibilities of the Self-Study Steering Committee	3
4. Self-Study Steering Committee Membership	4
5. Task Team Composition, Responsibilities and Charges	5
6. Eligibility Requirements	7
7. Task Team Purposes, Questions, Methodologies, and Membership	8
<i>A. Institutional Context</i>	
Standard I Mission, Goals, and Objectives	8
Standard II Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal	9
Standard III Institutional Resources	11
Standard IV Leadership and Governance	12
Standard V Administration	14
Standard VI Integrity	15
Standard VII Institutional Assessment	17
<i>B. Educational Effectiveness</i>	
Standard VIII Student Admissions	18
Standard IX Student Support Services	20
Standard X Faculty	22
Standard XI Educational Offerings	24
Standard XII General Education	26
Standard XIII Related Educational Activities	27
Standard XIV Assessment of Student Learning	29
8. Outcomes Assessment and the Self-Study	31
9. Inventory of Support Documents	32
10. Timeline	35
11. Task Team Report Style and Format	35
12. Self-Study Report Format	36
13. Evaluation Team Profile	38

Appendix A: Provost's invitation for faculty participation on task teams and sign-up form

Appendix B: Task Team membership and meeting schedule, Spring, 2002

Self-Study Design

1. Nature, Scope, and Context of the Self-Study

The American University of Beirut (AUB) is a private, independent, coeducational, and comprehensive institution of higher learning founded in 1866. Located in Beirut, Lebanon, it is administered by a private, autonomous Board of Trustees composed of leading citizens of the Middle East, Europe, and North America. With over 6,000 students, the University consists of the Faculties of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Architecture, Health Sciences, Medicine (which includes the School of Nursing), and the School of Business. All offer academic programs leading to the bachelor's and master's degrees, except for the Faculty of Medicine, which offers BSN, MS and MD degrees. The language of instruction is English.

AUB is a teaching-centered research university, convinced that excellence in teaching and research go hand-in-hand. Its mission is to enhance the education of primarily the peoples of the Middle East, to serve society through its educational functions, and to participate in the advancement of knowledge. AUB bases its educational perspective and methods and its academic organization on the American model of higher education. The University emphasizes scholarship that enables students to think for themselves, stresses academic excellence, and promotes high principles of character. It aims to produce men and women who are not only technically competent in their professional fields but also life-long learners who have breadth of vision, a sense of civic and moral responsibility, and devotion to the fundamental values of human life. The University believes in and encourages freedom of thought and expression. It expects, however, that this freedom will be enjoyed in a spirit of integrity and with a full sense of responsibility.

The designs for self-study delineated in *Designs for Excellence* were reviewed and evaluated by the president, the provost, and the members of the Self-Study Design Committee to determine the best approach for AUB. It was decided to adopt the Comprehensive Model for two reasons. First, because this is AUB's first application for accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, all concerned believe that the approach to institutional self-study should be as broad and encompassing as possible. Second, this approach allows the greatest latitude for participation by faculty members, students, administrators, and other members of the university community. A major aspiration for AUB is that the Self-Study be a continuation of the various forms of institutional self-assessment that it has undertaken and continues to undertake since the appointment of a new president in 1997. The Comprehensive Model offers a breadth and depth of scope that will foster the greatest self-awareness of the University's goals, successes, and challenges in ways that allow AUB to strengthen itself for the future.

With the appointment of John Waterbury as president in 1997 and other major changes in administrative leadership, AUB has undertaken a series of self-assessment activities leading to its application for accreditation from the Middle States Commission of Higher Education. The Joint Commission International (JCI) carried out an assessment of the AUB Medical Center to ascertain its quality of service and to identify the steps needed to attain accreditation by the JCI. This review was completed in fall of 1998; since then intensive efforts have been made toward bringing standards at the Medical Center to accreditation levels.

A second major initiative was a thorough review of academic programs through a combination of internal and external assessment. During the 1998-1999 academic year and into the fall of 1999, each academic department and Faculty engaged in an internal academic review exercise. Support from the Ford Foundation for the project "Rebuilding Academic Excellence at the American University of Beirut" enabled the University to form six visiting committees consisting of a total of 29 prominent scholars from prestigious universities (Berkeley, Cornell, Harvard, Michigan, Princeton, Rockefeller University, UCLA, and Wisconsin) to conduct external academic review visits. Each committee focused on the academic assessment of one of the Faculties. In the cases of the larger Faculties (Arts and Sciences, Medicine, and Engineering and Architecture), committee members focused on individual areas of specialization (the humanities, sciences, and social sciences in regard to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, for example). Each committee was charged with assessing all aspects of AUB's academic mission: curriculum, teaching and student advising; departmental and interdisciplinary academic structures; and the research profiles, activities, and support environment of the Faculty. In order to maintain a policy of transparent

interaction with faculty members, President Waterbury made all external review reports available to full-time faculty members in March 2000.

Concurrently with the visits of the final set of evaluators in the fall of 1999, and based on the process of internal and external review, the president, the provost, and the academic deans held a series of meetings to plan academic restructuring. An important focus of these strategy sessions was how best to reshape the undergraduate curriculum to establish a common set of general education liberal arts requirements for students in all Faculties. Making the curriculum more flexible to allow greater student choice, creating the possibility of minors, reducing overlapping and redundant courses, strengthening the freshman year, and promoting innovative teaching were recurrent themes of these meetings. This group also focused on streamlining graduate education and nurturing the research environment for faculty and students.

Two documents evolved from these discussions: one, a position paper on undergraduate education; the other, drafts of mission and vision statements along with recommendations for implementing a first round of academic restructuring. As a result, AUB undertook structural and curricular changes. The Division of Education rejoined the Faculty of Arts and Sciences after a quarter century of separation, and a new School of Business was created. Moreover, each Faculty and School has completed reviews and revisions of its undergraduate curriculum and is working on its graduate curriculum. The 2001-2002 catalogue is a completely new document.

To emphasize its continued commitment to teaching excellence, the University, with support from the Mellon Foundation, started a teaching excellence initiative that – among other things -- has created an interfaculty teaching excellence task force, provided a series of teaching workshops for faculty, and supported the incorporation of technology into teaching at AUB. This initiative is ongoing.

In addition, in fall 2000, AUB inaugurated a program of service quality training for all non-academic personnel. During the year all of AUB's 2,400 staff were trained in service quality excellence. Orientation sessions in service quality excellence were also available for 250 non-clinical full-time faculty members. The program continues in 2001-2002 with further staff training and Baldrige-based management reviews of organizational assessment, planning, and improvement.

During the past two years AUB has undertaken a review and restructuring of its academic support services. It has created new Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid. It has implemented a new student information system that enables students to register for classes via the web. Constant review of our academic rules and procedures is proceeding with the aim of simplifying and clarifying policies and practices in this area. An Office for Institutional Research and Assessment has been established. Moreover, the University has invested significant resources to upgrade the Office of Student Affairs, including filling the position of Dean of Student Affairs and making new appointments in student counseling, student activities, residential life management and a planned appointment in career and placement services, all of which the post-war era had left in a rudimentary state.

In fall 2000, work began on developing a comprehensive campus master plan to guide AUB in supporting current activities and planning future projects. The plan includes a comprehensive review and recommendations for effective facility use. AUB worked with a team of planners and architects led by Sasaki and Associates, a Boston-based firm with extensive experience in academic campus master planning. The plan for renewal and development of the campus over the next 20 years was completed and approved by the Trustees in March 2002, and phase I of the implementation was begun with a presentation to the community in April.

It is in this context of internal review and renewal that AUB, chartered since its foundation in 1866 by the Board of Regents of the State of New York, seeks accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Institutional self-study is an essential university priority since it enables all members of the university community, especially the faculty, to engage in intense self-scrutiny and reflection on the teaching and learning processes that lie at the core of their duties and at the heart of AUB's mission and goals. Outcomes assessment must infuse the institution so that it can engage in constant improvement.

2. Goals and Objectives of the Self-Study

The purpose of the Self-Study is to engage the University in close self-examination and analysis in order to review its performance from different perspectives and to set a framework for the future. The Self-Study will cover 14 study areas reflecting the standards of excellence defined in *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation*. The study areas are listed below. The first seven, focus on aspects of Institutional Context; the second group deals with issues of Educational Effectiveness:

Institutional Context

- I. Mission, Goals and Objectives
- II. Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
- III. Institutional Resources
- IV. Leadership and Governance
- V. Administration
- VI. Integrity
- VII. Institutional Assessment

Educational Effectiveness

- VIII. Student Admissions
- IX. Student Support Services
- X. Faculty
- XI. Educational Offerings
- XII. General Education
- XIII. Related Educational Activities
- XIV. Assessment of Student Learning

The specific objectives of the Self-Study are to insure that each of the study areas addresses issues of particular concern for AUB at this point in its history. Each area should:

- be informed by the mission statement -- in particular by its emphasis on AUB's regional role as a teaching-centered research university serving the needs of diverse learning communities.
- address the conditions and policies needed to implement the mission, goals, and objectives
- prescribe and describe outcomes assessment
- relate allocation of resources to long-term planning
- address issues of intellectual climate, collegiality, and sense of community.

The Self-Study gives the University a new opportunity to engage in a process where differing opinions are encouraged and respected and a sense of community is fostered. The task teams will gather qualitative and quantitative information in ways designed to foster objective analysis, test current assumptions, and explore new ideas. It is expected that their findings will stimulate lively discussion, further analysis, and recommendations for the future that will strengthen AUB's programs and its important role in the Middle East and in the global community.

3. Organizational Structure and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee

Provost Peter Heath, appointed by the president to lead AUB's application for accreditation, formed a *Self-Study Design Committee* in May 2001 to prepare a preliminary draft of the design. During the summer the committee developed a draft and made recommendations about the structure and responsibilities of the *Self-Study Steering Committee*. The provost reviewed the various areas to be examined during the self-study process and prepared a list of prospective Steering Committee members, drawn mainly from the membership of the Design Committee, with some additions. The president reviewed the list and in October sent invitations to 29 individuals. Nominees agreed to serve on the Steering Committee with the dual role of chair, co-chair or vice chair of one of 14 designated study groups, *task teams*, each charged with examining one study area.

The Steering Committee, chaired by Provost Heath, is comprised of trustees, faculty members, administrators -- many with faculty appointments -- and student representatives. All six AUB Faculties are represented. The Steering Committee is responsible for the final design and the effective implementation and coordination of the Self-Study. Membership on the Steering Committee of all task team chairs and co-chairs will encourage consistent and direct interaction among all the working groups. The Steering Committee will also work closely with various key standing committees and other campus constituencies to assure a high degree of coordination and communication.

An orientation meeting of the Steering Committee was held on November 17, 2001. Each member received copies of the starred documents (below) and relevant sections of the other documents:

- *AUB's mission statement
- **Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education (June, 2001)*
- **Designs for Excellence*
- *Self-Study Design Committee Membership Roster
- An early draft of AUB's *Institutional Self-Study Design*, October 2000
- *Steering Committee Membership Roster
- AUB's *Pre-Application Review* document prepared for Middle States, November 2000
- AUB's *Self-Assessment Document* prepared for Middle States, March 2001
- *A list of available Internal Survey Research Studies and External Reports

During the Self-Study the Steering Committee will coordinate the collection of data for the 14 task teams that are

charged with carrying out the Self-Study. The Steering Committee has compiled an inventory of institutional reports, surveys and other relevant documents for use by the task teams in their research. It will coordinate a schedule of task teams' interviews and focus groups with key individuals and constituencies. The OIRA will work closely with the Steering Committee and task teams to minimize duplication of effort in preparing surveys and analyzing data gathered. The Steering Committee will organize public forums to discuss draft reports of the task teams and to update the community on the progress of the self-study process.

The Steering Committee has developed a *self-study timeline* (see Section 10 below) that provides adequate time for the task teams to conduct research, analyze findings, draft reports, and review the reports in public forums with campus constituencies. The Committee will take final responsibility for integrating the reports of the task teams and for editing, formatting, and submitting the final self-study report.

To encourage communication with the larger community, an accreditation web site was established: <http://www.aub.edu.lb/accreditation>. The site includes general information about the accreditation process, AUB's progress through the process, documents submitted to Middle States, and pages about the Steering Committee and each task teams wherein meeting minutes and other information relating to the self-study will be available. Periodic updates are sent by the provost to the community, and progress reports appear in *AUB Bulletin Today* (newsletter) and *Outlook* (student newspaper).

4. Self-Study Steering Committee Membership

Peter Heath, PhD, Chair of the SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE; Provost; Professor, Arabic

Waddah Nasr, PhD, Vice Chair of the SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE; Co-chair of the GENERAL EDUCATION Task Team; Associate Provost; Associate Professor, Philosophy.

* * *

Kamel Abdallah, PhD, Co-chair of the RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES Task Team; Assistant Vice President, Regional and External Programs and Assistant Professor, School of Business.

Farouk Abi Khuzam, PhD, Co-chair of the INTEGRITY Task Team; Professor, Mathematics.

Layal Ammar, Vice Chair of the INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Task Team; Undergraduate in Economics.

Kamal Badr, MD, Co-chair of the MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Task Team; Professor, Internal Medicine.

John Bernson, MBA, Co-chair of the PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL Task Team; Vice President for Finance.

Khalil Bitar, PhD, Chair of the STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES Task Team; Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; Professor, Physics.

Saouma Boujaoude, PhD, Co-chair of the EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS Task Team; Professor, Education, Science and Math Education Center

Nabil Chartouni, Co-chair of the INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Chairman and Managing Director, Acropolis Tourism Development.

Nuhad Dagher, PhD, Co-chair of the LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE Task Team; Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences; Professor, Animal Sciences.

Said El-Fakhani, PhD, Co-chair of the ADMINISTRATION Task Team; Associate Dean and Professor, School of Business.

Karma El-Hassan, PhD, Co-chair of the INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Task Team; Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment; Associate Professor, Education.

Nesreen Ghaddar, PhD., Co-chair of the ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING Task Team; Professor, Mechanical Engineering.

Mohamed Harajli, PhD, Chair of the STUDENT ADMISSIONS Task Team; Associate Dean of the Faculty of Engineering; Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering.

Martha S. Joukowsky, PhD, Co-Chair of the GENERAL EDUCATION Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Professor, Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University.

Murad Jurdak, PhD, Co-chair of the ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING Task Team; Chairperson of the Department and Professor, Education.

Mustafa Khogali, MBBS, DM, Co-chair of the INTEGRITY Task Team; Chairperson of the Department and Professor, Family Medicine.

Philip S. Khoury, PhD, Co-chair of the MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Dean, School of Humanities and Social Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Nicola N. Khuri, PhD, Co-Chair of the PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Professor and Head of Laboratory and Theoretical Physics, Rockefeller University.

Hassan Mohanna, Vice Chair of the STUDENT ADMISSIONS Task Team; Undergraduate in Engineering.

Thomas Q. Morris, MD, Co-chair of the LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Senior Associate, Vice President for the Health Sciences, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University)

Andre Nahas, BSc, Co-chair of the ADMINISTRATION Task Team; Director of Service Quality and Organizational Management.

Hutham S. Olayan, Co-chair of the INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; President, Olayan America Corporation.

Carol Rhoder, PhD, Co-chair of the RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES Task Team; Associate Professor, Education.

George Tomey, MSEE, Co-Chair of the INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES TASK TEAM; Vice President for Administration.

James Wei, PhD, Co-chair of the FACULTY Task Team; Member, Board of Trustees; Dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science, Princeton University.

Huda Zurayk, PhD, Co-chair of the FACULTY Task Team; Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences; Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics.

Rami Zurayk, PhD, Co-chair of the EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS Task Team; Associate Professor, Land and Water Resources.

5. Task Team Composition, Responsibilities, and Charges

Following the formation and orientation of the Self-Study Steering Committee, the provost, as chair of the Committee, asked volunteers from campus constituencies to serve on the 14 task teams that will be conducting the self-study. The teams vary in size from 13 to 18 members; all include faculty, students, staff, and administrators, and several include trustees (as co-chairs); AUB alumni are amply represented among the faculty, administration and staff members. Task team members are listed below along with the purposes, questions and methodologies guiding each team's work. Memos inviting faculty, staff and student participation are included in *Appendix A*.

The provost conducted a general orientation meeting for all task team members on March 4, 2002. He provided an overview of the self-study process, the role of the individual teams, and the resources that would be available to the teams as they conduct their research.

In designing its self-study, AUB closely follows the methodology of the January 2002 edition of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. Questions for the task teams were developed by the Self-Study Design Committee,

taking an analytic rather than a descriptive approach. They were drawn partly from *Characteristics* and partly from concerns specific to AUB's mission and goals, and they were guided by the specific goals and objectives of the self-study. Fourteen drafts were prepared, in several stages, each including the following components:

- Statement of the purpose of the task team, summarized below as "charges"
- Proposed study questions
- Methodologies to be used to address the study questions
- Documentation of data sources

Each task team met two or three times in April and May to review the charges and the questions prepared for it by the Design Committee and to refine the methodologies it would be using to address the questions and draft its section of the Self-Study Report. A schedule of spring meetings with the members is attached as *Appendix B*.

Each team's report, not to exceed fifteen pages, will in most cases adhere to the following outline:

- Overview of the identified self-study area and task team questions
- Brief review of the significant achievements made since 1997
- Summary of the approaches the task team has taken
- Documented analysis of the strengths and challenges found
- Recommendations for maintaining the strengths and addressing the challenges

An editorial sub-committee of the Steering Committee will integrate the 14 team reports and produce one self-study draft report, for review by the community.

The following charges are both terms of reference and points of departure for the individual task teams as they undertake their work. The 14 charges are summarized as follows:

- I. The charge to the **Mission, Goals and Objectives Task Team** is to examine AUB's mission statement and related goals and objectives in terms of their history, comprehensiveness, clarity, distinctiveness, integrity, implementation, utility, adequacy, visibility and means of change.
- II. The charge to the **Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal Task Team** is to examine the effectiveness of AUB's strategic planning process in establishing the priorities and directions for the continued advancement of, and innovation within, the University. Although the primary focus will be on planning and resource allocation at the university-wide decision-making level, the team will also examine the extent to which these processes are implemented at academic and administrative unit levels.
- III. The charge to the **Institutional Resources Task Team** is to examine AUB's current and future financial stability and to assess the adequacy of its human, technical, and physical resources, both internal and external, to the implementation of its mission and goals.
- IV. The charge to the **Leadership and Governance Task Team** is to examine AUB's leadership and system of collegial governance. The team will examine the structures and roles of the corporate, administrative and academic governing bodies as to their adequacy, appropriateness, and effectiveness in furthering AUB's mission and goals.
- V. The charge to the **Administration Task Team** is to examine the effectiveness of AUB's administrative structure and communication systems in facilitating learning and research, fostering quality improvement, and supporting the institution in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives.
- VI. The charge to the **Integrity Task Team** is to examine how, in the conduct of its programs and activities, AUB demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and to its own stated policies. The team will look at how AUB creates an intellectual and scholarly environment that promotes openness and honesty and protects academic freedom and freedom of expression and thought. It will also look at how AUB creates an atmosphere conducive to higher learning, while at the same time maintaining institutional autonomy.
- VII. The charge to the **Institutional Assessment Task Team** is to provide evidence for the existence at AUB of an appropriate assessment plan and process at AUB that is used for periodic assessment of institutional effectiveness. In addition, it will examine the extent to which the information obtained is used as a basis for assessing AUB's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, and the extent to which assessment results are used in institutional planning and allocation of resources.

- VIII. The charge to the **Student Admissions Task Team** is to establish the extent to which AUB's admissions policies, procedures and practices are part of an overall enrollment strategy that is consistent with, and contributes to the realization of, the university's mission and goals. The team will focus in particular on the University's goal to serve, without discrimination, its constituencies at the local, regional and international levels.]
- IX. The charge to the **Student Support Services Task Team** is to assess the effectiveness of student services as contributors to the enrichment of the quality of life of AUB students from enrollment to graduation, and to determine how well these services are integrated and coordinated.
- X. The charge to the **Faculty Task Team** is to examine the extent to which faculty fulfill effectively their primary responsibilities of teaching, research, and service, as well as their related roles in student advising, curriculum development, and academic policy-making. The team will also examine the role of the faculty in rebuilding and sustaining AUB's academic environment and intellectual climate.
- XI. The charge to the **Educational Offerings Task Team** is to examine the university's undergraduate and graduate academic programs as to their content, rigor, and coherence. The team will also ask to what extent these programs serve AUB's goals of developing in its students both professional competence and the habits and skills for life-long learning.
- XII. The charge to the **General Education Task Team** is to establish the extent to which the general education requirement illustrates and implements AUB's unwavering commitment to the ideal of a liberal arts education.
- XIII. The charge to the **Related Educational Activities Task Team** is to examine all of AUB's non-degree educational programs, activities, and contractual and affiliated relationships to make sure that they meet appropriate standards and are consistent with and serve AUB's mission and goals.
- XIV. The charge to the **Assessment of Student Learning Task Team** is to examine the process by which AUB evaluates the learning outcomes of its academic courses and programs and demonstrates that its students have the knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

6. Eligibility Requirements

In submitting its Pre-Application Review document, approved by the Commission on Higher Education in February 2001, and its Self-Assessment Document, upon acceptance of which AUB became a Candidate for Accreditation in June of 2001, AUB demonstrated how it has met the eligibility requirements for candidacy for accreditation. The self-study will address the relevant eligibility requirements (ER) for accreditation, listed on pages xi - xiii of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as follows:

- ER1 Task Team 4 (Leadership and Governance)
- ER2 Task Teams 1 and 4 (Mission, Goals, and Objectives) and (Leadership and Governance)
- ER3 Task Team 11 (Educational Offerings)
- ER4 Task Teams 4 and 6 (Leadership and Governance) and (Integrity)
- ER5 Task Team 8 (Student Admissions)
- ER6 Task Team 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER7 Not applicable
- ER8 Institutional Profile
- ER9 Task Team 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER10 Task Team 3 (Institutional Resources)
- ER11 Task Team 3 (Institutional Resources)
- ER12 Task Team 4 (Leadership and Governance)
- ER13 Task Team 4 (Leadership and Governance)
- ER14 Task Team 5 (Administration)
- ER15 Task Team 8 (Student Admissions)
- ER16 Task Team 9 (Student Services)
- ER17 Task Team 11 (Educational Offerings)
- ER18 Task Team 10 (Faculty)
- ER19 Task Team 11 (Educational Offerings)

ER20	Task Team 12 (General Education)
ER21	Task Team 14 (Assessment of Student Learning)
ER22	Task Teams 14 and 7 (Assessment of Student Learning) and (Institutional Assessment)

7. Task Team Purposes, Questions, Methodologies, and Membership

The members of each task team were asked to review *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* to gain a sense of the standards for accreditation developed by the Commission on Higher Education, to review the eligibility requirements they will be addressing, and to review the charges, questions, and suggested methodologies developed by the Self-Study Design Committee. Each task team then refined the methodologies it would use in addressing its questions, detailed the documentation it would examine or develop in the course of the self-study, and reviewed the format of the self-study chapter it will write.

The Steering Committee will ask each task team that plans to conduct survey research to submit its questions to the Committee so that a common self-study survey can be developed. A core group of questions will be asked of all respondents, with multiple versions of the survey according to the target audience. For example, questions for faculty may not be appropriate for students, and questions aimed at students may not be appropriate for trustees. Surveys will be streamlined to encourage participation and to generate meaningful response rates. The Committee will work with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) to conduct a coordinated survey effort with a common format, consolidated questions, and centralized processing. OIRA will provide reports to each task team detailing the findings bearing upon the questions it contributed.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT, STANDARDS I - VII

Standard I: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Purpose:

The purpose of the Mission, Goals, and Objectives Task Team is to examine AUB's mission statement and related goals and objectives in terms of their history, comprehensiveness, clarity, distinctiveness, integrity, implementation, utility, adequacy, visibility, and means of change. Of primary importance is an examination of AUB's role as the leading institution of higher learning in the Middle East, of ways in which the mission and goals are communicated to, and are embraced by, its various constituencies, and of the mission statement's relevance in a changing environment.

Questions:

Based on a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 1.1 How has the mission statement evolved to reflect the university's changing institutional image and role in the context of its relationship with Lebanon, the region and the USA?
- 1.2 How adequately does the mission statement reflect AUB's role at the beginning of the new century?
How realistic are the goals and objectives?
- 1.3 Is the mission statement comprehensive, while also reflecting AUB's special character?
- 1.4 How does the mission statement reflect AUB's uniqueness as an institution of higher education and in comparison with institutions in the region and in the United States?
- 1.5 Is the mission statement clear and transparent, in language and in content, to its intended audience?
Are published policies and procedures consistent with the university's mission, goals and objectives?
- 1.6 To what extent do institutional, departmental and programmatic goals and objectives flow directly, clearly and consistently from the mission statement?

- 1.7 How do the defined mission, goals, and objectives guide the trustees, administration, faculty and staff in making decisions related to student learning, institutional improvement, planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development and definition of program outcomes?
- 1.8 What processes and vehicles are used to create and maintain awareness of and commitment to institutional values, goals, objectives and policies to new members of the AUB community and the community at large?
- 1.9 What processes and constituencies (faculty, students, staff, alumni, parents, and friends of AUB) are used to review and assess AUB's mission, goals, and objectives and to develop new goals and objectives?

Methodologies:

These questions provide a basis for the study of the Task Team on Mission, Goals, and Objectives. The task team will examine relevant documents including histories of AUB and the mission statements of some peer institutions; formulate specific questions for the self-study surveys to be directed to various constituencies (members of the administration, department and program chairs, faculty, students, trustees, alumni); review and interpret survey results; conduct interviews with key decision makers; and conduct focus groups with a cross section of campus constituencies to determine the extent to which they perceive congruence among the mission, goals and objectives and between word and action in fulfillment of the mission statement at all university levels. Interviews and focus groups will also consider the continued adequacy and relevance of the current mission statement in the light of changes in the environment and strategic planning efforts.

Membership:

- Kamal Badr, MD, Professor, Internal Medicine, *Co-chair*
- Philip S. Khoury, PhD, Member, Board of Trustees; Dean, School of Humanities and Social Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *Co-chair*
- *
- Leila Badre (Doctorat 3rd Cycle), Director of the University Museum
- Hassan Diab, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Loubna El-Amine, Undergraduate, Political Science
- Marwan El Sabban, PhD, Assistant Professor, Human Morphology
- Nada El Hussein, Medical Student
- Mary Jaber, MBA, Assistant to the Systems and Procedures Analyst
- Leonid Klushin, PhD, Associate Professor, Physics
- Jihad Makhoul, PhD, Assistant Professor, Health Behavior and Education
- Jala Makhzoumi, PhD, Assistant Professor, Plant Sciences
- George Najjar, PhD, Vice President for Regional External Programs; Dean, School of Business
- Howard Ray, CPA, Comptroller
- Kassim Shaaban, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, English, *Vice Chair*

Standard II: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Purpose:

The purpose of the Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal Task Team is to examine the effectiveness of AUB's strategic planning process in establishing the priorities and directions for the continued advancement of, and innovation within, the university. The task team will focus primarily on the strategic planning and resource allocation processes at the university-wide decision-making level. It will also examine the degree to which these processes are used at the Faculty and department (academic and administrative unit) levels. It will examine the monitoring, refinements and evaluation of goal achievement and the degree to which strategic plans actually guide the day-to-day operations of the university. Major emphasis will be placed on understanding the centrality of the strategic planning process to the university's past and future excellence.

Questions:

Based upon a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort:

- 2.1 What strategic planning effort is AUB currently engaged in and how informed are these efforts by the university's statement of mission, goals and objectives?
- 2.2 In developing its strategic plan and establishing its priorities, to what extent is AUB cognizant of its historic role in Lebanon and the Middle East region? How does it strive to maintain its prestige and leadership as the region's premier institution for higher education?
- 2.3 To what extent does the strategic planning effort take into account relevant demographic, economic, social and political factors in the local, regional, and global environments? To what extent does it benchmark against peer institutions?
- 2.4 How, and by whom, are strategic plans developed and on what timetable? How and from what levels, units and constituencies of the university is input sought and used?
- 2.5 By what processes and how effectively is strategic planning aligned with resource allocation at all levels of the university? How are priorities set in allocating resources to support and improve academic programs and services? To what extent and with what degree of accuracy are budget projections monitored, reviewed, and revised as new data become available?
- 2.6 Are there clearly articulated objectives, policies, and procedures governing the strategic planning process? How are these disseminated?
- 2.7 To what extent and how does the strategic planning process take into consideration relevant quantitative data and data assessment studies drawn from all academic and support units?
- 2.8 How and by whom are strategic plans reviewed and approved? How and to what extent are the plan assessments used to review, modify, and improve the plan, including the reallocation and more efficient use of resources?
- 2.9 How is the plan implemented? How does it guide day-to-day operations at all levels and how does it inform policy decisions?
- 2.10 By whom and on what schedule is the implementation of the plan monitored and assessed?
- 2.11 To what extent and with what vigor does the administration investigate alternative approaches to strategic planning and its alignment with allocation of resources? How are best practice models in other similar institutions or units applied to improvement efforts and development activities?
- 2.12 How well is authority delegated to enable individuals in a unit to undertake well-defined decision-making processes towards assurance of accountability and improvement?

Methodologies:

These questions provide a basis for this study. The task team will address the questions in three phases. In the first it will break into two groups, one looking at AUB's current practices by examining relevant documents and conducting interviews with deans and administrators, and another looking at peer practices by examining relevant planning documents from peer and other institutions. In the second phase it will reconvene, pool the results, then break into four groups to make recommendations about discrete aspects of the AUB planning process, as follows: the inputs, decision making, implementation, assessment and revision. In the third phase the team will reconvene, pool the results, agree on the contents of the final report and write it.

Membership:

- John Bernson, MBA, Vice President for Finance, *Co-chair*
- Nicola N. Khuri, PhD, Member, Board of Trustees; Professor and Head of Laboratory and Theoretical Physics, Rockefeller University, *Co-chair*

*

- Jamal Abed, PhD, Associate Professor, Architecture and Design
- Imad Baalbaki, PhD, Director, Office of Development, and Assistant Professor, Business
- Anwar Bikhazi, PhD, Professor, Physiology
- Nabil Bukhalid, BscEE, Director of Computing and Networking Services
- Claude Dubois, BComm, CMA, Director of Financial Planning and Budget
- Ziad El Khatib, Graduate Student, Interfaculty Program, Faculty of Health Sciences
- Rima Fakhry, MA, Instructor, English
- Maya Haddad, Undergraduate, Business
- Samar Jabbour, MD, Associate Professor, Anesthesiology
- Samer Ma'amari, MSCE, Associate Director of the Physical Plant and Interim Director for the Facilities Planning and Design Unit
- Paul Meers, PhD, Assistant Professor, Civilization Sequence Program
- Fadl Moukalled, PhD, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
- Musa Nimah, PhD, Professor, Land and Water Resources
- John Rhoder, MPA, Hospital Director
- Yahya Sadowski, PhD, Associate Professor, Political Studies and Public Administration

Standard III: Institutional Resources

Purpose:

The purpose of the Institutional Resources Task Team is to examine AUB's current and future financial stability and to assess the adequacy of its human, technical and physical resources, both internal and external, for the implementation of its mission and goals. In the financial area the task team will examine the soundness and effectiveness of the university's financial management, endowment management, budgeting, audit and fund-raising processes, and their alignment with the strategic planning effort. With regard to other resources, the task team will examine the processes of planning, acquisition, use, maintenance, management and assessment.

Questions:

Based upon a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 3.1 To what extent are AUB's financial, human, technical, and physical resources adequate to meet its mission and goals?
- 3.2 At what levels is the alignment of resources with priorities developed and approved, on what schedule, and for what time frame?
- 3.3 Is there an ongoing assessment plan to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of all institutional resources? How and by whom is assessment conducted?
- 3.4 Are the results of assessment being used for better utilization and more effective distribution of the resources required to support the mission and goals of the university?
- 3.5 What processes and procedures are used for developing the annual operating and capital budgets and at what levels is input solicited?
- 3.6 How is the annual independent audit conducted and what mechanisms are used to follow-up on concerns expressed in audits and accompanying management letters?
- 3.7 To what extent is the university tuition-dependent? Should this level of dependence be changed and by how much?
- 3.8 How effectively is the endowment managed and what benchmarks are used to measure endowment performance?
- 3.9 How are appropriate fundraising goals set, how well are they met, and how efficiently and effectively is fundraising managed?

- 3.10 How adequately does the Campus Master Plan serve the university's mission and goals and translate them into physical terms? Is it coupled with a long-term capital plan for its implementation?
- 3.11 Are the comprehensive facilities and infrastructure plan coupled with life-cycle management plans?
- 3.12 How effectively are the equipment and technological needs of educational and support services planned for and achieved?
- 3.13 Are educational facilities such as research centers, libraries and laboratories adequately supported and appropriately staffed to accomplish AUB's goals and objectives?
- 3.14 What formal and informal agreements does the university have to share resources with other local, regional and global institutions and organizations? How are these agreements and relationships negotiated, and how efficiently and effectively are they managed?

Methodologies:

The Task Team has divided into four sub-teams on (1) planning and assessment issues, (2) financial resources, (3) physical facilities, equipment and technologies, and (4) educational resources and inter-institutional resource sharing. Members will review current planning documents and reports, including the annual capital and operating budgets and projections, audit reports, fund raising plans and operations, tuition and financial aid levels and trends, physical facilities reviews, and the Campus Master Plan (2002). It will formulate questions to be directed to trustees and administrators, will review and interpret survey results, and conduct interviews with administrators as needed. It will coordinate its efforts with those of other task forces, especially II (Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal) and V (Administration).

Membership:

- Hutham S. Olayan , Member, Board of Trustees; President, Olayan America Corporation, *Co-chair*
- George Tomey , MSEE, Vice President for Administration, *Co-chair*
- *
- Samer Abbouchi, Undergraduate, Business
- Hanin Abdallah, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business
- Dani Asfour, MBA, CPA, Director of Business Services
- George Ayoub, PhD, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Helen Bikhazi, BA, ALA, University Librarian
- Nadim Cortas, MD, Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine
- Marj Heningsen, PhD, Assistant Professor, Education
- Stephen Jeffrey, BA, Vice President for Development
- May Jurdi, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, Environmental Health
- Maroun Kisrwni, PhD, Dean of Student Affairs
- Fuad Mrad, PhD, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Jacek Nikiel, PhD, Professor, Mathematics
- Rayan Saab, Undergraduate, Computer and Communications Engineering
- Adib Saad, PhD, Professor, Plant Sciences
- Ziad Yamut, BE, Director of Physical Plant

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Purpose:

The purpose of the Leadership and Governance Task Team is to examine the effectiveness of the university's leadership and the operations of the Board of Trustees in the overall governance of the university. The task team will examine the adequacy of the university's corporate by-laws as they define the roles and responsibilities of the board, president, provost, vice presidents, and deans in carrying out the university's mission and goals. The task team will also review the criteria and mechanisms by which the Board evaluates itself and the administration, and it will review the role of the faculty in governance through the Senate and its committees. The task team will also examine whether the system of governance provides a climate of collegiality and good working relationships across constituencies.

Questions:

Based upon a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort

- 4.1 Does AUB's system of governance enable it to realize its stated mission and goals? Is this the most appropriate governance structure for AUB?
- 4.2 Does AUB have a well-defined collegial governance structure? How clearly is this structure articulated in governing documents including corporate by-laws, by-laws for the individual Faculties, for the faculty Senate as a whole, and for individual committees of these bodies?
- 4.3 How clearly do the corporate by-laws delineate the responsibilities of the trustees, president, vice presidents and deans, faculty, and staff? How clearly do they define how these bodies interact?
- 4.4 How often is the governance system assessed? How are the results of assessment used to improve efficiency and effectiveness of different governance bodies? What are the mechanisms to change the by-laws of different groups?
- 4.5 Does the Board of Trustees reflect constituent interest? Does it include members with expertise to assure that its fiduciary responsibilities can be fulfilled? Does it have a conflict of interest policy? What is its process for orienting new trustees and providing regular updates for all trustees on AUB's organization, academic programs, and objectives?
- 4.6 To what extent is the Board of Trustees effective and involved in serving the needs of the university? In appointing and advising the president? Does the Board assist in generating the resources needed and participate effectively in fundraising? Does it get involved in the appropriate use and preservation of existing resources?
- 4.7 How is communication between the Board of Trustees and the university's several constituencies established and maintained?
- 4.8 Are there established policies and procedures for hiring and evaluating top administrators and academic department chairs that support the university's mission, goals, and objectives?
- 4.9 How effectively does the president provide leadership for the administration, faculty, staff and students in fulfilling AUB's mission, goals, and objectives?
- 4.10 How effective is the leadership of the Board of Deans, collectively and individually in providing the necessary governance on a Faculty and/or university-wide basis?
- 4.11 To what extent do academic and administrative leaders work collegially and effectively for the common good of the university?
- 4.12 Are issues of governance discussed openly and freely at AUB?
- 4.13 Do students have an opportunity to provide input regarding decisions affecting them? Is the system of student representation appropriate for AUB?

Methodologies:

The task team will divide into three sub-teams to study the governance structures and leadership of (1) the Trustees, (2) the president and Board of Deans, and (3) the Faculties, faculty Senate, and elected student government. The sub-teams will review relevant governance documents including the Corporate By-laws and Board minutes, and the by-laws, rules, and minutes of the Faculties, Senate, University Student/Faculty Committee and all university-wide committees, and will review governance structures and practices at some peer institutions. The team will survey relevant groups about governance issues and conduct interviews with individuals including trustees, the president, provost, vice presidents, deans and chairs of faculty and student governance groups.

Membership:

- Nuhad Dagher, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences; Professor, Animal Sciences, *Co-chair*
- Thomas Q. Morris, MD, Member, Board of Trustees; Senior Associate, Vice President for the Health Sciences, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, *Co-chair*
- *
- M. Assem Abdul-Malek, PhD, Associate Professor, Engineering Management
- Ghada El Hajj Fuleihan, Associate Professor, Endocrinology
- Asma Fatfalah, Archives and Special Collections Librarian
- Makhlof Haddadin, PhD, Professor, Chemistry
- Nizar Hamzeh, PhD, Associate Professor, Political Science and Public Administration
- Medhat Khattar, PhD, Assistant Professor, Biology
- Joe Manok, Undergraduate, Mathematics and Computer Science
- Sami Ramia, Professor, Medical Laboratory Technology
- Abdo Saad, Student, Medicine
- Helga Seeden, PhD, Professor, History and Archaeology
- Yussef Sidani, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business

Standard V: Administration

Purpose:

The purpose of the Administration Task Force is to examine how effectively AUB's administrative structure and leadership facilitate learning and research, foster quality improvement, and support the institution in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives. The task team will study the general administrative structure of AUB and determine the adequacy of administrative and staff resources. It will also evaluate the effectiveness of the communication systems and working relationships across constituencies, the enhancement of service quality among employees, and how well policies and procedures are followed. In addition, it will determine whether adequate information and decision-making systems are available to support the work of the administrative leaders.

Questions:

Based upon a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research.

- 5.1 What is AUB's general administrative structure? How adequately and clearly are the roles and responsibilities of each officer defined within that structure? Are job descriptions adequately and clearly articulated at all levels of the administration? Are roles and responsibilities defined in the context of the university's mission statement to support the achievement of its goals and objectives?
- 5.2 How often and by whom is the organizational structure assessed to ensure its appropriateness, and to improve efficiency and effectiveness in support of the mission, goals, and objectives of the university?
- 5.3 Are there established standards, policies, and procedures for hiring administrators and staff? Are these policies and procedures consistent with AUB's mission, goals, and objectives?
- 5.4 Does each individual in the administrative structure provide oversight for the various administrative services in his/her unit?
- 5.5 How well is authority delegated to enable individuals in a unit to undertake well-defined decision-making processes towards assurance of accountability and improvement?
- 5.6 Who has the fundraising responsibilities among the administrative governing members of the institution?
- 5.7 To what extent do senior administrators have the skills, time and assistance to discharge their duties effectively?

- 5.8 To what extent do AUB administrative units have the information and decision-making systems necessary to support their operation?
- 5.9 Are the lines of organization and authority clearly documented for all administrative departments and units?
- 5.10 Are the telecommunication systems adequate to ensure a dependable network for sharing academic and administrative information?
- 5.11 Are initiatives such as the Hospital Information System, Financial System, Library Automation, Student Information System, Fiber-Optic backbone and others appropriate?
- 5.12 Does AUB have adequate clerical support for administrative personnel? What plans are there to train support personnel to maintain their clerical support services at required standards?
- 5.13 To what extent does AUB depend on its own resources and personnel to provide the required administrative services? What portion of these services are bought or outsourced?

Methodologies:

These questions provide the basis for this study. The questions have been divided into three sets of issues: (1) organization structure and clarity of roles, (2) human resources, and (3) systems and information management. Three sub-teams, each with a leader, will examine one set of issues, looking at current practices and alternative practices, and then will make recommendations for improvement. Each team will develop methodologies appropriate to the questions assigned to them and refine their ideas with the whole team. They will review organization charts, AUB's human resources handbooks, policies and procedures and comparable documents from selected peer institutions. They will interview administrators and prepare survey questions for the self-study survey to be prepared by the Office for Institutional Research and Assessment. The data will be analyzed and draft reports will be written, submitted to process owners, redrafted, reviewed with team, presented to the co-chairs who will draft final team report.

Membership:

- Said El-Fakhani, PhD, Associate Dean and Professor, School of Business, *Co-chair*
- Andre Nahas, BSc, Director of Service Quality and Organizational Management, *Co-chair*
- *
- Maurice Carlier, ITA.FCA, Director of Internal Audit
- Sami Cortas, PhD, Assistant to the Vice President for Administration
- Nadim Darwiche, PhD, Associate Professor, Biology
- Michel El Azar, Graduate Student, Engineering Management Program
- Rima Farhat, BA, Director of Student Housing
- Marina Hajj, MD, MBA, Deputy Hospital Director
- Fadia Houmeidan, PhD, Associate Professor, Physiology
- Nahla Hwalla, Professor and Chairperson, Nutrition and Food Sciences
- Kassem Kassak, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, Health Services Administration
- Ilham Khalife, BS, Director of Human Resources, Hospital
- Toufic Mezher, DSc, Associate Professor, Engineering Management
- Hala Mohtaseb, PhD, Associate Professor, Biology
- Hilda Nassar MLIS, Medical Librarian
- Reem Rashash Shaaban, MA, Instructor, English
- Bashar Shihabuddin, Student, Medicine

Standard VI: Integrity

Purpose:

The purpose of the Integrity Task Team is to examine ways in which AUB, as a comprehensive, non-sectarian, teaching-centered research university based on the American liberal arts model of higher education and located in a Middle East setting, addresses the concept of institutional integrity. The task team will investigate ways in which the university creates an intellectual and scholarly environment that promotes

openness and honesty, protects academic freedom and freedom of expression and thought, and creates an atmosphere conducive to higher learning, while at the same time maintaining institutional autonomy. It will also address issues of academic and administrative integrity and transparency in the following areas: student recruitment, admission and retention, student assessment, curriculum development, faculty and staff recruitment, retention, promotion and training, diversity of students, faculty and staff, clarity of academic and administrative rules and regulations, and service to the institution and to the community.

Questions:

Based on a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 6.1 To what extent does AUB provide an environment conducive to teaching, learning and research and to the achievement of its mission, goals, and objectives?
- 6.2 To what extent does AUB ensure that all employees engage in sound ethical and academic practices?
- 6.3 To what extent does AUB show sensitivity to equity and diversity in admissions, recruitment, promotion?
- 6.4 By what measures does AUB promote honesty and transparency in its conduct and communications?
- 6.5 By whom and how are AUB policies and procedures established and reviewed? How are these policies disseminated?
- 6.6 How -- and how effectively -- does AUB assure the academic and intellectual freedom of all of its constituencies, and protect personal beliefs?
- 6.7 How regularly are university publications assessed to assure that they represent the institution accurately and truthfully?
- 6.8 Are student concerns regarding fair academic assessment, student conduct, and alleged disciplinary violations, addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
- 6.9 How does AUB train its faculty and staff to ensure a climate that nurtures respect, objectivity and freedom of expression?
- 6.10 How effectively does AUB protect its members from harassment and inappropriate pressures and discrimination?

Methodologies:

The questions generated by the Task Team on Integrity provide the basis for this study. The task team will review the university's published policies and procedures as well as the academic, staff, and student manuals and handbooks to identify areas where policies are lacking or ambiguous. It will conduct surveys and interviews as needed to address questions related to integrity issues, paying special attention to distinguish hearsay from factual reality. The team will divide into several groups to develop its survey and interview questions and analyze the findings.

Membership:

- Farouk Abi Khuzam, PhD, Professor, Mathematics, *Co-chair*
- Mustafa Khogali, DM, Chairperson of the Department and Professor of Family Medicine, *Co-chair*
- *
- Saleh Said Agha, PhD, Associate Professor, Arabic
- Kevin Butcher, PhD, Associate Professor, History and Archaeology
- Walaa El Kadi, Graduate Student, Health Behavior and Education
- Evangellos Dedoussis, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business
- Roy Ghandour, Undergraduate, Computer and Communications Engineering
- Ibrahim Hajj, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture; Professor, Electrical Engineering
- Robin Heath, PhD, Assistant Professor, Health Behavior and Education

- Ayman Kichly, Undergraduate, Electrical Engineering
- Diane King, PhD, Assistant Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Maysan Maarouf, Graduate Student, Ecosystem Management
- Moatasim Sidahmed, PhD, Associate Professor, Land and Water Resources
- Ahmed Smaili, PhD, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering
- Claire Uwayjan, BA, Director of Personnel
- Khaled Younis, MD, Assistant Professor, Pediatrics

Standard VII: Institutional Assessment

Purpose:

The purpose of the Institutional Assessment task team is to provide evidence for the existence of an appropriate assessment plan and process at AUB that is used for periodic assessment of institutional effectiveness. In addition, it will examine the extent to which the information obtained is used as a basis for assessing AUB's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, and the extent to which assessment results are used in institutional planning and allocation of resources.

Questions:

Based on a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 7.1 Is there a written and implemented institution-wide assessment plan for evaluating AUB's overall effectiveness with regard to students learning, to services, to use of resources, and other activities that support the institution in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives? Is this plan periodically evaluated for effectiveness and comprehensiveness?
- 7.2 What quantitative and qualitative measures and procedures are included in the assessment plan to determine AUB's effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals; its effectiveness in achieving the desired student learning outcomes; its effectiveness in evaluating the outcomes of its academic and non-academic support services; and efficiency in the use of its resources?
- 7.3 How frequently are assessments of such effectiveness and efficiency (referred to in 7.2) made, and to what extent are administrators, faculty, and staff involved in the assessment process?
- 7.4 Does the use of measures and procedures yield results that are useful for institutional planning, resource allocation and renewal?
- 7.5 How is data from the assessment results being utilized to improve the efficient use of resources and to enhance administrative services and processes, academic programs, and other activities?
- 7.6 Is there a clear institutional strategic plan based on data from assessment? Describe how this plan is implemented.

Methodologies:

The questions above provide the basis for this study. The task team will:

1. Conduct a comprehensive "situation audit" of institution-wide and program assessment practices.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of these practices with respect to their
 - alignment with mission, vision and values
 - involvement of faculty, professional staff and administrative leadership
 - alignment of the results with the strategic plan of the institution, i.e. extent to which results are used in program planning, evaluation and improvement.
3. Identify critical gaps for which new assessment techniques are needed.
4. Analyze and evaluate the information obtained from effectiveness evaluations, highlighting strengths and weaknesses, and making recommendations concerning the assessment of institutional effectiveness as seem warranted by the study's findings.

Membership:

- Nabil Chartouni, Member, Board of Trustees; Chairman and Managing Director, Acropolis Tourism Development, *Co-chair*
- Karma El-Hassan, PhD, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment; Associate Professor, Education, *Co-chair*
- *
- Rima Afifi Soweid, PhD, Assistant Professor, Health Behavior and Education
- Layal Ammar, Undergraduate, Economics, *Vice Chair*
- Nuhad Yazbik Dumit, RN, BSN, MPH, Assistant Professor, Health Education
- Florence Eid, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business
- Lea Hakim, Undergraduate, Economics
- Azmi Imad, MS, Director of Environmental Health, Safety, and Risk Management
- Nizar Jawhar, MS, University Statistician
- Shahe Kazarian, PhD, Assistant Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Tarak Kazzaz, PhD, SMArchS, Associate Professor, Architecture and Design
- Andre Nahas, BSc, Director of Service Quality and Organizational Improvement
- Ghaleb Okla, PhD, Administrative Associate Dean, Medicine, and Assistant Vice President for Medical Affairs
- Raja Tannous, ScD, Professor, Nutrition and Food Science

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: STANDARDS VIII – XIV

Standard VIII: Student Admissions

Purpose:

The purpose of the Student Admissions Task Team is to establish the extent to which the university's admissions policies, procedures, and practices are clearly stated, fully understood, widely communicated, consistently implemented, and periodically reviewed. The task team will establish the extent to which these policies, procedures, and practices are consistent with, and contribute to the realization of, the university's mission, goals, and objectives as part of an overall enrollment strategy. In particular, it will assess the extent to which these policies, procedures, and practices are consistent with AUB's commitment to the ideal of liberal arts education, and the extent to which they give expression to the university's aspiration to serve, without discrimination, all its constituencies at the local, regional, and international levels.

Questions:

Based upon a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 8.1 To what extent are the university's admissions strategies, policies, and procedures developed and implemented in line with its mission, goals, and objectives?
- 8.2 Are admissions policies and practices developed as part of an overall enrollment strategy? To what extent and how are admissions policies and practices coordinated with financial aid/scholarship policies and practices and with the policies and practices of other student support services, especially those affecting retention (e.g. orientation, academic and career advising, registration) to serve the mission, goals, and objectives of the university?
- 8.3 To what extent is the information regarding student financial aid, scholarships, student employment, tuition and refunds accurate and comprehensive, and how well are students aware of this information?
- 8.4 To what extent are the criteria for admission, both quantitative and qualitative, clearly stated and consistently applied?
- 8.5 To what extent are policies governing the transfer of credits and the equivalence of certificates, diplomas, and degrees developed in line with internal, national and international standards? To what extent are they clearly stated and consistently applied?

- 8.6 To what extent are admission and transfer of credit policies, procedures and practices effectively and widely communicated?
- 8.7 To what extent are policies and practices governing admissions of non-traditional degree students (part-time students, students with disabilities) clearly developed, fairly applied and effectively communicated?
- 8.8 To what extent are policies and practices governing admission to remedial and non-degree programs clearly developed, fairly applied, and effectively communicated?
- 8.9 How are the criteria for admission and transfer of credits established? What roles do the administration and the various academic units have in the development and review of admissions criteria and policies? To what extent is this process of development and review open to input from alumni, students, parents, and school officials? To what extent is such input encouraged and systematically sought?
- 8.10 How often and how effectively are admissions criteria and policies assessed in correlation with student performance at AUB? To what extent and how effectively are the assessment results used to review the university's admission criteria, to advise secondary schools of the performance of their graduates at AUB, and to improve AUB's programs, courses, and methods of teaching?
- 8.11 How systematically and with what regularity does the university monitor and assess student retention/attrition? How does information about retention and attrition influence recruitment strategies, admissions policies and practices, the review of student services, and curricular review?
- 8.12 Is the Office of Admissions adequately staffed with professional and support staff and resources? How effectively and efficiently does the Office coordinate and administer admissions policies and procedures? What is its role in setting admissions criteria and policies?
- 8.13 How effectively does the Office scan and analyze the student market, both nationally and internationally? How well does it understand and address the reasons well-qualified students do or do not apply to AUB, or once admitted choose to enroll or not to enroll? How effectively does analysis of the market inform recruitment strategies and practices?
- 8.14 How effectively does the Office establish and maintain good relations and ongoing communication with schools? How effectively does the Office reach, through these schools, prospective local, regional and international applicants?
- 8.15 How effectively do the university's publications, electronic and other media inform prospective students, their parents, and advisors about AUB's academic programs, costs, support services, campus life, and preparation for further study and careers? What processes are in place to assess the effectiveness of admissions literature?
- 8.16 To what extent and how effectively does the Office use current AUB student, faculty, and administration volunteers in the recruitment effort, e.g. as tour guides, presenters at college fairs, speakers? What sort of training do volunteers receive?
- 8.17 In its recruitment efforts, especially regionally and internationally, how effectively does the Office seek and develop the support of alumni groups, and how well does it coordinate its use of alumni in recruitment with the Office of Development and the Alumni Association?

Methodologies:

The research questions generated by the Student Admissions Task Team provide the basis for this study. The team has divided its study questions into three groups and itself into three sub-teams to study them: (1) admission criteria, policies and procedures, (2) assessment of admission criteria and policies, and (3) Admissions Office resources and planning. Sub-teams will interview the admissions staff, the academic deans, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Director of Financial Aid, the Registrar, and the University Statistician. Focus groups and surveys will be conducted with the University Admissions Committee, the admission committees of the various Faculties, and student groups. The task team will review all admissions

publications, relevant statistical studies, reports on enrollment and recruitment, reports of the relevant Senate and Faculty committees, and the relevant portions of interim and annual reports of offices and departments.

Membership:

- Mohamed Harajli, PhD, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, *Chair*
- *
- Abdel Rahim Abu Husayn, PhD, Associate Professor, History and Archaeology
- Amy Bourji Undergraduate, English literature
- Theodore Christides, PhD, Associate Professor, Physics
- Maya El Shareef, Graduate Student, Health Sciences
- Nadim Farajalla. PhD, Assistant Professor of Engineering
- Nizar Jawhar, MS, University Statistician
- Salim Kanaan, PhD, Director of Admissions
- Rolla Khatib, MS, Instructor, Medical Laboratory Technology
- Michael Lyons, MA, Director of International Student Services
- John Meloy, PhD, Assistant Professor, History and Archaeology
- Hassan Mohanna, Undergraduate, Computer and Communications Engineering, *Vice Chair*
- Mayssa Tamin Nehlawi, Research Assistant, Faculty of Medicine
- Sami Sanjad, MD, Professor, Pediatrics and Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, Medicine
- Rima Shadid, MA, Instructor, English
- Nadia Shuayto, DBA, Lecturer, Business

Standard IX: Student Support Services

Purpose:

The purpose of the Student Support Services Task Team is to examine the extent to which student support services contribute to the realization of the university's mission, goals, and objectives. The task team will assess, in particular, the effectiveness of student services as contributors to the enrichment of the students' quality of life from the time of enrollment to the time of graduation. The effectiveness of student services will be determined in light of AUB's mission statement and with the Middle States Association's emphasis on promoting "the comprehensive development of the student". The task team will assess each student support service individually and the whole system as a set of coordinated and integrated services. The team's report will include recommendations for improvement.

Questions:

Based upon a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 9.1 What support services are available for students and how do these services foster and facilitate the achievement of the mission, goals, and objectives of the university?
- 9.2 To what extent does the university commit sufficient resources, facilities and qualified personnel, to fully implement these services?
- 9.3 Is there a sufficient degree of coordination among the various student support services to integrate their efforts and enhance their ability to serve the needs of students?
- 9.4 To what extent does the university foster and value diversity in its student body? How does it encourage the free expression and exchange of diverse views? How effectively does the university build a climate of mutual respect, civility, and tolerance in a diverse community?
- 9.5 Has the university developed orientation programs and continuing support programs designed to address the interests, needs, and concerns not only of Lebanese students but also of international students from the region and beyond? How effectively does the university organize cultural programs and social activities designed to take advantage of the diversity of the student body to enrich the quality of life on campus?

- 9.6 How adequately do the university's health services meet students' physical and emotional needs? How well does the university address the concerns of students who may have special needs, such as students with physical disabilities, emotional or mental problems? Are these special services well planned, properly managed, and staffed with qualified professionals?
- 9.7 To what extent is the Office of the Registrar continuously updated about graduation requirements of the university's degree programs? To what extent does the Office communicate and implement these requirements effectively and consistently? Are student records processed in a timely and accurate manner? How are they maintained so as to provide appropriate access to those who need such information while protecting student privacy and the integrity of the content of the records?
- 9.8 To what extent do the resources committed by the university to financial aid meet the needs of admitted students who could not afford to attend otherwise? To what extent is financial aid awarded on the basis of clearly stated, fair, and consistently applied criteria? How does the administration of financial aid enhance and support the university's mission and goals? How do the financial aid policies and practices support the university's enrollment strategies? To what extent are admissions decisions affected by an applicant's request for financial aid?
- 9.9 To what extent does the university provide the appropriate physical facilities and qualified staff necessary to ensure a high quality of life for students living in campus residence halls? How successful are residence hall policies in fostering communities in which students not only share physical space but also learn to live together cooperatively? How successful have the activities or programs organized by the university been in promoting collegiality in the residence halls?
- 9.10 How successful are the catering and cafeteria services in meeting the needs of students, and in particular of students living on campus? Should these services be enhanced? If so, how?
- 9.11 To what extent are recreational, cultural, social and athletic activities and programs made available to the students? Does the university provide adequate physical facilities for these activities and programs? To what extent are they properly organized and managed by qualified staff? To what extent do students take advantage of these activities and programs? To what extent have these activities and programs proved valuable to the students?
- 9.12 Does the university publish and continuously update a student handbook? Does this handbook contain basic and useful information designed to help students understand their rights and obligations? How does it familiarize them with policies, procedures, and regulations of particular significance to students?
- 9.13 Has the university developed, and made known to all students, clear procedures for complaints and grievances? To what extent are complaints and grievances addressed promptly and fairly? Are there effective follow-up mechanisms to insure that grievances are properly addressed and righted?
- 9.14 How does the university assess the effectiveness of the student support services? How does it use the assessment results to improve services?
- 9.15 To what extent is student input solicited and used in developing, administering, and evaluating student services?

Methodologies:

The research questions generated by the Student Support Services Task Team provide the basis for this study. The first step is to gather information about presently available support services for students. The team will then divide into sub-teams to examine each of the services through surveys, focus groups, and interviews. The task team will survey and meet with directors of the various student services and programs (Registrar's Office, Financial Aid, Health Services, Athletics, Counseling, International Student Services, Placement Services, Residence, Student Activities) and with academic administrators. A liaison with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has been appointed to coordinate the survey needs of the team. Team members will conduct focus groups with the University Student Faculty Committee, University Student Affairs Committee, student affairs committees in the various Faculties, and with members from student clubs and societies. It will review documents relevant to its research such as the Student Handbook,

interim and annual reports of various offices and programs bearing upon student life as well as documents about student support services from peer institutions.

Membership:

- Khalil Bitar, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; Professor, Physics, *Chair*
*
- Amer Alayli, Undergraduate, Business
- Monique Chaaya, DPH, Assistant Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
- Mohammad El-Fakahani, Medical Student
- Maryam Ghandour, PhD, Student Counselor
- Ghaleb Halimi, MS, Director of Athletics
- Wadad Husseiny, MA, Director of Student Activities
- Hanaa Kobeissi, MPH, Associate Director of Financial Aid
- Khadijeh Lakkis, MA, Instructor, English
- Stella Major, BMBS, Assistant Professor, Family Medicine
- Nadine Naffah, MPH, MBA, Associate Director of Admissions
- Talal Nizzameddin, PhD, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs
- Bassim Saab, MD, Associate Professor, Family Medicine
- Salah Sadek, PhD, Associate Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Moueen Salameh, PhD, Registrar, Professor, Engineering Management
- Fawwak Sleiman, PhD, Professor, Animal Sciences
- Sahar Tabaja, Undergraduate, Economics
- Rabih Talhouk, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, Biology

Standard X: Faculty

Purpose:

The purpose of the Faculty Task Team is to examine the extent to which, and the effectiveness with which, faculty fulfill their primary responsibilities of teaching, research and service, as well as their related roles in student advising, curriculum development academic policy making and governance. The task team will consider issues related to faculty recruitment and retention, performance assessment and promotion. It will examine the role of the university and of the faculty in rebuilding and sustaining AUB's academic environment.

Questions:

Based on a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort.

- 10.1 To what extent do faculty activities and responsibilities accord with AUB's mission, goals, and expectations regarding faculty responsibilities for teaching, research, advising, service, and governance?
- 10.2 To what extent is there an adequate number of qualified full-time faculty and other qualified professionals developing, supporting, and carrying out AUB's academic programs. To what extent does this core provide for institutional continuity?
- 10.3 To what extent are the academic, intellectual and pedagogical roles, responsibilities and qualifications of faculty clearly defined?
- 10.4 To what extent is the university successful in recruiting and retaining qualified faculty?
- 10.5 To what extent are faculty recruitment and selection processes consistent with AUB's commitment to have a diverse faculty in such areas as age, gender, nationality, religious background, and ethnicity?
- 10.6 To what extent are there equitable and clearly articulated procedures and criteria for faculty appointment, periodic evaluation, promotion, demotion, grievance, discipline, and dismissal? Are these procedures and criteria consistent with AUB's mission statement and goals? Are they strictly

- followed? To what extent are these evaluations multi-dimensional? How are the results of these processes analyzed and used?
- 10.7 Are total compensation packages, at all levels and in all relevant categories, commensurate with those found in peer institutions and sufficient to attract and retain qualified faculty? How does AUB communicate such information to faculty? How and by whom are “peers”, both local and international, identified
 - 10.8 To what extent do AUB faculty and other qualified professionals, including graduate assistants, demonstrate excellence in teaching? How is their teaching performance assessed? Are actions recommended following assessment? What does AUB do to encourage excellence in teaching and provide opportunities for faculty development in this area?
 - 10.9 To what extent does AUB rely on part-time, adjunct, and temporary faculty? Are policies and procedures for recruitment and evaluation of these faculty members and their overall role in teaching effectiveness, clearly articulated and communicated? How are the contributions of these faculty members assessed? Are criteria used consistent with those for full-time faculty? Are policies and procedures periodically reviewed? What opportunities does AUB offer for orientation, professional development, and integration into university life?
 - 10.10 How does AUB encourage research and professional advancement and development? How is such encouragement monitored and assessed? To what extent, and with what degree of effectiveness, are faculty supported in seeking funds for research activities and granted protected time for research?
 - 10.11 To what extent are institutional research expectations in accord with AUB’s mission and goals? To what extent are they appropriate in regard to other professional expectations, such as teaching, service, and governance?
 - 10.12 To what extent do faculty and other qualified professionals participate in institutional planning, curriculum review, and other governance structures? To what extent are these roles clearly and adequately defined in AUB’s policies and procedures? How do these responsibilities accord with faculty’s primary responsibilities for teaching and research? Is service considered a primary faculty responsibility?
 - 10.13 What is the involvement of faculty in the selection of equipment and facilities that support instructional programs? Is there sufficient university support for equipment and facilities to teach and do research?
 - 10.14 To what extent, and with what degree of effectiveness, are resources being made available to support the appropriate use of technology by faculty in the educational process? What training and development opportunities are available to faculty in the use of technology? How is such faculty development assessed?
 - 10.15 To what extent do AUB faculty provide adequate student advising, academic guidance, and supervision of graduate thesis work? How does the university train faculty for these roles? How do their department, school or Faculty, and the universities assess their performance? To what extent is student advising considered (including graduate student supervision of thesis work) in assessing workloads and performance, and in promotion and salary decisions?
 - 10.16 To what extent are faculty members responsible for promoting academic integrity among students? Are policies and procedures related to academic integrity and academic freedom communicated clearly to all concerned? How does AUB assess the adherence of faculty and students to principles of academic freedom and academic integrity?
 - 10.17 To what extent does the university, including faculty, strive to perpetuate an academic environment? How does AUB assess its faculty’s satisfaction with the institution’s intellectual climate? How does it nurture this climate among faculty and students? To what extent are there effective communication channels in this regard between the faculty and the administration?

Methodologies:

The Faculty Task Team divided itself into three sub-teams to study (1) general questions (2) faculty recruitment and retention, (3) faculty activities: teaching, research, service, advising, leadership, equipment and technology. The teams will examine and analyze documents and other reports related to faculty recruitment and promotion, the academic (faculty) handbook, and written policies and guidelines. They will survey faculty, department chairs, program directors, deans and the provost. Instruments such as in-depth interviews and focus groups may also be used to provide supplemental insights and explanations to the information resulting from surveys and the review of documents.

Membership:

- James Wei, PhD, Member, Board of Trustees; Dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science, Princeton University, *Co-chair*
 - Huda Zurayk, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences; Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics, *Co-chair*
- *
- Nabil Dajani, PhD, Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - Nadia ElCheikh, PhD, Associate Professor, History and Archaeology; Acting Director, Center for Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies
 - Mounib El-Eid, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Physics
 - Eleanor Johnson, MA, Associate Director, Office of Development
 - Hadi Maamoun, Graduate Student, Mechanical Engineering
 - Mounir Mabsout, PhD, Associate Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering
 - Ramzi Sabra, MD, Associate Professor, Pharmacology and Therapeutics; Assistant Dean for Research, Faculty of Medicine
 - Bared Safieh-Garabedian, PhD, Associate Professor of Biology
 - Ibrahim Salti, MD, PhD, Professor, Internal Medicine, Endocrinology
 - Abia Mehio Sibai, PhD, Assistant Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
 - Salma Talhouk, PhD, Associate Professor, Plant Sciences
 - Angela Yassin, Undergraduate, Business
 - Sui Kwong Yau, PhD, Associate Professor of Plant Sciences
 - Philippe Zgheib, PhD, Associate Professor, Business

Standard XI: Educational Offerings

Purpose:

Teaching and learning are a primary purpose of AUB as a teaching-centered research university. The Educational Offerings Task Team will examine the content, rigor and coherence of the university's undergraduate and graduate academic programs. It will ask to what extent these programs serve the university's goals of developing in its students both professional competence and the habits and skills for life-long learning. It will examine expected student learning outcomes, including knowledge, skills, and values for each program. Individual courses, programs, and sequences of study will be reviewed to ensure that they are dynamic and responsive to new research findings and modes of inquiry. Policies and procedures by which degree requirements are established and student performance evaluated will be examined periodically. Finally, the task team will look for coherence between curricular offerings and co-curricular activities, and will review the sufficiency and effectiveness of resources – human, physical, information, learning, and technological -- used to support the programs.

Questions:

Based on a review of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the research effort:

- 11.1 What are the goals and objectives of the programs and how do they serve the university's mission, goals, and objectives?
- 11.2 How clearly and effectively are these goals and outcomes articulated and made available to students and faculty?

- 11.3 Is the design of each specific course, program, and learning activity linked to clearly articulated program goals and to the mission of the institution?
- 11.4 What are the expected student learning outcomes for each program? Are these stated in the course syllabi? How are courses designed to achieve these outcomes? How is student achievement assessed?
- 11.5 Describe how each program provides the appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge and learning.
- 11.6 How do undergraduate courses in a program differ from graduate courses in the same field in terms of content, teaching methods, and outcomes? How do these programs promote critical and independent thinking?
- 11.7 How does the program teach the student to access information efficiently, evaluate it critically, and use it effectively to accomplish a given task? How does it encourage students to integrate rather than simply accumulate information and to think independently and critically? How are these skills assessed?
- 11.8 How often and how effectively are ongoing academic programs evaluated in terms of congruence with the university's mission and strategic plans, impact on the budget, human, physical and technological resources, and market demands, especially in the region?
- 11.9 How carefully are proposed new or to-be revived degrees and programs evaluated in terms of the demands of the marketplace, congruence with the university's mission and strategic plans, and the impact on budget, space, faculty, and existing programs?
- 11.10 Are policies and procedures by which degree requirements are established and student performance evaluated examined periodically?
- 11.11 What impact do academic advising programs and programs for study skill development and tutoring have upon the intellectual development of students?
- 11.12 Has provision been made for comparability of quality of teaching/instruction regardless of the location or delivery mode?
- 11.13 Are there extra- or co-curricular experiences that contribute to the total educational environment (e.g. out-of-class lectures, exhibitions, civic involvement, community service, etc.)? What arrangements have been made with groups and organizations to facilitate these experiences and to what extent are they employed by students, faculty and staff?
- 11.14 How do AUB's educational programs fulfill its mission of service to the community? Are such activities part of the expected outcomes in different academic programs?
- 11.15 Describe the resources available to students for acquiring information and students' ease of access to these resources (library, internet, computer labs).
- 11.16 What programs are there to assist students, faculty and instructional staff to use information resources in a variety of media and formats?
- 11.17 Do graduate curricula foster the development of research and independent thinking, and how?
- 11.18 Are there published transfer procedures that are fair, consistently applied, and take into consideration student learning outcomes?

Methodologies:

The research questions generated by the Educational Offerings Task Team provide the basis for this study. The questions will be explored using several methods. The task team will: review documents available from Faculties and departments to provide information concerning educational programs and curricula; conduct interviews with the provost and deans of various Faculties; conduct focus group meetings among department

chairs, program directors, faculty and students to obtain additional perspectives; conduct surveys to assess users of the educational programs, the status of information literacy incorporated in the curriculum, information resources, reference tools and availability of trained instructional and reference staff or other support services to help students locate and evaluate information. Finally the task team will study the impact of transfer agreements or transfer acceptance mandates on the coherence and integrity of the institution's degree programs.

Membership:

- Saouma Boujaoude, PhD, Professor, Education, Science and Math Education Center, *Co-chair*
- Rami Zurayk, PhD, Associate Professor of Land and Water Resources, *Co-chair*
- *
- Kim Smith Abouchacra, PhD, Assistant Professor, Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery
- Issam Bashour, PhD, Associate Professor, Land and Water Resources
- Chadi Bejjani, Undergraduate, Environmental Health
- Antoine Feghali, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business
- Ghazi Ghaith, PhD, Associate Professor, Education
- Karim Kabalan, PhD, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Muhammad Ali Khalidi, Assistant Professor and Chairperson, Philosophy
- Charbel Khoury, Undergraduate, Biology
- Randa Nawam, BS, Assistant Registrar
- Helen Sader, PhD, Professor, History and Archaeology
- Hala Tamim, PhD, Assistant Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics

Standard XII: General Education

Purpose:

The purpose of the General Education Task Team is to establish the extent to which the general education requirement reflects AUB's unwavering commitment to the ideal of a liberal arts education. The task team will assess the extent to which the general education requirement contributes to the realization of the university's mission "to produce men and women who are not only technically competent in their professional fields but who are life-long learners who have a breadth of vision, a sense of moral responsibility, and devotion to the fundamental values of human life." It will assess the extent to which the general education program provides a broad, but academically balanced and challenging range of course offerings and the extent to which the content of these courses and the teaching methods and styles used are conducive to the development of critical analysis and independent thinking and judgment.

Questions:

Based upon a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence: Standards for Accreditation*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the Task Force in its research effort.

- 12.1 To what extent does the general education requirement contribute to the realization of the university's mission and goals?
- 12.2 To what extent are the general education requirements clearly described and explained to prospective applicants and students enrolled at the university? How effectively is the rationale for the general education requirements clearly stated and communicated to students, parents, and advisors?
- 12.3 To what extent do the general education courses enable students to acquire and develop core knowledge and skills such as communication skills, quantitative and scientific analysis, technological competencies, critical analysis, and reasoning?
- 12.4 To what extent is the general education requirement consistently implemented across the various Faculties and academic units at the university?
- 12.5 To what extent is the general education program balanced and broad-based? To what extent are major areas of knowledge such as mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities effectively represented in the general education requirement?

- 12.6 To what extent has an appropriate balance been established between a student's general education requirement and the specific requirements of his or her major? Has such a balance been achieved to the same degree across all departments and Faculties or do some students have greater difficulty integrating the general education requirement with the requirements of the major they are pursuing?
- 12.7 To what extent has the exposure to a variety of academic disciplines helped students make enlightened judgments outside the area of their academic specialty?
- 12.8 To what extent has the university committed sufficient resources to support the general education program?
- 12.9 To what extent and by what means has the university tried to ensure that the learning and educational objectives of the general education program are successfully realized? To what extent and how effectively has the university used the results of its assessment efforts to further develop and improve the general education program?
- 12.10 To what extent has the university established clear and effective procedures and mechanisms to facilitate the process of reviewing, renewing, and improving the general education program?
- 12.11 To what extent has the general education program at AUB influenced the curricula, and the curricular development, of other institutions of higher education in Lebanon and the region?

Methodologies:

The research questions generated by the General Education Task Team provide the basis for this study. The team will form several sub-teams, including one to study objectives of general education and another to study general education requirements and course content at AUB along with comparable curricula at Harvard College, the American University in Cairo, and some peer institutions. The teams will begin their work with thorough study of AUB's mission statement and of the long history of general education at AUB. The team will interview the provost of the university, the academic deans, the director and members of the Civilization Sequence Program, faculty members from 'contributing' academic departments; it will conduct surveys and focus groups with currently enrolled students and with alumni from different generations and in different areas of specialty.

Membership:

- Martha S. Joukowsky, PhD, Member, Board of Trustees; Professor, Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University, *Co-chair*
- Waddah Nasr, PhD, Associate Provost; Associate Professor, Philosophy, *Co-chair*
- *
- Abdel-Fattah Abdel-Rahman, PhD, Associate Professor, Geology
- Howeida Al-Harithy, PhD, Associate Professor, Architecture and Design
- Ramzi Baalbaki, PhD, Professor, Arabic; Chairperson, Arabic and Near Eastern Studies; Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Mohamad-Ragy Darwish, PhD, Land and Water Resources
- R. Joseph Hoffman, PhD, Associate Professor, Civilization Sequence Program
- Muhammad Ali Khalidi, PhD, Assistant Professor and Chairperson, Philosophy
- Marwan Khawaja, PhD, Associate Professor, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
- Omeira Mansour, Undergraduate, Biology
- Ibrahim Osman, PhD, Associate Professor, Business
- Peter Shebaya, MA, Senior Lecturer, Director, Civilization Sequence Program
- Richard Smith, PhD, Associate Professor, Civilization Sequence Program
- Mohamad Taha, Undergraduate, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Standard XIII: Related Educational Activities

Purpose:

The purpose of the Related Educational Activities Task Team is to examine all non-degree, non-credit, certificate, CEC, Extension, remedial and/or developmental educational programs or activities and any contractual and affiliated relationships carried out by AUB in order to ensure that they meet appropriate standards and are consistent with and serve AUB's mission and goals. The team will review courses and programs to see if they prepare students for success in achieving their educational goals, if they have clearly defined learning outcomes, and if they are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures, to assure that AUB has appropriate oversight of, and responsibility for, all activities carried out in its name or on its behalf. Further, the task team will study the impact of these programs on AUB's resources and ability to fulfill its mission and goals.

Questions:

Based on a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, and on issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the Task Team in its research effort. The questions examine AUB's related educational activities around three groups of issues: those related to administration of the programs, to academic content, delivery, and outcomes, and to how the programs serve AUB's mission.

- 13.1 What certificate, non-degree, non-credit, Continuing Education, and Extension programs or activities does AUB offer? What is the history of such programs? What markets do they serve? What are their objectives, requirements and curricular sequences? Where, when, and on what timetable are these programs described and published?
- 13.2 How and by what office are such programs planned, documented, advertised, administered and conducted?
- 13.3 Can a non-matriculated certificate program offered by the Continuing Education Center be used against university credit? If so, under what circumstances, and why?
- 13.4 What communication modalities are used to link Continuing Education Center to university faculties and academic departments? How is their effectiveness assessed?
- 13.5 Are student support services available for students in Continuing Education and are they effective?
- 13.6 What are the costs and benefits of such programs to the institution's resources (human, fiscal, physical)? How are these costs and benefits assessed?
- 13.7 What remedial programs are offered for students who do not fully satisfy admission criteria? How, and using what measures, are potential students identified and recruited, and are these measures systematically reviewed for their appropriateness?
- 13.8 Can students in these programs register for regular courses bearing academic credit while still in the remedial program? How is this decision made?
- 13.9 What contractual and affiliative relationships has the university made? How and by what office are such agreements negotiated, administered and assessed?
- 13.10 Have faculty members and other qualified academic professionals been involved in the design, delivery, and ongoing evaluation of the offerings and programs?
- 13.11 How are the contents of related educational programs and activities determined, and is there a general core around which they revolve?
- 13.12 What support services are offered to pre-admission students during their remedial period? How is the quality and effectiveness of such services assessed?
- 13.13 How is the impact of remedial/developmental programs on student persistence and academic achievement in degree courses assessed?

13.14 Do the institution's related educational programs and non-credit offerings have a clear mission translated to corresponding goals and performance indicators and outcome assessment criteria? Are these goals and objectives reflective of and consistent with the institutional mission?

13.15 How are AUB's related educational activities and programs consistent with, and how do they further, its mission, goals and objectives?

Methodologies:

The questions will be explored using several methods. Specifically, the task team will: review documents available from Faculties, the Continuing Education Center and Regional and Extension Programs to provide information concerning these specialized educational programs and affiliations. It will conduct surveys to assess student needs and satisfaction with offerings and programs. Finally, it will examine documents and reports describing AUB's contractual, affiliative, and exchange relationships with other educational institutions.

The questions will be explored by three sub-teams: (A) certificate, non-credit, non-degree, CEC, Extension programs; (B) contracts and affiliations; (C) remedial/developmental programs. Each team will (1) examine relevant documents to inventory existing programs and identify the offices responsible for administering the programs, (2) look at how these programs align with AUB's mission, (3) examine the administrative structure and academic content of the programs, (4) study the costs and benefits of each program with the Financial Planning and Budget Office (5) develop survey questions for the self-study surveys and conduct interviews with administrators, faculty and students, in collaboration with OIRA, (6) analyze the data for consistency and alignment of programs, contracts, and affiliations with *Characteristics*, pp 48-49 and with AUB's mission and goals, (7) submit a written report to be merged into one team report and forwarded to the Steering Committee.

Membership:

- Kamel Abdallah, PhD, Assistant Vice President, Regional and External Programs and Assistant Professor, School of Business, *Co-chair*
- Carol Rhoder, PhD, Associate Professor, Education, *Co-chair*
*
- Farqod Alkhar, PhD, Engineering Management
- Rula Baalbaki, MA, Instructor, English
- Munir Bashshur, PhD, Education
- Amal Bou Zeineddine, EdD, Assistant Professor, Education
- Farid Chaaban, PhD, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Mohamad Farran, PhD, Professor, Animal Sciences; Director, Agricultural Research and Education Center
- Zeina Maalouf, Undergraduate, Nutrition
- Arabia Mohammed Ali, PhD, Instructor, Health Services Administration
- Sarah Richani, Undergraduate
- Hind Rizkallah, MS, Instructor, Biology
- Rosangela Silva, PhD, Director of Academic Computing
- Ghazi Zaatari, MD, Professor and Chairperson, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

Standard XIV: Assessment of Student Learning

Purpose:

The purpose of the "Assessment of Student Learning" task team is to examine the process by which AUB assesses (gathers information and evaluates) the learning outcomes of its educational courses and programs to demonstrate that its students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with the mission and goals of the institution and the educational objectives of its programs and academic units.

Questions:

Based on a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, as well as issues specific to AUB, the following questions have been developed to guide the task team in its research effort:

- 14.1 Are there clearly articulated expectations of student learning at various levels of the institution, faculties/school, degrees/programs, and individual courses that are consonant with the institution's mission and with the standards of higher education and of the relevant disciplines?
- 14.2 Is there an implemented plan for assessment of these outcomes? Who implements assessment of student learning outcomes and how frequently is the process conducted? What kind of quantitative or qualitative tools are used and how appropriate are they? Do the assessment measures demonstrate that students have achieved the stated learning outcomes at both course and program level? Are these measures suitable to demonstrate congruence between the university's mission, goals, and objectives and the actual outcomes of its educational courses, programs and activities?
- 14.3 Are the results of outcomes assessment made available to and are they understandable by students, faculty, staff and academic advisors?
- 14.4 How, and to what extent, are the assessment results or findings utilized to enhance student learning, and to improve curricula, educational programs and instructional activities?
- 14.5 How, and to what extent, are the actual outcomes of student learning linked to the process of the institution's ongoing planning and resource allocation to improve institutional quality, effectiveness, and accountability?

Methodologies:

The task team will examine available quantitative and qualitative measures used in the assessment of student learning and, where necessary, recommend the development of alternative and additional measures. The team will specifically:

1. Collect information about the existence of articulated student learning outcomes at the institution, faculties/schools, degrees/programs and individual courses. Documentary analysis on the gathered information will be done by examining the statements of objectives of representative samples of programs/courses and by interviewing selected academic administrators and faculty members
2. Review current assessment measures of student learning outcomes at the course, degree/program, faculty/school and institution levels in order to identify:
 - Who implements the measures?
 - When are these measures implemented?
 - How appropriate are they?
 - How valid are the measures?
 - How comprehensive and accessible are these measures by students, faculty, professional staff and academic advisors?
3. Look for evidence that student learning outcomes assessment is being used to improve student learning and curricula by conducting interviews with faculty members and students and by examining departmental, faculty and relevant committee reports.
4. Look for evidence that student learning outcomes assessment is being used continually as part of the institutional assessment and improvement/planning cycle.

The team will divide into three sub-teams, each to study one of the following areas: (1) learning outcomes, (2) assessment tools, and (3) the use of assessment in improving learning outcomes and in institutional planning. Each sub-team will develop a plan for collecting data concerning its mandate. The plans will specify relevant documents to be reviewed (e.g. mission statement, syllabi, assessment tools and reports) and survey questions, interviews and focus groups to query various constituencies (students, faculty, chairperson, deans, provost, president). Data collection will take place in the fall, followed by analysis and integration of the findings into the team report.

Membership:

- Nesreen Ghaddar, PhD. Professor, Mechanical Engineering, *Co-chair*
- Murad Jurdak, PhD, Chairperson of the Department and Professor of Education, *Co-chair*

*

- Rida Abou Zeineddine, Undergraduate, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Suad Araj, MA, Instructor, English
- Ali El-Hajj, Docteur Ingenieur, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Karma El Hassan, PhD, Associate Professor; Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
- Samira Halabi, Undergraduate, Business
- Abdo Jurjus, PhD, Associate Professor, Human Morphology
- Malakeh Khoury, MA, Instructor, English
- Sawsan Kreydiyyeh, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, Biology
- Samar Nouredine, PhD, RN, Assistant Professor, Health Promotion, Cardiopulmonary Nursing
- Iman Nuwayhid, MD, DPH, Associate Professor, Environmental Health; Assistant Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences
- Prem Chandra Saxena, PhD, Professor, Population Studies
- Malek Tabbal, PhD, Assistant Professor, Physics
- Imad Toufeili, PhD, Associate Professor, Nutrition and Food Science

8. Outcomes Assessment and the Self-Study

As stated in the Middle States document, *Framework for Outcomes Assessment*, “The Fundamental purpose of assessment is to examine and enhance an institution’s effectiveness, not only in terms of teaching and learning, which rest at the heart of the mission at colleges and universities, but also the effectiveness of the institution as a whole.” In the last five years AUB has embarked on a series of initiatives involving institutional assessment and effectiveness and the assessment of educational outcomes. These initiatives are important components of the institution’s plan to insure that self-study, evaluation, and improvement are ongoing and systematic activities.

The Teaching Effectiveness Initiative and the Service Quality Initiative both addressed institution-wide assessment concerns. The Teaching Effectiveness Initiative was launched to improve excellence in teaching. Outcomes assessment was systematically developed as an essential feature of teaching portfolios. In 2000 faculty were surveyed to obtain their views of the effectiveness of their role at AUB. In addition, all graduating students in the classes of 2000 and 2001 were surveyed to obtain candid feedback on educational practices and experiences at AUB. The plan is to conduct the faculty survey every other year and the student survey every year.

The Service Quality Initiative is an ongoing project focused on improving service quality across the university. In September 2001, AUB filled the newly created position of Director of Service Quality and Institutional Improvement, a senior management position reporting directly to the President. In the ensuing months, the new Director has worked closely with the university’s academic and non-academic administrative support units to develop a program of comprehensive institutional improvement based on the model of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program’s *Educational Criteria for Performance Excellence 2001*. Adopting this program on a university wide-level is a multiyear task that is being closely coordinated with the university’s efforts to obtain accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

AUB has made considerable advances in developing strategies for assessing educational outcomes. All academic departments have prepared reports on how best to evaluate student performance and outcomes. The School of Business recommended an integrated outcome evaluation strategy that sums up AUB’s agenda on the subject of outcomes assessment. The Faculty of Engineering and Architecture has improved evaluation procedures while preparing for accreditation from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). The Faculty of Health Sciences’ study, “Who are our Students and Where are our Graduates?” is another example of an effort to assess teaching-learning activities.

AUB’s application for accreditation and its preparation for the Self-Study have underscored the need to develop a far greater capacity for, and commitment to, conducting systematic and coordinated institutional research than presently exists. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) was established in the fall of 2001 to meet this challenge. The office’s first priority is to provide an institutional framework for and assistance in the assessment activities to be conducted during the self-study. OIRA will provide existing data and studies to study groups where these are available. It will also support each in developing its survey questions, will coordinate data requests and survey questions into one or several surveys targeting different constituencies, and will help in both the administration of the surveys and in the analysis of the findings. The conclusions and recommendations of the task teams will be supported by documented evidence.

Finally, corollary with the AUB’s establishment of Self-Study Task-Teams, the Provost’s Office has established an Ad-hoc Committee on Educational Outcomes in order to develop a draft plan for establishing criteria and systems of measurement for academic assessment.

9. Inventory of Support Documents

Documents to be reviewed	'M' denotes multiple years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Mission Goals and Objectives															
2. Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal															
3. Institutional Resources															
4. Leadership and Governance															
5. Administration															
6. Integrity															
7. Institutional Assessment															
8. Student Admissions															
9. Student Services															
10. Faculty															
11. Educational Offerings															
12. General Education															
13. Related Educational Activities															
14. Assessment of Educational Outcomes															
General University Documents and Publications															
Mission Statement of the American University of Beirut		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Admissions recruitment brochures, video, DVD, applications							*		*						
<i>American University of Beirut Catalogue</i>	M	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<i>AUB Bulletin</i> (yearly publication)	M						*								
<i>AUB Bulletin Today</i> (bi-monthly newsletter)	M						*								
<i>AUB Magazine (alumni quarterly)</i>	M						*								
<i>AUB Contributors Report</i>	M			*											
<i>AUBMC News</i> (monthly newsletter)	M						*			*					
<i>Outlook</i> (student newspaper)	M						*								
President's Interim and Annual Reports to the Trustees	M	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<i>A Mutual Concern (history of AUB)</i> , John Munro, 1977		*			*										
<i>That They May Have Life</i> (history of AUB), Stephen Penrose, Jr., 1952		*			*										
<i>The Campaign for Excellence at AUB, 2002</i>			*	*											
University Planning and Financial Documents															
Academic Planning for AUB in the Next Decade; AUB 2004			*								*	*	*		
Academic Strategic Plans (Faculties/Libraries), 2001			*	*							*	*	*		
Audited Financial Statement	M		*	*											
Balanced Scorecard, 2002			*												
Campaign Plan, 2002			*	*											
Campus Master Plan, 2002			*	*											
Capital Budget	M		*	*											
Interfaculty Committee for Laboratory Development 5-year Plan			*	*											
Operating Budget	M		*	*											
Strategic Five-Year Plan (financial)	M		*	*											
General and Departmental Manuals															
Academic Staff Manual							*				*				
Departmental Manuals (Business Services, Comptroller, Computing and Networking, Environmental Health, Extension Programs, Hospital, Infirmary, Internal Audit, Libraries, New York Office, Physical Plant, Purchasing, Regional External Programs, Stores, Student Affairs, Supply)						*	*								
Personnel Manual for Non-academic Employees						*	*								
Student Handbook							*			*					
Summary Information Guide for Prospective Faculty members											*				
Charter, By-Laws, and Minutes															
Certificate of Incorporation of the Trustees of the Syrian Protestant College, 1863		*			*										
Corporate By -Laws of the American University of Beirut		*			*										
<i>Faculties/Schools By -Laws</i> : Agricultural and Food Sciences, Arts and Sciences (and Education Department), Business, Engineering and Architecture, Health Sciences, Medicine, Nursing					*										
Organization Chart (Administration)						*									
Outlook (student newspaper) By-Laws					*										
Senate By -Laws					*						*				
Unified Faculty By-Laws					*						*				
Minutes: Board of Trustees (summaries)					*										
Minutes: Board of Deans (summaries)					*										
Minutes: Policy and Procedures Review Committee						*	*								
Minutes: Senate, and Committees of the Senate					*						*				
Minutes: University Admissions Committee									*						
Minutes: University Financial Aid/Scholarship Committee									*	*					
Minutes: University Student/Faculty Committee					*					*	*				
General University Policies															

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
1. Mission Goals and Objectives																
2. Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal																
3. Institutional Resources																
4. Leadership and Governance																
5. Administration																
6. Integrity																
7. Institutional Assessment																
8. Student Admissions																
9. Student Services																
10. Faculty																
11. Educational Offerings																
12. General Education																
13. Related Educational Activities																
14. Assessment of Educational Outcomes																
Documents to be reviewed	'M' denotes multiple years															
Access to Campus							*									
Airline Ticketing Procedure																
Benefits and Allowances for Academic Personnel							*				*					
Code of Business Ethics							*									
Conflict of Interest					*		*									
Corporate Audit Policy			*	*			*									
Discrimination and Harassment							*									
Fraud				*			*									
Fund Raising				*		*	*									
Graduate Assistantships							*			*	*					
Housing						*	*				*					
Insurance						*										
Intellectual Property							*				*					
Parking						*										
Policy Development			*													
Research Assistantships										*	*					
Selecting Professional Services			*			*	*									
Smoking																
Records Retention				*	*											
Travel																
Reports																
Academic Restructuring, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture			*									*			*	
Admissions Proposal Based on School Specific Regression Analysis									*							
American University of Beirut Library Report, 2002 (external report)				*					*	*						
Annual and Interim Reports on Financial Aid	M								*	*						
Annual and Interim Reports of the Registrar	M								*	*						
Annual and Interim Reports on Student Admissions	M								*							
Annual Report of U niversity Admissions Committee	M								*							
AUB Service Excellence Summary Faculty Workshops Evaluation Report, 2001											*					
Charles W. Hostler Student Center Survey Report, 2002			*	*						*						
Employee Satisfaction Report, 2001						*										
Establishing Awards for Teaching Excellence, 2000											*					
Evaluation of Admissions Criteria in Relation to Performance at AUB									*							
Faculty Promotion Task Force Report, 2002											*					
Financial Aid at the American University of Beirut, 2002 (external report)									*	*						
Instructor Course Evaluation, 2001-2002											*					
Library Satisfaction Survey Report, 2000				*												
Looking Forward: Options for Growth (Development Off, 2000)			*	*												
Parking Lot Issues, 2001			*	*		*										
Physical Plant Review, 2001				*		*										
Proposal for Early Admissions Decisions, 1999									*							
Proposal for Establishing Office of Admissions, 1999									*							
Proposal for Granting Transfer Credit for IB and AP exams, 2000									*			*		*		
Retention/Attrition of Freshman and Sophomore Students	M								*	*						
Scoping Study on the Proposed AUB Natural History Museum and a Review of the Existing Collections, 2002			*	*												
Service Quality Tak Force Report on Staff Workshop Outcomes, 2001						*										
Student Registration Satisfaction Report	M								*	*						
Sub-Committee on Establishing Awards for Excellence, 2001						*										
Summary of External Review Reports, 1998-1999 (FAFS, FA S, FHS, FM, DEdu)			*								*	*				

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Mission Goals and Objectives														
2. Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal														
3. Institutional Resources														
4. Leadership and Governance														
5. Administration														
6. Integrity														
7. Institutional Assessment														
8. Student Admissions														
9. Student Services														
10. Faculty														
11. Educational Offerings														
12. General Education														
13. Related Educational Activities														
14. Assessment of Educational Outcomes														
Documents to be reviewed 'M' denotes multiple years														
Survey of Graduating Students 2000-2001		*							*					
Survey on Teaching Methods Report, 2001										*				
Task Force on PhD Programs Report, 2002		*								*	*			
Task Force on Teaching Excellence Annual Report, 1999-2000										*				
Teaching Practices at AUB: A Teacher-Student Perspective, 2001										*				
The Faculty of Health Sciences Asks: Who Are Our Students? Who Are Our Graduates? 2000														*
University Records Retention Report, 2002			*		*									
Reports to Middle States Commission on Higher Education														
Pre-Application Review, November, 2000	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Self-Assessment Document, March, 2001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Interim Report, February, 2002	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
External Surveys														
ACT Survey								*						
Admitted Student Questionnaire, College Board								*	*					*
Market Study Survey								*						
Villanova Institutional Survey								*						
External Documents														
Assessment Essentials, Palomba and Banta, 1999								*						*
Assessment of Student Learning, Options and Resources MSCHE								*		*				*
Balancing Qualitative and Quantitative Information for Effective Support, Howard and Borland, 2001								*						*
Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Designs for Excellence, Handbook for Institutional Self-Study, MSCHE	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Effective Reporting, Bers and Seybert, 1999	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Framework for Outcomes Assessment, MSCHE								*						*
Handbook for Chairing and Hosting an Evaluation Team, MSCHE														
Higher Education as Competitive Enterprise, Zemsky Shanan, Shapiro, 2001		*	*	*										
HIP Five-Year Review, 2000		*			*									
Institutional Research: Decision Support in Higher Education, Howard, 2001								*						*
Journal of the Association for Institutional Research: Research in Higher Education, 2001, 2002								*						*
KPMG Allocation Study, 1999		*	*											
Mail and Internet Surveys, Dillman, 2000								*						*
Market Study Report, 2002		*						*	*					
Measuring What Matters: Competency-Based Learning, Models Education, Voorhees, 2001											*			*
NCTLA Assessment Institute Research Notebook, 2001-2002								*						*
Questionnaire Survey Research: What Works, Suskie, 1996								*						*
Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries			*											
The Commitment of Trusteeship, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges				*										
The Journal of Higher Education			*					*						
The Student Ratings Debate: Are They Valid? How Can We Best Use Them?										*				
The Survey Research Handbook, Alreck and Settle, 2001								*						*
Transforming Minds and Hearts, Institutional Self-Study, Villanova University, 2001														
University of Louisville, Strategic Planning Process, 1999		*												
Web sites of selected colleges	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
What Matters in College, Four Critical Years Revisited, Astin, 2000		*						*	*	*				

10. Timeline for AUB's Application for Candidacy Status and Self-Study

(Shaded area represents steps completed through the submission of Design to Middle States in May, 2002)

Preparation of pre-application document	June-October 2000
Provost's memo informing community of application for accreditation and pre-application process	October 2000
President's letter of intent to apply for accreditation and pre-application document submitted to Middle States	November 2000
<i>Pre-application visit to campus of Middle States liaison officer</i>	<i>December 10-11, 2000</i>
Preparation of self-assessment document	January-February 2001
Self-assessment document submitted to Middle States	March 2000
<i>Middle States assessment team visit to campus</i>	<i>March 29-30, 2001</i>
Provost's update to community on application for candidacy status	April 2001
Formation and first meeting of self-study design committee	May 2001
AUB admitted to Candidacy Status by Middle States	Late June 2001
Preparation of first draft of self-study design	June-October 2001
Provost's update to community on candidacy status and progress on application for accreditation	October 2001
President's appointment of steering committee members	October 2001
Steering committee meeting #1	November 2, 2001
<i>Self-Study Institute attended by provost and associate provost</i>	<i>November 7-8, 2001</i>
Steering committee meeting #2	January 17, 2002
Task team membership solicited and finalized	October 2001 - February 2002
Interim Report submitted to Middle States consultant, Dr. Judson Taylor	February 15, 2002
Provost-led general orientation meeting for all task team members	March 4, 2002
<i>Two steering committee members attend Middle States Assessment workshop</i>	<i>March 12-14, 2002</i>
<i>Consultant conference with President and Provost</i>	<i>March 15, 2002</i>
Task teams meet to review charges, refine design, submit revisions of design to steering committee	March - May 2002
Final Review of Design	May 2002
Design submitted to Middle States	May 2002
Middle States approval to begin Self-Study (tentative)	June 2002
<i>Visit of Middle States Liaison (cancelled)</i>	<i>July 2002</i>
Some task teams begin research	Summer 2002
Steering committee meets to assess progress of task teams	Summer 2002
Continuation of task team research	Fall 2002
Task teams draft reports	Winter 2002-2003
Task teams submit first drafts to steering committee for review	By end of March 2003
Steering committee reviews task team reports	April 2003
Task teams revise reports	May 2003
Editing team reviews task force reports, writes self-study report	Summer 2003
Edited self-study Report reviewed by task teams, approved by steering committee and shared with the community	Early Fall 2003
Community-wide forums and discussions	Fall 2003
Revision of self-study report by SSSC based on community discussions	December 2003
Final self-study report reviewed/approved by steering committee and president	January 2004
Final report submitted to Middle States and visiting team	February 2004
<i>Middle States Evaluation Team Visit and Report</i>	<i>April 2004</i>
Respond to Middle States team report	May 2004
Middle States Commission on Higher Education meets to act on AUB's application for accreditation	June 2004

11. Editorial Style and Format of Task Team Reports

The work of each of the 14 task teams will be combined into a single *Self-Study Report* that will integrate the questions, methodologies, data reviewed, findings, and recommendations of each task team. Additional chapters will

provide an executive summary, the institutional profile, an overview of the self-study process, and the conclusions of the self-study. Task team members will have adequate opportunity to review edited drafts to insure that their work is fairly and accurately represented.

The task teams are expected to use their independent judgment to develop self-study activities. At the same time, it is important to remember that the final report needs to be a concise, readable document for a variety of audiences, including the internal constituencies of faculty, student, staff, administrators and trustees, and, externally, the Commission on Higher Education and the peer evaluation team members.

Some standards have been developed for the preparation of task team reports in order to assure a level of consistency, as follows:

- Basic adherence to the task team outlines (See **Format of the Self-Study Report**, below)
- Concise writing
- Logical and objective conclusions based on clearly presented evidence
- Minimum of repetition of material from the Self-Study Design Report
- Availability in Microsoft Word format, using font Times New Roman, 10-pitch with 1-inch margins on all sides; Excel spreadsheets
- Maximum length of fifteen double-spaced pages.

A central editing team will work with each of the task teams on their reports to develop a draft self-study report that meets the Commission on Higher Education's guidelines, speaks with a consistent voice, and accurately represents the work of the task teams.

12. Format of the Self-Study Report

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

- Mission Statement
- Self-Study Approach and Process
- Executive Summary: Highlights, Major Findings, Major Recommendations
- Eligibility Requirements
- Institutional Profile

CHAPTER 1 MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

- Historical Overview; comprehensiveness, clarity, distinctiveness and relevance of mission statement
- Congruence of mission and goals with departmental and programmatic missions, goals and objectives
- Implementation, utility and effectiveness of mission, goals and objectives
- Community-wide understanding of and commitment to the mission statement
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 2 PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

- Overview of Current Planning Practices and Alternative Models
- Planning Inputs, Decision Making, Implementation, Assessment and Revision
- Strengths and Challenges
- Climate for Change and Renewal at AUB
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 3 INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

- Overview of Financial, Human, Technical and Physical Resources
- Significant Achievements over Ten Years
- Strengths and Challenges
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 4 LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

- Survey of Governance Structures and Governing Bodies
- Effectiveness of Implementation in Congruence with Mission
- Major Findings and Recommendations

CHAPTER 5 ADMINISTRATION

- Organization Structure and Clarity of Roles
- Human Resources
- Systems and Information Management
- Strengths and Challenges
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 6 INTEGRITY

- Mission, Academic Freedom, and Freedom of Expression and Thought
- Overview of Ethical Standards and Practices at AUB and in the Environment
- Clarity, Transparency, Adequacy and Implementation of Policies and Procedures
- Challenges and Recommendations

CHAPTER 7 INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

- Overview of Institutional Assessment Planning Processes and Plans at AUB
- Plan for Assessing AUB's Effectiveness in Achieving Standards I-VI
- Plan for Assessing AUB's Effectiveness in Achieving Learning Outcomes
- Challenges and Recommendations

CHAPTER 8 STUDENT ADMISSIONS

- Review of Admission Criteria, Policies and Procedures
- Congruence of Admission Criteria, Policies and Procedures with AUB's Mission and Goals
- Assessment of Admissions Office Resources, Planning, and Effectiveness
- Enrollment Management: Admission, Financial Aid, Retention
- Strengths and Challenges
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 9 STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

- Mission and Organization of Student Support Services
- Approach to Assessment of Support Services
- Adequacy and Effectiveness of Support Services
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 10 FACULTY

- Faculty Roles and AUB's Mission
- Faculty Responsibilities/ University Responsibilities/Support
- Faculty Recruitment and Retention
- Academic Environment
- Findings and Recommendations

CHAPTER 11 EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

- Congruence with Mission, Goals and Objectives
- Relationship to Intellectual and Professional Development of Students
- Responsiveness to needs of Students and Community
- Development, Assessment, and Revision of Educational Programs
- Strengths and Challenges
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 12 GENERAL EDUCATION

- Mission and History of General Education at AUB
- Review of Current General Education Program and Requirements at AUB and Selected American and Regional Universities
- Assessment of General Education Program and Processes of Development and Revision at AUB
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 13 RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Overviews of Non-degree Educational Programs and Contractual Relations
- Administration of the Programs
- Curriculum, Faculty, Students

- Congruence with AUB's Mission
- Challenges and Recommendations

CHAPTER 14 ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

- Planning for Assessment of Learning Outcomes at AUB
- Review of Current Measures of Learning Outcomes
- Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment to Improve Curricula
- Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment as Part of Institutional Assessment, Planning, Improvement Cycle
- Challenges and Recommendations

CONCLUSION: RECOMMENDATIONS, AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

APPENDICES

13. Profile of Evaluation Team and Peer Institutions

Profile of Evaluation Team

The American University of Beirut Self-Study Steering Committee requests that the members of the Middle States Association peer review team include individuals who are sensitive to AUB's leadership role in the Middle East and who are familiar with institutions that combine an emphasis on the liberal arts with strong preparation in professional fields, including: agriculture, business, engineering, health sciences and medicine with a teaching hospital. The Steering Committee further requests that the team consist of eight to twelve individuals, including a university president, and that specific expertise among the members include:

- Enrollment Management
- Faculty Promotion and Retention Policies
- General Education
- Governance and Leadership
- Institutional Research and Outcomes Assessment
- Inter-university (or inter-institutional) agreements
- Strategic and Financial Planning
- Student Services and Student Governance

Peer Institutions

AUB is comprised of six Faculties/Schools, a research and teaching hospital, and a division for Regional and External Programs that includes extension courses and programs, with a fall 2001 enrollment of 5200 undergraduates (**U**), 700 graduate students (**G**) and 300 medical students.¹ AUB's faculty/student ratio (**FSR**) is 1/12; within the Middle East it is "most competitive" (**MC**) in admission; within the context of the Middle States Region it would probably fall somewhere between "highly competitive (**HC**) and "competitive (**C**); its Library (**L**) contains 625,000 volumes; its Endowment (**E**) is \$340 million.

According to the Carnegie system of classifying universities, AUB is a **Comprehensive** university; but it also has a medical school (**M**), which few comprehensive universities have. As such it falls between Comprehensive and **Research II** universities or **Research I** universities with relatively small PhD programs. Some indicators for

¹ Enrollment by Faculty, in order of size

- *Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) – 2755*
[Computer Science – 485; Biological Science – 466; Education – 455; Economics – 300; Social and Behavioral Sciences – 288; Physical Sciences – 117; Mathematics and Statistics – 75; Humanities – 73; Majorless (freshmen and other) – 496]
- *Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA) – 1289*
- *School of Business (SB) – 994*
- *Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FEA) - 405*
- *Faculty of Medicine (FM) – 340*
- *Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS) - 307*
- *School of Nursing (SN, part of the Faculty of Medicine) - 118*

comparison besides breadth and scope of educational programs offered are: student body size and quality, admissions selectivity, faculty size and research productivity, faculty/student ratio, library size, endowment size. With these indicators in mind, the Steering Committee suggests that the following institutions, or schools within them, are similar to AUB in enough respects to be considered “peer” institutions:

American University in Cairo (Egypt), Comprehensive

U: 4300, **G:** 750; A&S, business, computer science, engineering; **FSR:** 1/13; **L:** 425,000; **E:** \$340m; Selectivity: **HC**

College of New Jersey (NJ), Comprehensive

U: 5539, **G:** 817; A&S, business, computer, engineering **FSR:** 1/17; **L:** 500,000; **E:** public; Selectivity: **HC**

Cornell University (NY), Research-I;

U: 13668, **G:** 5352; **Agriculture School:** College of Agriculture and Life Sciences – State Assisted; Selectivity in CALF: **MC**

George Washington University (DC), Research-II;

U: 7427, **G:** 11,6519; A&S, engineering, health services administration, teacher education; **FSR:** 1/13; **L:** 1.8m; **E:** \$747m; Selectivity: **HC**

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey/Cook College (NJ), Research-I

U: 2976; **Agriculture,** biological science, computer science, health professions; **FSR:** 1/11; **L:** 6.3m (all Rutgers); **E:** public; selectivity: **HC**

University of Rochester (NY), Research-I

U: 4311, **G:** 3168; A&S, business, computer science, engineering, health sciences; **Medical School;** **FSR:** 1/10; **L:** 3m; **E:** \$1.28b; Selectivity: **HC**

Villanova University (PA), Comprehensive

U: 6374, **G:** 2000; A&S, business, computer science, engineering, nursing; **FSR:** 1/13 **L:** 900,000; **E:** \$175m; Selectivity: **HC**

Wake Forest University (NC) –Research - I

U: 3817, **G:** 2164; **FSR:** A&S, business, computer science, education; **Medical School;** **L:** 1.6m; **E:** \$970m; Selectivity: **MC**