

American University of Beirut  
**Institutional Self-Study Design**

*Submitted to:*  
Middle States Commission on Higher Education  
*Prepared by:*  
Self-Study Steering Committee



**April 2007**

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

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>1. Nature, Scope, and Context of the Self Study</b> .....	3
<b>2. Specific Goals and Objectives of the Self-Study</b> .....	7
<b>3. Organizational Structure and Responsibilities of the Self-Study Steering Committee</b> .....	8
<b>4. Self-Study Steering Committee Membership</b> .....	9
<b>5. Working Groups Composition, Responsibilities and Charges</b> .....	10
<b>6. Eligibility Requirements</b> .....	12
<b>7. Working Group Purposes, Questions, Methodologies, and Membership</b>	13
Working Group One: Mission, Goals, and Integrity .....	13
Working Group Two: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal .....	15
Working Group Three: Leadership, Governance, and Administration .....	18
Working Group Four: Student Admissions and Support Services .....	21
Working Group Five: Faculty .....	24
Working Group Six: Educational Offerings.....	25
Working Group Seven: General Education and Related Educational Activities .....	27
Working Group Eight: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment .....	29
<b>8. Inventory of Support Documents</b> .....	32
<b>9. Timeline</b> .....	39
<b>10. Working Groups Report Style and Format</b> .....	39
<b>11. Self-Study Report Format</b> .....	40
<b>12. Evaluation Team Profile</b> .....	42

Attached:

*Appendix A:* Provost’s invitation to faculty, students, trustees participation on working groups and sign-up form

*Appendix B:* Working Group membership, Spring, 2007

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

**Self-Study Design**

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

The American University of Beirut (AUB) is a private, independent, non-sectarian, non-profit institution of higher learning, founded in 1866. It functions under a charter from the State of New York and is governed by a private, autonomous Board of Trustees. The University has six faculties: Arts and Sciences, Medicine (including the School of Nursing), Engineering and Architecture, Agricultural and Food Sciences, Health Sciences, and the Olayan School of Business. At present, AUB offers programs leading to bachelors, masters, and MD degrees. Recently eight Ph.D. programs have been proposed to the New York State Education Department (NYSED). NYSED has approved seven of these programs in departments in the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture and in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; the final program remains under review and the university expects to learn about it soon. AUB is currently reorganizing its graduate recruitment procedures to ensure that it attracts outstanding regional and international students for these new Ph.D. programs.

AUB's mission statement declares that it is "an institution of higher learning founded to provide excellence in education, to participate in the advancement of knowledge through research, and to serve the peoples of the Middle East and beyond." The university "bases its educational philosophy, standards, and practices on the American liberal arts model of higher education. The university believes deeply in and encourages freedom of thought and expression and seeks to foster tolerance and respect for diversity and dialogue. Graduates will be individuals committed to creative and critical thinking, life-long learning, personal integrity and civic responsibility, and leadership." English is the language of instruction in all programs, except for coursework in the Department of Arabic.

The University has a faculty of 640 full-time equivalents (FTEs), a student body of around 7000 students (5700 undergraduates, 1000 graduate students, and 300 medical students). Its ratio of full-time faculty is 84%, its faculty-student ratio is 1/12, and its graduation rate is 82%. AUB has been coeducational since 1922; its student body is 50 percent male and 50 percent female. AUB's endowment is approximately \$430 million.

At present, the majority of AUB's student body is Lebanese. The university is unique in having a faculty and student mix that constitutes a representative cross-sample of Lebanon's mosaic of confessional backgrounds. In addition, AUB in recent years has devoted intense efforts to broaden its regional appeal and to achieve greater geographical diversity in faculty and student recruitment. Currently, almost one-fifth of its students attended secondary school or university outside of Lebanon before coming to AUB, with the number of undergraduates from the region (the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Kuwait) increasing slowly but steadily. The university provides almost \$13 million in need-based and merit-based scholarships (not counting university arranged loan programs); approximately one-third of its undergraduates receive need-based aid. AUB has also striven to expand its social diversity by launching a number of initiatives to reach out to outstanding students from severely economically disadvantaged families.

An important component of the university is its Medical Center (AUBMC), a private, not-for-profit, in-patient and out-patient teaching facility of the Faculty of Medicine. This is a state-of-the-art tertiary medical center that operates 334 beds (capacity 420), serves around 20,770 in-patients per year, and has an out-patient facility that receives over 200,000 visits (128,304 private; 38,283 general; and 41,112 emergency) annually. It provides a wide spectrum of medical, nursing, and paramedical training programs at the undergraduate and post-graduate levels in different specialties and subspecialties to 85 interns, 160 residents, and 33 fellows. It is predominantly served by 250 highly credentialed physicians trained in the US. AUBMC is considered the most prominent tertiary referral medical center in Lebanon and neighboring countries. It is fully equipped and hosts a number of centers of excellence. Medical standards of practice at AUBMC compare with similar institutions in the US in adhering to guidelines of the Joint Commission International (JCI) for Accreditation.

Degrees awarded by the American University of Beirut are officially registered with the Ministry of Higher Education in Lebanon and with the New York State Department of Education. AUB was granted institutional accreditation in June 2004 by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. In September 2006, the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) acted to accredit the university's Graduate Public Health Program in the Faculty of Health Sciences. The AUB Graduate Public Health Program is the first CEPH-accredited public health program outside the North American continent. The Olayan School of Business is a candidate for accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB); the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture is preparing for accreditation from the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET); and the School of Nursing is a candidate for accreditation from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN).

The University is also a member of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the Association of American International Colleges and Universities (AAICU), the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the Arab Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (Arab ACRAO), the Association of Institutional Research (AIR), the College Board, the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), the National Association for Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC), the Overseas Association for College Admission Counseling (OACAC), and the European Council of International Schools (ECIS).

In its 2004 letter of accreditation, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education urged AUB to work on “documenting the development and implementation of (1) a comprehensive Institutional strategic plan which links long-range planning to decision-making and budgetary processes and assessment results, and (2) a written plan for the assessment of student learning at the institutional, program, and course levels.” These two projects have been the focus of activity in the ensuing years.

Preparations for institutional strategic planning began in the summer of 2004 with the creation of a new in-house unit, the Office of Institutional Planning and Process Improvement (IPPI). This unit developed a guide for academic and administrative strategic plans before the establishment of interdisciplinary, faculty/school, and academic and administrative support unit planning committees. Drafts of individual strategic plans were completed during the 2005-06 academic year. Starting in the fall of 2006, the university-wide Strategic Planning Steering Committee, chaired by the president, analyzed the assembled plans with the aim of aligning major initiatives with resources. The Steering Committee expects to present its completed institutional strategic plan to the Board of Trustees in June 2007.

In similar fashion, efforts to establish clear learning outcomes and to develop a written plan for the assessment for student learning have progressed through stages of analysis, organization, and

implementation. A series of sub-committees prepared initial guidelines and training documents to inform the work of faculty members and departments before the formation of a University Committee on Learning Outcomes. This committee is now approaching individual departments to aid them in developing their course and program learning outcomes and assessment mechanisms. Much of this work has already been completed in the professional schools, since their own accreditation processes require that they articulate learning outcomes and delineate assessment plans. Establishing learning outcomes and assessment indicators is a major project, but good progress is being made.

In addition, many of the recommendations of the institutional self-study of 2004 have been fully or partially implemented. A new mission statement was drafted, reviewed by the university community and approved by the University Senate and Board of Trustees in June 2005. Faculties, schools and administrative units have revised their mission statements accordingly. To improve administrative efficiency, provide better leadership, and create clearer accountability, two new vice-presidential positions were created and filled, one in Facilities and one in Human Resources. Simultaneously, the position of Vice-President for Administration, which had previously managed these two areas, was eliminated with the retirement of its occupant.

Institutional and academic integrity have both been strengthened. The policy for academic appointments and promotions was revised in 2004. Promotion committees have now been expanded at the dean's advisory committee and the Board of Deans levels to include broader faculty representation. At each step of the promotion process, a neutral senior faculty member serves as a non-voting "Due Process Monitor" to ensure that the promotion procedure is strictly followed. On the student level, the effectiveness of the Student Code of Conduct has been monitored and minor adjustments have resulted. Each new student is required to take an online mini-course on plagiarism and to pass the accompanying test. Faculty members have recourse to the online "Turn-It-In" system to affirm that no plagiarism occurs in written assignments.

As a result of the recommendations of the Self-Study task-team on General Education, a strategic planning committee was appointed and met through the academic year 2005-06 to review AUB's general education requirements. Their suggestions are now being considered by the University Senate.

Improved institutional self-assessment is also occurring. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) has stabilized its program of surveys and more time is being spent on assessing and acting on their results. The Office of Institutional Planning and Process Improvement has worked with individual units throughout the university to develop their Balanced Scorecards, based on Norton/Kaplan methodology. An in-house online faculty workload system is being developed so that faculty members have better awareness of how they allocate time and effort and so that academic administrators can recognize and compensate faculty efforts in an equitable manner.

Support for faculty professional development has increased as well. The number of staff at AUB's Office of Grants and Contracts has grown from one in 2001 to five in 2007 in order to provide increased assistance for faculty research. The Center for Teaching and Learning was established in 2005 to organize workshops and seminars to train faculty in the skills needed for teaching excellence. An array of model state-of-the-art classrooms has been created so that faculty can experiment with varied levels of technical support and physical configurations and so better ascertain future needs. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has funded a series of seminars and workshops that integrate faculty training in library information services, academic computing, and methodologies of teaching and learning. The number of faculty members who use the course management system and other services that the Academic Computing Center provides rises each semester. The university libraries are constantly benchmarking their level and variety of service to students and faculty to keep pace with the challenges of this rapidly developing field. Career services centers have been expanded to assist students in finding employment after graduation. Several new programs and research centers

have been established since receiving institutional accreditation in June, 2004. These include a Department of Fine Arts and Art History in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and a minor in Information Technology in the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture; the Walid Bin Talal Center for American Studies and Research (FAS), the Center for Research and Population Health (FHS), the Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs, and the Initiative for Biodiversity in Arid Regions (Interfaculty).

Another component of faculty support is professional security. The university's Office of Human Resources is studying the funding levels of current retirement plans to ensure that faculty members will be able to retire with financial security. In the spring of 2006, AUB engaged Dr. Charles Vest, former president of MIT, to serve as a consultant to help review the issue of faculty tenure. After lengthy discussions with faculty, administrators, and trustees, Dr. Vest drafted a report that urged strong consideration of some form of tenure. During the current academic year, a large faculty task force with members from each professional rank and representative of all faculties/schools is studying this issue.

To keep pace with new demands for physical space and to update existing buildings, the university is pursuing its Campus Master Plan and engaging in an ambitious building program. The AUB Archeological Museum was completely renovated and reopened in June 2006. The CCC Scientific Research Building, a 5000sqm laboratory facility designed to provide flex space during renovations of other similar buildings, was completed in February 2007 and is currently being occupied by the Faculty of Engineering. The Charles Hostler Student Center, which will provide an outstanding space for athletics and other student activities, will be completed by the fall of 2007. The new building for the Olayan School of Business is under construction and will be completed in 2008, as will the renovated School of Nursing. The Irani Oxy Engineering Complex is scheduled to be finished in 2010. Renovations are also being planned for the Bechtel Engineering Building, the Dar al-Handasah and Shair Partners Architecture Building, and the Science and Engineering libraries. On the medical campus, two major renovations to house the university health services are being completed this year: the new private physician clinics and the new interdisciplinary research and clinical centers for cancer and neuroscience. The noted Iraqi architect, Zaha Hadid, has won an international competition to design the new Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs. Further renovations are waiting for funds to become available.

AUB has been able to launch these ambitious projects due to its Campaign for Excellence, a five-year fundraising effort aimed at raising \$140 million to build our endowment, fund a number of new and critically important capital projects, and raise the level of annual contributions in support of the university and its programs. Additional endowment funds are needed to strengthen AUB's research infrastructure, build academic programs, support professorships and research fellowships in different schools and faculties, help us launch the Ph.D. programs, and increase student financial aid—the single largest component of this campaign. To date, the university has raised \$150 million, with some seven months still remaining until the campaign ends.

At the AUB Board of Trustees meeting of 16 March 2007, John Waterbury announced his retirement as university president effective June 2008, after ten years in office. President Waterbury's decision caps a decade of constant institutional improvement. He expressed the opinion that this was an appropriate moment for the university to engage in a process of orderly transition and to seek new and energetic leadership to take it forward in the coming years. President Waterbury plans to remain in Beirut as a full professor in AUB's Department of Political Studies and Public Administration.

Despite these numerous institutional advances, AUB cannot ignore its geographical location or the political context in which it exists. The university survived the 2006 summer war without suffering physical damage. However, the war created a budgetary setback as educational and medical

operations failed to meet financial expectations. Not unsurprisingly, the number of international and regional students decreased in the fall, which affected the university financially and in terms of its goal to increase student diversity. Faculty attrition was modest, but continued political tension and uncertainty aid neither recruitment nor retention of faculty. The number of academic visitors from abroad is down sharply and lectures and talks are often postponed. The economic situation in the country is worsening due to the current political stalemate. Lebanon is a small economy and changes in direction can occur quickly, but the current ongoing crisis is taking its toll on the country and on the AUB community.

Throughout its history, AUB has encountered and overcome numerous challenges, so the university pursues its plans with an eye to the future. The university has always embodied the efforts and aspirations of literally thousands of men and women who believe in the importance of promoting the values of objective inquiry, rational discourse, and mutual understanding between peoples of differing cultural backgrounds. AUB is a university that promotes the ideals of critical thinking, personal integrity, honesty, and tolerance. Although these values have always been important, we believe that they are especially critical today.

The multiple designs for self-study described in *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process* were reviewed and evaluated by the president, the provost, and the members of the Self-Study Design Committee. Given that the Comprehensive Model is required at this stage and that the 2004 self-study is still relatively recent, the format of a “Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards to Reflect the Institution” (p. 22, figure 10) was selected. We decided that a smaller number of working groups examining documentation from related standards would provide the best combination of depth and efficiency. During the past decade, AUB has compiled a significant amount of institutional information. A major aspiration for this new self-study effort is that it serve both as a continuation of the various forms of institutional self-assessment that the university has already undertaken and as a bridge to the future. We hope that this new self-study will chart courses for institutional improvement that will accentuate and direct AUB’s drive for continued self-reflection, objective assessment, operational efficiency, and academic advancement.

## **2. Specific 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.

### **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

Eight working groups have been formed to study these areas as follows:

Working Group One: Mission, Goals and Integrity

Working Group Two: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal

Working Group Three: Leadership, Governance, and Administration

Working Group Four: Student Admissions and Support Services

Working Group Five: Faculty

Working Group Six: Educational Offerings

Working Group Seven: General Education and Related Educational Activities

Working Group Eight: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment

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

- Be informed by the mission statement — particularly its emphasis on AUB's regional role and its commitment to serve the peoples of the Middle East and beyond.
- 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 further opportunity to engage in a process where differing opinions are encouraged and respected and a sense of community is fostered. The working groups 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 role in the Middle East and in the global community.

### **3. Organizational Structure and Responsibilities of the Self-Study Steering Committee:**

The Provost, in consultation with the Deans of the various faculties at the university, formed an Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee comprised of faculty members, administrators, and student representatives. The Steering Committee is chaired by the Provost; The Associate Provost is Vice Chair. The co-chairs of the eight working groups are members of the steering committee.

**The Six Faculties at the university are represented on the steering committee.** 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 working groups' 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.

During the Self-Study the Steering Committee will coordinate the collection of data for eight working groups 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 working groups in their research. It will coordinate a schedule of working groups' interviews and focus groups with key individuals and constituencies. The OIRA will work closely with the Steering Committee and working groups 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 working groups 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 working groups 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 working groups and for editing, formatting, and submitting the final self-study report.

To encourage communication with the larger community, use will be made of the accreditation web site on the AUB homepage: <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 working group 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, FAS
- \*Waddah Nasr, PhD,** Vice Chair of the **Self-Study Steering Committee**; Associate Provost; Associate Professor, Philosophy, FAS
- \*Howyda Al-Harithy, PhD.** Co-chair of Working Group **Seven**, Professor, Architecture, FEA
- Isam Bashour, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Six**, Professor, Land and Water Resources, FAFS
- Theodore Christidis, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Four**, Research Associate, Physics, FAS
- \*Hassan Diab, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Seven**, Vice President, Regional and External Programs
- Mutasem El-Fadl, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Three**, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, FEA
- \*Karma El -Hassan, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Eight**; Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment; Associate Professor, Education, FAS
- \*Carla Huijer,** Undergraduate Student, FEA
- Nesreen Ghaddar, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Five**; Professor and Chairperson, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- \*Mohamed Harajli, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Four**; Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, FEA
- Murad Jurdak, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Eight**; Professor, Education, FAS
- \*Hala Muhtasib, PhD,** Co-chair of Working Group **Five**, Professor, Biology, FAS

<b>*Andre Nahas, BSc,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>Two</b> ; Director, Institutional Planning and Process Improvement
<b>*Jim Radulski, MBA,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>Three</b> , Vice-President, Human Resources
<b>*Sami Ramia, PhD,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>One</b> , Professor and Coordinator, Medical Lab Technology, FHS
<b>Ramzi Sabra, PhD,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>One</b> , Professor, Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Associate Dean for Medical Education, FM
<b>*Helen Sader, PhD,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>Six</b> , Professor, History and Archeology, Associate Dean, FAS
<b>Yusuf Sidani, PhD,</b>	Co-chair of Working Group <b>Two</b> , Assistant Professor, Management, Marketing, and Entrepreneurship, OSB
<b>*Hassan Jad Traboulsi</b>	Undergraduate Student, OSB

\* Also members of the Self-Study Design Committee

## 5. Working Groups Composition, Responsibilities and Charges:

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

In designing its self-study, AUB closely follows the methodology of the 2006 edition of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. Questions for the working groups 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. Eight drafts were prepared, in several stages, each including the following components:

- Statement of the purpose of the working groups, summarized below as "charges"
- Proposed study questions
- Methodologies to be used to research and address the study questions

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

- Overview of the identified self-study area and working group questions
- Brief review of the significant achievements made since 2004
- Summary of the approaches the working group 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 eight working group 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 working groups as they undertake their work. The eight charges are summarized as follows:

- I. The charge to the **Working Group One on Mission, Goals, and Integrity** is to examine AUB's mission statement and related goals and objectives in terms of their history, comprehensiveness, clarity, distinctiveness, implementation, utility, adequacy, visibility and means of change. And to examine how, in the conduct of its programs and activities, AUB demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and to its own stated policies. The group 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.
- II. The charge to the **Working Group Two on Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal** 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 group will also examine the extent to which these processes are implemented at academic and administrative unit levels and 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.
- III. The charge to the **Working Group Three on Leadership, Governance and Administration** is to examine AUB's leadership and system of collegial governance. The group will review and evaluate 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. It will also 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.
- IV. The charge to the **Working Group Four on Student Admissions and Support Services** 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. It will assess the effectiveness of student services as contributors to the enrichment of the quality of life of AUB students from enrollment to graduation, and determine how well these services are integrated and coordinated
- V. The charge to the **Working Group Five on Faculty** 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.
- VI. The charge to the **Working Group Six on Educational Offerings** is to examine the university's undergraduate and graduate academic programs as to their content, rigor, and coherence. The group 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.
- VII. The charge to the **Working Group Seven on General Education and Related Educational Activities** 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. It will also 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.

- VIII. The charge to the **Working Group Eight on Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment** 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. It will 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 the various stages of the process that led to AUB receiving institutional accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, AUB demonstrated that it meets the eligibility requirements for accreditation. The Self-study will again address the relevant eligibility requirements (ER) for accreditation listed pages xii –xiv of the 2006 edition of *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*.

- ER1 Working Group One (Mission, Goals, and Integrity)
- ER2 Working Group Four (Student Admissions and Support Services)
- ER3 Working Group Three (Leadership, Governance, and Administration)
- ER 4 Working Group Six (Educational Offerings)
- ER 5 Working Group Two (Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER 6 Working Group Two (Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER 7 Working Group Two (Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER 8 Working Group Three (Leadership, Governance, and Administration)
- ER 9 Working Group Three (Leadership, Governance, and Administration)
- ER 10 Working Group Three (Leadership, Governance, and Administration)
- ER 11 Working Group Three (Leadership, Governance, and Administration)
- ER 12 Working Group One (Mission, Goals, and Integrity) AND Working Group Four (Student Admissions and Support Services)
- ER 13 Working Group Five (Faculty)
- ER 14 Working Group Two (Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal)
- ER 15 Working Group Six (Educational Offerings)
- ER 16 Working Group Seven (General Education and Related Educational Activities)
- ER 17 Working Group Four (Student Admissions and Support Services)
- ER 18 Working Group One (Mission, Goals, and Integrity)
- ER 19 Working Group Four (Student Admissions and Support Services) AND Working Group Six (Educational Offerings)
- ER 20 Working Group Eight (Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment)
- ER 21 Working Group Eight (Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment)
- ER 22 Not Applicable

## 7. Working Groups Purposes, questions, Methodologies, and Membership

### **Working Group 1: “Mission, Goals, and Integrity”**

*(Standards 1 and 6 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*

**Co-chairs: Dr. Sami Ramia and Dr. Ramzi Sabra**

### **Standard 1: Mission and Goals**

#### **Purpose:**

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. The working group will also establish the extent to which the institution’s stated goals are consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education and clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. Of primary importance is an examination of AUB’s role as a 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:**

- 1.1. To what extent and how well does the mission statement of AUB reflect the purpose and principles upon which the institution was founded?
- 1.2. To what extent are the mission statement and stated goals of AUB: i) clear and transparent in language and in content; and ii) publicized and widely known to institutional constituencies?
- 1.3. How well are the mission statements of individual departments and programs aligned with the mission of the university?
- 1.4. How realistic and comprehensive are the mission statement and articulated goals in addressing the educational, social, cultural and technological needs of the region? How well do the mission statement and goals reflect AUB’s uniqueness as an institution of higher learning in the Middle East?
- 1.5. To what extent and how well are the educational goals of the institution guided by its mission and articulated and integrated in support of it? To what extent and how well are decisions related to admission practices, financial planning, resource allocation, curriculum and program development, and learning outcomes made in compliance with or in support of the stated goals and mission of the institution?
- 1.6. How successful has AUB been in accomplishing its mission and stated goals? How well and by what performance indicators is this success measured and evaluated?
- 1.7. How often and how well is the mission statement and stated goals of the institution reviewed and assessed? To what extent do the various constituencies have an opportunity to participate in the formulation of the mission statement and in the assessment process? How well are the assessment results used for re-thinking or upgrading the mission or for addressing evolving educational, social and cultural needs, opportunities, and challenges in Lebanon and the region?

#### **Methodology:**

1. Examine the mission statement of the institution and of the various academic and non-academic units.
2. Examine AUB’s published policies and procedures in relation to the mission statement of AUB and various departments.

3. Conduct interviews with selected key decision-makers (trustees, president, provost, vice-presidents, deans, etc.).
4. Conduct interviews with selected chairs and heads of academic and administrative departments.
5. Conduct interviews with selected alumni, prominent educators and public national and regional figures.
6. Survey AUB constituencies.
7. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 1-Mission

## **Standard 6: Integrity**

### **Purpose:**

To examine ways in which AUB, as a comprehensive, nonsectarian university committed to the ideal of liberal arts education, and "founded to provide excellence in education, to participate in the advancement of knowledge through research, and to serve the peoples of the Middle East and beyond" addresses the concept of institutional integrity. The working group 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:**

- 6.1 How well are AUB's policies and procedures (academic, financial, managerial, etc.) developed in line with the mission and stated goals of the institution?
- 6.2 How well are AUB's policies and procedures implemented or adhered to at AUB?
- 6.3 How transparent, clear, and widely disseminated is information about the university in general and its stated policies and procedures in particular?
- 6.4 To what extent and how well does AUB exercise impartial practices in (i) recruitment of students and their academic assessment; (ii) recruitment of faculty and their promotion and reappointment; and (iii) recruitment of staff and their training, evaluation, promotion and contract renewal?
- 6.5 To what extent do AUB's policies and procedures and their implementation help to provide an environment of openness, honesty, academic freedom, and freedom of expression in support of the mission and educational goals of the institution? How and by whom is success in providing this positive environment measured or evaluated?
- 6.6 How effectively are student concerns regarding fair academic assessment, student conduct, and alleged disciplinary violations (cheating, plagiarism, misconduct, etc.) addressed? Is there sufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of the institution in this area?
- 6.7 To what extent and how well does AUB assure the academic and intellectual freedom of all of its constituencies? How effectively does AUB protect its members from harassment and inappropriate pressures, intimidation and discrimination? How well and by whom is the effectiveness of these particular attributes measured?
- 6.8 To what extent has the university been successful in identifying areas of potential conflict of interest and in adopting regulations to avoid such conflicts? How has the university addressed any violations in this area?
- 6.9 To what extent has the university developed an efficient, consistent and equitable system for handling grievances?
- 6.10 To what extent is there periodic assessment of institutional policies and procedures on integrity and their implementation? To what extent and how well have the assessment

findings been used to improve policies and practices? How successful have been the major changes made at AUB during the last five years to improve performance in this area?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine AUB's published policies and procedures on recruitment of faculty, staff, and students.
2. Examine surveys and interviews previously conducted with faculty, staff, and students.
3. Conduct interviews with faculty, staff, and students on integrity issues.
4. Interview the provost, deans, chairs, and senior staff managers.
5. Collect information regarding number and type of cases dealing with breach of integrity.
6. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 6- Integrity

**Membership:**

- Sami Ramia, PhD, Professor and Coordinator, Medical Laboratory Technology, FHS, Co-chair
- Ramzi Sabra, MD, Professor, Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Assistant Dean for Medical Education, FM, Co-chair
- Wajih Ajouz, Undergraduate Student, OSB
- Rima Deeb, Instructor, English, FAS
- Myrna Doumit, PhD, Assistant Professor, School of Nursing, FM
- Hafez El Zein, Director, Clinical Research Unit, Internal Medicine, FM
- Nadim Farajallah, PhD, Assistant Professor, Land and Water Resources, FAFS
- Carla Huijjer, Undergraduate Student, FEA
- Faruk Jabre, Trustee
- Mey Jurdi, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Environmental Health, FHS
- Bassam Karam, Undergraduate Student, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- Yussef Mneimneh, PhD, Director, Central Research Science Laboratory
- Rima Shadid, Instructor, English, FAS
- Rabih Talhouk, PhD, Professor, Biology, FAS
- Rania Tohme, Officer, Office of Grants and Contracts

**Working Group 2: "Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal"**

*(Standards 2 and 3 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*

**Co-chairs: Mr. Andre Nahas and Dr. Yusuf Sidani**

**Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal**

**Purpose:**

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 working group 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:**

- 2.1. To what extent are the goals and objectives of the individual units and the university clear, well-defined and widely communicated to the AUB community? How are these goals and objectives established and how well are they coordinated, integrated, or guided in support of AUB's mission and strategic goals?
- 2.2. How well-defined and clear is the strategic planning process at AUB? What main factors or issues are addressed in the process? What are the key steps and who are the key participants in this process?
- 2.3. How well does AUB in general and the academic and administrative units in particular develop and deploy action plans? How well are these action plans integrated to achieve key strategic institutional objectives and goals?
- 2.4. How well does AUB allocate resources to ensure accomplishment of the action plan? At what level is the resource allocation decision made and how well integrated is the allocation system?
- 2.5. How well does AUB track progress toward achieving the expected goals and objectives?
- 2.6. How often and how well are the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal processes assessed and evaluated? How well are the conclusions drawn from assessment results used to improve institutional planning and resource allocation, and how effective are these improvements?
- 2.7. To what extent has the planning process at AUB been successful in enabling the institution to accomplish its goals and objectives? How well is success measured at the level of the individual units and the institution?

**Methodology:**

1. Documents to be examined:
  - i. President's state of university report;
  - ii. List of strategic planning committees;
  - iii. Guide for developing strategic plans;
  - iv. Reports of the institution-wide Strategic Planning Committees;
  - v. Reports of the unit-level Strategic Planning Teams;
  - vi. KPIs—Academic BSC;
  - vii. KPIs—Institution-wide BSC;
  - viii. Report cards—Institution-wide BSC.
2. Interviews with the president, provost, deans, vice-presidents, comptroller, and directors of Internal Audit, Budgeting and Financial Planning, and Institutional Planning and Process Improvement.
3. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 2-Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

**Standard 3: Institutional Resources****Purpose:**

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 working group 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 working group will examine the processes of planning, acquisition, use, maintenance, management and assessment.

**Questions:**

- 3.1. To what extent are the human, financial, and technological resources at AUB efficiently and effectively utilized in support of the mission and goals of the institution? How often and how well are the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of these institutional resources assessed and evaluated?
- 3.2. How successful is AUB in fund-raising efforts? Who is responsible for fund-raising and how well are the revenues allocated?
- 3.3. To what extent and how well are AUB alumni involved in advancing the institution's mission in such areas as student recruitment, fund-raising, placement of new graduates, etc.?
- 3.4. What policies and processes does AUB have in place for the allocation of assets? How consistent and transparent are they and how well do they provide operational checks and balances? How often and how well are these policies and processes assessed and how well are the results of the assessments used? What was the impact of these assessments during the last five years?
- 3.5. How well does AUB ensure that adequate faculty, staff, and administration are allocated to support the institution's mission and goals?
- 3.6. How well is the AUB facilities "Master Plan" aligned to the mission and educational goals of the university?
- 3.7. How successful is the equipment acquisition and renewal process in providing for current and future technology appropriate to AUB's educational programs and support services?
- 3.8. When AUB is visited by auditors and consultants, what are the main areas of concern that are identified? How well does AUB follow up to resolve these concerns?
- 3.9. How often and how well are the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of institutional resources assessed and evaluated? What have the results of this assessment been? What major changes or improvements has AUB introduced during the last five years in this area?

**Methodology:**

1. Documents to be examined:
  - i. Master Plan;
  - ii. HR compensation study;
  - iii. IT benchmarks study;
  - iv. Report on capital campaign (with Imad Baalbaki);
  - v. Contributors' report;
  - vi. OIRA reports;
  - vii. Operating budget;
  - viii. Capital budget;
  - ix. KPIs—Institution-wide BSC;
  - x. Report cards—Institution-wide BSC;
  - xi. Reports of the institution-wide Strategic Planning Committees;
  - xii. Reports of the unit-level Strategic Planning Teams;
  - xiii. Comptroller's Office manual online;
  - xiv. Financial planning and budgeting policy and procedures documents online;
  - xv. Audited financial statements;
  - xvi. Consultants' and external auditors' reports (Adams Report, etc.).
2. Interviews with the president, provost, deans, vice-presidents, comptroller, and directors of Internal Audit, Budgeting and Financial Planning, and Institutional Planning and Process Improvement.
3. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 3- Institutional Resources.

**Membership:**

- Andre Nahas, Institutional Planning and Process Improvement, Director, President's Office, Co-chair
- Yusuf Sidani, PhD, CPA, Assistant Professor, OSB, Co-chair

- Omar Ardati, Undergraduate Student, OSB
- Imad Baalbaki, PhD, Director, Office of Development,
- Elias Baydoun, PhD, Professor, Biology, FAS
- Maurice Carlier, Director, Internal Audit
- Nabil Chartouni, Trustee
- Nagib Choueiri, Organizational Design Manager, Human Resources
- Imad Dayya, Comptroller and Acting VP for Finance
- Hadi Fathallah, Undergraduate Student, Computer and Communication Engineering, FEA
- Mary Khairallah, Policies and Procedures Analyst, Human Resources, Vice President's Office
- Souheir Mabsout, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning & Design Unit
- Emile Mhanna, 2<sup>nd</sup> year Student, FM
- Fadl Moukalled, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- Nabil Nassif, PhD, Professor, Mathematics, FAS
- Nadine Takieddine, Administrative Assistant, Medical Dean's Office, FM

**Working Group 3: “Leadership, Governance, and Administration”**  
*(Standards 4 and 5 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*  
**Co-chairs: Dr. Mutasem El Fadel and Mr. Jim Radulski**

## **Standard 4: Leadership and Governance**

### **Purpose:**

To examine the extent to which the institution's system of Governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The working group will examine the effectiveness of the university's leadership and the operations of the Board of Trustees in the overall governance of the university. The working group 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 working group 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 working group will also examine whether the system of governance provides a climate of collegiality and good working relationships across constituencies.

### **Questions:**

- 4.1. How well-defined and clear are the written by-laws, policies, and procedures outlining the governance responsibilities of administration and faculty and how well are these policies and procedures disseminated to the concerned members of the AUB community? How often and how well are the by-laws and policies evaluated for clarity?
- 4.2. How well do formal, written documents delineate the governing structure and provide for collegial governance? How clearly are duties and responsibilities defined? How well are authority and accountability assigned for policy development and decision-making? How well do governance policies and practices sustain a selection process for governing body members?
- 4.3. To what extent and how well do the different AUB constituencies share in the university's governance system? To what extent and how well does the governance structure provide appropriate opportunities for student and faculty input into decisions that affect them? How appropriate is the size of the governing system to fulfill its objectives and responsibilities?
- 4.4. To what extent and how well are the members of AUB's Board of Trustees drawn from a sufficiently broad spectrum: i) of fields of practice and expertise; ii) and of constituencies (non-profit, education, corporate, government)? To what extent and how well are the Board members committed to the organization's success, mission, and vision?

- 4.5. To what extent and how well does the BOT provide strong direction and support to functional leadership? To what extent and how well is the BOT engaged as a strategic resource? How frequent and clear is communication between the Board and the University?
- 4.6. To what extent has the BOT been successful in accomplishing its stated objectives? How well and by whom is success assessed and how well are the assessment results used for continuous improvement?
- 4.7. To what extent and how well are the president and senior management team effective in guiding the organization to accomplish its educational and financial objectives? How well is this effectiveness measured?
- 4.8. To what extent are issues of transition and delegation of authority clearly stated in university by-laws and are these by-laws consistently applied?
- 4.9. How often and how well is the effectiveness of institutional leadership and the governance system at AUB assessed? How well and by whom is this assessment made? How well have the assessment results been used to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the various governing bodies?
- 4.10. Are there sufficient safeguards in place to prevent conflicts of interest at all levels and how well are these safeguards monitored and enforced?
- 4.11. To what extent and how well are students involved in decisions that concern them? How is this involvement accomplished, how successful is it, and how well is this success assessed?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine all governance documents relating to the BOT, AUB administration, BOD, Senate, and student government.
2. Examine related policies and procedures for faculty, non-academic employees, and students.
3. Interview the President, Provost, BOD, Senate members, chairs, and students.
4. Participate in the university wide survey, and survey the BOT, BOD and Senate, as well as the President, Provost, Senior management, and students to assess the effectiveness of governance
5. Interview administrators and prepare questions for the self-study survey to be administered by the Office for Institutional Research and Assessment.
6. Examine organizational charts, AUB's human resources handbooks, policies and procedures, and comparable documents from selected peer institutions.
7. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 4—Governance and Leadership.

## **Standard 5: Administration**

**Purpose:**

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 working group 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:**

- 5.1. To what extent are the administrative structures and services at AUB adequate and well aligned to comply with the complexity, size, mission, and needs of the organization? How well

- do they facilitate the achievement of student learning, the stated educational objectives, and the strategic goals of the institution?
- 5.2. How well are the administrative units, administrative operations and various services at AUB coordinated? To what extent are there clear, formal lines/systems for decision-making that involve as broad a degree of participation as practical and appropriate? How well are decisions made and disseminated in a timely manner?
  - 5.3. To what extent are the job descriptions outlining employee duties and responsibilities clearly stated? How clear are the documentation and delineation of the lines of organization and authority?
  - 5.4. How robust are the systems and controls in place governing all financial operations and the integration of budgeting, decision-making and organizational objectives/strategic goals? How effectively are cash flows managed in accordance with institutional goals and objectives?
  - 5.5. Is there a well-planned process to recruit, develop, and retain key managers? How actively interested is management in general staff development? How effective has AUB been in attracting and retaining administrative leaders that have the combination of skills, experience, degrees, and training needed to carry out their responsibilities and duties effectively?
  - 5.6. How well is knowledge management handled? Are there well-designed, user-friendly systems and how well do they capture, document, and disseminate knowledge internally to all relevant areas? How well are staff aware of knowledge systems and proficient in their use, and how frequently do they make use of them?
  - 5.7. How well does the physical infrastructure meet the organization's current and future needs? How well does it enhance the organization's efficiency? How satisfied are various constituencies with the physical work conditions at AUB?
  - 5.8. How well-developed and efficient are the internal and external legal infrastructures for day-to-day legal work, and how specialized is external expertise to cover extraordinary cases? How well is property and casualty insurance regularly reviewed and adjusted?
  - 5.9. To what extent is the technological infrastructure (computers, applications, network, telephones, fax/copy facilities and email) up-to-date and accessible? How often and how well is the technological infrastructure assessed for effectiveness and efficiency?
  - 5.10. To what extent is the AUB website comprehensive and user-friendly? How well and regularly is it maintained and updated to reflect the latest organizational developments? How effective and useful is the website in providing information to students, faculty, and administration?
  - 5.11. To what extent are the databases and management reporting systems adequate to meet the needs of students, faculty, and administration? How widely and how well are these systems used to increase information sharing and efficiencies?
  - 5.12. How often and how well are the adequacy of administrative structures and the effectiveness and efficiency of administrative operations and services assessed and evaluated? What are the results of this assessment and how well are the findings used to make improvements? How effective have these improvements been?
  - 5.13. To what extent and how well have the issues of salary benchmarking, merit increases, and retirement been reviewed and discussed to improve the work environment of non-academic employees?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine all administrative documents relating to the BOT, AUB administration, BOD, Senate, and student government.
2. Examine related policies and procedures for faculty, non-academic employees, and students.
3. Create survey instruments for the BOD and Senate, as well as the president, provost, senior management, non-academic employees, and students, to assess the effectiveness of administrative policies and practices.
4. Interview the president, provost, BOD, senior management, non-academic employees, chairs, and students.

5. Create survey instruments to evaluate effectiveness of knowledge management, including technology applications.
6. Participate in the university-wide self-study survey.
7. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 5 - Administration.

**Membership:**

- Mutasem El Fadl, Professor, Civil Engineering, FEA, Co-chair
- Jim Radulski, Human Resources, Vice President, Co-chair
- Assem Abdel Malak, PhD, Professor, Engineering Management, FEA
- Camille Atieh, Undergraduate Student, OSB
- Sami Gheriafi, Process Improvement Manager, Institutional Planning & Process Improvement
- Rania Haddad, AUBMC Web Master, CNS
- Fouad Houwayek, Undergraduate Student, Civil Engineering, FEA
- Rula Murtada Karam, Administrative Assistant, Dean's Office, OSB
- Philip Khoury, Trustee
- Joe Manok, Assistant Director, Development Office
- Rayan Makarem, Undergraduate Student, Biology, FAS
- Patrick McGreevy, PhD, CASAR, Director, FAS

**Working Group 4: “Admissions and Support Services”**

*(Standards 8 and 9 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*

**Co-chairs: Dr. Theodore Christidis and Dr. Mohammad Harajli**

**Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention**

**Purpose:**

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 working group 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:**

- 8.1. How well are the admissions criteria, policies, and procedures and the enrollment management plan aligned with the mission, educational goals, and strategic plan of the institution? How effective are these policies and procedures in helping the university to achieve its admissions goals?
- 8.2. To what extent are the admissions policies and procedures clear and consistently applied? How effectively are they communicated to prospective applicants and school counselors? How clear and consistent are admissions information and university publications? How often and how well is admissions literature reviewed and updated?
- 8.3. How aware are prospective students of the available educational and support programs and services at AUB? To what extent are these programs and services effective in helping students to meet their learning and educational goals and in improving retention? How well is this effectiveness measured?

- 8.4. How well have new programs been developed or existing programs upgraded to attract students whose educational goals are compliant with the evolving social, economic, and technological needs and trends of the region?
- 8.5. How frequently and systematically does AUB monitor student retention and how well are the lessons learned from retention studies used to enhance admissions criteria, policies, and practices and to improve student support services, support programs, and campus life?
- 8.6. How aware are prospective applicants of AUB's financial aid program and how well do financial aid and scholarships help to attract and retain academically qualified but less privileged students? How frequently and how well is the effectiveness of the financial aid package evaluated and how well are the results of this evaluation used to improve the financial aid program? How clear and transparent are the criteria for awarding financial aid?
- 8.7. How often and how well are admissions policies and practices assessed in relation to the academic success of matriculating students? How well are the assessment findings used to improve admissions practices? How effective were these improvements?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine admissions reports, admissions and retention data, and published admissions materials.
2. Examine reports on admissions strategic planning.
3. Interview or administer questionnaires to the president, provost, academic deans, director of admissions and financial aid, vice-president for finance, dean of student affairs, and director of development.
4. Interview the University Admissions Committee (and the Unified Admissions Committee—UAC).
5. Participate in the university-wide self-study survey.
6. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 8—Admissions.

## **Standard 9: Student Support Services**

**Purpose:**

To examine the extent to which student support services contribute to the realization of the university's mission, goals, and objectives. The working group 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 working group will assess each student support service individually and the whole system as a set of coordinated and integrated services.

**Questions:**

- 9.1. How effective are the basic support services provided to students at AUB and how well are these services integrated or coordinated to sustain the mission and educational goals of the university?
- 9.2. How effective are student support services and educational support programs in promoting the intellectual, social and cultural development of students at large and in catering to the needs of diverse student population including students from different cultural backgrounds, students with disabilities, and international students?
- 9.3. How often and how well is the effectiveness of student support services or educational support programs assessed? How satisfied are students with these services/programs? How well have findings been used to improve available services or to implement new ones? How effective were these improvements in achieving the anticipated goals?
- 9.4. What are the extracurricular and co-curricular activities and programs in place at the university? How well are these activities and programs organized and coordinated? How

- frequently are they assessed and reviewed and how well are the results used for their improvement?
- 9.5. How often and how well are studies conducted to link student retention/attrition to the adequacy of student support services? What are the results of these studies and how well are the findings used to improve services and retention?
  - 9.6. How qualified are the staff who supervise or deliver student support services and how much training do they have in dealing with students from different cultural backgrounds? To what extent are there programs to train staff for better delivery of services and how effective are these training programs?
  - 9.7. How effective is academic advising at AUB? What measures are taken to ensure effective advising?
  - 9.8. How clear and effective is the procedure or process for addressing student complaints or grievances? How well are these procedures communicated to students? How often are students consulted about their satisfaction with the process and its outcomes? To what extent have the results of these consultations been used to make improvements?
  - 9.9. How clear, accurate and comprehensive is published information regarding student support services, including financial aid? Are studies conducted to evaluate the adequacy and clarity of such information and how effective are these studies?
  - 9.10. How aware are students, faculty, and staff across AUB of information relative to student support services, including financial aid? How efficiently and effectively is new information about these services disseminated to concerned parties?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine archival data.
2. Examine survey data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
3. Examine documents and reports on strategic planning.
4. Examine published materials on student support services.
5. Conduct student focus group.
6. Interview the dean of student affairs, the director of financial aid, and the registrar.
7. Interview or administer questionnaires to the president, provost, and academic deans.
8. Examine documents for students' complaints and grievances.
9. Examine reports and documents on student academic advising.
10. Participate in the university-wide self-study survey.
11. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 9—Student Support Services.

**Membership:**

- Theodore Christidis, PhD, Research Associate, Chemistry, FAS, Co-chair
- Mohammad Harajli, PhD, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, FEA, Co-chair
- Nabil Bukhalid, Director, Computer Network Services
- Rula Diab, PhD, Assistant Professor, English, FAS
- Michael Fares, Trustee
- Maryam Ghandour, Career Counseling and Placement Specialist, Career & Placement Service, Office of Student Affairs
- Mona Haddad, Undergraduate Student, Environmental Health, FHS
- Wadad Husseiny, Director, Student Activities, Office of Student Affairs
- M. Khaled Joujou, Electrical Laboratories Engineer, Electrical Engineering Lab, Electrical and Computer Engineering, FEA
- Rolla Khatib, Instructor, Medical Lab Technology, FHS
- May Massoud, PhD, Assistant Professor, Environmental Health, FHS
- Nadine Naffah, Associate Director, Admissions
- Fida Nashef, Undergraduate Student, Mathematics, FAS

- Leonard Nordone, Associate Dean for Athletics, Office of Student Affairs
- Moueen Salameh, Professor, Engineering Management, Registrar, FEA
- Hala Sayegh, Collection Development Librarian, Jafet Library
- Hassan Jad Traboulsi, Undergraduate Student, OSB
- Drew Wickens, Director, Financial Planning and Budgeting

### **Working Group 5: “Faculty”**

*(Standard 10 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*

**Co-chairs: Dr. Nesreen Ghaddar and Dr. Hala Muhtasib**

## **Standard 10: Faculty**

### **Purpose:**

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 working group 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 strengthening and sustaining AUB’s academic environment

### **Questions:**

- 10.1. To what extent are faculty at AUB sufficiently numerous and diverse, and appropriately prepared and qualified to ensure the continuity and coherence of the institution’s educational programs? How and by what means and how well are these indicators measured?
- 10.2. How well are faculty at AUB involved in or responsible for developing academic, research, and service programs? How clearly and how well are these responsibilities defined?
- 10.3. To what extent are faculty development opportunities adequate to the needs of the institution? By what criteria and how well is support for faculty development prioritized and distributed, and what has been its impact on faculty teaching and research productivity?
- 10.4. How well are the policies and procedures for reappointment and promotion clearly articulated and communicated to the faculty? How fairly and consistently are these policies applied? How have these policies and their implementation improved in the last five years and what was their impact on faculty productivity, professional growth, and retention?
- 10.5. How often and how well are the teaching and research of faculty reviewed and evaluated? How equitable and comprehensive are the evaluation processes and how effective are they in ensuring an appropriate level of institutional growth as well as teaching and research excellence?
- 10.6. In what way and how well are the new promotion/reappointment policies and processes and the strengthening of graduate programs helping to advance the reinstatement of tenure? What efforts have been made for reinstating tenure? If tenure is reinstated what would be the critical issues for the faculty and university during the transition from the current system of academic appointments and evaluation to the tenure system?
- 10.7. How have the policies and practices for the recruitment of faculty improved over the past few years? How well are the recruitment policies articulated in AUB by-laws? To what extent and how well is the planning process for hiring and introducing new lines coordinated across faculties on the basis of need and aligned with the mission and goals of faculties? How well are faculty involved in recruitment plans and decision-making?
- 10.8. What measures have been taken to strengthen and expand graduate programs and how well do they bear on faculty productivity and research opportunities?

- 10.9. How dependent is AUB on part-time faculty? By what criteria and policies and how well are part-time faculty appointed and evaluated? And how well are part-time faculty integrated into the activities and life of the institution?
- 10.10. How well are faculty involved in the design, implementation and update of educational curricula? How well have the faculty work environment, faculty involvement, and the availability of resources impacted the quality of undergraduate and graduate programs?
- 10.11. How often and how well are faculty employment (salaries, benefits, retirement, etc.) and professional (teaching and research support) conditions assessed to improve the teaching and research environment at the institution and how effective have the improvements been?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine and analyze documents and reports related to faculty recruitment and promotion.
2. Examine key performance indicators in relation to faculty.
3. Examine available data on faculty research and teaching support services.
4. Examine reports in relation to faculty benefits, salaries, and retirement plans.
5. Examine the faculty handbook and written policies and guidelines relevant to the standard.
6. Survey the provost, deans, department chairs, faculty, and students.
7. Conduct focus group interviews for faculty from different ranks.
8. Conduct focus group interviews for students.
9. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 10 - Faculty

**Membership:**

- Nesreen Ghaddar, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Mechanical Engineering, FEA Co-chair
- Hala Muhtasib, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Biology, FAS, Co-chair
- Monique Chaaya, DPH, Associate Professor, Epidemiology & Population Health, FHS
- Ronnie Coffman, Trustee
- Nabil Dajani, PhD, Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences, FAS
- Wassim Dbouk, Assistant Professor, Finance, OSB
- Arne Dietrich, PhD, Associate Professor, and Chairperson, Social and Behavioral Sciences , FAS
- Munib El Eid, PhD, Professor, Physics, FAS
- Sherif Kassatly, Undergraduate Student, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- Tamara Keblaoui, Undergraduate Student, OSB
- Sawsan Kreydiyeh, PhD, Professor, Biology , FAS
- Leila Musfy, MFA Design, Professor and Chairperson, Architecture and Design, FEA
- Boushra Rahhal, Statistician, Dean's Office, FM
- Adib Saad, PhD, Professor and chairperson, Plant Sciences, FAFS
- Malek Tabbal, PhD, Associate Professor, Physics, FAS
- Julnar Usta, PhD, Professor, and Acting Chairperson, Biochemistry FM

**Working Group 6: “Educational Offerings”**

*(Standard 11 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*

**Co-chairs: Dr. Isam Bashour and Dr. Helen Sader**

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings**

**Purpose:**

Teaching and learning are primary purposes of AUB as an institution of higher learning founded to provide excellence in education. The working group 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. The working group 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**

- 11.1. To what extent are the institution's educational offerings consistent with the missions of the university, faculty, and individual academic units? How clearly articulated and how easily accessible are the goals and objectives of the educational programs?
- 11.2. How appropriate are the institution's educational offerings to degree levels in terms of depth, breadth, purposefulness, ability to integrate knowledge, and balance between theory and practice?
- 11.3. What evidence is there that educational offerings are periodically assessed and developed? How well are the assessment results used to improve student development programs? How often and how well are existing undergraduate offerings upgraded or new offerings developed to meet evolving social and technological needs in Lebanon and the region, in support of the mission and goals of the institution?
- 11.4. How well do the institution's graduate offerings provide for the development of research and independent thinking? How well are the goals and objectives of graduate programs assessed? To what extent is there evidence that there are faculty with credentials appropriate to the graduate curricula?
- 11.5. To what extent are the learning resources and facilities adequate to support educational programs and how effective are they in enriching the learning experience of students? How well is this effectiveness measured?
- 11.6. How clearly formulated and communicated are student learning outcomes at the program and course levels? How well are the learning outcomes of courses coordinated with the learning outcomes of educational programs? Where are statements about learning outcomes published, and how well are these statements communicated or made easily accessible to concerned constituencies?
- 11.7. How well are learning outcomes periodically assessed and measured? How well are the assessment results being used for the continuous improvement of student learning?
- 11.8. How clearly stated and well communicated are procedures and policies on transfer credits? What criteria does the institution use for consideration of transfer of credit? How well are problems pertaining to the transfer policy and its implementation addressed and resolved?

### **Methodology:**

1. Examine and analyze samples of course offerings in faculties/departments, examine and analyze course syllabi/textbooks/bibliographies.
2. Examine updated or new undergraduate and graduate curricula developed during the last five years.
3. Examine Curriculum Committee standards and evaluation criteria.
4. Examine graduation requirements of departments in the various faculties and schools.
5. Examine evidence of student learning outcomes assessment at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.
6. Examine data related to graduate students' independent research, publications, and teaching performance over the last five years.
7. Conduct survey of existing faculty and their specializations in each department.
8. Examine evidence related to student information literacy and academic computing.

9. Examine published policies and procedures related to transfer of credit; interview deans and administrative committee chairs.
10. Examine faculty strategic plan reports in relation to educational offerings.
11. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 11- Educational Offerings

**Membership:**

- Isam Bashour, PhD, Professor and Chairperson, Land and Water Resources, FAFS, Co-Chair
- Helen Sader, PhD, Professor, History and Archeology, FAS , Co-Chair
- Fida Afioni, PhD, Lecturer, Marketing and Management Track, OSB
- Syed Hussein Ali Akbar, PhD, Assistant Professor, Plant Science, FAFS
- Fatme Charafeddine, Librarian, Jafet Library
- Zaher Dawy, PhD, Assistant Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering, FEA
- Alex Geha, Trustee
- Huda Abu Saad Huijjer, PhD, Professor, Director, School of Nursing, FM
- Karim Kaban, PhD, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering, FEA
- Noura Kamel, Graduate Student, Economics, FAS
- May Mikati, Instructor, English, FAS
- Hilda Nassar, Librarian, Medical Library
- Randa Nawwam, Assistant Registrar, Registrar's Office
- Abuallah Salami, Undergraduate Student, Computer and Communication Engineering, FEA

**Working Group 7: “General Education and Related Educational Activities”**  
*(Standards 12 and 13 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*  
**Co-chairs: Dr. Howyda Al-Harithy and Dr. Hassan Diab**

**Standard 12: General Education**

**Purpose:**

To establish the extent to which the general education requirement reflects AUB’s unwavering commitment to the ideal of a liberal arts education. The working group will assess the extent to which the general education requirement contributes to the realization of the university’s mission to graduate individuals who will be "committed to creative and critical thinking, life-long learning, personal integrity and civic responsibility, and leadership." 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:**

- 12.1. How well do the breadth and depth of the liberal arts (general) education policy at AUB fulfill the institution’s objectives? How well do general education offerings reflect the educational mission of the individual academic units and the institution?
- 12.2. How well are AUB’s general education requirements clearly and accurately articulated and widely communicated to students and faculty?
- 12.3. How often, through what means, and how well are general education offerings reviewed and assessed?

- 12.4. How effectively are AUB's general education offerings used to enhance intellectual growth, communication skills, and understanding of values, ethics and diverse perspectives? By what means and how well is this effectiveness measured?
- 12.5. How well is the balance in degree programs between the general education and specialized course components? How well are the skills and knowledge derived from general education courses integrated and applied in students' major courses?
- 12.6. How well is the effectiveness of student learning in general education offerings assessed and evaluated? How well is this assessment integrated within AUB's overall process for the assessment of student learning outcomes?
- 12.7. How often and how well is the adequacy of course requirements for general education assessed and evaluated? How well have the assessment results been used for curricular improvement?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine documents and reports prepared at AUB relative to the requirements of general (liberal arts) education and the history of its development over the years.
2. Examine the general education requirements at peer institutions for comparative purposes.
3. Conduct interviews with the provost and academic deans, and with faculty directly involved in general education.
4. Conduct surveys and focus groups involving students and alumni.
5. Participate in the university-wide survey.
6. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 12- General Education

**Standard 13: Related Educational Activities**

**Purpose:**

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 group 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 working group will study the impact of these programs on AUB's resources and ability to fulfill its mission and goals.

**Questions:**

- 13.1. How well does AUB encourage collaborative teaching and research or exchanges with other institutions of higher education? How effective are the policies and procedures which regulate these joint ventures? How frequently and how well are collaborative or exchange programs assessed?
- 13.2. How are AUB's non-degree educational activities and programs (remedial programs, Continuing Education programs, etc.) consistent with its mission, goals and objectives, and how well do they further them?
- 13.3. What measures are used to identify and recruit potential students to pre-college remedial programs? How well are these measures reviewed to ensure that they are appropriate? How effective is the provision of relevant courses and support services for students admitted to remedial programs in enabling them to join regular programs?
- 13.4. How effective is the procedure to allow students in remedial programs to register simultaneously for regular courses bearing academic credit?
- 13.5. How well has the impact of remedial programs on student determination and academic achievement in degree courses been assessed?

- 13.6. How well do the certificate, non-credit, Continuing Education, and Extension programs address the needs of students within Lebanon and the region?
- 13.7. How effective are support services offered to students in remedial programs and Continuing Education?
- 13.8. How well does the institution commit sufficient resources to support Continuing Education programs? How well are the benefits of these programs to the institution measured and assessed?
- 13.9. How well are faculty and other qualified academic professionals involved in the design, delivery, and ongoing evaluation of Continuing Education offerings and programs?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine documents available from faculties, Continuing Education Center, and Regional and Extension programs on specialized educational programs available at AUB.
2. Examine documents, reports, and contracts describing AUB's affiliative, exchange, and contractual relationships with other educational institutions in Lebanon and the region.
3. Conduct interviews with the provost and vice-president for REP.
4. Conduct surveys to examine student satisfaction with the remedial programs and continuing education programs.
5. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 13- Related Educational Activities.

**Membership:**

- Howyda Al-Harithy, PhD, Professor, Architecture & Graphic Design, FEA, Co-chair
- Hassan Diab, Co-chair, PhD, Regional and External Programs, Vice President
- Hadi Abdel Khalek, UG Student, OSB
- Rula Baalbaki, Instructor, English, FAS
- Lina Choueiri, PhD, Associate Professor and Chairperson, English, FAS
- Marwan Darwish, PhD, Professor, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- George Farag, Regional and External Programs, Assistant Vice President
- May Farhat, PhD, Assistant Professor, Art History, FAS
- Ghazi Ghaith, PhD, Professor, Education, FAS
- Rima Hunaidi, Trustee
- Charbel Houry, MD student, 4<sup>th</sup> year, FM
- Waddah Nasr, PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Provost, Philosophy, FAS
- Fawwaz Tuqan, PhD, Professor, Arabic, FAS
- Imad Zbib, PhD, Assistant Professor, OSB

**Working Group 8: “Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment”**  
*(Standards 7 and 14 of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, MSCHE)*  
**Co-chairs: Dr. Karma El Hassan and Dr. Murad Jurdak**

**Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**

**Purpose:**

To establish the extent to which an appropriate assessment plan and process at AUB are 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:**

- 7.1. How well does the assessment process reflect AUB's mission and its program and unit goals?

- 7.2. How well does the institutional assessment process currently undertaken at AUB evaluate and improve: the total range of programs and services; the achievement of institutional mission, goals, and plans; and compliance with accreditation standards?
- 7.3. To what extent and how well are multiple quantitative and qualitative assessment measures used? How well do they relate to goals, maximize use of existing data, and possess sufficient quality?
- 7.4. To what extent is the assessment process sufficiently simple, practical, and detailed, with a clear timetable?
- 7.5. To what extent and how well has the institution developed and applied appropriate criteria for determining whether its mission and key institutional goals have been met?
- 7.6. In what ways and how well have assessment results been shared and discussed with appropriate constituents? To what extent and how well have these results been used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal?
- 7.7. How well do institutional strategic plans reflect consideration of assessment results?
- 7.8. How adequate is institutional support for assessment in terms of: i) the quality and utility of policies and governance structure; ii) faculty and administrator support; iii) the availability of technical, financial, and other appropriate institutional resources; and iv) professional development opportunities for faculty and staff to learn how to conduct assessments?
- 7.9. How well does AUB assure a culture of assessment of institutional effectiveness? How well have faculty and administrator views on assessment and the extent to which they understand their roles in assessment been identified and dealt with? How adequate are campus-wide efforts to recognize, encourage, and value assessment?
- 7.10. To what extent and how well does the institution periodically evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the assessment process?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine institutional, faculty, and program documents with respect to (institutional) assessment plans, processes, criteria, and indicators.
2. Conduct focused interviews with key AUB academic and administrative personnel.
3. Collect survey information regarding different aspects of assessment from various constituencies.
4. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment

## **Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning**

**Purpose:**

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:**

- 14.1. To what extent and how well are statements of expected learning outcomes clearly articulated for all programs and at all levels? How well are they integrated with one another and consonant with the institution's mission and with the standards of higher education and of relevant disciplines?
- 14.2. What process does AUB have in place for the assessment of student learning? How well documented, structured, organized, and sustainable is the process?
- 14.3. How well does the process utilize both quantitative and qualitative assessment measures? How comprehensive, accurate, clear and relevant are the assessment measures in relation to

- the outcomes being assessed? How well do the assessment measures provide evidence for the achievement of the stated student learning outcomes?
- 14.4. What are the direct and indirect outcome measurements in place and how well are they being used? (Examples of direct outcome measurements: quality of final year (capstone) projects; graduation rates; career prospects of AUB graduates.... Satisfaction surveys are indirect measures since they report how students or faculty feel.)
  - 14.5. How well are faculty, staff, and administrators involved in the process of assessing student learning? How effective is this involvement in improving the assessment process?
  - 14.6. How well do the assessment results provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes?
  - 14.7. To what extent and how well does the institution periodically evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the student learning assessment process is taking place?
  - 14.8. To what extent and how well has student learning assessment information been shared and discussed with appropriate constituents? To what extent and how effectively has the institution taken measures to ensure that workable, regularized, collaborative institutional processes and protocols are employed for the dissemination, analysis, discussion, and use of results among all relevant constituents within a reasonable time frame?
  - 14.9. To what extent and how well has the institution been able to establish that student learning assessment information is used to improve teaching and learning, and that such improvements have had the desired effects?
  - 14.10. To what extent and how well has the institution been able to establish that student learning assessment information is used in institutional assessment?
  - 14.11. How adequate is institutional support for student learning assessment in terms of: i) policies and governance structure; ii) administrative support and collaboration; iii) availability of technical, financial, and other appropriate institutional resources; and iv) professional development opportunities for faculty to learn how to assess student learning and improve their curricula and their teaching?
  - 14.12. To what extent and how well does the institution encourage and support a culture of assessing student learning? How well have faculty and administrator views on assessment and the extent to which they understand their roles in assessment been identified and dealt with? How adequate are campus-wide efforts to encourage, recognize, and value student learning assessment? To what extent and how well is there effective collaboration in the development of statements of expected student learning and assessment strategies?
  - 14.13. To what extent and how well does the institution conduct analysis of course, department, and school reports on classroom assessment practices and their outcomes, including grading approaches and consistency?

**Methodology:**

1. Examine institutional, faculty, and program documents with respect to (learning outcome) assessment plans, processes, criteria, and indicators.
2. Conduct focused interviews with key AUB academic and administrative personnel.
3. Collect survey information regarding different aspects of assessment from various constituencies.
4. Examine the earlier AUB Self-Study Report on Standard 14- Assessment of Student Learning.

**Membership:**

- Karma El-Hassan, PhD, Associate Professor and Director, OIRA, FAS, Co-Chair
- Murad Jurdak, PhD, Professor, Education, FAS, Co-Chair
- Rabab Abou Chakra, Secretary, Dean's Office, FEA
- Rima Afifi Soweid, PhD, Assistant Professor, Health Behavior and Education, FHS
- Nuhad Dumit, MSc, Assistant Professor, School of Nursing, FM
- Ali El Hajj, PhD, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering, FEA

- Rhea Fellas, Undergraduate Student, Mechanical Engineering, FEA
- Azmi Philip Imad, Director and Radiation Officer, Environmental Health, Safety and Risk Management
- Nizar Jawhar, University Statistician, OIRA
- Abdo Jurjus, PhD, Professor, Human Morphology, FM
- Shahe Kazarian, PhD, Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences, FAS
- Samer Khalil, PhD, Assistant Professor, OSB
- Herant Khatchadourian, Trustee
- Nidal Mawas, Undergraduate Student, Political Studies, FAS
- Andre Nahas, Director, Institutional Planning & Process Improvement, President's Office
- Talal Nizameddine, Associate Dean of Student Affairs, Office of Student Affairs
- Kassim Shaaban, PhD, Professor, English, FAS
- Imad Toufeili, PhD, Professor, Nutrition and Food Science, FAFS

## 8. Inventory of Support Documents

### List of Documents for review by Working Groups

<b>Standard 1</b>	Mission and Goals	<b>Standard 2</b>	Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
<b>Standard 3</b>	Institutional Resources	<b>Standard 4</b>	Leadership and Governance
<b>Standard 5</b>	Administration	<b>Standard 6</b>	Integrity
<b>Standard 7</b>	Institutional Assessment	<b>Standard 8</b>	Student Admissions and Retention
<b>Standard 9</b>	Student Support Services	<b>Standard 10</b>	Faculty
<b>Standard 11</b>	Educational Offerings	<b>Standard 12</b>	General Education
<b>Standard 13</b>	Related Educational Activities	<b>Standard 14</b>	Assessment of Student Learning

Documents to be reviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>1. Documents Relevant to All Standards</b>														
Mission Statement	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Catalogue 2006-2007	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Fact Book (OIRA)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
President's reports: Interim and Annual 2004-2007	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
President's Report: States of the University	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
President's Report: Future States of the University	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>AUB Reports to Middle States Commission on Higher Education</b>														
Accreditation Self- Study Recommendations	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Institutional Self-Study prepared for MSCHE, January 2004	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Appendices, Self-Study, January 2004	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Interim Report to MSCHE (1)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Interim Report to MSCHE (2)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Documents to be reviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>2. Strategic Planning Reports</b>														

Guide for Developing Strategic Plans		x												
Strategic Planning Reports: Reports of Institution-wide Committees		x	x	x	x									
Enrolment Management Committee		x	x	x	x			x	x					
General Education Committee		x	x	x	x						x	x		x
Graduate Education and Research Committee		x	x	x	x						x			x
Information Technology Committee		x	x	x	x						x			

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>Strategic Planning Reports: Unit-level Committees</b>														
Business Services Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
Development Office Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
Finance group Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
FPDU Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
Human Resources Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
Physical Plant Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x									
University Libraries Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x						x	x		
REP Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x								x	
FAFS Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
FAS Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
FEA Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
FHS Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
OSB Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
SON Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
Student Affairs Strategic Planning Report		x	x	x	x					x				
Strategic Planning Over view		x	x	x	x					x				

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>3. Learning Outcomes Documents</b>														
Concept paper on Educational Goals and Objectives and Learning Outcomes										x	x	x		x
Learning Outcomes implementation Plan										x				x
Program Learning Outcomes Handbook										x				x
Course Learning Outcomes Handbook										x				x

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>4. University Planning and Financial Documents</b>														
Audited Financial Statement			x											
Balanced Scorecard Reports: KPIs Academic BSC		x	x	x	x									
KPIs Institution-wide BSC		x		x	x									
Balanced Scorecard Report Cards		x		x	x									
Campaign Plan, 2002-2007														
Campus Master Plan, 2002			x	x	x									
Capital Budget 2006-07			x	x	x									
Operating Budget 2006-07			x	x	x									
Market Survey Reports: 2002: Lebanon				x	x			x						
Market Survey Reports: 2007: Region				x	x			x						

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>5. Charter, By-Laws, and Minutes</b>														

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Certificate of Incorporation of the Trustees of the Syrian Protestant College, 1863	x			x	x									
Corporate By-Laws of the American University of Beirut	x			x	x									
<b>Faculties/Schools By-Laws:</b>														
Agricultural and Food Sciences				x	x					x				
Arts and Sciences				x	x					x				
Olayan School of Business				x	x					x				
Engineering and Architecture				x	x					x				
Health Sciences				x	x					x				
Medicine				x	x					x				
Nursing				x	x					x				
AUB organization charts				x	x									
Outlook (student newspaper) By-Laws				x	x				x					
Senate By-Laws				x	x					x				
Senate Representative Committees				x	x					x				
Unified Faculty By-Laws (2001)				x	x					x				
University Student/Faculty Committee By-laws (1981,1995,2001,2003)				x	x				x					
Minutes: Board of Trustees (summaries)				x	x									
Minutes: Board of Deans (summaries)				x	x					x				
Minutes: Policy and Procedures Review Committee				x	x									
Minutes: Senate, and Committees of the Senate				x	x					x				
Minutes: University Admissions Committee														
Minutes: University Financial Aid/Scholarship Committee														
Minutes: University Student/Faculty Committee				x	x				x					

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>6. Centers and Initiatives</b>														
Center for Advanced Mathematical Sciences (CAMS)										x	x			
Center for American Studies & Research(CASAR)										x	x			
Center for Arab & Middle East Studies (CAMES)										x	x			
Center for Behavioral Research (CBR)										x	x			
Center for Research on Population and Health (CRPH)														
Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)						x				x	x			x
Collaborative IT Program for Education and Research (CITPER)										x	x			
Digital Documentation Center (DDC)											x			
Flagship Program - Health Sector Reform and Sustainable Financing for the MENA Region														
Initiative for Biodiversity Studies in Arid Regions (IBSAR)										X			x	
Institute of Financial Economics									x	x	x			
Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs										x	x			
Middle East Medical Assembly (MEMA)										x	x		x	
Science and Mathematics Education Center										x	x		x	



<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Graduate Assistantships									x					
Housing				x	x				x	x				
Information/Computer Resources				x	x				x	x				
Incident/Occurrence Reporting				x	x				x	x				
Insurance				x	x				x	x				
Intellectual Property				x	x					x				
Lost and Found				x	x									
Medical Center Security/Keys														
Medical Insurance and Travel				x	x					x				
Parking				x	x									
Performance Guarantees														
Policy Development			x											
Principles, Policies, Procedures for the Academic Community				x	x					x				
Public Functions									x	x				
Records Retention				x	x									
Research Assistantships				x	x				x	x				
Safety and Risk Management				x	x									
Selecting Professional Services				x	x									
Service Quality				x			x							X
Signing Authorities				x	x									
Smoking				x	x				x	x				
Student Code of Conduct				x	x				x					
Student Emergency Protocol									x					
Travel				x	x					X				
Work-Related Injuries				x	x					x				

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>9. Manuals and Handbooks</b>														
Faculty Manual				x	x					x				
Departmental Manuals					x					x				
Auxiliary Services					x									
Air Travel Office					x									
Business Services				x	x									
Central Duplicating Service					X									
Comptroller			x											
Computing and Networking				x	x									
Financial Planning and Budgeting			x	x	x									
Extension Programs				x	x								x	
Food Services									x					
Infirmery									x	x				
Internal Audit						x								
ID Center					x				x	x				
Libraries			x						x	x				
Materials Management				x										
Maintenance Contracts Office					x									
Motor Pool					x									
New York Office				x	x									
Physical Plant				x	x									
Post Office					x									

Documents to be reviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Publications										x				
Purchasing					x									
Regional External Programs				x	x								x	
Registrar's Office								x	x					
Student Affairs									x					
Non-academic Staff Manual				x	x									
Student Handbook									x					
Information Guide for Prospective Faculty members				x	x					x				

Documents to be reviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>10. Brochures 2004-2006</b>														
AUB Academic Profile							x		x	x				x
Nursing Staff Development Brochure					x									
Cardiology Brochure										x				
Hostler Center Brochure									x					
Serving Communities in Lebanon & the Region Brochure	x												x	
Summer Training Program (FHS)										x				
Public Health Training Program (FHS)										x				
Master of Urban Planning & Urban Design											x			
Armenian Financial Aid Brochure								x	x					
SON Fundraising Brochure				x										x
SON B.S. program Brochure										x	x			
International Student booklet									x					
Patient's Handbook					x									
OSB Capital Campaign Brochure			x											
NICU Pediatrics Brochure														
Financial Aid Brochure 05-06								x						
An Introduction to AUB 05-06								x	x					
Braveheart Fund brochure			x											
Continuing Education Center Brochure														x
FAFS landscape design Brochure										x				
FAFS Nutrition Brochure										x				
FAFS General Brochure										x				
AMPL Brochure										x				
Diabetes Brochure (English)														
Diabetes Brochure (Arabic)														
Summer Program Brochure											x		x	

Documents to be reviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>11. AUB Accreditation Reports to Other Groups</b>														
Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH): Faculty of Health Sciences, Graduate Public Health Programs (GPHP), Final Self-Study Document, April 5, 2006				x	x					x	x			
Faculty of Health Sciences GPHP Self-Study for Accreditation, Faculty Retreat, April 29, 2006				x	x					x	x			

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Report on Findings of CEPH about GPHP: Review for Accreditation of the Graduate Public Health Program at AUB, September 30, 2006				x	x					x	x			
Report for New York State Education Department (NYSED): Assessment of Readiness for PhD Level, January 2006 , E. Johnson				x	x		x				x			x
Appendices to the Report for NYSED, January 2006				x	x		x				x			x
Self-Study Report prepared for the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), March, 2007				x	x				x	x				x
Self-Study Appendices to CCNE, March, 2007				x	x				x	x				x

<b>Documents to be reviewed</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>12. Additional Resources</b>														
Assessment Essentials, Palomba and Banta, 1999	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Assessment of Student Learning, Options and Resources MSCHE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Balancing Qualitative and Quantitative Information for Effective Support, Howard and Borland, 2001	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education</i> , MSCHE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Designs for Excellence, Handbook for Institutional Self-Study</i> , MSCHE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Effective Reporting</i> , Bers and Seybert, 1999	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Framework for Outcomes Assessment</i> , MSCHE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Higher Education as Competitive Enterprise</i> , Zemsky Shaman, Shapiro, 2001	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Institutional Research: Decision Support in Higher Education</i> , Howard, 2001	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Journal of the Association for Institutional Research: Research in Higher Education</i> , 2001, 2002	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>KPMG Allocation Study</i> , 1999	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Mail and Internet Surveys</i> , Dillman, 2000	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Measuring What Matters: Competency-Based Learning, Models Education</i> , Voorhees, 2001	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>NCTLA Assessment Institute Research Notebook, 2001-2002</i>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Questionnaire Survey Research: What Works</i> , Suskie, 1996	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries</i>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>The Commitment of Trusteeship</i> , Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>The Journal of Higher Education</i>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>The Survey Research Handbook</i> , Alreck and Settle, 2001	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>University of Louisville, Strategic Planning Process</i> , 1999	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Web sites of selected colleges	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>What Matters in College, Four Critical Years Revisited</i> , Astin, 2000	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

## 9. Timeline for Renewal of Institutional Accreditation Process Self-Study

1. Self- Study Steering Committee (SSSC) formed	January 2007
2. Self-Study Design Team (SSDT) formed	January 2007
3. Self Study Design draft completed	April 2007
4. MSCHE Staff Liaison visits AUB and approves the Self Study Design	May 2007
5. Self-Study Working Groups are formed and the Self-Study is begun	May 2007
6. MSCHE selects the evaluation team Chair, and the Institution approves the selection	January 2008
7. Institution sends a copy of the Self-Study Design to the Chair of the Team	February 2008
8. Chair and Institution select dates for team visit and for the Chair's preliminary visit	March 2008
9. MSCHE selects evaluation team members, and the Institution approves the selection	April 2008
10. Working groups submit their final reports to the Self Study Steering Committee	May 2008
11. Self Study Steering Committee integrates the reports of the working groups and develops a draft self-study report. (The draft self-study report that is approved by the SSSC would be reviewed at this point as indicated in 12 and 13 below)	August 2008
12. Draft of the self-study report is placed on the web, and campus-wide review by various constituencies ensues	September - October 2008
13. The draft self-study report is reviewed by: - The President of the University - The Board of Trustees - The Evaluation Team Chair	October 2008 November 2008 November 2008
14. Evaluation Team Chair makes preliminary visit	December 2008
15. The Self-Study Steering Committee approves the final version of the Self-Study report and sends copies to the MSCHE and to the Evaluation Team	Not later than 10 February 2009
16. Evaluation Team Visit	During first half of April 2009
17. Evaluation Team Report	April – May 2009
18. AUB's response	May 2009
19. MSCHE Action!	June 2009

## 10. Working Groups Report Style and Format

The work of each of the eight working groups will be combined into a single ***Self-Study Report*** that will integrate the questions, methodologies, data reviewed, findings, and recommendations of each working group. Additional chapters will provide an executive summary, the institutional profile, an overview of the self-study process, and the conclusions of the self-study. Working groups' members will have adequate opportunity to review edited drafts to insure that their work is fairly and accurately represented.

The working groups 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 working group reports in order to assure a level of consistency, as follows:

- Basic adherence to the working group 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 century Schoolbook, 10-pitch with 1 inch-margins on all sides.
- Maximum length of twenty double-spaced pages.

A central editing team will work with each of the working groups 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 working groups.

## **11. Self-Study Report Format**

### **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 INTEGRITY**

- 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
- Challenges
- Recommendations regarding Standard One
- 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
- Recommendations regarding Standard Six

### **CHAPTER 2 PLANNING, RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL**

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

- Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Two
  - Overview of Financial, Human, Technical and Physical Resources
  - Significant Achievements since 2004
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Three
- CHAPTER 3 LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
- Survey of Governance Structures and Governing Bodies
  - Effectiveness of Implementation in Congruence with Mission
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Four
  - Organization Structure and Clarity of Roles
  - Human Resources
  - Systems and Information Management
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Five
- CHAPTER 4 STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND SUPPORT SERVICES
- 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
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Eight
  - Mission and Organization of Student Support Services
  - Approach to Assessment of Support Services
  - Adequacy and Effectiveness of Support Services
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Nine
- CHAPTER 5 FACULTY
- Faculty Roles and AUB's Mission
  - Faculty Responsibilities/ University Responsibilities/Support
  - Faculty Recruitment and Retention
  - Academic Environment
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Ten
- CHAPTER 6 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
  - Challenges
  - Recommendations regarding Standard Eleven
- CHAPTER 7 GENERAL EDUCATION AND RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES
- 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
- Challenges
- Recommendations regarding Standard Twelve
- Overviews of Non-degree Educational Programs and Contractual Relations
- Administration of the Programs
- Curriculum, Faculty, Students
- Congruence with AUB's Mission
- Challenges
- Recommendations regarding Standard Thirteen

## CHAPTER 8 INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

- 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
- Recommendations regarding Standard Seven
- 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
- Recommendations regarding Standard Fourteen

## CONCLUSION: RECOMMENDATIONS, AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

## APPENDICES

### **12. 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 such professional fields as agriculture, business, engineering, health sciences and medicine (teaching hospital).

The Steering Committee further requests that the team consist of eight to twelve individuals, including a university president or chief academic officer, and that the members possess specific expertise in the following areas:

Governance, Leadership, and Integrity  
 Financial Management and Planning  
 Graduate Education and Research  
 Learning Outcomes Assessment  
 Strategic Planning and Institutional Assessment  
 General Education  
 Faculty Workload and Professional Development

### 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 2007 enrollment of 5741 undergraduates (**U**), 1004 graduate students (**G**) and 313 medical students and a Spring 2007 enrollment of 5633 undergraduates (**U**), 958 graduate students (**G**) and 313 medical students. AUB's faculty/student ratio (**FSR**) is 1/12.3; 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 650,000 volumes; and its endowment (**E**) is \$430 million. According to the Carnegie system of classifying universities, AUB is a **Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)** university; but it also has a medical school (**M**), which few comprehensive universities have. It has also initiated Ph.D. programs in select fields of study. Consequently, it is moving from the status of Master's College and University to that of **Doctoral/Research University**.

Some indicators for comparison besides breadth and scope of educational programs offered are: student body size and quality; admissions selectivity; retention and graduation rates; faculty size and research productivity; full-time to part-time faculty ratio; faculty/student ratio; library size; and endowment size. With these indicators in mind, the Steering Committee believes that the following institutions are similar to AUB in enough respects to be considered "peer" or "aspirational" institutions:

**American University (Washington DC):** DRU (Doctoral, Research University); **U:** 5866; **G:** 3263; A&S, business, communications, public affairs, law; **FSR:** 1/14; **L:** 1,035,000m; **E:** \$319m; Selectivity: **HC**.

**American University in Cairo (Egypt):** Master's; **U:** 3890; **G:** 1013; A&S, business, computer science, engineering; **FSR:** 1/13; **L:** 414,748; **E:** \$475m; Selectivity: **HC**.

**George Washington University (Washington DC):** RU/H (Research Universities/High Research Activity); **U:** 10,761; **G:** 11,022; A&S, education, law, business, engineering, medicine, health sciences; **FSR:** 1/13.6; **L:** 1.8m; **E:** \$964m; Selectivity: **HC**.

**Loyola University (Illinois):** RU/H (Research Universities/High Research Activity); **U:** 9240; **G:** 4089; A&S, computer science, nursing, education, business, medicine; **FSR:** 1/14; **L:** 1.1m; **E:** \$306m; Selectivity: **HC**.

**Villanova University (Pennsylvania):** Master's L (Master's Colleges and Universities/Larger Programs); **U:** 6374; **G:** 2000; A&S, business, computer science, engineering, nursing, law; **FSR:** 1/13; **L:** 900,000; **E:** \$279m; Selectivity: **HC**.

**Wake Forest University (North Carolina):** RU/H (Research Universities/High Research Activity); **U:** 3972; **G:** 1239; A&S, business, computer science, education, medicine; **FSR:** 1/10.1; **L:** 1.7m; **E:** \$1,043m; Selectivity: **MC**.

**Howard University (Washington DC):** RU/H (Research Universities/High Research Activity); **U:** 7137; **G:** 1310; A&S, business, education, engineering, computer science, law, medicine, nursing; **FSR:** 1/7; **L:** 215,000; **E:** \$424m; Selectivity: **HC**.