

# Accreditation Committee (Standard 2) Meeting

## MINUTES

07-11-2005

9:00-10:20

IRWIN A

MEETING CALLED BY	Abdallah Al-Khal
TYPE OF MEETING	Discussion
FACILITATOR	Abdallah Al-Khal
SECRETARY	John McGill
TIMEKEEPER	None
PRESENT	Abdallah Al-Khal, May Hamdan, Walid Touma, John McGill, Elie Badr
ABSENT	Youssef Abi Abdallah

## Agenda topics

50 MINUTES

ACCREDITATION PROGRAM & STANDARD 2

ELIE BADR

DISCUSSION	Dr. Badr described the overall accreditation program. He gave his opinions about the status of planning at LAU. He suggested areas that the Standard 2 Committee might look into for planning: enrollment management, faculty and staff planning, and budgeting.	
	Dr. Badr described the "evaluation" section of Standard 2: course, staff, and faculty. He suggested tools such as external juries (art & design), and external tests (pharmacy).	
	Committee members offered their own opinions about the accreditation process. Dr. McGill said that he had been on accreditation committees at 2 other colleges accredited by NEASC and was broadly familiar with the process. Dr. Touma compared the accreditation process to process reengineering.	
CONCLUSIONS	The accreditation process is similar to reengineering: define the current situation, analyze it, and develop new ways of doing things.	
	The accreditation process should produce results consistent with the strategic plan.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		

30 MINUTES

METHODOLOGY

ABDALLAH AL-KHAL

DISCUSSION	The committee broadly explored what information would be required, how detailed it should be, how it should be collected, and who should collect it.	
	The committee discussed the "as-of" date for data to be collected ("as-of last year", "as of next year" etc.).	
CONCLUSIONS	In-person interviews rather than questionnaires would be used to obtain data. Vice-presidents should be contacted first to obtain approval for their subordinates to be interviewed. Several committee members would interview each person to ensure data accuracy. All applicable supporting documentation (reports, print-screens etc.) would be obtained.	
	Data should be "as-of now", that is, as the process is currently performed at the time data are collected. Recognition was made that this is a moving target. Data will involve (1) university planning/evaluation, and (2) school planning/evaluation.	
	Data for all three phases in the accreditation process should be collected at the same time if possible: (1) how do you currently do it; (2) what do you think of it (assessment); (3) how should it be done.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Develop a tentative list of who should be interviewed.	Abdallah Al-Khal	11-11-2005
Obtain copies of Standard 2 from several NEASC accredited universities to show data requirements and the level of detail required.	John McGill	11-11-2005