

Lebanese American University

January 18, 2006

**Memo to:** Members of the Accreditation Committee (Standard Five)  
**Subject:** Minutes of the Accreditation Committee Standard Five held on Wednesday, January 18, 2006 at 4:30 P.M. in Irwin Hall Conference Room A  
**Present:** E. Bader, R. Bahous, R. Bell, H. Harmanani, C. Issa (Chair), A. Kabbani, N. Samaan

- R. Bell started the meeting by pointing out that the institution should do its own study. R. Bell should not talk about content or process due to ethical issues.
- Dr. Issa briefed R. Bell on the work of the committee.
- Dr Issa's commented that the Faculty manual should be on the web as one document.
- R. Bell talked about the three phases of each standard

- Descriptive phase (20%)

Assemble together materials to write a concise summary with respect to this topic. Write simple basic facts, do not use judgment or evaluation. Point to referenced materials

- Appraisal (60 %)

Evaluate the institution according to each standard. How does LAU compare / measure itself based on each standard? Answer back questions.

What data do I need to assess the institution? (identification) (expository (descriptive narrative + qualitative assessment)

The document is about 100 pages long; each standard is around 6 to 7 pages. it should present tight concluding points.

The five particular subheadings to keep in mind are the following:

1. recent history of LAU (3 to 5 years) (major trends going on)
2. the organization structure of the university (offices, structures, people? What does the topic look like? Who is running the show? Who are the players, functional)? Who is responsible for what?

3. What are the relevant publications? Process flows? Governance documents? ... Is there a faculty handbook???? Do we have a faculty senate? Constitution? Job description for each position?
4. What is the data that is important here? What exists? Where should I go to get it? What is its accessibility?
5. What is happening right now? Changing the face of the university? (What group is working on what to change the face of the university?)

In order to do a proper assessment, think about what is the core of the institution doing? (talk about inconsistencies regarding the institution). Look at how the university is managing itself in that regard as well as the quality... form and substance / form and realization (what is the form? Policy? etc. is there any? Is it set up to meet the needs? Is it adequate? Is it really what is happening? (against the standard) imply some subjective implications/ conclusions .. Where is governance? Statistics??

Major vulnerabilities: Inconsistencies of policies...Part time faculty standards....

- o Projection (20%)

What should be done in the next few years...

Check the following in the document (description part):

Page 1:

... are fully consonant (is more of an assessment or judgment) with rare exceptions..... pursue in analysis phase

page 3:

this load.... Moves to appraisal

page 6:

limited tenure needs to be clarified (careful with wording)

it is a three year rolling contract which we call limited tenure.. (oxymoron)

remove tenured faculty / non tenured faculty

page 7:

there is a rigorous examination

should be more the process calls for a rigorous

the guidelines ensure judicious

the guidelines are intended to ensure judicious

well defined, clear policy (get rid of these judgmental words)

LAU is committed

LAU invests ....

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 P.M.