

Memo to : Members of the Accreditation Subcommittee STD#6
From : Mona Nabhani
Subject: Minutes of the meeting of the Accreditation Subcommittee for Standard 6, held via video conferencing in Irwin Conference Room B on Friday **March 31** at 12:15.
Present: A. Lahoud, S. Garabedian, G. Abi Fares, M. Nabhani, E. Badr, V. Papazian, M. Semaan, E. Samia, M. Othman, L. Massara, and R. Mouawad

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved, and no changes were made to the agenda, which is to discuss how to approach the assessment phase.

Meetings

Dr. Semaan commented that in April, several holidays fall on Fridays, so Wednesday April 12 at 12:15 was chosen for the next meeting for Standard #6 teams. The descriptive report for Standard #6 was sent to Dr. Badr who will share it with other LAU constituents for remarks, then it will be sent back to the Chairs.

Dr. Badr commented that the appraisal is harder and more important, so by the end of April, all the groups should send “bullets” on what LAU is doing well and where improvement is needed, so that Mr. Bell will see and comment on. Mr. Bell will visit between the appraisal and projection phases.

Dr. Semaan asked all to look at the exhibits list that he sent and see if these reflect the details of the descriptive document VO, and check that all the exhibits are available in the Chairs’ offices. Dr. Badr commented that not all the collected exhibits will appear on the final list, but collecting them helped educate us about what we have and where LAU is.

Assessment phase

Dr. Semaan asked all to study the sent descriptive draft VO section by section and point out what LAU is doing well or not and write comments individually, then we need to meet as a group and come up with one document.

Sample appraisal

Dr. Badr presented and explained the appraisal framework that was discussed in the Steering Committee, so each member or subteam can do the suggested exercise independently before the group meeting when everyone’s comments will be collected and examined. The subteams need to remember that we are gauging LAU against NEASC’s standards, so we could be similar or not in various different aspects regardless of whether the standards are applicable to our culture or not. If LAU is lacking in a certain NEASC required practice then we need to say so and why.

Dr. Badr also asked the subteams to discuss the issue of effectiveness and decide how effective LAU is in all the substandards. Break this in 2 columns: not effective and

working on it, that is, building its capacity. Then the whole group has to discuss how effective LAU is on Standard #6.

Use the indicators that we came up with then say why LAU is not performing to NEASC standards on certain indicators. Also, in appraisal, one criterion is the impact on student learning because in Standard #6, we are connecting what happens in class and outside class and keeping in mind how we want LAU to respond to our needs.

Important meetings

- Wednesday April 12, we meet via video conferencing to discuss the work of the subteams. So by then, each pair would have examined their areas in detail.
- Monday April 17, 10:30- 3:00 on Byblos campus to examine each substandard one at a time then collectively.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15