

Lebanese American University

Memo to : Members of the Accreditation Subcommittee STD#6
From : Elie Samia
Subject : Minutes of the meeting of the Accreditation Subcommittee for Standard 6, held in the Irwin Faculty Lounge on Friday, May 5, 2006 at 12:00 noon.
Present : G. Abi Fares, S. Garabedian, A. Lahoud, L. Massara, E. Samia, M. Semaan, and V. Papazian.

Agenda : To continue the revision of the gap analysis and come up with a consensus on where to clarify various services related to the appraisal of substandards.

G. Abi Fares and E. Samia will conduct a series of focus group discussions in Byblos related to the student perception of student services. Simultaneously, M. Nabhani & L. Massara will conduct a similar focus group discussion in Beirut.

V. Papazian raised the concern that the classification of substandards should be substantiated by facts. Accordingly the members of the Accreditation subcommittee reconsidered the preliminary appraisal of substandards # 6.1 → 6.4. The below table indicates the amendments agreed upon:

Appraisal of Substandards #6.1→6.4		Gap Analysis		
LAU performs this function/expectation, and does so very well (i.e., it is a point of excellence)	LAU performs this function not so very well, but above the reasonable expectation of the NEASC standard	LAU performs this function, but not at the level of the NEASC standard	LAU performs this function, but in an erratic or inconsistent manner (from campus to campus; department/program/office to department/program/office; from course to course; from faculty to faculty; from year to year; etc.)	LAU does not perform this function at all, nor does it have alternative methods by which it claims to accomplish the intended outcome
6.1.1 enrollment 6.1.2 ethical 6.1.3 admission policy: present & available to students				6.1.3 retention, no policies available
6.2.2 → 6.2.3 → 6.2.4 → 6.2.5 →	6.2.2 LAU does reasonably well 6.2.3 academic needs & remedial courses 6.2.4 6.2.5		6.2.1 Studies should be done on compatibility of LAU's objectives & admission criteria	
6.3.1 → 6.3.2 →	6.3.1 pending study 6.3.2 pending focus group discussion			

6.4.1 Admission criteria: general and for specific majors	6.4.2.2 Counseling 6.4.2.2 Intensive English providing for students	6.4.2.1 Accessibility of programs and services 6.4.2.2 Guidance Office advising 6.4.2.2. Faculty advising	6.4.2 Services of Learning Center	
	6.4.3 Information and guidance for students (pending focus group discussion)	6.4.2.2 Effectiveness of English support programs		

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.