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Introduction: Quality at AUB

- Quality at AUB has kept up with changes in conceptualizations of quality in higher education.
- Initially ‘earmarks’ of quality were denoted by only measures of resources, faculty and staff qualifications. Recent years have witnessed
  - inclusion of learning outcomes assessment as standard for reviewing performance,
  - a focus on teaching, documentation, and transparency with more public accessibility to information.
- Care for quality at all levels, a quality culture.
- Guided by AUB’s mission and values.
Quality Processes at AUB

- The initial purpose for the process was for continuous improvement and institutional renewal. Require ongoing reflection and critique of the way things are done to enhance student learning and success in achieving goals and realizing mission. An internal QA point of reference.

- With accreditation (2004) and re-accreditation (2009) the need arose for compliance with standards, an external QA perspective. The existence of a comprehensive explicit internal quality strategy facilitated the efficacy of external evaluation.

- Internal assessment and approaches were then focused on helping to achieve purposes. Structure and processes were put in place to ensure dissemination of results, implementation of recommendations, and follow-up reviews to complete the quality action cycle.
Assessment Initiatives at AUB

To monitor quality and performance at AUB and its administrative & academic units from a variety of perspectives, a number of assessment initiatives were launched at institutional & unit levels. OIRA plays a leading (L) & supporting (S) roles in the monitoring performance.

- Strategic planning and assessment (L)
- Balanced Scorecards and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) (L)
- Monitoring budgets & expenditures (S)
- Internal audit monitoring (S)
- Assessment of student learning outcomes (S)
- Assessment of General Education Program (S)
- Periodic Program Review (S)
- Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIRA) Activities (L)
Quality Processes Timeline

- Program Review
- LO Assessment
- Reaccreditation
- GE Assessment
- Strategic Planning
- Accreditation
- IR

Since 2004, AUB has embarked on its first strategic planning cycle with the development of plans for 15 major academic & administrative units, and an Institutional Strategic Plan (2004-2009) was implemented.

Each stage of the planning process involved assessment in some way (SWOT, external trends & influences, etc).

University’s vision was articulated in terms of operational objectives involving all stakeholders, business processes, and financial resources.

AUB is making use of Kaplan-Norton Balanced Scorecard (BSC) methodology to measure the achievement of objectives.
Initially AUB had 180 KPIs, but these have been updated with revised and new strategic plans.

Institutional BSC is reviewed annually by the president and his ‘Cabinet’, review process looks at trends indicated by KPIs and the steps to be taken to improve performance.

Based on evaluation, another strategic plan was implemented in 2009-14.

A third plan is now in process of being finalized for 2014-2019.
Strategic Planning at AUB

- Intellectual and social growth of students
- Student satisfaction with various processes
- Level of faculty and staff preparedness
- University’s financial stability

- Deliver world class student experience
- Create knowledge and advance quality research
- Maximize impact for positive change in region
- Invest in health of community and Arab World

2004-9 Strategic Plan Goals

2014-2019 Strategic Plan Goals
Assessment of Learning Outcomes

Assessment of Learning Outcomes in the Major
- Since the 2004 Self-Study, the University has devised, established the processes, and started implementing a comprehensive plan for the assessment of student learning in all faculties.
- Newly established Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) led the initiative of training and mentoring faculty.
- Assessment committees were formed, trained on development of assessment plans and tools.

General Education (GE) Learning Outcomes Assessment
- GE Committee has
  - developed standards for the designation of general education courses,
  - completed the designation of 400 courses in various disciplines, and
  - Developed an assessment and evaluation plan of the GE program learning outcomes using direct and indirect measures.
In June 2010, Senate approved the Program Periodic Review Policy, and implementation began fall 2010.

It entails the review of all of our programs at least once every six years.

Each department is required to evaluate its undergraduate and graduate degree programs simultaneously in accordance with a schedule set in consultation with the academic deans.

The process has four main steps.

- First, faculty members conduct a departmental self-study that provides descriptive and evaluative information about its programs, faculty, and students; and suggests areas and plans for improvement and identifies future program needs, direction/s, and priorities.
- Second, external reviewers visit the campus and prepare a separate report.
- Third, an internal review committee studies the documents and drafts a final report to the provost.
- Finally, the provost presents the plan’s financial implications to academic and administrative heads for their input and asks the Senate to consider and approve its educational aspects.
Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIRA)

- OIRA
  - Coordinates institutional assessment and research activities,
  - Collects, analyzes, restructures data into information and disseminates this accurate and timely information to stakeholders for decision making and strategy support.
  - Provides trend analysis data for various institutional indicators and these have been benchmarked against parallel data from seven ‘peer’ institutions
  - Plays a critical role in developing a culture of inquiry on campus that says

  ‘we use data to make decisions’
  - Information is converted into increased organizational intelligence which supports organizational learning.
Director of IR and Assessment

External & Internal Reporting

Internal
Fact book
Facts & Figures
Faculty Workload

External
College Board Survey
Common Data Set
Thomson Petersons Surveys
ASHA
Middle States IP

Planning & Assessment Support

- Enrollment projections
- Revenue projections
- Accreditation self-studies
- Strategic Planning KPIs
- Units in preparation of assessment plans
- Special research projects

Data Management Technical Support

- Student database
- Data warehouse
- Hardware & software support
- Faculty workload & evaluation database
- Faculty evaluation

Assessment and Research

Outcomes assessment:
- Institutional Program & General Education

Survey research
- Campus climate research
- Institutional effectiveness
- Alumni studies
Adopted Principles

- **Assessment for improvement** is emphasized

- Activities are accomplished with *complete transparency and objectivity*.

- **Communication and collaboration** are key elements in the success of activities

- **Dissemination of findings** is essential for ensuring that results were made use of in planning and effecting change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Time Period Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Entering Student Survey (ESS), ACT*,</td>
<td>Admitted students</td>
<td>Fall (orientation week), annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 College Outcomes Survey (COS), ACT</td>
<td>Representative sample of undergraduate students</td>
<td>Spring (May), annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collegiate Assessment of Academic</td>
<td>Enrolled junior students</td>
<td>Spring, annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (CAAP), ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Graduating Senior Exit Survey (GSS)</td>
<td>Graduating students</td>
<td>Spring/Summer (June), annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE)</td>
<td>All students in courses</td>
<td>End of every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faculty Survey, HERI**</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Spring, every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Alumni Survey (AS),</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Summer, every five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS)</td>
<td>All AUB employees</td>
<td>Fall, every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Special Studies/ Satisfaction Surveys</td>
<td>Constituent groups</td>
<td>Fall and spring, annually, 10 departments/year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Common Data Set (CDS), College Board</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, Peterson’s, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Assessment Committee

- Develop a strategy for coordinating various assessment functions.
- Develop, supervise implementation and periodically review Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP).
- Review assessment reports and recommend actions for improvement.

Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP)

- A systematic and ongoing process of collecting information for improving the overall effectiveness of the institution.
- Lays a comprehensive approach to assessment, a complete framework of assessment for all units, departments, programs and offices with uniform standards and consistency of implementation, documentation and dissemination of assessment activities and results.
Institutional Assessment Plan

Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Assessment

Outcomes Assessment in the Major
General Education Outcomes
Program Review
Teaching & Research

Institutional Assessment

Administrative Units
Student Support Services
**OIRA Evolution Ladder**

**IR Blended with Institutional Effectiveness**
Assimilated data management/IR to ensure meeting AUB mission.

**Providing IR functions**
Data gathering, analysis & reporting; supporting planning, enrollment management, assessment, accreditation; information management

**Reporting institutional statistics**
Enrollment, graduation, persistence, class size, student/teacher ratios, etc...

**Integrating major data & information foundations and quality functions**
Integration of Data Functions

- At its core, integration reflects Data Diamond.
- Sustains a culture of evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement.
- An integrated model of quality & data functions are the latest practices in higher education institutions & are effective means of achieving a quality culture.
Excerpts from the Report

- University was classified as a 'high performer' characterized by a formal mission, very high management, very high autonomy, very high accountability, and relatively high participation.
- University seems to strike a balance between the different dimensions of governance, with one dimension needing improvement.
- Results on self-perception and questionnaire were very similar, except on participation.
### AUB UGSC Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auto-perception</th>
<th>Screening Card Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tabular Presentation

#### Graphic Presentation
Stakeholder participation in the decision-making process was the area in which the university presented relatively lower scores.

It was one of the dimensions on which the university's self-perception score was different from the score obtained through the questionnaire.

'Students have an active mode of representation within university, although they do not have a say when it comes to the definition of goals and type and number of courses offered'.

‘Impact on decision-making concentrating mainly in academic and staff groups, although others have a say’.
Reflections on Governance Screening Card Experience and Results

Report and results provided AUB with

- another measure of the effectiveness of its governance structure; an external validation of our internal assessments
- an overall snapshot of its governance system as well as a profile of strengths and weaknesses in various dimensions of governance
- opportunity to benchmark performance both nationally and regionally on an important dimension
- opportunity to monitor its progress over time on this important dimension, and to monitor effect of various initiatives to be undertaken
Alignment between QA Assessments, Strategic Planning at AUB and UGSC

- AUB found strong alignment between results of its own quality assurance assessments, both internal and external, and those of the UGSC.
- Accordingly, implementing a good number of its self-study recommendations and accomplishing university strategic goals would at the same time help improve performance on UGSC.
- So, action plans were NOT an add on to all that we are doing
1. Initiative: Implementing self-study recommendations on governance & administration
   Indicator: Extent of implementation of recommendations.

2. Initiative: Lay critical enablers for achieving goals by developing policies for facilitating academic governance and administration
   Indicator: Number of policies developed in last five years to uphold shared governance.
   - In the last six years, 35 policies have been developed or refined.
   - 14 policies in governance including the Unified Faculty Bylaws.
**Accountability & Participation: Domain Sub-scales**

1. Education Quality, Academic Integrity
2. Social Responsibility
3. Financial Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Dimension</th>
<th>Participation Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of different stakeholders in Decision Making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership in governing boards &amp; councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accountability - Quality Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal I</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Programs</td>
<td>Expanding Experiential and Community-Based Learning</td>
<td>Percent of programs having a 'capstone' component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count of internship / practicum courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service learning participation (number of students enrolled in service learning courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring and Expanding e-learning</td>
<td>Percent of course sections using learning management system (LMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of faculty members using technology in courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Blended Learning courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Library Data Bases and digital collections in AUB Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usage and growth of digital repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of online programs offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal III</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships and Collaborations</td>
<td>Collaborating with universities</td>
<td>Number of signed agreements with other universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating with governmental bodies</td>
<td>Number of memorandums of understanding with governmental bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating with the business sector</td>
<td>Number of signed agreements with the business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating with civil society organizations</td>
<td>Number of signed agreements with civil society organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship and Innovation</td>
<td>Establishing the Centre for Research &amp; Innovation as an incubator for start-up businesses &amp; inventions emerging from faculty, staff, and student projects</td>
<td>Number of intellectual property measures (patents, disclosures, licenses, options, new start-ups, surviving start-ups, etc.) which are result of effort of the &quot;Centre for Research &amp; Innovation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Expanding engaged scholarship and community-based learning</td>
<td>Total grants for development and community-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service learning participation (number of students enrolled in service learning courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting and deepening community service and outreach activities</td>
<td>Number of community related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students engaged in community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of extramural funding granted for community service/development projects during the year (in $000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing public spaces for inquiry and discourse</td>
<td>Student satisfaction with public facilities and public display spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E-Learning Initiative**

- An e-learning Task Force has been formed to explore the possibilities for e-learning and assess their appropriateness for AUB’s goals and context.
- Composed of faculty, staff, & students
- Surveyed: faculty, students & alumni
- Studied marketability (how suitable to employers), and IT infrastructure.

**All new programs.** Needs assessment is done and feedback of students, graduates, employers is sought.

**Financial Integrity Consultations**

- Town Hall Meetings with AUB leadership
- Board of Trustees meetings with faculty, students, & staff.
- Faculty Task Forces formed
Conclusion

- UGSC has broadened our conceptualization of university governance.

- Highlighted the need for an **integrated balanced approach** to university governance.

- Aligned very well with both our internal and external quality assurance assessments, as well as our strategic planning.

- Identified institutional profile with areas that need improvement to work on them.
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