

**American University of Sharjah
Sharjah, United Arab Emirates**

Self-Study Design

**Submitted to Middle States Commission on Higher Education
June 2017**

Contents

A.	Institutional Overview	2
A.i	AUS Description.....	2
A.ii	AUS Vision.....	4
A.iii	AUS Mission	4
A.iv	Recent Developments	4
A.v	Anticipated Directions Based on Planning and Assessment Processes.....	4
A.vi	Institutional Priorities	4
A.vii	Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study	8
B.	Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study	8
C.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups	9
D.	Charges to the Work Groups and Guidelines for Reporting.....	10
E.	Organization of the Final Self-Study Report.....	16
F.	Editorial Style and Format	16
G.	Timetable for the Self-Study.....	17
H.	Profile of the Evaluation Team	19
I.	Documentation Roadmap	19
STANDARD I:	Mission and Goals.....	25
STANDARD II:	Ethics and Integrity	26
STANDARD III:	Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	28
STANDARD IV:	Support of the Student Experience	30
STANDARD V:	Educational Effectiveness Assessment.....	31
STANDARD VI:	Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	33
STANDARD VII:	Governance, Leadership, and Administration.....	34

A. Institutional Overview

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should begin with a brief description of the institution, its mission, important recent developments, anticipated directions based on planning and assessment processes, and steps taken to date to prepare for Self-Study. This section creates a context for the shared understanding of the institutional needs and priorities to be addressed through Self-Study. Institutional priorities described in this section should also be reflected in the Charges to Working Groups section of the Design and guide the Self-Study process.

A.i AUS Description

Founded in 1997 by His Highness Sheikh Dr. Sultan bin Muhammad Al Qasimi, Member of the Supreme Council of the United Arab Emirates and Ruler of Sharjah, the university was envisaged by His Highness as a leading educational institution in the Gulf region. Consciously based upon American institutions of higher education, AUS is thoroughly grounded in Arab culture and is part of a larger process of the revitalization of intellectual life in the Middle East. We are an independent, not-for-profit coeducational institution that is proud of its role as a leading comprehensive coeducational university, serving students from the region and around the world.

AUS should be viewed within the cultural and environmental spheres it occupies—locally the emirate of Sharjah, nationally the UAE, regionally the Arabian Gulf and, more broadly, the Middle East. The emirate of Sharjah is one of seven independent states that make up the federation of the United Arab Emirates, the country occupying an area along the east central coast of the Arabian Gulf. Sharjah is the third largest of the emirates, having an area of 1,000 sq. miles (2,600 sq. kilometers), and is the only one to span the breadth of the UAE, having coastlines on both the Arabian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman. The emirate contains a wide variety of vistas - from palm-fringed sandy beaches to arid level plains, from gently rolling dunes to rugged mountain ranges. The university is located 10 miles (16 kilometers) from the city of Sharjah, the emirate's capital, which is situated on the shores of the Arabian Gulf. Sharjah has developed as a city of learning and the arts, as confirmed by its 1998 UNESCO designation as the Cultural Capital of the Arab World and by being named the Islamic Culture Capital for 2014 by the Organization of Islamic Countries. The city has nearly 30 museums covering art, science, history and culture, and hosts internationally recognized art exhibitions and literary festivals.

AUS is situated within University City, which is characterized by its attractive grounds and boulevards, and the distinctive architecture of domes and arches of its academic and administrative buildings. University City houses several colleges, universities and other facilities including:

- University of Sharjah, with separate men's and women's campuses, plus an associated College of Fine Arts, a medical college and a teaching hospital
- Higher Colleges of Technology, for national men and women, with gender-segregated campuses
- Al Qasimia University, a specialized Islamic institution
- Skyline University College
- Sharjah Police Sciences Academy

- Institute of Training and Judicial Studies
- University City Hall
- Dr. Sultan Al Qasimi Centre for Gulf Studies
- Regional Centre for Educational Planning and Training

The fact that AUS students come from many nationalities serves to reflect the high percentage of expatriates in the UAE. The most recent UAE government census, conducted in 2010, showed the population to be about 8.3 million (source: UAE Yearbook 2013, National Media Council). UAE nationals make up about 23 percent of this number. The UAE is renowned for its tolerance toward its large expatriate communities, which contain people from a rich variety of cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds. AUS follows this spirit of openness and admits students solely on the basis of academic qualifications, regardless of any other consideration. AUS has thereby succeeded in building an academic community that brings together people from diverse nations and backgrounds, and strives to instill in its students the importance of appreciating and understanding diversity, global issues and their own roles in society.

Islam is the official religion of the state, and Arab Islamic culture predominates. While Arabic is the official language of the UAE, English is commonly used as a *lingua franca* between the different communities. All classes (except for some in Arabic, French and translation studies) and administrative functions at AUS are conducted in English.

Recently, the Arabian Gulf region has seen unprecedented economic growth. This has, in turn, provided both challenges and opportunities for educational institutions. The rapid rate of development in the UAE has resulted not only in a significant increase in population, but also increases in both individual incomes and the cost of living. Several universities from North America, Europe, Australia and other parts of the world, taking the opportunity to offer educational services in this active economy, have opened branches in the UAE. Such a rapidly changing context will affect AUS as it looks to the future.

Today AUS offers 26 bachelor's degrees, 41 minors and 13 master's degrees through four academic units: the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Engineering (CEN), the College of Architecture, Art and Design (CAAD) and the School of Business Administration (SBA).

As a provider of quality higher education in the Gulf, AUS is licensed and its programs are accredited by the Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the Ministry of Education's Higher Education Affairs Division in the United Arab Emirates. AUS is also accredited in the United States of America by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The Bachelor of Science degree programs in chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer engineering, electrical engineering and mechanical engineering offered by the College of Engineering are accredited by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET. The Bachelor of Science degree program in computer science offered by the College of Engineering is accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET. The Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degrees offered by the School of Business Administration are accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The Bachelor of Architecture program of the College of Architecture, Art and Design is accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) of the United States.

A.ii AUS Vision

The vision of the university is that: 'American University of Sharjah (AUS) will be the region's leader in higher education, known for excellence and innovation in teaching, learning, research and service.'

A.iii AUS Mission

The university's Mission Statement is:

American University of Sharjah (AUS) is a comprehensive, independent, non-profit, coeducational institution of higher education that fosters excellence in teaching, learning and research. Based on an American model of higher education and grounded in the culture of the Gulf region, AUS fosters a community that embraces cultural diversity and whose members are committed to the ideals of open intellectual inquiry, ethical behavior and social and civic responsibility. An engaged, productive and effective member of society, AUS educates lifelong learners who display mastery in the core competencies of their areas of specialization, and who communicate clearly, think critically and solve problems creatively.

A.iv Recent Developments

The Sharjah Research, Technology and Innovation Park is under development adjacent to University City. The park is primarily owned by AUS Enterprises, a newly-established organization which itself is owned by AUS. AUS Enterprises is a holding company mandated to develop commercial activities with the aim to strengthen the financial resources of AUS through special purpose vehicles, including the management and execution of investment projects that support the university and strategic initiatives in the academic, research, technology and real estate sectors.

A.v Anticipated Directions Based on Planning and Assessment Processes

AUS aspires to become more research-oriented, and is developing a plan towards that goal. The university aims to begin doctoral programs in the near future, as well as to recruit additional faculty and staff to support the increased research orientation.

A.vi Institutional Priorities

The following institutional priorities were developed by the MSCHE Core Team. They were subsequently discussed and approved by the Steering Committee, and finally approved by the Chancellor.

- 1. We will be an institution that prepares all students to succeed in their professional endeavors, by providing excellent education, service, and research/scholarship opportunities.**

We will provide excellent education by providing excellent faculty and staff who are well-versed in instructional methods, excellent classroom and laboratory facilities, rigorous curricula and challenging assessment of student learning.

We will provide excellent service in areas such as academic support services, career services and others.

We will provide excellent research/scholarship opportunities by encouraging faculty to include graduate and undergraduate students in their research efforts, and by providing appropriate resources for such research.

2. We will be an institution that fosters the holistic development of students.

We will help students to develop beyond their academic pursuits in areas such as ethics, leadership and teamwork through providing opportunities to participate in activities and organizations outside of the classroom.

3. We will be an institution that uses effective and transparent internal and external communication practices.

We will communicate effectively and transparently with our internal and external stakeholders.

The elements of the institutional priorities are mapped to the elements of the AUS mission in Table 3. They are also mapped to the MSCHE standards in Table 4.

Table 3: Elements of the institutional priorities mapped to the elements of the AUS mission

		AUS Institutional Priorities					
		1a: Success in professional endeavors by providing an excellent education	1b: Success in professional endeavors by providing excellent service	1c: success in professional endeavors by providing excellent research/scholarship opportunities	2: Fostering the holistic development of students	3a: Using effective and transparent internal communication practices	3b: Using effective and transparent external communication practices
Elements of AUS Mission Statement	Excellence in teaching	✓				✓	✓
	Excellence in learning	✓				✓	✓
	Excellence in research	✓		✓		✓	✓
	Embraces cultural diversity		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Committed to the ideal of open intellectual inquiry	✓		✓		✓	✓
	Committed to the ideal of ethical behavior		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Committed to the ideal of social responsibility		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Committed to the ideal of civic responsibility		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Educates life-long learners who display mastery in their areas of specialization	✓		✓			✓
	Educates life-long learners who display mastery in thinking critically	✓		✓			✓
	Educates life-long learners who display mastery in solving problems creatively	✓		✓			✓

Table 4: Elements of the institutional priorities mapped to the MSCHE standards.

		AUS Institutional Priorities					
		1a: Success in professional endeavors by providing an excellent education	1b: Success in professional endeavors by providing excellent service	1c: success in professional endeavors by providing excellent research/scholarship opportunities	2: Fostering the holistic development of students	3a: Using effective and transparent internal communication practices	3b: Using effective and transparent external communication practices
MSCHE Accreditation Standards	Standard I: Mission and Goals	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Standard II: Ethics and Integrity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	✓		✓		✓	✓
	Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Standard V: Education Effectiveness Assessment	✓				✓	✓
	Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration					✓	✓

A.vii Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study

October 2016	Lee Blank (Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer) and Ahmed Abou Baker (Director, Institutional Research and Analysis) attended MSCHE Self-Study Institute.
January 2017	Dana Abouelnasr named Chair of Middle States Reaccreditation Steering Committee. MSCHE Core Team assembled and began weekly meetings.
February 2017	Workgroup chairs are recruited from among campus leaders. Workgroups are assembled by the Workgroup chairs in collaboration with the MSCHE Core Team. The Steering Committee was assembled comprising the MSCHE Core Team, the Workgroup Chairs, and other leaders of the university community.
March 2017	Steering Committee began monthly meetings. Workgroups are given their preliminary charges.
April 2017	The Self-Study Design is prepared by the MSCHE Core Team, with input from the Workgroups and in collaboration with the Steering Committee.

B. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

MSCHE Notes:

The intended outcomes of the Self-Study should be based on a clear understanding of what the institution plans to achieve through self-analysis. Stating a limited number of outcomes, in explicit and observable terms, will establish a clear direction for the Self-Study and will allow the institution to assess its own progress over time.

Outcomes, or goal statements, should focus on ways to integrate the Self-Study process with other institutional planning and renewal processes, thereby ensuring that the Self-Study will be as useful and meaningful as possible. Examples include:

- Demonstrating how the institution currently meets Middle States Standards for Accreditation with a focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the institution's vision, mission, and goals.*
- Documenting current assessment practices to identify challenges and opportunities and making recommendations for improvement in the use of institutional assessment results.*
- Capitalizing on the overlapping efforts of strategic planning and Middle States Self-Study to inform decision-making and to identify specific opportunities and challenges, including budgeting and enrollment.*
- Providing a concise and accurate analysis of the institution that can guide institutional planning, growth, and renewal efforts.*
- Engaging in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the institutional community.*
- Developing forward-looking recommendations to help the institution attain its goals in undergraduate and graduate education, research, and service for the public good.*
- Assessing the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and administrative services, at all degree levels and in all departments, particularly*

in relation to the changing needs of the institution's student body and community.

- *Analyzing the quality and effectiveness of the institution's processes for planning and assessment in order to make necessary adjustments to methods and measurements and ensure that the use of assessment data will lead to meaningful programmatic and institutional renewal.*

AUS views the self-study process as an important opportunity for reflection and continuous improvement. The expectations for the self-study include:

- The provision of evidence that AUS meets MSCHE Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation and therefore warrants reaccreditation.
- Affirmation that the university's mission and goals continue to be appropriate.
- An investigation into the quality and effectiveness of the university's planning and assessment processes to ensure that they are focused on continuous improvement and used to inform institutional decision-making and change.
- A reflective analysis that provides a realistic appraisal of the university's strengths and weaknesses.
- A set of focused and realistic suggestions/recommendations that can facilitate ongoing institutional improvement.

C. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include a clear description of the structure of the Steering Committee and the Working Groups, how they relate to each other, and how they fit into the organization of the institution as a whole. To the extent possible, the names and titles of the members of the Steering Committee and Working Groups should be included.

Members of the Steering Committee and the Working Groups have a vital role to play throughout the Self-Study. Members may be appointed or elected and they should represent the total campus community including faculty, administrators, staff, students and trustees. Members should possess expertise, credibility, availability, commitment and perspective; in addition, they must be given the time, resources and authority to carry out their Self-Study responsibilities.

Membership of the Steering Committee

- **Dana Abouelnasr**, Professor of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering (Chair and member of the MSCHE Core Team)
- **Ahmed Aboubaker**, Director of Institutional Research and Analysis (member of the MSCHE Core Team)
- **Teresa Crompton**, Research Administration Coordination, Office of Research and Graduate Studies (member of the MSCHE Core Team)
- **Leland Blank**, Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer (ex-officio member of the MSCHE Core Team)
- **Jeannette Vinke**, Chief Operating Officer
- **Rula Shahin**, Executive Assistant, Office of the Provost

- **Kevin Mitchell**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and Instruction (Chair of Work Group 1)
- **Juliet Coutinho**, Director of Judicial Affairs (Chair of Work Group 2)
- **Lutfi Albasha**, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering (Chair of Work Group 3)
- **Mehvash Ali**, Director of the Academic Support Center (Chair of Work Group 4)
- **Md. Maruf Mortula**, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering (Chair of Work Group 5)
- **Yass Alkafaji**, Associate Professor of Accounting, School of Business Administration (Chair of Work Group 6)
- **John Katsos**, Assistant Professor of Management, School of Business Administration (Chair of Work Group 7)
- **Daphne Flanagan**, University Librarian (Chair of Work Group 8)
- A student representative from the AUS Student Leadership Group to be named Fall 2017

D. Charges to the Work Groups and Guidelines for Reporting

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include a charge to each Working Group that defines the scope of its tasks and responsibilities, provides guidance for its research activities and preparation of reports, and is linked to institutional priorities. As discussed in the prior chapter, it is highly recommended that one Working Group be assigned to each Standard in order to ensure that each Standard is addressed sufficiently within the Self-Study. Institutions considering a different approach should speak with their staff liaison. Within the framework of the Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation, each Working Group is also expected to engage in a process of active and open inquiry, to identify institutional strengths and challenges, and to propose possible recommendations for ongoing improvement. For each Working Group, this section of the Design should include:

- *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation to be addressed;*
- *Names and titles of members, and the Designation of Working Group chair(s);*
- *Key sources of relevant documentation to be gathered, reviewed, summarized and used to support conclusions of the Self-Study*;*
- *Relevant institutional processes and procedures to be reviewed, summarized and used to support conclusions of the Self-Study*;*
- *Linkages, where appropriate, between the assigned Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation and relevant institutional priorities, as identified in the Overview section of the Design;*
- *Analysis of institutional strengths, challenges and opportunities for improvement (recommendations).*

**to be included in the Documentation Roadmap*

Self-study research questions of the kind emphasized in previous Commission self-study handbooks are not highlighted in this self-study model. If research questions are used, experience suggests that they are most helpful if they are limited in number, clearly linked to institutional priorities, aligned with relevant Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation, and designed to evoke analytical, not descriptive, responses.

Work Group 1: Mission and Goals

Work Group 1 is charged to: 1) evaluate the AUS Mission Statement and goals, considering the criteria in Standard I; 2) align the Requirements of Affiliation #7 and #10 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider all three institutional priorities as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Kevin Mitchell**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and Instruction (Chair)
- **Johnannes Martin Giesen**, Professor of Art and Design, College of Architecture, Art and Design
- **Linzi Kemp**, Associate Professor of Management, School of Business Administration
- **John Montague**, Assistant Professor of Architecture, College of Architecture, Art and Design
- **Scott Rousseau**, Senior Instructor, Bridge Program
- **Paul Sills**, Associate Director, Human Resources
- **Rick Angell**, Interim E-Learning Specialist
- **Uthra Varghese**, Undergraduate Student, College of Architecture, Art and Design

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 1.1 To what extent is the AUS mission statement structured to allow the university to measure how effectively it fulfills its mission?
- 1.2 To what extent is the AUS mission statement effectively communicated to stakeholders?
- 1.3 To what extent are the AUS goals structured to allow the university to measure how effectively it fulfills its goals?
- 1.4 To what extent are the AUS strategic priorities structured to allow the university to measure how effectively it fulfills its goals?
- 1.5 To what extent is the AUS strategic plan effectively communicated to stakeholders?

Work Group 2: Ethics and Integrity

Work Group 2 is charged to 1) evaluate the faithful execution of the AUS Mission, the honouring of its contracts and commitments, the adherence to its policies, and its truthful and transparent representation of itself, considering the criteria in Standard II; and 2) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider all three institutional priorities as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Juliet Coutinho**, Director of Judicial Affairs (Chair)
- **Pia Anderson**, Assistant Professor of International Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- **Lina El-Khoury**, Associate Registrar
- **Steve Crouch**, Senior Financial Analyst and Project Coordinator, Office of Finance
- **Noreen Barron**, Human Resources Manager

- **Farid Alvie**, Content Manager, Office of Strategic Communications and Marketing
- A student representative of the Conduct Council Hearing Board to be named Fall 2017

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 2.1** How successful is AUS in demonstrating a sustainable culture of ethics and integrity?
- 2.2** How effective is AUS in conveying institutional expectations of ethical behavior to students, faculty and staff?
- 2.3** What evidence does AUS have that appropriate policies and procedures, which are fair and impartial are in place and followed to address complaints or grievances raised by students, faculty and staff?

Work Group 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Work Group 3 is charged to: 1) evaluate the rigor and coherence of each academic program, certificate and degree level irrespective of modality, considering the criteria in Standard III; 2) align the Requirements of Affiliation #8, #9, #10 and #15 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider institutional priorities 1 and 3 as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Lutfi Albasha**, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering (Chair)
- **Hana Suleiman**, Professor and Department Head of Mathematics and Statistics, College of Arts and Sciences
- **Samer Kherfi**, Associate Professor of Economics, School of Business Administration
- **Mahmoud Ibrahim**, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering
- **Cindy Gunn**, Director, Faculty Development Center
- **Alanna Ross**, Associate University Librarian for Public Services
- **Kateryna Kadabashy**, undergraduate student and Peer Advisor in the Academic Support Center

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 3.1** How does AUS foster a coherent learning experience and promote learning?
- 3.2** To what extent does AUS ensure that its student learning experiences are designed, delivered, and assessed by qualified and sufficiently numbered faculty who are regularly reviewed, and are adequately supported, to provide rigorous and effective teaching?
- 3.3** To what extent does AUS effectively communicate program requirements to stakeholders?
- 3.4** To what extent does AUS ensure that adequate learning opportunities and resources are made available to help students succeed in their academic and professional endeavors?

- 3.5 To what extent does AUS provide opportunity for students to develop the intellectual skills, critical thinking and innovation, attitudes and values necessary to participate effectively in a rapidly evolving world?
- 3.6 What opportunities exist for students at AUS for research and scholarship?
- 3.7 What procedures does AUS employ to ensure that all programs of study are periodically assessed?

Work Group 4: Support of the Student Experience

Work Group 4 is charged to: 1) evaluate the student support function including recruitment and admission of students to instructional programs for which they show interest and have the ability to complete, commitment to student retention, graduation, and experiences that enhance student performance and foster success through the coherent strategies of a professional and qualified staff, considering the criteria in Standard IV; 2) align the Requirements of Affiliation #8 and #10 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider all three institutional priorities as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Mehvash Ali**, Director, Academic Support Center (Chair)
- **Lynda Ataya**, Registrar
- **Rami Mahfouz**, Director of Enrollment Services, Office of Enrollment Management
- **Munketh Taha**, Director of Student Development and Organizations
- **Aldrine Creado**, Manager, Financial Grants and Scholarships
- **Mohamed Otmani**, Manager, Career Advancement Services
- A representative of the Undergraduate Student Council to be named Fall 2017
- A student Peer Advisor from the Academic Support Center to be named Fall 2017

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 4.1 How effective are services available to support students in attaining appropriate goals in line with the mission of the university?
- 4.2 What student services and programs are available at AUS to ensure excellence in fostering the holistic development of students?
- 4.3 How effectively does AUS communicate information about student services and programs to current and prospective students?
- 4.4 What policies and procedures are in place to secure and maintain the confidentiality of student records?
- 4.5 What procedures are in place to ensure maintenance of standards of services provided or assessed by third party providers?

Work Group 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Work Group 5 is charged to: 1) evaluate the process by which AUS assesses student learning outcomes that show students have achieved educational goals consistent

with their program of study, degree level and in accordance with AUS' mission and with expectations appropriate for an institution of higher education, considering the criteria in Standard V; 2) align the Requirements of Affiliation #8, #9 and #10 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider institutional priorities 1 and 3 as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Md. Maruf Mortula**, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering (Chair)
- **Jerry Kolo**, Professor of Urban Planning, College of Architecture, Art and Design
- **Joe Wallis**, Professor of Management, School of Business Administration
- **Yehya Elsayed**, Associate Professor of Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences
- **Rhonda Stricklett**, Information Literacy Librarian
- A student representative of the Graduate Student Association to be named in Fall 2017

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 5.1 How are student learning outcomes at the program and institutional level related to the AUS mission?
- 5.2 How program and institutional goals assessed?
- 5.3 How are the assessment results used for improvement of educational effectiveness?
- 5.4 How does AUS assess the effectiveness of the general education program?
- 5.5 How does AUS support underprepared students, accelerated students, and underprepared faculties?
- 5.6 How is a periodic evaluation of the assessment process carried out?

Work Group 6: Planning, Resources and Institutional Improvement

Work Group 6 is charged to: 1) evaluate that the alignment of AUS' planning process, resources, and structures are sufficient to fulfill the institutional mission and goals, and provide for the continuous improvement of programs and services to students while remaining responsive to opportunities and challenges, considering the criteria in Standard VI; 2) align the Requirements of Affiliation #8, #10 and #11 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider institutional priorities 1 and 3 as they relate to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **Yass Alkafaji**, Associate Professor of Accounting, School of Business Administration (Chair)
- **Reem Al Alami**, Finance Manager
- **Bashar Nusir**, Project Manager, Information Technology
- **Alina Balonuskova**, Business Analyst, Office of the Chief Operating Officer
- **Randa Bou-Mehdi**, Instructor of Writing, College of Arts and Sciences
- **Thomas Hodge**, Assistant University Librarian for Technology and Technical Services

- **Zubaida Muhumed**, Graduate Student, School of Business Administration

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 6.1 How are institutional objectives, both institution-wide and for individual units assessed?
- 6.2 How are assessment results used in the planning and improvement process?
- 6.3 How is the financial and budgeting process linked to the institution and unit strategic plans and objectives?
- 6.4 To what extent are fiscal and human resources appropriate to support operations?

Work Group 7: Governance, Leadership and Administration

Work Group 7 is charged to: 1) evaluate how AUS governs and administers in a manner that permits it to realize its mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies that it serves, considering the criteria in Standard VII; 2) align the requirements of Affiliation #12 and #13 with the Standard; and 3) use relevant documents, policies and procedures (found in the Documentation Roadmap) to make recommendations for institutional improvement. The Work Group will consider Institutional Priority 3 as it relates to their standard and requirements. The members of this work group are:

- **John Katsos**, Assistant Professor of Management, School of Business Administration (Chair)
- **Basheer Daoud**, Executive Director of Finance
- **Hazim El-Baz**, Associate Professor of Industrial Engineering, College of Engineering
- **Jeffry Singer**, Visiting Instructor of Management, School of Business Administration
- Student representative of the SBA Dean's Business Team

Examples of the research questions that this work group will consider are:

- 7.1 How effectively does the Board of trustees communicate with internal and external stakeholders?
- 7.2 How effectively does the Chancellor communicate with internal and external stakeholders?
- 7.3 How effectively does University leadership communicate with internal and external stakeholders?
- 7.4 How effectively does the Board of Trustees support and oversee policymaking and quality?
- 7.5 How does the Board of Trustees manage potential and actual conflicts of interest?
- 7.6 How do the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and University leadership manage and supervise the financial health of the University?

Work Group 8: Documentation Roadmap

Work Group 8 is charged to i) provide and maintain information resources to assist the other Work Groups and Steering Committee in the performance of their charges; and ii) Assist Work Groups in procuring required documents when necessary, appropriate and feasible. The members of this work group are:

- **Daphne Flanagan**, University Librarian (Chair)
- **Veronique Lecat**, Technical Services Librarian
- **Frank Seiffee**, Director of Information Technology
- **Nabeel Amireh**, Director of Academic Computing

E. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include an annotated outline of the organization and structure of the final Self-Study Report.

The final Self-Study report will be organized as follows:

Executive Summary

- A brief (1-5 page) description of the major findings and recommendations of the Self-Study

Introduction

- A brief overview of the institution and description of the Self-Study process

For each Standard:

- A heading indicating the Standard under consideration
- A description of the topic(s) under review and analysis of the evidence considered, with appropriate reference to the Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation
- Cross-references to relevant materials in other parts of the report
- Analysis of relevant strengths and challenges, with appropriate reference to Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation
- Recommendations for improvement

Conclusions

- A summary of the major conclusions and recommendations offered in the report.

List of Acronyms

Appendices

F. Editorial Style and Format

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include guidelines to facilitate consistency of style across all documents (i.e., Working Group drafts and reports, supporting documentation, the final Self-Study Report). These guidelines should specify the word processing program to be used, fonts, margins, spacing, the use of institutional acronyms, and so forth. Writing and editing the Self-Study Report should be understood as a multi-phase activity.

Members of the Working Groups should clearly understand how final editorial changes will be made, and consistency of style throughout the process will allow interim reports to be more easily combined into a seamless final document.

Institutions may assign final editorial responsibility to members of the Steering Committee or invite a designated editor to participate throughout the Self-Study process.

The following guidelines are provided for the final report from each Work Group. The structure of the final reports is:

- Purpose: Clearly state what the Work Group set out to accomplish.
 - Discuss any connection with another Work Group, including any collaboration between groups.
- Scope: Identify the extent of research done, including any limitations imposed by the Work Group or other source.
 - Data that were collected
 - Interviews that were conducted
 - Data gaps that remain
- Methods: Describe the evaluation methods that were used
 - Data analysis
 - Models or best practices use for comparison
 - Experts called upon to assist in the evaluation
- Conclusions: Explain what the Work Group's research revealed
 - Strengths and challenges
- Recommendations
 - Improvements that could make the University's performance in this area more effective or complete.
 - How these recommendations could improve the University's overall effectiveness.

The following guidelines regarding the format of the final Work Group reports will help to assure consistency:

- Individual Working Group reports will be no longer than ten pages.
- Use 11 point Verdana font, 1.15 spacing, with one-inch margins.
- Use 16 point, non-bold Georgia font for heading.
- Line break between paragraphs; do not indent paragraphs.
- Acronyms: Written out in full for the first usage, with acronym in parentheses; thereafter use acronym. Provide list of acronyms at end.
- Do not use headers or footers, other than page numbers at the bottom-middle of the page.
- Write in the third person; avoid 'I' and 'we' statements.
- When referring to documentation, provide relevant section or page numbers as appropriate.

G. Timetable for the Self-Study

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include a timeline for every major step in the process, beginning with the early stages of on-campus planning activities and culminating with the Commission's accreditation action approximately two-and-one-half years later.

Academic Year 2016-2017	
November 2016	Self-Study Institute

January 2017	Assign Chair, assemble Steering Committee Core group
February-March 2017	Assemble Working Groups and Steering Committee
March-April 2017	Develop Self-Study Design
April 10, 2017 (target)	Working Group reports to the Steering Committee Core group
April 17, 2017 (target)	Send Self-Study Design to MSCHE Liaison
May 1-2, 2017	MSCHE Liaison visit
June 2017	Self-Study Design Revisions complete (with approval from MSCHE)
<i>Academic Year 2017-2018</i>	
August-September, 2017	Work Groups gather necessary documentation, including documentation for compliance report
October-December 2017	Working Groups review data, conduct interviews, meet with Steering Committee
December 2017	Progress updates due from Work Group Chairs
February 2018	First drafts of chapters from Working Groups; feedback obtained from Steering Committee Core group
February-May 2018	Team Chair selected and confirmed
April 2018	Second drafts from Working Groups; feedback obtained from Steering Committee Core group
May-June 2018	Chair drafts complete Self-study based on drafts by Working Groups
<i>Academic Year 2018-2019</i>	
August-September 2018	Review and community-wide discussion of Self-Study; revisions made as necessary based on feedback. Begin preparation of Verification of Compliance Report
October 2018	Second draft of Self-Study generated and distributed
November 2018	Self-Study draft to Team Chair in advance of Preliminary Visit Preliminary Visit by Team Chair; feedback on Self-Study draft
December 2018	Verification of Compliance report due
February 2019	Final version of Self-Study produced and sent to Visiting Team (6 weeks prior to visit)
March/April 2019	Visiting Team on campus

H. Profile of the Evaluation Team

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include the institution's recommendations concerning the characteristics of the chairperson and team members who will visit the institution. Recommendations should take into consideration institutional type and size, constituencies served, and institutional priorities. This section should include a list of peer and aspirational peer institutions, preferably from the Middle States region, and should also indicate any institutions whose representatives might present a conflict-of-interest as outlined in the Commission policy, Conflict of Interest: Peer Evaluators and Commissioners. Although the institution's expressed preferences will be given careful consideration, the final decision about team membership remains with the Commission and its staff.

AUS requests that the Commission consider the following characteristics when selecting the visiting evaluation team:

1. Members who have experience of strong professional programs with a liberal arts core.
2. Members familiar with the middle-sized non-profit institutions that serve a mix of residential and commuter students.
3. Members with experience with both undergraduate and Masters level programs.
4. Members who are not focused on doctoral programs or medical programs.
5. Members with international experience, but who are not from universities in the UAE.
6. Members who are from the following or similar universities:
 - a. Stevens Institute of Technology
 - b. Lehigh University
 - c. Carnegie Mellon University
 - d. American University of Cairo
 - e. American University of Paris

I. Documentation Roadmap

MSCHE Notes:

The Design should include an annotated inventory of recent and current accreditation reports, assessment and planning data, enrolment and financial information, policies, procedures and other resources that the Working Groups will use as they conduct their inquiry and analysis. The institution should organize these resources using the format of the Documentation Roadmap.

Although this inventory will change and develop throughout the Self-Study process, the Design should include an early version of the final range of documents, demonstrating that adequate information will be made available to the Steering Committee, the Working Groups, and the Evaluation Team. A template is available in Appendix B. Each institution should review the Standards, including their component

criteria, as well as the accompanying Requirements of Affiliation, to ascertain the best way to provide relevant source material in support of the Self-Study.

Because some Standards overlap, certain types of source material may be relevant to the inquiry of more than one Working Group. Some documentation is fairly straightforward and readily accessible (e.g., mission statements, financial audits, faculty and student handbooks); other documentation may require the description and analysis of complex, multi-layered institutional processes and procedures (e.g., how the budgeting process is linked to strategic planning, how assessment results are utilized to improve educational effectiveness). The institution should use existing documentation whenever possible. If necessary to address perceived gaps, the Steering Committee may decide to gather new documentation through a small number of limited research projects.

Resources included in the Documentation Roadmap will be used in several ways: as primary source material to support the inquiry of the Working Groups, as appendices to the final Self-Study Report, and for review by the Evaluation Team.

Requirements of Affiliation

<i>Requirement of Affiliation</i>	<i>Compliance Process /Aligned with which Standard?</i>	<i>Documents, Processes and Procedures</i>
1. The institution is authorized or licensed to operate as a postsecondary educational institution and to award postsecondary degrees; it provides written documentation demonstrating both. Authorization or licensure is from an appropriate governmental organization or agency within the Middle States region (Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands), as well as by other agencies as required by each of the jurisdictions, regions, or countries in which the institution operates.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	CAA decree for license to operate as a university
2. The institution is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate Catalog • Graduate Catalog • AUS Factbook

3. For institutions pursuing Candidacy or Initial Accreditation, the institution will graduate at least one class before the evaluation team visit for initial accreditation takes place (Step 7 of the initial accreditation process), unless the institution can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission that the lack of graduates does not compromise its ability to demonstrate appropriate learning outcomes.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	Not Applicable
4. The institution's representatives communicate with the Commission in English, both orally and in writing.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	Previous reports to the MSCHE (2008 self-study and 2013 Periodic Progress Report)
5. The institution complies with all applicable government (usually Federal and state) policies, regulations, and requirements.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	CAA decree for license to operate as a university
6. The institution complies with applicable Commission, interregional, and inter-institutional policies. These policies can be viewed on the Commission website, www.msche.org .	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	Previous reports to the MSCHE (2008 self-study and 2013 Periodic Progress Report)
7. The institution has a statement of mission and goals, approved by its governing body that defines its purpose within the context of higher education.	Standard I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • AUS Strategic Plan
8. The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.	Standards III, IV, V and VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAA program self-study reports • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Student Handbook</i> • <i>AUS Policies and Procedures Manual</i> • Program effectiveness and survey reports: Office of Registrar, Academic Support

		<p>Center, Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Student Affairs, Advancement and Alumni Affairs, Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freshmen Survey • Exit Survey • Advising Survey • Registration Process Survey • Residence Hall Survey • General Education Requirements and Assessments, • Outcomes assessment plans for each college and school
9. The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.	Standards III and V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>AUS Factbook</i> • <i>AUS Prospectus</i> • Academic Unit websites • Professional program websites • Self-Study reports from CAA Accreditation • General Education Requirements and Assessments • Outcomes assessment plans for each college
10. Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.	Standards I, III, IV, V and VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Strategic Plan • Program effectiveness and survey reports: Office of Registrar, Academic Support Center, Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Student Affairs, Advancement and Alumni Affairs, Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships • Freshmen Survey • Exit Survey • Advising Survey • Registration Process Survey • Residence Hall Survey • Data pertaining to: retention rates, 6-year graduation rates, other graduation data,

		<p>placement data at time of graduation, admission data, exchange student data, probation data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Study reports from CAA accreditation • Proposals for the BA in Psychology and BS in Physics • Internal vetting procedure document
<p>11. The institution has documented financial resources, funding base, and plans for financial development, including those from any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership) adequate to support its educational purposes and programs and to ensure financial stability. The institution demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, has a prepared budget for the current year, and undergoes an external financial audit on an annual basis.</p>	Standard VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Strategic Plan • AUS Budget (2-year projection) • Budgets by college/school and department • RTI Park: AUS Enterprises strategic plan • Audited financial statements for several years • Auditor's Management Letter and AUS responses
<p>12. The institution fully discloses its legally constituted governance structure(s) including any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership). The institution's governing body is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out.</p>	Standard VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University by-laws • Organizational chart • Founding Decrees • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Staff Handbook</i> • <i>Policies and Procedures Manual</i>
<p>13. A majority of the institution's governing body's members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in</p>	Standard VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University by-laws • Board of Trustees by-laws • Board of Trustees information (name, affiliation and occupation;

the institution. The governing body adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. The institution's district/system or other chief executive officer shall not serve as the chair of the governing body.		members who are remunerated by the institution through salaries, wages or fees; members who are creditors of the institution; guarantors of institutional debt, or active members of businesses of which the institution is a customer)
14. The institution and its governing body/bodies will make freely available to the Commission accurate, fair, and complete information on all aspects of the institution and its operations. The governing body/bodies ensure that the institution describes itself in comparable and consistent terms to all of its accrediting and regulatory agencies, communicates any changes in accredited status, and agrees to disclose information (including levels of governing body compensation, if any) required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS	Previous reports to the MSCHE (2008 self-study and 2013 Periodic Progress Report)
15. The institution has a core of faculty (full-time or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals with sufficient responsibility to the institution to assure the continuity and coherence of the institution's educational programs.	Standard III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>AUS Factbook</i>

STANDARD I: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

<i>Standard I Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
<p>1. Clearly defined mission and goals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. are developed through appropriate collaborative participation by all who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional development and improvement b. address external as well as internal contexts and constituencies; c. are approved and supported by the governing body d. guide faculty, administration, staff, and governing structures in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and the definition of institutional and educational outcomes e. include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity, at all levels and of the type appropriate to the institution f. are publicized and widely known by the institution's internal stakeholders g. are periodically evaluated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes or other material from the strategic planning process • AUS Strategic Plan • Board of Trustees meeting minutes • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • Budget planning processes • Board of Trustees progress reports
<p>2. Institutional goals are realistic, appropriate to higher education and consistent with mission.</p>	<p>AUS Strategic Plan</p>
<p>3. Institutional goals focus on student learning and related outcomes and on institutional improvement; are supported by administrative, educational, and student support programs and services; and are consistent with institutional mission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Strategic Plan • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • Material related to administrative, educational, and student support programs and services; e.g. financial grant measures, Academic Support Center initiatives, disability service provisions, etc.
<p>4. Periodic assessment of mission and goals to ensure that they are relevant and achievable.</p>	<p>Board of Trustees progress reports</p>

STANDARD II: Ethics and Integrity

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

<i>Standard II Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
1. Commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • AUS Institutional Review Board website: https://www.aus.edu/info/200145/research_and_graduate_studies/472/research/7 • Library's copyright permissions service: library.aus.edu/faculty-resources/copyright-permissions-service/ • library.aus.edu/faculty-resources/copyright-permissions-service/ • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i>
2. A climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • Templates of Faculty Orientation Program by Department of Human Resources and Faculty Development Center • Staff Orientation Training Program by Department of Human Resources • Student orientation • <i>Student Handbook</i> • University Cultural Events Committee guidelines • <i>AUS Factbook</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • Student Academic Integrity Pledge
3. A grievance policy that is documented and disseminated to address complaints or grievances raised by students, faculty, or staff. The institution's policies and procedures are fair and impartial, and assure that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student Handbook</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • Department of Human Resources Policies and Processes – 'Problem Resolution' Policy/80.0
4. The avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all activities and among all constituents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict of Interest policy for trustees and disclosure form • Statement of Board of Trustee Member Commitment and Responsibilities • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • Student Code of Conduct • <i>Delegation of Authority Manual</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Human Resources Policy Manual</i>
5. Fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline and separation of employees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Human Resources Policies and Procedures • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Delegation of Authority Manual</i> • Promotion process: Job Analysis Questionnaire Template • Staff Employment contracts template and Faculty Employment contracts template
6. Honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials and practices, as well as in internal communications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Communications Policies • AUS Web Policy • AUS Social Media Policy • <i>AUS Editorial Style Guide</i> • Publication Policy • CAA guidelines on when and how programs are advertised • Public Disclosure and Integrity Policy
7. As appropriate to mission, services or programs in place to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. promote affordability and accessibility b. enable students to understand funding sources and options, value received for cost, and methods to make informed decisions about incurring debt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Enrollment Management brochures • Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships leaflets • AUS website • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • Enrollment Packs • <i>Student Handbook</i>
8. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements to include reporting regarding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure or licensing board pass rates b. the institution's compliance with the Commission's Requirements of Affiliation c. substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion d. the institution's compliance with the Commission's policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAA program and university reports • Previous reports to MSCHE
9. Periodic assessment of ethics and integrity as evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Staff Handbook</i> • <i>Student Handbook</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i>

STANDARD III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

<i>Standard III Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
1. Certificate, undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential, designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>AUS Factbook</i> • <i>AUS Prospectus</i>
2. Student learning experiences that are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and /or other appropriate professionals who are rigorous and effective in teaching, assessment of student learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, as appropriate to the institution's mission, goals, and policies b. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and /or other appropriate professionals who are qualified for the positions they hold and the work they do c. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and /or other appropriate professionals who are sufficient in number d. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and /or other appropriate professionals who are provided with and utilize sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for professional growth and innovation e. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and /or other appropriate professionals who are reviewed regularly and equitably based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Annual Reports • Course Assessment Reports • Teaching awards • Research awards • Teaching evaluations • Student evaluation reports • Faculty CVs / Bios • DSS – the faculty database • <i>AUS Factbook</i> • Faculty Research Grants and Travel grants (Office of Research and Graduate Studies) • Professional grants • <i>Faculty Handbook</i>

3. Academic programs of study that are clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution in a way that students are able to understand and follow degree and program requirements and expected time to completion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Student Handbook</i> • Registration pack
4. Sufficient learning opportunities and resources to support both the institution's programs of study and students' academic progress.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Resources Guide (Academic Support Center website)
<p>5. At institutions that offer undergraduate education: A general education program, free standing or integrated into academic disciplines, that:</p> <p>a. offers a sufficient scope to draw students into new areas of intellectual experience, expanding their cultural and global awareness and cultural sensitivity, and preparing them to make well-reasoned judgments outside as well as within their academic field</p> <p>b. offers a curriculum designed so that students acquire and demonstrate essential skills including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy. Consistent with mission, the general education program also includes the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives</p> <p>c. In non-US institutions that do not include general education, provides evidence that students can demonstrate general education skills</p>	<i>Undergraduate Catalog</i>
6. In institutions that offer graduate and professional education, opportunities for the development of research, scholarship, and independent thinking, provided by faculty and/or other professionals with credentials appropriate to graduate-level curricula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Admissions Prospectus</i> • Internal Faculty Grant program policy • Faculty CVs
7. Adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval on any student learning opportunities designed, delivered, or assessed by third party	

providers.	
8. Periodic assessment of the programs providing student learning opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exit survey • Employer surveys • Course outcome assessment • Advisory board meeting minutes • Professional accreditations regional and international • Student evaluations • LibQual Survey

STANDARD IV: Support of the Student Experience

<i>Standard IV Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
<p>1. Clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to admit, retain, and facilitate the success of students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals provide a reasonable expectation for success and are compatible with institutional mission, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. accurate and comprehensive information regarding expenses, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, repayment, and refunds b. a process by which students who are not adequately prepared for the study at the level for which they have been admitted are identified, placed, and supported in attaining appropriate educational goals c. orientation, advisement, and counseling programs to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience d. processes designed to enhance the successful achievement of students' educational goals including certificate and degree completion, transfer to other institutions, and post-completion placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • Reports, data, and information/ application packet from Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships • AUS admission (undergraduate and graduate) prospectus • AUS Website: Policies and Procedures of Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships, Academic Support Center, University Counseling Services, Office of Advancement and Alumni Affairs, Office of the Registrar, Writing Center, Math Learning Center, Department of Finance, Testing Center, International Exchange Office, Library • Exit Survey
<p>2. Policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits, and credits awarded through experiential learning, prior non-academic learning, competency-based assessment, and other alternative learning approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer policy document from the Office of Registrar • Course approval forms from the Office of the Registrar • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i>

3. Policies and procedures for the safe and secure maintenance and appropriate release of student information and records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • Information Technology policies • Academic Computing policies and procedures • Office of the Registrar policies and procedures • University Health Center Record-keeping Policy • University Counseling Services Record-keeping Policy • Public Affairs Record-keeping Policy
4. If offered, athletic, student life, and other extracurricular activities that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles and procedures that govern all other programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Student Handbook</i> • Office of Student Affairs <i>Insight</i> newsletter • AUS website • Office of Student Affairs policies and procedures • Freshmen Orientation Packs • Office of Student Affairs facts/figures • Office of Student Affairs reflection surveys • Post-event evaluation forms • Exit forms • Student feedback • Success stories
5. If applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of student support services, designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers.	
6. Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs supporting the student experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program effectiveness and survey reports: Office of Registrar, Academic Support Center, Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Student Affairs, Advancement and Alumni Affairs, Office of Financial Grants and Scholarships • Freshmen Survey • Exit Survey • Advising Survey • Registration Process Survey • Residence Hall Survey

STANDARD V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

<i>Standard V Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
1. Clearly stated student learning outcomes, at the institution and degree/program levels, which are interrelated with one another, with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Graduate Catalog</i> • <i>Undergraduate Catalog</i>

relevant educational experiences, and with the institution's mission.	
<p>2. Organized and systematic assessments, conducted by faculty and/or appropriate professionals, evaluating the extent of student achievement of institutional and degree/program goals. Institutions should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> define meaningful curricular goals with defensible standards for evaluating whether students are achieving those goals articulate how they prepare students in a manner consistent with their missions for successful careers, meaningful lives, and, where appropriate, further education. They should collect and provide data on the extent to which they are meeting these goals support and sustain assessment of student achievement and communicate the results of this assessment to stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-Study Reports from CAA accreditation General Education Requirements and Assessments
<p>3. Consideration and use of assessment results for the improvement of educational effectiveness. Consistent with the institution's mission, such uses include some combination of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> assisting students in improving their learning improving pedagogy and curriculum reviewing and revising academic programs and support services planning, conducting, and supporting a range of professional development activities planning and budgeting for the provision of academic programs and services informing appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs improving key indicators of student success, such as retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates implementing other processes and procedures designed to improve educational programs and services 	Self-Study reports from CAA accreditation

4. If applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of assessment services designed, delivered, or assessed by third party providers.	Not applicable
5. Periodic evaluation of the assessment processes utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Documentation • AUS Policies and Procedures Manual • Self-Study Reports from CAA Accreditation • Course Approval Forms

STANDARD VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

<i>Standard VI Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
1. Institutional objectives, both institution-wide and for individual units, that are clearly stated, assessed appropriately, linked to mission and goal achievement, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, and are used for planning and resource allocation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUS Strategic Plan • AUS Budget (2-year projection) • Budgets by college and departments • RTI Park: AUS Enterprises strategic plan
2. Clearly documented and communicated planning and improvement processes that provide for constituent participation and incorporate the use of assessment results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory Control Plan • Budget Review Process • AUS Strategic Plan • CAA Program Self-Studies • CAA License Renewal Self Study • Renovation and Maintenance Report • Construction update report
3. A financial planning and budgeting process that is aligned with the institution's mission and goals, evidence-based, and clearly linked to the institution's and units' strategic plans/objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for the operational budget • AUS Budget (2-year projection) • Budgets by college and departments • AUS Strategic Plan
4. Fiscal and human resources as well as the physical and technical infrastructure are adequate to support the institution's operations wherever and however programs are delivered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAA Program Self-Studies • CAA License Renewal Self-Study • The professional accreditation reviews for programs accredited by professional organizations. • <i>AUS Factbook</i> • Resource allocation document for Academic Computing Group and Central IT • Report on library resources • NACUBO report
5. Clear assignment of responsibility and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational chart • Board of Trustees By-laws • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Delegation of Authority Manual</i> • <i>Staff Handbook</i> • Library policies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Analysis Questionnaire: Job Administrative Questionnaire
6. Comprehensive planning for facilities, infrastructure, and technology that includes consideration of sustainability and deferred maintenance and is linked to the institution's strategic and financial planning processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities and infrastructure planning procedures • Academic Computing Group request forms and evaluations • AUS Strategic Plan • AUS budgets
7. An annual independent audit confirming financial viability with evidence of follow-up on any concerns cited in the audit's accompanying management letter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audited financial statements for several years • Auditor's Management Letter and AUS responses
8. Strategies to measure and assess the adequacy and efficient utilization of institutional resources required to support the institution's mission and goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAA program self-studies • CAA License Renewal Self Study • Budget system evaluations on resource usage • AUS budgets and corresponding financial statements • List of internal auditor reports by area
9. Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal auditor reports • Board of Trustees meeting minutes • Budget system evaluations on resource request and usage

STANDARD VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

<i>Standard VII Criteria</i>	<i>Documents, Processes, and Procedures</i>
1. A clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that outlines its roles, responsibilities and accountability for decision making by each constituency, including governing body, administration, faculty, staff and students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University by-laws • Organizational chart • Founding Decrees • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Staff Handbook</i> • <i>Policies and Procedures Manual</i>
2. A legally constituted governing body that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. serves the public interest, ensures that the institution clearly states and fulfills its mission and goals, has fiduciary responsibility for the institution, and is ultimately accountable for the academic quality, planning, and fiscal well-being of the institution b. has sufficient independence and expertise to ensure the integrity of the institution. Members must have primary responsibility to the accredited institution and not allow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University by-laws • Board of Trustees by-laws • Board of Trustees committee structure • Board of Trustees names and information • Board of Trustees meeting agendas • Board of Trustees meeting minutes • Board of Trustees committee agendas • Board of Trustees committee minutes • Board of Trustees Audit Committee agendas • Board of Trustees Audit Committee minutes • CEO Performance Evaluation Criteria • Board of Trustees Written Conflict of

<p>political, financial, or other influences to interfere with their governing responsibilities</p> <p>c. ensures that neither the governing body nor individual members interferes in the day-to-day operations of the institution</p> <p>d. oversees at the policy level the quality of teaching and learning, the approval of degree programs and the awarding of degrees, the establishment of personnel policies and procedures, the approval of policies and by laws, and the assurance of strong fiscal management</p> <p>e. plays a basic policy-making role in financial affairs to ensure integrity and strong financial management. This may include a timely review of audited financial statements and/or other documents related to the fiscal viability of the institution</p> <p>f. Appoints and regularly evaluates the performance of the Chief Executive Officer</p> <p>g. is informed in all its operations by principles of good practice in board governance</p> <p>h. establishes and complies with a written conflict of interest policy designed to ensure that impartiality of the governing body by addressing matters such as payment for services, contractual relationships, employment, and family, financial or other interests that could pose or be perceived as conflicts of interest</p> <p>i. supports the Chief Executive Officer in maintaining the autonomy of the institution</p>	<p>Interest Statement</p>
<p>3. A Chief Executive Officer who:</p> <p>a. is appointed by, evaluated by, and reports to the governing body and shall not chair the governing body</p> <p>b. has appropriate credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization</p> <p>c. has the authority and autonomy required to fulfill the responsibilities of the position, including developing and implementing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University by-laws • Board of Trustees by-laws • Chancellor job description • Chancellor CV • Chancellor hiring process • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Staff Handbook</i> • <i>Policies and Procedures Manual</i> • Organizational chart • Top management team CVs

<p>institutional plans, staffing the organization, identifying and allocating resources, and directing the institution toward attaining the goals and objectives set forth in its mission</p> <p>d. has the assistance of qualified administrators, sufficient in number, to enable the Chief Executive Officer to discharge his/her duties effectively; and is responsible for establishing procedures for assessing the organization's efficiency and effectiveness</p>	
<p>4. An administration possessing or demonstrating:</p> <p>a. an organizational structure that is clearly defined and that clearly defines reporting relationships</p> <p>b. an appropriate size and with relevant experience to assist the Chief Executive Officer in fulfilling his/her roles and responsibilities</p> <p>c. members with credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization and their functional roles</p> <p>d. skills, time, assistance, technology, and information systems expertise required to perform their duties</p> <p>e. regular engagement with faculty and student in advancing the institution's goals and objectives</p> <p>f. systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units and for using assessment data to enhance operations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational chart • <i>Policies and Procedures Manual</i> • University by-laws • Top management team CVs • Top management team job descriptions • Top management team training schedules • <i>Faculty Handbook</i> • <i>Policies and Procedures Manual</i>
<p>5. Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance, leadership, and administration.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Audit Scope and Structure • Internal Audit Policies and Procedures • Board of Trustees Audit Committee Scope and Structure • Board of Trustees Audit Committee Policies and Procedures