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The RA Prime Minister and the RA Minister of Education and Science participated in the event dedicated to the 20th anniversary of the American University of Armenia. The series of events called “Education Festival” launched at the American University of Armenia on September 26 and will run until October 1.

Among participants of today’s festivity dedicated to the university’s 20th anniversary were several honorable guests, university students, graduates and state officials, including RA Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan and RA Minister of Education and Science Armen Ashotyan. In light of the university’s 20th anniversary, there to bring his patriarchal wish to the academic institution was Catholicos of All Armenians Karekin II.

The event began with a march with the Armenian, U.S. and AUA flags, the national anthems of both countries and an opening speech by AUA President, Dr. Bruce Poghosyan who briefly presented the hard road and the current plan for advancement.

On behalf of the Armenian government, Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan congratulated the university on its 20th anniversary and said the 20th anniversary of Armenia’s independence and the 20th anniversary of AUA represented a great symbol. “In a rapidly changing world, knowledge must be the main instrument for strengthening our statehood. I am pleased to see that there is an American University in Armenia, which has undergone the trials and tribulations with Armenia and is currently developing its new plan for advancement. I think the American University of Armenia must expand, its functions should become more versatile and it should provide its services to many youth in Armenia,” the Prime Minister mentioned.

The head of the Armenian government added that knowledge is the main demand in today’s world and the nations that understand that are armed with knowledge and give new knowledge. He also expressed certainty that the American University would continue that mission in the Republic of Armenia.

The Prime Minister also expressed satisfaction with the fact that the American University of Armenia is a U.S. accredited university, which goes to show that all educational processes take place in line with high standards accepted in the U.S. “We have to make more efforts to expand the university’s functions and understand that Armenia can win by educating talented youth,”
Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan said in closing.

In his speech, Minister of Education and Science Armen Ashotyan placed importance on the role of the American University in Armenia’s system of higher education and described the university as an educational institution that is giving something new to Armenia’s educational system and is still advancing.

“I would like to be rest assured that the impact of the American University’s benevolence on Armenia’s educational system will be more systematic, large-scale and will help citizens of Armenia find their place in society and politics,” the minister added.

Then, the RA Prime Minister had a meeting with the university’s students and professors. By the Prime Minister’s decision, former rector of the Armenian State University of Engineering, Professor of Mechanics and Automobile Construction, member of the board of trustees of the American University of Armenia Foundation Yuri Sargsyan was awarded the Medal of the RA Prime Minister in light of the 20th anniversary of the American University of Armenia and for his notable contribution to the spheres of education and science, while Chairman of the board of trustees of the AUA Corporation, Head of the Center for Higher Education Research at UC Berkeley, Dr. Jadson King was awarded the Gold Medal of the RA Ministry of Education and Science.

The opening of a photo exhibition was held at the AUA Mihran and Elizabeth Aghbabian Hall. The exhibition served as a unique chronology of the university’s 20-year history and included almost all notable events that have taken place in the course of the university’s advancement.

P.S. The American University of Armenia was established on September 21, 1991 by the decision of the RA Council of Ministers. The goal of establishing this university was accomplished with support from the RA Government and two large U.S. institutions, including the Armenian General Benevolent Union (AGBU) and the University of California. The latter has shown assistance through expertise by providing AUA with professors and developing programs for cooperation.

The main goal of the American University of Armenia has always been to create an opportunity to learn and conduct research in line with the system and standards of higher education of the U.S. in the region.

As an institution of higher learning, the American University of Armenia carries out educational and research projects and provides services.

*Harutyun Tsatryan*

Curriculum Vitae

Bruce M. Boghosian
President
American University of Armenia
40 Baghramian Avenue Yerevan 0019, Republic of Armenia
bruce.boghosian@aua.am
(+374 10) 512 526 (office), (+374 10) 512 512 (fax)

Employment History

• American University of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia: President (2010 – present).

• Tufts University, Medford, MA: Professor, Department of Mathematics (2000 – present, promoted to rank of Professor in 2003, Department Chair from 2006-2010); Adjunct Professor, Department of Computer Science (2003 – present); Adjunct Professor, Department of Physics (2010 – present). Currently on indefinite leave of absence to serve as President of American University of Armenia.

• Boston University, Boston, MA: Research Associate Professor, Center for Computational Science and Department of Physics (1994 – 2003).


Visiting Positions


• Peking University, Beijing, China: Visiting Professor, School of Engineering, gave half-semester course enti- tled “Topological Fluid Dynamics” (5 November – 12 December 2007).

• University College London: EPSRC Visiting Fellow, Centre for Computational Science, Department of Chem- istry (2002-present).

• University of California, Berkeley: Visiting Professor, Department of Physics (1996 – 1997).

• International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy: Visiting Scientist, Condensed Matter Division (Summer, 1996).


• University of California, Davis: Research Scientist, Department of Applied Science (1995).


Education

• University of California, Davis: Doctor of Philosophy degree, Department of Applied Science and Engineering (1980 – 1986, degree conferred in March, 1987). Thesis research was conducted primarily at the University of California at Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

• Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Bachelor of Science degree, Physics; Master of Science degree, Nu-clear

**Awards and Honors**

- Distinguished Scholar Award of Tufts University Faculty Research and Awards Committee (2010).
- Elected as a Foreign Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia (2008).
- Recipient of Undergraduate Initiative in Teaching (UNITE) award, College of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, Tufts University (2002)
- Elected to Fellowship of the American Physical Society (2000)

**Patents**


**Editorial Work**

- Member, editorial board of *Journal of Computational Science* (Elsevier, 2009 – present).
- Member, editorial board of *Physica A* (2001 – present)
- Member, editorial board of *Computing in Science and Engineering* (2001 – present)

**Selected Funded Grants**

- ARO, Physics Division, Quantum Information Science, basic research grant (2004-2007).
- DARPA QuIST grant subcontract for postdoc position (2002-2006), subcontracted to Texas A&M University.
- NSF PACI/NRAC grant of supercomputer time from Pittsburgh Supercomputer Center (2003-2005).

Selected Professional Service

• Member Program Committee, “Challenges of Large Applications in Distributed Environments (CLADE),” to be held in conjunction with the 18th International Symposium on High Performance Distributed Computing (HPDC-18), Munich, Germany (9-10 June 2009).
• Member Organizing Committee, “Plasma Theory, Wave Kinetics, and Nonlinear Dynamics,” University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California (5-7 October 2007)
• Participant, National Science Foundation Visualization Workshop, Arlington, Virginia (27-28 September 2007)
• Participant, National Science Foundation Cyber-Fluids Workshop, Arlington, Virginia (19-20 July 2007)
• Chair of Visiting Assessment Committee, Center for Computational Science, Boston University (September, 2005)
• Program Review panel member, U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque, New Mexico (May, 2005)
• Member of Nicholas Metropolis Award Committee, Division of Computational Physics, American Physical Society (2002-2005), chair (2003-2004)
• Member of Fellowship Committee, Division of Computational Physics, American Physical Society (2002)
• Member of Program Committee of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO-99)
• Member of APS organizing committee for Conference on Computational Physics (CCP99), March, 1999, Atlanta, Georgia
• Member of APS organizing committee for Physics Computing ’97, August 25–28, 1997, Santa Cruz, California
• Member of American Mathematical Society, American Physical Society, Mathematical Association of America, and Sigma Xi

Selected Service within University

• Faculty representative to Information Technology Advisory Council (2008–present).
• Principal Investigator, Center for Scientific Visualization, Tufts University (inaugurated on 8 February 2008).
• Member, Faculty Subcommittee for Visiting Lecturer Selection, Tufts Experimental College (April 2007)
• Member of advisory committee to the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (2007).
• Chair of the Department of Mathematics (2006–present)
• Faculty representative to Tufts University Information Technology Council (2005–2006).
• Member of Tufts University Faculty Research and Award Committee (2001–2006).
• Member of Tufts University Scholarship Committee (2003–present).
• Member of Curriculum or Graduate Committee, Department of Mathematics (continuous basis).
• Chair of Hiring Committees, Tufts University Department of Mathematics (2003-2004 and 2005-2006).
• Speaker at events for prospective students held by Office of Undergraduate Admissions, Tufts University (2004 and 2005).
Refereed Articles in Journals and Proceedings

   http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.4493


36. F.W.J. Weig, P.V. Coveney and B.M. Boghosian, “Lattice-Gas Simulations of Minority-Phase Domain Growth in


**Invited Articles**


http://archive.teragrid.org/events/teragrid08/Papers/papers.html


**Thesis**


**Invited Talks and Presentations**

1. Colloquium speaker, Department of Mathematics, Purdue University (27 August 2010).


5. Colloquium speaker, Center for Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina (1 December 2009).

6. Invited speaker, NSF-NAIS Workshop, the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland (20 October 2009).

7. Colloquium series as Scholar in Residence, American University of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia (16, 21, 27, 30 July 2009).

8. Colloquium Speaker, Center for Computational Science, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (8 May 2009).


12. Colloquium Speaker, Department of Physics, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut (13 November 2008).


15. Colloquium Speaker, Shanghai Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, Shanghai University, Shanghai, China (6 December 2007).


17. Colloquium Speaker, Manchester Centre for Interdisciplinary Computational and Dynamical Analysis (CICADA), University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom (27 June 2007).


22. Speaker, Dynamics Seminar, Brown University (17 April 2006).

23. Speaker, Center for Computational Science, Boston University (7 April 2006).
25. Speaker, Department of Applied Mathematics Colloquium, Brown University (29 November 2005).
27. Speaker, 14th International Conference on the Discrete Simulation of Fluid Dynamics (DSFD 2005), Kyoto, Japan (22-26 August 2005).
29. Speaker, Conference on Vortex Rings, International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy (7-10 June 2005).
30. Speaker, 93rd Statistical Mechanics Conference, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey (15-17 May 2005).
31. Speaker, Physics Department Colloquium, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts (3 March 2005).
32. Speaker, Workshop on Quantum Computing for Physical Modeling, Martha’s Vineyard, Massachusetts (12-15 September 2004).
33. Speaker and Member of Organizing Committee, 13th International Conference on the Discrete Simulation of Fluid Dynamics (DSFD 2004), Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA (16-20 August 2004).
34. Speaker, International Conference on Computational and Experimental Engineering and Sciences (ICES 2004), Madeira, Portugal (26-29 July 2004).
40. Speaker, Quantum Information Processing (QIP) Colloquium, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (10 March 2003).
41. Speaker, Workshop on Anomalous Distributions, Nonlinear Dynamics, and Nonextensivity, Center for Nonlinear Studies, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Santa Fe, New Mexico (7 November 2002).
42. Speaker, Greater Boston Statistical Physics Workshop, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts (19 October 2002).
43. Session Chair, New England Complex Systems Institute, Annual Meeting, Nashua, New Hampshire (11 June 2002).
44. Speaker, Department of Electrical, Computer and Systems Engineering, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (15 May 2002).
45. Speaker, Workshop on Quantum Computing for Physical Modeling, Martha’s Vineyard, Massachusetts (9 May 2002).

47. Speaker, Knowledge Foundation Conference on Mesoscale Modelling, Boston, Massachusetts (13-14 August 2001).

48. Member of Topical Committee for sessions on dynamical systems and turbulence, StatPhys 21 Meeting, Cancun, Mexico (15-20 July 2001).


51. Colloquium speaker, Department of Mathematics, Tufts University (1 December 2000).

52. Speaker, “Symposium Celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the Center for Computational Science,” Boston University (17 November, 2000).


56. Speaker, Materials and Manufacturing Directorate, Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio (30 May 2000).


58. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts (27 April, 2000).

59. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (4 April, 2000).

60. Speaker, “Recent Developments in Computer Simulation Studies in Condensed Matter Physics,” Center for Simulational Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia (21-25 February, 2000).

61. Colloquium speaker, Department of Mathematics, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts (17 February, 2000).


63. Seminar speaker, Department of Applied Mathematics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (5 November, 1999).

64. Seminar speaker, Department of Chemistry, University of London, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London, United Kingdom (9 July, 1999).

65. Seminar speaker, Center for Nonlinear Studies, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, 10 June 1999.


68. Seminar speaker, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (6 April 1999).

69. Speaker, Silicon Graphics Scientific Visualization Seminar, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (31 March 1999).

70. Speaker, Conference on Computational Physics '99, American Physical Society Centennial Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia (25 March 1999).

71. Session chair, Conference on Computational Physics '99, American Physical Society Centennial Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia (25 March 1999).

72. Colloquium speaker, Department of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island (18 March 1999).

73. Colloquium speaker, Department of Applied Science, University of California, Davis (4 March, 1999).

74. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts (24 November 1998).

75. Seminar speaker, Air Force Research Laboratory, Space Vehicles Directorate, Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts (16 September, 1998).

76. Speaker, Conference on Computational Physics (CCP98), Granada, Spain (2-5 September, 1998).


79. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania (17 April, 1998).

80. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts (4 February, 1998).


82. Plenary speaker, Physics Computing '97, American Physical Society, Santa Cruz, California (August, 1997).

83. Course speaker, Department of Materials Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts (18 April, 1997).

84. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (10 April, 1997).

85. Seminar speaker, Physics Department, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts (November, 1996).

86. Seminar speaker, Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Complex Systems, Northeastern University (May 7, 1996).


88. Colloquium speaker, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (April, 1996).
89. Session speaker, American Physical Society Topical Meeting on Condensed Matter, St. Louis, Missouri (March 21, 1996).

90. IAP Seminar on Molecular Modelling, Department of Nuclear Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts (January 29, 1996).

91. 74th Statistical Physics Conference, Hill Center, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey (Dec. 17-19, 1995).

92. Nanotechnology Forum, Laboratory for Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (December 5, 1995).

93. Colloquium speaker, Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (October 31, 1995).

94. Speaker, Nonlinear Optics Workshop, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona (October 1-3, 1995).

95. Lattice Gas Automata Workshop, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland (August 22, 1995).

96. Seminar speaker, Department of Applied Science, University of California, Davis/Livermore, Livermore, California (May 16, 1995).

97. Seminar speaker, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (May 8, 1995).

98. Seminar speaker, Center for Computational Science, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (March 17, 1995).


100. Seminar speaker, Institute for Scientific Computing, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California (February 13, 1995).

101. I.A.P. Seminar on Molecular Modelling, Department of Nuclear Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts (January 25, 1995).


103. Seminar speaker, Center for Computational Science, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (October 7, 1994).

104. Colloquium speaker, Physics Department, Clark University (September 22, 1994).


107. Dynamics of Complex Systems Seminar, Boston University (February 9, 1994).

108. Second IMACS Conference on Computational Physics, International Association for Mathematics and Computers in Simulation (IMACS), St. Louis, Missouri (October 6-9, 1993).

109. Inauguration of CM-5 Computer Facility, Department of Computer Science, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands (October 1, 1993).

110. Seminar speaker, Parallelulatorcentrum, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden (September 30, 1993).

111. Conference on Pattern Formation and Lattice Gas Automata, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (June 8-12, 1993).


117. Plenary speaker, Lattice ’92 Conference, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (September 14-18, 1992).

118. Seminar speaker, NORDITA, Niels Bohr Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark (August, 1992).


121. Workshop on Cellular Automata, Mathematical Sciences Institute, Cornell University (May 10, 1992).

122. Seminar speaker, Edinburgh Parallel Computer Centre, Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom (March 5, 1992).

123. Colloquium speaker, Nuclear Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (November 25, 1991).


125. Session organizer, (Parallel Implementations of Molecular Dynamics and Monte Carlo Codes), Supercomputing ’91, Albuquerque, New Mexico (November 19-21, 1991).


129. Workshop on Lattice Gases, Observatoire de la Cote d’Azur, Nice, France (June 25-28, 1991).

130. Session chairman, American Physical Society Topical Meeting on Computational Physics, San Jose, California (June 10-14, 1991).


133. Seminar speaker, Computation Department, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland (September 26, 1990).


135. Europhysics Conference on Computational Physics, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (September 13, 1990).


138. Monte Carlo and Molecular Dynamics Workshop, Department of Nuclear Engineering and Center for Space Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (January 23, 1990).
140. Lattice Gas Methods for Partial Differential Equations, Los Alamos National Laboratory (September 6-9, 1989).
141. Lecturer, Santa Fe Institute Summer School, Santa Fe, New Mexico (June 11-17, 1989).
142. Seminar speaker, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom (March 1, 1989).
144. Seminar speaker, University of Karlsruhe, Karlsruhe, Germany (January 19, 1989).
145. Seminar speaker, German Federal Computer Science Laboratory (GMD), Sankt Augustin, Germany (January 18, 1989).
149. Seminar speaker, California Institute of Technology (August 10, 1988).
151. Colloquium speaker, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts (February 23, 1988).
152. Design and Application of Parallel Digital Processors, The Institution of Electrical Engineers (IEE), Lisbon, Portugal (April 11-15, 1988).
153. Seminar speaker, Plasma Fusion Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (February 12, 1988).
155. Sixth International Conference on Mathematical Modeling, St. Louis, Missouri (August 4, 1987).
AUA Strategic Plan 2011-2017  
(with summaries of Department Strategic Plans)

This report is the culmination of a university-wide effort involving scores of meetings, individual submissions, and deliberations among internal and external stakeholders that started nearly two years ago with the McKinsey & Co strategic plan, commissioned by the AUA Board of Trustees. The materials from the Strategic Plan Mapping Session in July 2011 as well as individual submissions for this process and background papers are archived at the university’s Office of Institutional Research. Key documents, including issue sheets, factsheets, deliberation minutes, process description and information about outside facilitation engaged for this process are available on the AUA website:  

Introduction

Declaring Armenia’s “intellectual capacity is our chief development resource,” RA Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan called on institutions of higher education to expand Armenia’s capacity to create a knowledge-based society by assuring access to education at “highest international standards.” He cited the American University of Armenia (AUA), with its US accreditation, as one of two universities which have led the way in this effort.

As a model for such education, AUA is uniquely positioned to provide internationally competitive educational opportunities for students from Armenia and its region. As it embarks on its third decade, the AUA plans to establish an undergraduate program, building on the solid foundation of its master’s level graduate programs. Adding the undergraduate level to its established graduate programs, AUA will further its mission of providing “teaching, research, and service programs that prepare students to address the needs of Armenia and the surrounding region for sustainable development in a setting that values and develops academic excellence, free inquiry, scholarship, leadership and service to society” (AUA mission statement). By providing over 1200 undergraduate students with access to American-style higher education in Armenia, even as it continues its graduate program of 400 students, AUA aims to train a critical mass of young people with the knowledge and skills necessary to become globally competitive professionals and leaders in the development of Armenia and its region.

AUA was initially positioned primarily to complement, not compete, with existing educational programs in Armenia. In the past decade, other institutions started offering similar degrees, creating a more competitive milieu of convergence and competition. Almost two years ago, discussions on campus began on how to achieve financial sustainability and respond to the changing needs of higher education in Armenia and the region. This strategic plan is the culmination of those discussions.

Vision

The American University of Armenia aims to be a laboratory and model for the type of education that will guide and spur Armenia’s development. Based on AUA deliberations and market studies over the past several years, a new vision for AUA has come into focus. This vision calls for an expansion and diversification of AUA’s current 1) programming, 2) faculty and student body, and 3) financial support.

Expansion & Diversification of Programming

By 2017, AUA aims to have approximately 1600 students, 1200 undergraduate and 400 graduate, enrolled in three or more undergraduate degrees and seven graduate programs. The university’s current master’s programs will continue to be centers of professional excellence and research aimed at (1) cultivating the technical expertise of professionals, (2) developing projects of national significance for Armenia’s sustainable development, cultural, political and economic vitality, and (3) providing exemplary models of graduate education in Armenia. Building on the experience gained and infrastructure built for these master’s programs, the undergraduate program will expand and diversify AUA’s programs and course offerings. Specifically, we intend to start with three undergraduate majors, each with two specialization tracks. These majors and tracks will be loosely aligned with our graduate programs and, hence, benefit from the accumulated experience and expertise.

Expansion & Diversification of Faculty and Students

Through the creation of the undergraduate program, AUA will increase its core faculty nearly threefold. Faculty expertise will also become more diversified in order to meet the needs of various undergraduate programs as well as larger student body. To attract and maintain this larger scholarly community, the faculty’s commitment to the university will need to be matched by the university’s commitment to the faculty in terms of career track and benefits.

In addition to the expansion and diversification of the faculty, the student body will be transformed. Remaining true to its commitment to need-blind admissions, AUA will seek to recruit a more economically diversified student body, of which between 10% to 20% will be from abroad. Undergraduate studies will create new possibilities for junior exchange students, summer students, and more students from regions in and around Armenia, across the economic and social spectrum.

Expansion & Diversification of Financial Support

By establishing the first American-style undergraduate program in Armenia, AUA will seek to tap a broader and more stable financial base by nearly doubling its endowment through attracting more donors from more countries, creating a wide range of levels of giving, and having an active alumni giving program. AUA will also have a range of new sources of commercial income from research and university facilities. To support these efforts, the newly established Vice President of Advancement will take a leading role in promoting AUA both locally and internationally in order to attract students, scholars, and donors. Due to major construction projects completed during the past decade, the
University is well prepared to accept a greater student body in terms of its physical plant and infrastructure.

This vision is the product of an unprecedented process of brainstorming, analysis, and deliberation drawing on the insights of AUA faculty, students, staff, and alumni as well as Armenian government officials, businesses, and NGOs. This report summarizes the way in which AUA will realize this vision while also building on its strengths, addressing its weaknesses, and seizing potential opportunities.

What sets AUA apart?

Like most institutions, AUA was founded to add value to the relevant markets and communities it serves. Symbolic of its mission, AUA was established on September 21, 1991, the day Armenia broke from the USSR to become an independent nation. In the context in which AUA was founded, it had to be a part of the inherited Soviet higher education system, yet be apart from that system in certain essential ways. That tension emerged as a recurrent theme of AUA’s strategic planning discussion. On the one hand, discussants focused on building and bolstering what sets AUA apart – namely, the added value AUA brings to Armenia by providing American-style higher education that is integrated into the global academic network. On the other, they stressed that AUA must strive for greater integration into the local educational milieu in order to achieve its mission in promoting economic and educational development in Armenia.

AUA was an early entrant into the post-Soviet region in 1991. The environment in which it operates has changed significantly since 1991:

- there are new international entrants into the higher education market in Armenia and the region (e.g., French, Slavonic, European Academy in Armenia as well as the planned Millennium University in Georgia, Moscow State University Yerevan branch);
- existing institutions have more resources and have begun adopting global standards (e.g., Bologna process in Armenian universities);
- there are more English-speaking students and faculty in Armenia;
- greater resources, better preparation, and increased access to information (scholarship programs such as Luys Fund, IREX, Muskie) have made study abroad programs more accessible to Armenian students;
- foreign degrees have become accessible and are considered by many to be more valuable than a domestic degree.

As a result, the differences in content and value are shrinking between AUA degrees and those of other universities in Armenia. In short, competition has increased, putting more pressure on AUA master’s degree programs.

Nonetheless, AUA remains a good value proposition for most students: The AUA degree helps them advance their careers and contributes to Armenia’s development. AUA is a zone of predictable fairness in Armenian higher education. At AUA, outcomes are based on merit. Furthermore, the public is aware
of AUA’s corruption-free environment. In surveys, students highly value the AUA experience for its American academic environment, transparency and fairness, from pre-admission through graduation.\(^2\)

AUA has also been strongly committed to community and national development, filling gaps in Armenia’s research and educational system. It has a solid track record of applied research in economic and public policy and engineering (e.g., health, law, human rights, earthquake engineering, renewable energy, cryptography, environmental and cultural heritage protection) tailored to Armenia’s needs, such as the Turpanjian Rural Development Program (small loan program), Acopian Center for the Environment (Birds of Armenia, environmental conservation), and Digilib (Digital Library of Classical and Western Armenian literature).

**Challenges to Realizing AUA’s Mission**

As an institution established with a developmental mission, AUA’s work is never done and its mission is forever only partially fulfilled as new goals appear on the horizon when old goals have been achieved. Starting with its first graduate programs in Engineering (Earthquake and Industrial Engineering) and Business and Management, AUA has been responsive to Armenia’s evolving needs, adding degrees in Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, Political Science and International Affairs, Public Health and Law during its first decade as a graduate institution. The Computer and Information Science Program was added in 2001.

AUA has faced financial challenges in meeting the needs of an under-resourced environment. Providing international quality instruction at local tuition levels has resulted in a persistent structural budget deficit. Integration into both the local and global academic communities requires resources that have thus far been scarce. Since the last strategic plan, the 2008 financial crises resulted in cutbacks that forced the university to look inward and focus on reallocating resources. During this period, university enrollments rose nearly 50%, amplifying the structural deficit, while academic programs faced 10-15% budget cutbacks. Although the introduction of an undergraduate program is not intended to cover this deficit, it will reduce the per student subsidy substantially by spreading costs over a larger student body. A consensus has emerged that AUA’s financial model must fundamentally change as the university plans through 2017.

To achieve its potential, AUA needs to communicate and collaborate more effectively with its external constituencies, potential students within and outside Armenia, other educational institutions, U.S. and Armenian governments, alumni, the Armenian diaspora, donors, employers, and civil society. This will require more faculty and financing as well as staff dedicated to these functions (particularly advancement, public relations, research, and fundraising), better use of online and e-resources, and recalibration of the Extension Program to assure that AUA’s outreach arm effectively meets its needs. As a vital bridge between Armenia and the world, AUA has unrealized potential as a link to global academic and economic networks. As a meeting place for students and scholars from within and outside

\(^2\) Surveys, Focus Groups archived and on-line (IRO to provide specific references).
Armenia, AUA has the potential to become a more dynamic center of innovation and creativity that contributes more effectively to Armenia’s development.

The appointment of its first full-time resident President in 2010 has spurred greater integration in the local and global milieu, as will the appointment of a Vice President for Advancement, scheduled for Fall 2011. The larger, resident faculty for the undergraduate program will also bring more global ties and capacity for local networking.

**Background**

AUA continues to contribute directly and indirectly to Armenia’s economic development and higher education system. Although a relatively small institution, AUA has had a unique impact on Armenia, preparing professionals fluent in English who are both rooted in Armenia’s local reality and also attuned to global trends and standards. Each year AUA adds hundreds of graduates to Armenia’s global-ready workforce. AUA’s faculty and researchers foster Armenia’s development through research, consultation, public service, innovation and global networking.

The opening of the Paramaz Avedissian Building (PAB) in 2009 increased AUA’s physical capacity for a larger student body and more faculty, researchers, and scholars. Over the past three years, despite hardships caused by the global financial crisis, AUA’s graduate enrollment has grown and leveled off at approximately 400 graduate students, roughly 150% of pre-2009 enrollment levels. Notwithstanding this substantial growth, the AUA community has come to a consensus that the university has the capacity and potential to do more and have a greater impact while also achieving financial sustainability.

Since AUA’s founding, undergraduate education had been considered a potentially important aspect of AUA’s mission; however, limited capacity prevented the creation of an undergraduate program. The completion of the PAB building has greatly added to AUA’s capacity and spurred a broad discussion among internal and external stakeholders on how AUA can better achieve its mission. These discussions were informed by reports prepared by AUA’s Office of Institutional Research, focus groups (of potential students, parents of potential students, alumni), alumni and library patron surveys, and professional strategic planning by McKinsey & Co commissioned by the Board of Trustees, as well as extensive deliberation on campus. These discussions resulted in a consensus that AUA should pursue an undergraduate program both to better achieve its mission and to attain financial security.

---

3 All these reports and data are available from the Office of Institutional Research. The McKinsey Report, prepared for the Board of Trustees in the fall of 2009 concluded that an integrated university with both undergraduate and doctoral programs was feasible and desirable based on their market research and analysis. Campus leadership (both academic and administrative) were involved in deliberations relating to this report, which was submitted in the spring of 2010, with certain conclusions placed in circulation on campus during the summer of 2010. As this period coincided with the search for a new AUA President, action was postponed until the fall of 2010. At December 2010 meeting, the Board of Deans decided to move forward with more detailed study of an undergraduate program. In the winter and spring of 2011, an Undergraduate Task Force (UGTF), with two subcommittees (financial model and curriculum) were formed and began deliberations and data collection and analysis. One of the first tasks was to corroborate and refine the McKinsey conclusions regarding market
The introduction of an undergraduate program is not meant to detract or diminish the importance of the existing graduate programs, but to complement them. The graduate programs will continue to pursue their strategic plans for growth and improvement, with an emphasis on student diversity and stable enrollment as well as research and applied projects that promote Armenia’s economic development and bolster the university’s financial stability. The initial undergraduate programs will be in fields for which AUA already has graduate faculty. In light of the institutional loyalty that prevails in Armenia, the undergraduate program is likely to be a feeder for the graduate programs, creating a stable pool of well-prepared applicants who share AUA’s values and culture. Undergraduate programs will also increase opportunities for graduate students to serve as teaching assistants and could in the future help support doctoral programs in some fields. Thus, the creation of an undergraduate program will likely lead to substantive improvements in AUA’s graduate programs.

The undergraduate program will also help address some of the concerns raised by various stakeholders, such as financial sustainability, the need for a critical mass of resident faculty for both scholarly, teaching, and administrative functions, and lack of student diversity. With more students and degrees, the disproportionate costs of administration for small institutions would be spread over a larger student body, reducing per student costs and increasing faculty size. An undergraduate program would also create more opportunities to diverse students through exchange programs, which are more common at the undergraduate level.

A related but distinct goal is to transition from a quarter to a semester system. Such a transition will reduce the administrative costs associated with each cycle of registration, faculty hiring, and grade reporting. It would also bring AUA into sync with local and most foreign universities, facilitating student exchanges, particularly during the peak summer term, but also for junior year abroad programs.

Creating undergraduate programs in fields related to existing programs will also enable the university to build up its core of resident faculty and foster a community of scholars with the introduction of new policy on hiring, promotion and retention and multi-year contract, which are on the university’s agenda for the fall of 2012.

A larger resident administration is also part of the preparation for expansion and includes the university’s first resident President, who started during the Fall 2010, and a new Vice President for Operations, demand and pricing. An Alumni Survey was organized by the UGTF. Later in the spring, it was determined that further research was warranted, targeting high school students and their parents. Focus groups with English-speaking high school students and their parents were held in August and another survey was organized based on the AUA Library patron’s list, which contains several thousand users of AUA’s English language library collections, many of whom are parents or know potential undergraduate applicants.

AUA - Alumni Survey by UGTF - March 2011, Number of Respondents: 293
AUA - AUA student Survey by UGTF - March 2011, Number of Respondents: 214
AUA – Focus Group (FG) EEC, Quant School, High School Students and Parents - High School Students - August 2011, Number of Respondents: 24
AUA - Library Patrons - Survey- August 2011 - Participants: 277
streamlining and consolidating administrative functions on campus to promote efficiency. In addition, a new Vice President for Advancement is scheduled to be hired in the US during the Fall of 2011 to direct outreach, public relations, promotion of the university, and fundraising, including a capital campaign for the AUA endowment for the 25^{th} anniversary of its first graduating class in 2017.

**Milestones for Strategy2017^{4}**

The strategic milestones for 2011-2017 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2011</td>
<td>Substantive Change Proposal and first new degree proposals to WASC to inaugurate the undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2011</td>
<td>Capacity and Preparatory Review to WASC for reaccreditation of the graduate programs and Substantive Change Proposal for undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2012</td>
<td>Proposal for additional bachelor’s degrees to WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>WASC CPR Site Visit of the graduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>Launch capital campaign for endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2012</td>
<td>WASC EER site visit for reaccreditation of the graduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness Review to WASC for reaccreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2013</td>
<td>First undergraduate class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2015</td>
<td>Graduate program self-study cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>First graduation of undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2017</td>
<td>25^{th} anniversary of the first graduating class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Some Specific Strategic Targets and Recommendations**

**Students**

Making AUA’s education accessible is paramount to both AUA’s impact and mission. For this reason, increasing access to an AUA education through new programs (both undergraduate and graduate) and assuring access through need-blind admissions, scholarships, and financial aid are core goals. The proposition that “no qualified student should be denied an AUA education simply for inability to pay” has been repeatedly cited as a touchstone of the university’s value system during the strategic planning

---

^{4} Because the first graduating class from the proposed undergraduate class will be in 2017, this strategic plan covers 2011 through 2017.
process. AUA has succeeded in honoring and sustaining this ideal, introducing the first need-based financial assistance program, nearly 6 years ago.\(^5\)

Because students are at the center of AUA’s mission, demographic trends and university enrollment patterns are especially important for AUA’s strategy from 2011 through 2017. A demographic dip is predicted for the coming years due to hardships of the post-Soviet transition, blockade, and war in the early 1990s, which will reduce the number of 18-24 year olds in Armenia for the next decade. Also Armenia’s transition to a 12-year universal education system will leave a gap in the number of entering master’s students in 2015. However, because of a growing pool of English-speaking high school graduates in Armenia, from which AUA draws most of its students, it is predicted that these demographic trends will have a minimal effect on AUA.

There was slight increase in the number of international students at AUA over the past decade, although the absolute numbers are too small for trend analysis, especially if diasporans and others already resident or tied to Armenia are excluded. A diverse, international student body that enriches the student experience, brings fresh perspectives in and out of class, and fulfills the university’s educational mission of serving the region remains a goal for undergraduate and graduate programs. Although recruitment efforts increased over the past several years, international students continue to be few in number. One of AUA’s goals for 2017 is to have a more robust, targeted recruitment and marketing effort, focusing on those students that are inclined to come to Armenia and AUA, in particular. Undergraduate programs, including junior year abroad and summer programs, may attract more international students because undergraduates are more disposed to foreign study as part of their degree programs than graduate students.

By 2015, AUA aims to participate more in intergovernmental exchanges such as those between Armenian universities and institutions in China, India and elsewhere. AUA also seeks greater foreign recognition of its degree programs by neighboring countries, such as Iran. Achieving both these goals will also help attract more international students.

Strategies to Increase Student Enrollment and Diversity:

- Design and implement better promotion of AUA’s Tuition Assistance Program in time for the 2012 admissions (including multilingual web-pages and materials (English, Armenian, Russian, Farsi) to assure that the program is clearly understood by students, parents and teachers abroad;
- Streamline the admissions process, reduce barriers to admission, consolidate sources of admissions information (admissions cost rebates, subsidies for test fees, prep courses);
- Obtain international recognition for AUA degrees by foreign ministries of education (e.g., Iran);
- Evaluate the impact on international student enrollment of financial assistance for tuition, room and board

\(^5\) As noted during our strategic planning discussions, this is a high aspiration that even many far better endowed, longer established institutions have been unable to consistently attain. In many ways this puts AUA’s developmental mission in the foreground, as this a principle-driven, rather than an economically optimal policy.
• Determine whether non-resident tuition is appropriate for the international market;
• Evaluate differential tuition for various programs (which may make some programs more accessible through tuition reduction), and implement them where justified,
• Foster Public-Private Partnerships through more engagement with the RA and US governments, private sector scholarship funds and sponsorship of courses and degrees; more internship and alumni involvement in securing scholarships/post-graduate employment.
• Develop more effective means for communication with international students, including revamping of the AUA website (ongoing) and its translation into Russian and Armenian, and development of electronic and paper-based promotional materials.

Faculty

Fostering a community of scholars is one of AUA’s reaccreditation themes for WASC.\(^6\) Having a critical mass of resident faculty was also identified as essential for the health of the institution during the strategic planning session and in our last accreditation review. A larger, more permanent community of scholars will be a natural outgrowth of the introduction of an undergraduate program. Care must be taken to assure synergies between undergraduate and graduate faculty selection as well as disciplinary and general education coverage in designing faculty positions for a balanced university.

Multi-year and longer-term contracts, which were called for in the 2006-7 WASC Accreditation Review, are on the agenda for Fall 2011. The University’s Policy on Hiring, Promotion and Retention will need to be periodically reevaluated and modified as the university grows over the next six years.

Research

As a master’s degree-conferring institution, research is one of the core functions and missions of the university. Research is essential to training graduate students, developing a robust intellectual atmosphere, establishing ties with the global scholarly community, and ensuring that the university contributes to Armenia’s development. However, because of the challenges of operating in a developing country and the fact that AUA does not confer doctorate degrees, research conducted in AUA has been mostly applied in nature. To address this issue and as part of the reaccreditation process, a new definition of research has been proposed that is based on the universal goals of research and scholarship

\(^6\) “Cultivating a community of scholars is a cumulative process that requires a critical mass of resident faculty and a supportive institution with long-term reciprocal commitments to each other. As the University grows into its third decade, there is a need to develop the University as a community of researchers and scholars, one that includes faculty, students, and researchers, and the need to foster more creativity throughout the University to successfully compete for students, faculty, and resources in a world of rapidly changing and continuously rising standards of educational excellence.” Institutional Proposal (IP), p. 11
http://www.aua.am/accreditation/inst_proposal.html
but also tailored to the realities AUA faces. The strategic planning discussions have generated a number of recommendations for promoting research and strengthening AUA’s seven research centers, all of which, except the Environmental Research Center, are associated with an academic program:

- Incentivize research (improve mechanisms for augmenting salary through outside funding, promotion, overhead to centers);
- Establish a university-wide grants/contract office to coordinate and serve as an information clearinghouse, provide technical support, process grants (Vice Provost for Research);
- Review policies on research centers (restrict routine business consulting services and work involving liability);
- Increase core faculty to expand the institution’s research potential and opportunities to engage students in research by 2015;
- Position AUA to lead or support longer-term projects with commercial potential, including incubation of products and companies, technology licensing and commercialization; develop a policy on royalties that encourages research leading to commercialization; promote partnerships with private institutions;
- Increase AUA’s technical facilities for research (labs, research computing/computational capacity, software, experimental equipment);
- Develop policies to address conflicts of commitment for researchers who have projects outside the university.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach

The need for improved relations with the public and alumni as well as improved communication within the university was a recurrent concern in strategic planning deliberations in a wide range of contexts, including financial sustainability, international student recruitment, public-private partnerships, and externally funded research. The consensus is that shortcomings in this sphere have hindered the university’s development and will continue to impede the sustainability of AUA’s current programs and plans for expansion. Hence, this cluster of interrelated functions must be treated as a high priority.

---

7 Creative scholarship is the substantive contribution of new knowledge or significant new applications of knowledge: (1) scholarship of discovery, (2) scholarship of integration, (3) scholarship of application, and (4) scholarship of teaching. This definition aims to value a broad spectrum of scholarship which allows for AUA to tailor recognition of faculty activities and efforts to match the unique qualities and strengths of the university and each academic program. Scholarship of discovery means the traditional concept of scholarship vetted in peer reviewed journals and monographs. Scholarship of integration values cross-disciplinary work which produces or presents new, creative and innovative perspectives, including textbooks and reference works. Scholarship of application values the application of theory to practice in a specific or novel context which results in a new, creative and innovative understanding of universal knowledge. Scholarship of teaching values creative and innovative pedagogical approaches to curriculum, instruction and assessment including curriculum design or other activities beyond routine teaching responsibilities. [http://md.aua.am/RSTF/](http://md.aua.am/RSTF/) (log-in, password required); See also, Modern Language Association, 1996 Report, Making Faculty Work Visible. [http://www.mla.org/rep_facultyvis](http://www.mla.org/rep_facultyvis)

8 Annual reports on Research Centers at AUA, prepared by the Vice President of Research and Development, are available from the Office of Institutional Research and on the AUA website.
AUA’s new president, Bruce Boghosian, has made communications a top priority and has commissioned a study by the Brakeley-Briscoe Fundraising & Management Consultants on university fund-raising and public relations. He has also announced the new position of Vice President of Advancement (VPA), which is to be filled by the end of 2011, for which the executive search firm of Paschal-Murray has been engaged. The VPA’s function will be to restructure the university’s relations with the public, donors, alumni and the RA and US governments. The Extension Program, which serves as the university’s principal interface with the community, has recently undergone a self-study, and a range of recommendations tracking the strategic planning discussion have been made and await implementation; thus, it is unnecessary to repeat them here. Key recommendations from the strategic planning discussions include:

- Appoint a Vice President of Advancement (already underway) to lead a proactive public relations effort (improving coordination of public relations and focusing more on developments in Yerevan, closer to action/news gathering, depending on media outlets and nature of audience) by 2012;
- Revamp the AUA website to make it more user-friendly and multilingual (English, Armenian, Russian, Farsi) (see also Student recommendations above);
- Start a periodic e-bulletin, newsletter to document and promote events and research at AUA as well as achievements of students and faculty to a large readership;
- Cultivate and reinforce alumni ties with the university, e.g., recognize alumni achievement, give AUA alumni life-time e-mail accounts; perhaps also initiate alumni guest lectures or networking events where students meet alumni
- Enhance AUA’s ability to share its global knowledge in the Armenian educational system, foster more direct impact and interaction with other institutions of higher learning, e.g., professor-to-professor collaboration, joint projects;
- Develop a global network of Armenian and non-Armenian (e.g., former visiting professors) academics interested in AUA and use that network to promote academic collaborations, exchanges, faculty development and public relations;
- Assure capacity to promote AUA’s competitive advantages.

Finances

AUA suffers from a structural deficit that is the product of providing world-class education at local, Armenian tuition rates. AUA has been heavily reliant upon a relatively small number of large diasporan donations from the US to cover its structural deficit each year. The 2008 global economic crisis has had both direct and indirect effects on AUA as well as Armenia, both of which largely depend on diasporan cash flows that were affected by the crisis.

Given inflation and currency fluctuations, the psychological threshold of AMD 1 million for annual tuition will have to be faced in the near future. Nevertheless, tuition income from resident students is

---

9 [http://www.aua.am/about/institutional_research.html](http://www.aua.am/about/institutional_research.html) (log-in, password required)
not likely to close this deficit in the near future and tuition from non-resident students, which is closer to covering actual costs, is an insignificant source of revenue due to the low number of such students. A robust undergraduate exchange program, foreign recognition of the AUA degree and increased numbers of international students, and intergovernmental exchanges could boost revenue in the longer term; however, non-resident tuition is not projected to generate enough income to significantly defray the structural deficit by 2017 (first graduating undergraduate class). Although the undergraduate program will be designed to cover its incremental costs and will reduce the per-student subsidy, it cannot be expected to cover the university’s overall structural deficit.

Income from endowments, donations, alumni, and research grants as well as rentals and passive income, research center income and commercialization of AUA projects remain the main sources of deficit funding. Each source of revenue must contribute more to covering the university’s current structural deficit for its graduate program and overall operations.

An overarching goal and commitment is to assure access to an AUA education for all who are qualified, regardless of their ability to pay. Continued effective collections for the university’s revolving student loan fund are essential to assure access for future students. Both endowed and donor directed scholarship programs are also an important resource that can help assure access to an AUA education.

**Targets:**

To design an undergraduate program that is revenue- and cost-neutral to the current operation of the university, identifying bridge funding as necessary to cover costs from the ramp up from the first admitted class in Fall 2013 to the fully enrolled undergraduate program in 2016-2017.

To increase income from the endowment, other commercial activities, and a more diversified donor base to cover the existing structural deficit by 2017.

The strategic planning effort resulted in a number of specific recommendations:

- Diversify the donor base (number of donors, size of donations, and geographic scope). Diasporan donations are currently concentrated in the US; however potential resources include wealthy individuals in Armenia, diasporan communities in places such as Russia and Europe, and significant beneficiaries of AUA’s educational programs who are currently affiliated with large companies.
- Launch a capital campaign for AUA’s 25th anniversary, with the goal of securing between $25 and $50 million for the endowment, which would generate enough income to cover most of the structural deficit;
- Reassess tuition levels as conditions change in Armenia;
- Study the impact of differential tuition (different tuition for different degrees based on the job prospects, competition, market for those degrees) and implement it if shown to be effective by 2013;
- Pursue foundation and government assistance, for example, U.S. Government funding for undergraduate education;
• Diversify certificate offerings, promote revenue-generating courses and instructional modules, on-site, off-site and on-line;
• Cultivate alumni giving, aiming for a relatively high participation by 2016, institutionalize alumni relations;
• Diversify and be more entrepreneurial about earned income (e.g. commercialization of IP, such as the digital library, database software developed in-house for student records and registration, other services);
• Select and implement recommendations from the 2011 Brakeley-Briscoe report; see also discussion under Advancement above.

Institutional Capacity, Program Maintenance

A key concern as the university contemplates a major expansion is institutional capacity. A physical capacity review was prepared by the Administration and aside from a few matters largely beyond the university’s control (e.g., traffic and parking in the vicinity of the university), classroom space and other public areas were deemed sufficient for the planned undergraduate expansion. Cafeteria capacity (currently 180 seats) will be significantly expanded by the current renovation plans with undergraduate demand in mind; however, lunch-time/course schedule coordination is still likely to be required to assure smooth function of the cafeteria. Existing library expansion plans should be adequate for the expanded student body. Internet and communications capacity will need to be more specifically assessed and addressed, but expansion on the existing architecture was deemed feasible. Faculty workspace will need to be reallocated, with more faculty sharing offices. Administrative capacity, information management, oversight of academic programs, and quality control gave rise to a number of organizational concerns, most of which are either in the process of being addressed or are on the university’s agenda as a result of the president’s initiative or the regular academic program cycle.

The specific recommendations on institutional capacity that came out of the strategic planning process are as follows:

• Review organization chart in anticipation of expansion, assure scalability, introduce new positions: VP for Advancement, VP for Operations by 2012; Vice Provost for Research, probably a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, possibly a Student Recruitment Officer (or Dean of U-Grad Admissions) by 2013 (subject to funding); Chief Information Security Officer (explore); Consider a reorganization of academic units, possibly structured under a system of colleges and schools, each housing departments offering graduate and undergraduate majors.
• Implement an integrated Information Management System that will bring student information, alumni, and basic faculty into a unified system by 2013 and clear the way for on-line applications, financial aid application, course registration, grade reporting, course and faculty evaluations, course management system, tuition payments.

---

10 Available through the Institutional Research Office.
11 AUA is easily accessible by a variety of modes of public transportation and is walking distance from two metro stops.
12 AUA is conveniently located near a number of restaurants and cafes, which can handle excess demand during peak hours.
• Enhance trust and morale via teambuilding, collaborative research and scholarly activity, and bolstering the university’s consultative culture and decision-making (including students, staff); assure open communication and transparency;
• Introduce multiyear contracts (scheduled for Fall 2011) (including benefits, salary equity) to build morale, create a sense of community, and increase job satisfaction;
• Implement annual/regular performance evaluation mechanism for higher administration (including Deans and VPs) by 2012;
• Consider the pros and cons of quarter as opposed to semester systems and conversion to the semester system in the fall of 2012 (currently being considered by the Provost’s Office in connection with the work of the Undergraduate Task Force); a conversion to the semester system is expected to reduce expenditures in a number of areas, including registration, course scheduling, and possibly faculty hiring and travel expenses.
• Assure that implementation of the Strategic Plan is monitored and evaluated, primarily through the self-study and audit processes of the academic programs;

**Topics for Further Consideration, Research and Thought**

Like any constructive deliberative process, more ideas and issues for evaluation and investigation were generated than are possible to turn into specific targets at the present time. In some instances, the consensus was that more information was needed in order to make a recommendation; in others, a consensus had yet to emerge on the ripeness of the issue or the options that should be considered. The deliberation notes for the strategic discussions as well as comments and individual submissions are archived at the Institutional Research Office and available for review. Most are also available at the AUA Strategy2017 webpage: http://www.aua.am/accreditation/strategy2017.html.

This strategy is not a fixed long-term plan. Rather, it consists of a series of guideposts and trajectories that will need adjustment over time. The strategic planning process is like a map of the university’s course into the future. As the university proceeds in its journey, a better understanding of the terrain will emerge and the map as well as our path may need adjustment. In that spirit, the AUA Strategy2017 webpage, cited above, presents a range of ideas for the university community and leadership consideration.

As the institution approaches its destination, new destinations will no doubt appear on the horizon, warranting informed changes in course and crew. In short, this is a living document, not a static map, since the terrain itself is only partly knowable. What is important is to create the capacity to adapt as a group to changing circumstances and conditions. The process of which this document is but a summary is, in this sense, more important than the document itself, since it is both a demonstration of that adaptive capacity and a means of developing it. Below are some of the key points designated for further research:

• Inquire at foreign embassies (and also foreign universities and exchange programs) in Armenia and Armenian embassies abroad about means for international student recruitment;
• Develop closer collaboration with diasporan organizations and participation in diasporan-oriented events, e.g., Pan-Armenian Games; place ads in event books for diasporan youth organizations such as ACYO, AYF, AGBU-YP, ASAs, etc.);
• Conduct a professional study and investigation of the international student potential for AUA degrees, including evaluating the resources and methods necessary to do effective international student recruitment; investigate the possibility of engaging student recruitment agencies for selected countries;
• Explore hosting/participating in rotating master’s programs offered by consortia of institutions in different countries, where students spend one term or more at AUA;
• Conduct further evaluation and consolidate data on needs of stakeholders (start with students (domestic and international), applicants and private sector);
• Identify desirable spheres and partners for collaboration and complementary activity, and modes of collaboration (emphasis on direct peer-to-peer collaboration) (e.g., universities, research institutes, collaboration with industrial associations and multinationals);
• Further cultivate joint academic and R&D programs with leading academic and research institutions, and the private sectors in Armenia and abroad;
• Select undergraduate majors/degrees. There is growing consensus on several clusters of disciplines: (1) business/economics/hospitality, (2) engineering/computer science/applied math/design, (3) English/communications. As this matter is part of the Undergraduate Task Force’s ongoing deliberative process, the materials from the discussions will be turned over to this process for further consideration.
• Evaluate the possibility of a five-year BA/MA degree. Following the expected launch and full assessment of an undergraduate program, determine the feasibility of a five year BA/MA degree.
• Full assessment of the undergraduate program as a feeder to the university’s graduate program. In light of the tradition in Armenia of loyalty to one’s undergraduate university, it will be important to collect data from the first and second graduating classes in this regard.
• Alumni and Employee/Graduate school surveys regarding the overall effectiveness of the undergraduate program in terms of programs, offered degrees, course selection and tracks.
• Mid stream assessments of the existing strategic plan as well as a new strategic planning process and timeline for three to five years beginning in 2017.
• New self study outline and timeline based on the updated WASC criteria and possibility of new division of schools.
Department of English Programs

Strengths: DEP is one of AUA’s oldest departments and a leader in English language pedagogy and proficiency assessment in Armenia. As Armenia’s only institution of higher learning whose language of instruction is English, AUA has special expertise and a unique mission to promote excellence in the study of English. The DEP has been able to bring outstanding specialists to Armenia who not only taught graduate courses at AUA, but also contributed to language teaching and assessment methodology through conferences and training for colleagues at other universities and high school teachers. With core faculty including 2 PhDs and 3 experienced TEFL lecturers, DEP has a proven track record of growth and competence. The DEP’s community outreach programs, providing experimental English classes for young learners now enroll more than 600 students.

Challenges: While retaining its reputation for excellence, the DEP faces more competition both locally and globally. At the MA TEFL and graduate certificate level, there have been some recent setbacks in recruitment attributable to a number of factors. The university’s recent university-wide admissions tests have created a barrier for DEP students. High tuition continues to be a challenge. And, in preparation for an undergraduate program, there will be a need for additional faculty.

Specific Targets:

Students. Increase number of MA TEFL students to 20, provided that there is more tuition assistance or differential tuition. Attract more students from the region and outside of Armenia – reconsider international tuition level and financial assistance to international students.
Faculty/Staff. Diversification into literature and communications at undergraduate level, more diverse specialties for Graduate Courses. Secure more adjunct instructors and perhaps full-time faculty for the undergraduate writing courses. Larger faculty may facilitate upward expansion into doctoral programs.

Research. EEC and other settings as a lab for applied linguistic research on Curriculum & Instruction for more effective teaching of English to Armenian learners. Provide Assistance to RA

Government/Ministry of Education with more effective research on assessment.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Utilize excellence in training as opportunity to engage funders. Reengage large alumni base. Build on success of EEC – great example of community outreach and service. Gain recognition of program by neighboring countries (e.g., Iran)

Finances and Resources. Investigate possibility of differential tuition.

**College of Engineering**

**Strengths:** As one of AUA’s founding programs, CoE has a relatively large, experienced, core faculty many of whom are engaged in research through the Engineering Research Center. It has satisfactory infrastructure and a collegial, corruption-free atmosphere that students and faculty find attractive. CoE also has a large network of visiting faculty and partners and collaborates with institutions, companies and agencies in the US. Because technology and science are high priorities for Armenia’s future, the CoE has an important role to play in both the country’s and university’s development. For these reasons, it is well-positioned to be among the first university programs to expand into undergraduate education, with a bachelor’s in Computational Science.

**Challenges:** From its inception, the CoE’s programs at the master’s level target were designed for non-traditional students, many of whom are making a transition from a different educational background and career. While the student profile has changed somewhat from the early years, teaching a diverse student body with disparate knowledge levels in the classroom remains a challenge. A perennial problem has been the uniqueness and lack of understanding of IESM in the local market, making recruitment more difficult for this degree. Limited resources for textbooks and small size do not permit gradations or more diversity in course offerings to accommodate the diversity of the student body. Because of the universality of skills and knowledge covered by its degrees, CoE has had a relatively large international student enrollment for AUA; however, most of them have been Armenian diasporans. Attracting a more diverse student body is a goal CoE aims to achieve in line with the university’s overall recruitment effort. The introduction of an undergraduate program will present an opportunity and challenge for international recruitment. Alumni relations has also been good, but with a growing number of alumni, it is a challenge to keep them tied to the university and build a network for university support and collaboration on projects.

Although its facilities and labs are adequate for current needs, expanded research and a larger more diverse student body, as well as commercialization demands more robust facilities for incubation of business projects. The lack of a Ph.D. program is also an inherent limit on the kinds and variety of research that the CoE and ERC can support. To some extent, the expansion into undergraduate studies will address this by creating opportunities for teaching assistants and providing more opportunities for
full-time employment as core faculty, which means a larger, more diverse community of scholars with more subdisciplinary specialties, enrich the graduate and undergraduate offerings and open new possibilities for fruitful multidisciplinary collaborative work.

With the introduction of undergraduate, there are opportunities to address these Challenges: Perhaps the greatest challenge is increase competition from local universities and the shrinking student pool in the coming years, which the university faces as a whole. CoE does not anticipate a problem, because job prospects are good for its graduates at the undergraduate and graduate levels and the pool of applicants with sufficient English proficiency is growing in Armenia overall. Growing numbers of qualified younger scholars and researchers have the potential to contribute to the university and become involved in university-affiliated research.

**Specific Targets:**

Students. Increase the number of international students.

Faculty. Develop an even more diverse and larger core faculty particularly.

Research. Upgrade and expand the research facilities, project incubation capacity, and collaborate work with private sector.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Reinforce alumni relations.

Finances and Resources. Armenia’s and AUA’s financial stability are a global concern. With some targeted external funding, CoE has come through budgetary contraction of the past couple of years relatively well. Pursue options to expand this.

**School of Business Management**

**Strengths:** The majority of MBA graduates stays in Armenia and serve as a link between Armenian companies and global markets by promoting international best practices. The AUA MBA is an excellent value for students and continues to enjoy great popularity among applicants.

**Challenges:** Although AUA’s SBM is the oldest business school in Armenia, it is still a young entity with limited financial resources. In the competitive global market for business education, SBM competes for faculty members and financial resources with regional and global universities that have significantly more funds and resources. With its competitive tuition for local Armenian students and given the range and variety of comparably priced MBA programs outside of Armenia, SBM will need to position itself to attract more international students. In addition, SMB is in a period of transition as it gears up for the introduction of a BA in business. After 20 years of management by part-time deans, it is prepared to have a full-time resident dean, whose first priority will be to build a solid, core faculty of resident instructors and recurrent adjuncts.
Specific Targets:

Students: Review, develop and expand program. Reevaluate and redesign the MBA second year curriculum composed of advanced elective courses and three concentrations (Accounting, Finance and Marketing). Examine the necessity of aligning the MBA concentration in Finance with the requirements of Certified Financial Analyst (CFA) certification and the viability of a specialized Master’s degree program in Finance and Banking. Evaluate and possibly introduce an Executive Education Certificate program. Introduction of BA in Business (2013), providing students with a high-quality business education based on solid liberal arts foundation. Design and possibly implement a Master’s degree in Economics in partnership with the Central Bank of Armenia.

Faculty. Enhance and Engage Faculty. Increase the number of full time and recurring visiting faulty, building a core faculty with the quality and depth of skills necessary to meet SBM’s future program expansion and diversification needs.

Research. Reexamine and Recalibrate Research and Development Activities. SBM will need to review and redefine CBRD’s overall strategy and recalibrate CBRD’s consulting undertakings. Resident SBM leadership and larger core faculty should assist in revitalizing the Center.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Expand and enhance student enrollment by increasing international recruitment and increasing the part time cohort. Expand alumni participation in networking and recruiting activities. Strengthen partnerships with the business community and other local and international stakeholders.

Finances and Resources. Reengaging the MBA alumni with SBM through lifelong learning and other initiatives. Partnering with the main employers of MBA graduates in view of establishment of chaired positions, student scholarships, and other naming opportunities. Utilizing CBRD as a platform to acquire grants and expand research.

Institutional Capacity. Program Maintenance. Explore establishing a two-level advisory board; a general board for oversight of SBM operations and several subordinate boards in functional areas of marketing, accounting, economics and finance.

College of Health Services

Strengths: Over 80% of our graduates are working in Public Health in a variety of positions in government, academics, NGO’s and private groups. Active engagement in health projects including tobacco control, ophthalmology, oral health, TB, Primary Health Care Reform, HIV, nutrition and women’s health among others. Diverse staff. Program engages students in team and group work throughout the program. Strong research center: CHSR’s studies have an ongoing influence in policymaking in the healthcare field of RA. Publications from student’s theses are valued abroad. Affiliation with Johns Hopkins. Collaboration with NGOs and with government for Public Health projects.
Challenges: Funding. Not enough focus on Armenia-oriented public health problems. Lack of management-oriented courses in the curriculum. Absence of practical obligatory internship and opportunity to take part in real projects. Low level of cooperation with government sector and MOH. Limited collaborative research with other western universities. Limited number of resident professors. Low number of international students. Inadequate salary for the jobs in the field of public health. Limited cooperation with YSMU students scheduling into the MPH program. Lack of governmental funding for projects and research. Geographical and political isolation. Strong cultural values, because of lack of diversity (Difficulty of western oriented culture implementation in Armenia in problem solving.

Specific Targets:

Students: Develop entrepreneurship and innovation in scholarship and education by increasing capacity of CHSR in developing and organizing continuing education courses for the medical community, particularly, for medical staff involved in primary healthcare and ophthalmic care; developing CHS and CHSR as a regional center for public health international continuing medical education courses; and further developing on-line courses for the regional community. Partner with schools of public health. Increase student recruitment with attention to diversity of professions and geographic origin. Expand offerings to provide elective courses/short term programs/practica. Provide students access to additional resources/enrichment opportunities.

Faculty. Enhance and support faculty. Further develop the staff of the Center for Health Services Research to provide resources, guidance and assistance to MPH students. Expand the use of CHSR staff and AUA alumni in teaching as guest lecturers, to share their experience in the field of PH with MPH students. Increase the CHSR staff and resident faculty participation in international professional conferences, training workshops, and other PH events. Continue to organize public seminars and workshops for medical professionals, PH practitioners, and NGO representatives in Armenia and regionally. Increase publication and dissemination of scientific material from CHS Faculty and CHSR staff in national and international peer-reviewed journals.

Alumni. Continue to Engage Alumni. Increase alumni participation in seminars for MPH students to share experiences of working on the master projects (e.g., developing proposals).

Research. Become a leader in the health development of Armenia and the region by creating and building upon Armenian and international network of public health specialists. Initiate local and regional PH programs; pursuing interdisciplinary and regional R&D projects. Expand regional visibility of program to market the program and to demonstrate its technical capabilities.

Finances and Resources. Develop opportunities for potential revenue stream by working toward Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) accreditation in the United States. Recruit additional foreign students whose full tuition would offset moving to an every-year admission cycle. Expand resident faculty to facilitate every-year admission, increase elective offerings, and offer special conferences/short courses. Expand research/development projects to support increased numbers of resident faculty; identifying sources for supporting training programs/fellowships, etc.
**Department of Law**

**Strengths:** AUA’s Law Department is a unique resource for Armenia. Its American-style teaching method (Socratic method), English-language of instruction, emphasis on practitioner skills and precedent-based analysis and argumentation, make AUA attractive for students seeking career enhancement as well as those planning to continue their studies abroad. Most AUA LL.M. students are already working and make their careers in Armenia, promoting international best practices in private transactions as well as public interactions with state bodies. Because of its comparative law perspective, which takes Armenian law and practice into account, the AUA LL.M. is an excellent value for Armenian students, enhancing their career and further educational options, and continues to attract top students from Armenia’s recent graduates and young professionals.

**Challenges:** Like most AUA programs, the AUA LL.M. is facing stiffer competition both within Armenia and globally. Some of the specific factors that have made these challenges greater are noted. The part-time format and Armenian-law perspective that make the AUA LL.M. practical and valuable for its current student body in tension with the kinds of offerings that would be attractive and practical for international students. The tuition is relatively high when compared to other International choices. While the two year part time program suits local students well, for international students, AUA’s relatively high tuition is compounded by loss or reduction of income for 2 years. The AUA LL.M. has limited US Accreditation and due to the jurisdictional nature of law, the program focuses primarily on students from Armenia. Although U.S. accredited through WASC, AUA’s LL.M. is not and cannot be American Bar Association accredited. In addition, the high cost of law professors couple with the relatively little opportunity for full-time academic career due to small size poses a unique challenge to the department. The Law Department has a top-heavy administration, with 2 international resident teaching, administrators. This has been a benefit to the university and the law department because it costs the department less than what it would cost to routinely brings in foreign law school faculty to teach. At the same time it limits options for developing cohort- and content-based tracks. Students complain about having too many courses with the same instructors, but this is the unavoidable consequence of the current model based on two resident teaching-administrators.

**Specific Targets:**

Students. Our target of 25 students per year seems reasonable and attainable, although in 2015 there may be a dip in applicants, because there will be no graduates from LL.B. programs in Armenia, due to the extension of high school through 12th grade in 2011. By then, the Law Department will have a number of undergraduate courses, which should sustain it until 2016. Targeted international recruitment will be more feasible with more varied course offerings, which will permit students to concentrate on areas of law.

Faculty/Staff. Building on the core faculty developed during the past 5 years, the Law Department aims to have more full-time, resident faculty, who teach a mix of undergraduate and graduate courses.

Research. The Legal Resource Center is a public service that continues to make English-language legal materials available to students, faculty, practitioners and academics not only from AUA but also from other universities. In addition, its on-line resources, including the Citizens’ Rights Guides, Arbitration Guide, and Armenian Law Review, which makes student master’s papers and faculty research more widely accessible, are an asset that promotes the program and raises legal awareness in the community.
However, the pressing need for applied research on how to bring Armenia’s legal system, institutions, attitudes, and practices into line with international best practices is not being effectively addressed. Faculty and students, as well as alumni and external stakeholders, urge the LRC to be more proactive in the field of research and legal reform. To do so, we need to focus more time and resources research. A first step in this direction is the appointment in the fall of 2011 of an LRC Programs Director who has the academic credentials and global academic ties in Europe and the US to build the research program and make AUA a forum for scholarly discussion and debate.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. For many donors, support for AUA is an investment in Armenia’s future. Rule of law is widely recognized as essential for Armenia’s development. The AUA Law Department counts three deputy ministers, a number of judges, prosecutors, NGO activists, and leading private practitioners among its alumni. The program is well-regarded and alumni often express their appreciation for the role that AUA played in their career advancement. In short, this good will and gratitude is ready to be tapped into as AUA prepares for its 25th anniversary in 2017 and the Law Program for its 15th anniversary in 2013.

Finances and Resources. Law students already pay roughly double the tuition per credit as the rest of the university. Thus, there is already differential tuition at AUA. When the administration required further cuts and efficiencies, the class sizes were increased, so that in many instances net income per seat in the law department was quadruple that of other academic programs. On the other hand, these larger classes, which are still medium to small by the standards of most law school classes, was not well-received by students and some faculty, who prefer smaller, cohort-based classes and more specialty courses. By streamlining the Law Department’s administration, it will be possible to address the financial restraints.

Institutional Capacity, Program Maintenance. As noted in the university’s Strategy2017 report, in preparation for the next phase of the university’s diversification and expansion in to undergraduate, streamlining and reorganization of academic program administration has to be on the agenda. For the Law Department, this means rethinking its top-heavy resident administrative structure, which is out of line and out of sync with the rest of the university.

**School of Political Science and International Affairs**

**Strengths:** The quality and substance of the courses offered and materials covered. The graduating students who are interested in making a difference in the development of Armenia. The name and quality of faculty who present courses in the program. Large alumni network, significant social and political research, leader in polling and public opinion research methodologies that have contributed to various international and national efforts to improve Armenian public policy. New resident faculty enabling the department to design and offer a new set of courses at the graduate and undergraduate level (general education dources) and revitalize and enhance existing courses. Historically motivated high-level student body. Well placed alumni who continue to contribute to Armenia.

**Challenges:** Insufficient core faculty to create and enhance a cohesive community of scholars and cover the full diversity of specialties and sub-disciplines in the field. Because core faculty are insufficient administrative burdens divert effort from scholarship and turnover imposes additional burdens to maintain continuity and institutional memory. Competition has increased in the Armenian
market with at least one local university offering a competitive undergraduate program in political science. Two funding challenges exist: one for the program overall and one for faculty salaries.

**Specific Targets:**

**Students:** Aim to increase diversity of the student body through recruitment of more international students in line with university-wide goals. PSIA is well-positioned as a non-localized field with few pre-requisites for international as well as local students who wish to continue their studies abroad. Continue to enhance the opportunities for students to engage in the Turpanjian Center’s research. As the university enters a new phase of undergraduate education, design and offer several new undergraduate general education courses providing a testing ground for the feasibility of an undergraduate program in political science.

**Faculty/Staff:** Increase the number of core faculty creating an engaged and cohesive community of scholars.

**Research:** As core faculty increases, engage in continued research in collaboration with domestic and international organizations. Develop a short and long term focus for the Turpanjian Center on particular development issues. As the university prepares to launch an undergraduate program, develop teaching assistant opportunities for graduates, providing additional supplemental materials for undergraduates and an opportunity to identify outstanding undergraduates for continued study at the graduate level. With continuing European harmonization and integration, upcoming elections and democratization, and changes in Armenia’s geopolitical surroundings AUA is well located for research.

**Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach:** Engage alumni to enhance the student experience and gather information about career/further education.

**Extension Program**

**Strengths:** The Extension Program is well positioned to take advantage of the university’s qualities, capabilities, synergies and linkages in providing training with major differentiators. Extension’s portfolio and range of offerings. Long standing and solid experience in providing General English and TOEFL preparation courses for students seeking quality education. Customer Loyalty. Experienced Instructors; Clearly Identified Programs with dedicated and hardworking support team. Cooperation with MOE. Cisco Certified Regional Networking Academy; ETS Certified Test Administration Site; Microsoft Certified Information Technology Academy and Authorized Test Center for TOEFL iBT, LSAT, GRE, SAT, SAT Subject, with impeccable integrity in administration of tests. Established relationships with a number of key organizations in Armenia including Orange Telecom, Central Bank of Armenia, Ameriabank, VirageLogic and USAID Projects that relate to workforce capacity.

**Challenges:** One challenge has been effectively working with AUA’s myriad academic and research departments to offer fulfilling courses. Lack of a core instructional staff instead depending heavily on contracted professionals which tend to be more expensive than permanent staff. Several logistical challenges include a broken telephone system which lacks voice-mail capability, the limited hours of the university’s cashier office, fully coordinating use of classrooms and facilities in the Paramarz Avedisian Building. Extension is also faced with growing competition in all walks of adult training, lifelong learning and continuing professional education in Armenia. In particular, English Language training...
competition is fierce. With lower overheads and smaller classroom sizes and competitive fees, these education centers are a real competitor. Some customer dissatisfaction due to larger class sizes, higher tuition fees, quality of our classrooms.

**Specific Targets:**

Students. Expand the range of topics that address English language learning. Some courses in particular that need developing and/or improving include: English for Legal Profession, English for Medical Profession, English for Banking and Finance, English for Tourism & Hospitality Industry, English on the Phone – or Telephone English, and American Ways – The Central Elements of American Culture.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Extension aims to expand existing and develop new partnerships. In particular, Extension will seek closer cooperation with the university’s SBM and organizations outside the university, such as National Competitiveness Foundation of Armenia, the Armenian Development Agency (ADA), and a number of USAID Programs, to expand offerings and address the skills development needs of Armenian businesses.

---

**Acopian Center for the Environment**

**Strengths:** The ACE has positioned itself as a strong organization which utilizes western standards of methods of controlling the human impact on nature using accumulated long-term monitoring data and analysis of trends. Solid reputation. Existence within the AUA campus and availability of a modern building with necessary tools for educational work. Modest but stable financial resources. Consistency of work and reputation. Strong history of leading relevant seminars and conferences. The university’s only multi-disciplinary unit.

**Challenges:** Narrow range of educational product. Limited equipment. Limited managerial experience of leadership. Limited finances. New strategy toward sustainable management of natural resources.

**Specific Targets:**

Students. Creation of topical products. The preconditions for topicality are based on (1) analysis of global trends in environmental field; (2) analysis of local market of potential employers and students. Strengthening of the educational base by topical research. Developing a partnership with US universities (UC Davis, UC Riverside, and UC Berkeley) to offer a new impulse for the students’ enrollment.

Faculty/Staff. Increase of the number of qualified faculty and scholars to cover the expansion of educational programs. Provide existing faculty with the opportunity to develop competencies within partner universities in order to replace some visiting faculty.


Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Develop content for and design new website with focus on potential donors, partners and applicants. Increase number of scientific articles in
peer-reviewed magazines as well as popular articles in non-sectoral magazines. Research possibility of developing ecoclubs in rural schools.

Finances and Resources. Research Grants and contracts to leverage endowment.


**Library**

**Strengths:** The AUA library is one of the most widely visited libraries in Armenia. The library contains over 47,000 volumes of books and periodicals. In addition, a vast amount of e-resources is available on the Internet through commercial databases to which the library subscribes. The Library is the central resource in the country for the World Bank publications and project reports.

**Challenges:** Due to the current budgetary limitation the Library has become more selective in its subscriptions, book purchase, and multimedia resources; does not house an adequate number of textbooks; and library staff is unable to keep up with developments in the profession due to the lack of opportunity for library staff to participate in professional trainings.

**Specific Targets:**

Students. Maximize availability of information in all formats to our user population. (Partially funded) Develop and up to date collection department policy; provide access to the collection in all formats; collect and provide access to unique resources. Provide improved and current effective instructional support for students, in partnership with faculty, with particular attention to undergraduate needs.

Faculty/Staff. Enhance library effectiveness by recruiting and developing a highly qualified and skilled staff to provide the best possible service and leadership. (Partially funded.) Recruit and hire qualified service oriented staff providing professional development and educational opportunities.

Institutional Capacity, Program Development. Expand the library’s physical space and IT infrastructure (fully funded via ASHA grant). Expand facilities to meet requirements of growing collections, expanding services and increasing number of patrons. Upgrade equipment and software. Systematically upgrade the library’s automated management system. Provide improved web infrastructure to support expanded access.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Provide leadership and promote partnership in developing and sharing library resources. (Partially funded.) Continue active participation in networking and consortia governance activities.

Financial Resources. Increase the operating budget by seeking new resources including grants and new partnerships. Purchasing of electronic information products via consortia licensing.
Information and Communication Technologies Services (ICT)

Strengths: ICT employs open standards and best practices promoting an environment that provides protection from unauthorized or inadvertent access, sabotage or disasters and ensures the availability, integrity and confidentiality of information yet does not unduly hinder the university from conducting business as usual.

Challenges: Challenges include financial restrictions limiting the expansion of human other resources; the development of distance learning programs; limited use of online and e-resources. In addition several improvements are needed including to AUA’s internal and external network capabilities and Information Security policies, standards, evaluations, and university-wide security awareness.

Specific Targets:

Students: Purchasing, installing, and supporting a new conference system (for 50 participants) to accommodate growing needs. Determine and provide for the increased internet and technology needs of an undergraduate program.

Faculty/Staff: Reconfiguration of the existing LAN; increase the capacity of the network up to 1GB/sec in main buildings; implementation of Universal Network Authentication capability in all buildings.

Institutional Capacity/Program Maintenance. Defining and enforce internal processes including clear delineation of responsibilities and coordination workstations and software issues for users accommodated by support of ICTS staff. Hire of an Information Security Officer to oversee security policies, standards, evaluations, and university-wide security awareness. Upgrade existing AUA PABX system with VOIP technologies and following features and major benefits. ICTS will participate in the university’s library expansion project. Other internal restructuring will be necessary to accommodate growing university needs. Begin implementing Evergreen Equipment Program.

Administrative

Strengths: The major strength of the administrative departments is its dedicated long term staff, a significant part of which has worked for more than ten years. The department has almost zero staff turnover. Great teamwork and cooperation among various administrative departments has led to successful graduation ceremonies, conferences and seminars.

Challenges: The biggest challenge has been continuous budget cuts in recent year. However, a number of problematic areas have been addressed and the budgeting process for the next year promises to address accumulated concerns. A bigger challenge has been ensuring that the PAB systems work effectively.
Specific Targets:

Personnel. Enhance employee morale and performance. Apply COLA (expected fall 2011). Ensure adequate and competitive compensation system through considering merit, as well as internal and external equity adjustments. Undertake review and enhancement of the benefit and allowance system. Develop and deliver staff training and development programs to help staff and managers to accomplish the goals of the University Strategic Plan.

Faculty Services. Enhance country and city orientation and oversee visa and residential needs of the client groups. Budget implications will follow when the number of foreign students and faculty (due to introducing undergraduate programs) is increased significantly.

Facilities. Complete the construction related work at PAB (with private funds). Implement renovation projects (with USAID ASHA support) in the Main building/Library-kitchen project, replacement of old elevators, upgrade of building systems, A/C in the Large auditorium; in the AUA Center; and in Barsam Suites/Construction of an elevator).

Photocopying Service. Ensure a breakeven operation and outsource about 50% of the orders to prolong the economic life of copiers.

Revenue Generation from Conferences/Seminars, as well as from providing other Services. Ensure constant revenue flow by maintaining high quality service to customers and promoting the AUA conference and catering facilities. Implementing the marketing plan will require one-time investment costs.

Public Relations

Strengths: The department’s consistent coverage of the university’s main events: graduation, alumni dinner, lectures, panel discussions, conferences with no additional budget requirements. Promotional materials are prepared in house. Broad interdepartmental cooperation and close relations with ROA media.

Challenges: Some of the challenges which face the university’s PR Office are lack of a native English speaker (an editor for proof-reading annual report, booklets, brochures, website and releases), limited staff including a designer and assistant, limited budget to allow for advertising, promotional materials (t-shirts, cups, etc.), and subscription to newspapers and journals.

Specific Targets:

Students: Increase outreach regarding needs based financial aid

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach: Increase outreach in Armenia and Diaspora with a multi pronged focus including messaging about AUA’s research centers as well as academic programs.
Office of the Registrar

Strengths: The Office of the Registrar and Student Services has staff that provide institutional memory for the office with employment at AUA ranging from 2-18 years. Educated and well-trained office staff know their jobs extremely well and form a cohesive unit that serves the university to a high level. In the same vein they all have university degrees with 4 holding masters degrees from AUA. The staff works well both as individuals and as members of a bigger team. With the opening of the newly renovated office last year procedures have become and are still becoming more streamlined and student-friendly.

Challenges: One of the strengths of the office is also one of its challenges in that sometimes long employment in one place becomes routine. New infusions of blood and ideas keep everyone excited and looking to the future. Also after loss of staff, individuals can feel overwhelmed and customer service can suffer due to this. Limited staff

Specific Targets:

Students. Complete design and use of database including online registration (by 2013). Financial counseling for students.

Faculty/Staff. Complete design and use of database including online grading and admissions process.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Increase number of recruitment visits and application helps days in areas outside of Yerevan. Increase the number of Open Houses. Strategically increase international recruitment/outreach to Russia and CIS, Europe, Iran, China, and India. Work to provide English language instruction throughout the country providing non Yerevan residents with the English language proficiency necessary for admission. Translate materials into Armenian, Russian, and Farsi.

Institutional Capacity/Program Maintenance. An improved method of records management both electronic and paper needs to be identified and implemented to ensure the long-term efficacy of student records. Printed materials need to be enhanced. A records retention policy for academic records must be developed and utilized. Registrar’s office must continue to do annual audits of policies, processes and personnel.

Alumni and Career Development Office

Strengths: Regular outreach to alumni. Regular services and programs aimed at helping students and alumni improve their job hunting skills including career days with potential employers for students/alumni. Strong relations with a number of potential employers. Consistent updating of AUA Alumni database.

Challenges: One of the challenges for ACDO is the relatively low number of students utilizing available services. In addition, the limited number of internships/part time jobs available for students makes job placement challenging. Limited financial resources have made expanding outreach an additional challenge.
Strategic Targets:

Students. Increase students’ awareness of ACDO services. Continue to provide and enhance a variety of services for students and alumni to interact with employers from private, government, education, and non-profit sectors including. On-campus recruiting, information sessions, and fairs. Help students prepare to enter the workforce. Expand the number of partnerships with industry and government to increase the pool of employers. Define employers’ hiring requirements to enhance graduates to be hired.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Enhance alumni and students networking; encourage alumni participation in university life. Develop services for alumni. Determine alumni needs and more effectively support alumni in their career development. Organize diverse cultural, social and professional networking events for alumni/students.

Institutional Research Office

Strengths: The Office of Institutional Research consistently collects, analyzes, and reports university data-- on students, faculty, curriculum, course offerings and learning outcomes. The office has a strong record of working with myriad university departments and units. The IRO has a strong background in statistics, research methods, and computer based reporting tools, as well as strong written and oral communication skills, attention to details, and knowledge about how institutions of higher education operate.

Challenges: The establishment of undergraduate degree programs starting from 2013 will increase student and faculty body, and challenge the work of IRO in terms of the breadth and depth of assessment and evaluation activities, as well as data collection efforts. IRO will face the challenge to address the increase in the workload and efficient management.

Strategic Targets:

Research. Determine new needs and reevaluate and update the existing surveys for maximal relevance and utilization. Distribute alumni survey and institute a process of regularly surveying alumni. Launch an employee satisfaction survey. Plan for the intensive regular assessment of the undergraduate program. Reevaluate the existing Factbook. Formulate and implement policies on data requests and data publication. Initiate online surveys wherever possible.

Development

Strengths: Institution’s reputation.

Challenges: The main challenges have been lack of a solid, experienced, fully staffed development department; lack of clear attainable short and long term objectives; recent focus mainly on fundraising for the PAB (a successful project); failure to effectively use alumni profiles in outreach.
Strategic Goals:

Faculty/Staff. The immediate hiring of a VP for Advancement is a top priority. The hiring of additional fully qualified development staff as needed to assist the VP in the implementation of an aggressive development plan.

Advancement, Public Relations, Alumni Relations, Outreach. Enhance the newly begun monthly Ebulletin, Bi monthly during the academic year. Steadily increase the number of recipients.

Increase overall outreach / publicity. Review and update (as needed) all university materials. Review for consistency (including use of logos, etc.). Update as necessary.

Annual Fund. Substantially increase the number of individual donors and income from the Annual Fund Drive. Specific Targets to be developed by the new Vice President of Advancement based on research.

Alumni Involvement. Creation of an alumni circle. Develop a culture of involvement and giving potentially launching to coincide with the 20th anniversary of first graduating class.

Endowment. Launch of a capital campaign perhaps in connection with the university’s 25th anniversary.

Major gifts. Creation of a major gifts task force to identify and profile ten potential major donors. Developing the number of major gifts will be based primarily on the availability of AUA’s President and senior administrators (Deans, Vice Presidents) to engage one on one with key individuals.

Public support. Investigate the possibility of public support through United States Congressional earmark, discretionary funding via embassies in area (especially in terms of scholarship funding).
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PAB 133W

November 7, 2011 Update of the Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards

SC and Expanded CPR Working Group meeting held on March 10, 2011

Participants:
Dr. Lucig Danielian         Dr. Irshat Madyarov
Dr. Vahan Bournazian       Ms. Anahit Ordyan
Mr. Arthur Drampyan        Mr. Gevorg Goyunyan
Ms. Satenik Avakyan
Mr. Berj Gatrjyan

SC and Expanded CPR Working Group meeting held on March 17, 2011

Participants:
Dr. Lucig Danielian         Dr. Irshat Madyarov
Dr. Aram Hajian             Dr. Catherine Buon
Mr. Arthur Drampyan         Dr. Varduhi Petrosyan
Ms. Satenik Avakyan         Mr. Eric Guevorkian
Mr. Berj Gatrjyan           Ms. Rebecca Carter
Dr. Vahan Bournazian        Ms. Anahit Ordyan
Mr. Gevorg Goyunyan

SC and Expanded CPR Working Group meeting held on March 24, 2011

Participants:
Dr. Lucig Danielian         Dr. Varduhi Petrosyan
Dr. Aram Hajian             Mr. Arthur Drampyan
Ms. Satenik Avakyan         Mr. Eric Guevorkian
Mr. Berj Gatrjyan           Ms. Rebecca Carter
Dr. Vahan Bournazian        Ms. Anahit Ordyan
Mr. Gevorg Goyunyan

SC and Expanded CPR Working Group meeting held on November 7, 2011

Participants:
Dr. Tom Samuelian           Dr. Aram Hajian          Mr. Berj Gatrjyan          Ms. Bella Avakyan
Mr. Gevorg Goyunyan         Ms. Anush Bezhanyan      Dr. Irshat Madyarov         Dr. Karen Aghababyan
Ms. Shari Melkonian         Dr. Doug Shmavon           Ms. Anahit Ordyan

This version updates 2009 Preliminary Review of Steering Committee.
### Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher educational community and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

#### Criteria for Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Review Rating</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= We do this well; area of strength for us</td>
<td>A= High priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= Aspects of this need our attention</td>
<td>B= Lower priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= This item needs significant development</td>
<td>C= Does not need to be addressed at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= Does not apply or not enough evidence to address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review Rating</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The institution’s formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.</td>
<td>The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution’s purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines, or are subject to peer review within the framework of generally recognized academic disciplines or areas of practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mission statement; strategic plan Used as basis for mission statements of academic programs and the AUA strategies and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.</td>
<td>Published in academic program handbooks and online. All in place, except for institutional level objectives based on the AUA mission statement. Educational objectives clearly stated at all other levels and used by faculty and available to students. Retention and completion is analyzed and policies changed to increase student success in the first quarter of study. Student learning assessment are conducted by each academic program for selected objectives annually in accordance with a student learning assessment plan. Data is made public through the Factbook.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**American University of Armenia**

**Attachment 5-2**
### Institutional Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review Rating</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Organizational charts; job descriptions; shared responsibilities of Deans and Assoc/Asst Deans. Assoc/Asst Deans and administrative heads evaluated annually. BOT charge (from AUA Charter) Policy on the regular review process of President, Provost and Deans is in place and is partially implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review Rating</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.</td>
<td>The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world-views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure these conditions are consistent with academic freedom. Due process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Po Statement on academic freedom (Faculty and Student Handbooks); Ethics and grievance Committee; Student Code of Ethics (Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.</td>
<td>The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WASC Statement on Diversity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enrollment open to all applicants (Equal Opportunity Policy); Equal opportunity employer. Proactive recruitment and training outreach to disadvantaged regions. Special mentorship programs for women. Statistics on students, faculty and staff, financial assistance (Factbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.</td>
<td>The institution has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by political, religious, corporate or other external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mission Statement, Charter. AUA is an independent institution of higher learning focused on education and research with no outside influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, and human subjects in research and refunds. The institution has published or readily-available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. and has no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution has published or readily-available grievance procedures for faculty and staff. The institution’s policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated, and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Student Handbook; AUA Catalog; Student Code of Ethics, Ethics and Grievance Committee Charge, E&amp;G Rules of Procedure on website. Documents referred to during orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.</td>
<td>The institution’s finances are regularly audited by external agencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Purchasing policy, Annual AUAF and AUAC audit reports; Regular BOT Finance Committee meetings; Provost follow-ups on quarterly financial reports with academic and administrative heads. Handbook of Administrative Policies. Financial Audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AUA observes WASC substantive change policies and is in communication with WASC through its ALO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synthesis/ Reflections on Standard One

After completing this analysis, what are the 2 or 3 most important issues that should be emphasized in the Review under this Standard?

- (1.1-1.2) Institutional objectives must be developed and operationalized; clarification of org-chart; recalibration of mission statement to better reflect the current realities and future of the institution, including consideration of various directions for expansion
- (1.3) Regular review process for Deans is in place but has not been implemented
- (1.7) Check policy on maintenance of complaint records (ethical grievances are held confidentially)

Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional strengths for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Full time IRO; Accreditation Director, resident senior faculty member serves as ALO on campus, on-line publically accessible institutional Factbook
- E&G and Curriculum Committees of the Faculty Senate
- Student Learning Assessments; Program Self-studies and Audits on-line, along with guidelines and resources
- Regular Deans’ Retreats and strategic planning sessions

Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are areas to be addressed or improved for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Improved market research data
- Streamlining and clarification of the organizational chart
- Institutionalize the review process for Deans
### Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution’s efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</th>
<th>Who interprets it?</th>
<th>How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The institution’s educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.</td>
<td>The content, length, and standards of the institution’s academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Charge of the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate (on web); Faculty Handbook; Self-Study and Audit Review Guidelines (Being updated for new cycle).</td>
<td>Academic Program descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.</td>
<td>Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are clearly defined for all academic programs and for each course syllabus. Available in program student handbooks, online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life. These programs also ensure the development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster an understanding of diversity; civic responsibility; the ability to work with others; and the capability to engage in lifelong learning. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in the areas of cultural and aesthetic, social and political, as well as scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons in this society. Finally, students are required to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study as part of their baccalaureate programs.</td>
<td>The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, consisting of a minimum of 45 semester units (or the equivalent), together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a major).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Self-Review</td>
<td>Importance to address at this time</td>
<td>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</td>
<td>Who interprets it?</td>
<td>How is it used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2b</td>
<td>Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ at least one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered, and demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Admissions Policies (online); Catalog (online); full-time faculty are employed for each degree program; Program faculty lists; Library and Internet resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The institution’s student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and expectations are reflected in academic programs and policies; curriculum; advisement; library and information resources; and learning environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SLA Manual 2008, New SLA Plans for 2011-12, 2012-13; new SLA guidelines under development; establishment of SL Subcommittee of Curriculum Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Student Handbook. Faculty Handbook. The on-going assessment of student learning is included also in the self-study/audit review process which engages the faculty of the academic programs. Annual student learning assessment workshop. CC audits/reviews go to Provost, President and Board for review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount of students/faculty (student: faculty) Faculty by program and degree (Factbook)</td>
<td>Consolidated Report of Research Centers 2010-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Self-Review</td>
<td>Importance to address at this time</td>
<td>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</td>
<td>Who interprets it?</td>
<td>How is it used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course syllabi; all changes to curricula and individual courses reviewed by CC. Student feedback is systematically gathered through source evaluations Exit surveys; frequency of written graded assignments; interactive teaching. Rubrics are used for grading and assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit survey of students; Self-study reports; Employer surveys; Alumni surveys; syllabi; Dean’s review of syllabi; mentoring by faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-study and Audit Guidelines; Student learning assessment manual and plans; Student Exit surveys; Employer and Alumni surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scholarship and Creative Activity

2.8 The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovations as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.

Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</th>
<th>Who interprets it?</th>
<th>How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>Research and Scholarship task Force. Report and Recommendations of RSTF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Support for Student Learning

The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences.

<p>| 2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs. | 1 B | Alumni and Career Development Office, Student Council and other clubs; As graduate institution, limited co-curricular activities Need: Exit survey should include a question on Student council | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.12</th>
<th>The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.</th>
<th>Recruiting and admission practices, academic calendars, publications, and advertising are accurate, current, complete, and are readily available to support student needs.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Student Handbooks of the academic programs; Catalog; websites; university-wide and program student orientations. Academic Writing Course. Resident deans and associate deans are in regular contact with students. Application help days, open houses; notifications regarding application dates sent via SMS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Student support services—including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information services—are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AUA financial aid policies and coordinator; student advising by Registrar/Director Student Affairs and resident deans; Alumni and Career Development Office (career counseling, workshops, career days, job announcements), Papazian Library workshops and trainings, library electronic acquisitions and IT infrastructure improvements. Library and IT work with academic programs to assure coordinated, effective services for academic assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Synthesis/ Reflections on Standard Two

After completing this analysis, what are the 2 or 3 most important issues that should be emphasized in the Review under this Standard?

- (2.1) More core faculty; Need for faculty development
- (2.8-2.9) Need to develop AUA’s approach to research/scholarship of both faculty and students; develop model of scholarship and research tailored to the institution’s realities by academic program and discipline.

Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Learning outcomes are clearly defined for all academic programs and for each course syllabus
- Admissions policies; CC and Self-studies/Audits; Student Evaluations of courses/Faculty; Dean’s Evaluation of Faculty; Student Handbook; Annual Research Reports

Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Need to assure that academic programs use evidence-based analysis to assure adequate core faculty and specializations
- Benchmark research and scholarship standards at comparable Master’s Degree-only institutions
- Resource assessment for supporting sustainable research
### Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Self-Review</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td>3.1 The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Organizational chart, Faculty qualifications and statistics. Factbook. Low Student:Faculty ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook. IRO data on faculty; Self-studies and audit reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Annual evaluation processes for faculty and staff; student course evaluations; self-studies link to the evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its institutional objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Library training (extended hours) ICTS (hours, 24 hour hotline), online resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Self-Review</td>
<td>Importance to address at this time</td>
<td>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources</td>
<td>3.5 The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources.</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUAF and AUAC annual audits; Recruitment and Enrollment Strategy and Plan. Quarterly reports to the BOT. In accordance w/ ROA law, publish balance sheets. Budget process – inclusive and transparent even when cuts are inevitable. President is restructuring development; Search for a VP of Advancement; need for increased endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information sources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution’s educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kinds to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered.</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papazian Library, electronic collections; Libraries of the academic programs; ICTS services; PAB and renovation of MB Interlibrary source that helps to find whatever you want. Library workshops and trainings. Library renovation (Planned: Winter 2012) Library accessible off-campus via AUA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7. The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library page on website. Papazian and other libraries, off-campus access to electronic holdings; CS services, computer labs and WIFI access to libraries Faculty can view their class lists, enter grades, communicate with students, see course evaluations ICTS services, hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Self-Review</td>
<td>Importance to address at this time</td>
<td>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8. The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining effective academic programs.</td>
<td>The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority which are reflected in an organization chart.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Organizational chart; job descriptions; BOT charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9. The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.</td>
<td>The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AUA Charter; BOT Charge; AUAF Board. Presidential review in contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10. The institution has a full time chief executive officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Full time resident president. CV Four out of six Deans are resident. Two remaining have experienced resident Associate Deans and long-term non-resident deans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11. The institution’s faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution’s educational purposes and character.</td>
<td>The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook; Faculty Senate and its Committees and Charges; Curriculum Committee, Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee. Self-study and audit review process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synthesis/ Reflections on Standard Three

After completing this analysis, what are the 2 or 3 most important issues that should be emphasized in the Review under this Standard?

- (3.1-3.4) Need to move to multiple-year contracts and/or tenure (as advised by EE team)
- (3.1-3.4) Need for faculty development and formal orientation for all short and long term faculty
- (3.5) Need to restructure development and decide on funding model that meets AUA’s mission; increase endowment for financial stability; funding needed for international student recruitment to increase tuition base; need to increase level of direct funding to the academic programs
- (3.10) Resident deans for academic programs

Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional strengths for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Faculty evaluations by students and Deans
- Annual budgeting process, quarterly monitoring

Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are areas to be addressed or improved for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Assess and benchmark number of faculty and recruitment of faculty for each academic program
- Strategic plan for development to assure financial viability, in particular to address the consequences of the global financial crisis
- Assess alignment between mission, strategic plan, and financial resources – benchmark against institutions of similar size, mission
**Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Importance to address at this time</th>
<th>Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Thinking and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including faculty, in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of its plans and planning processes and revises them as appropriate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2005-2010 Strategic and Financial Plans; 2011-2017 Strategic Plan, Academic Program Self-Studies and audits, Undergraduate Task Force, Research and Scholarship Task Force. Inclusive strategic planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Self-study and audit guidelines, 2011-2017 Strategic Plan (fact sheets, issue sheets, and analysis prepared by IRO for planning discussions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, and using comparative data from external sources and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee policies and processes; Self-study/Audit review cycles; Assessment of student learning cycles Data collections: student surveys; exit surveys; Factbooks Need to update process for data collection, review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Review</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Self-Review</td>
<td>Importance to address at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Learning and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5. The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purpose and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.</td>
<td>Periodic analyses of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of the educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Synthesis/ Reflections on Standard Four

After completing this analysis, what are the 2 or 3 most important issues that should be emphasized in the Review under this Standard?

- (4.1) Need for new CEO to create processes for the development of the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan
- (4.3) Need to make data-based decisions on expansion options
- (4.6-4.7) Need to close the loop of the self-study/audit review process with BOT engagement. BOT should use the reports for assessment of the academic programs and institutional planning

Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional strengths for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Exit surveys; alumni surveys; employer surveys; IRO Factbook Annual Learning Outcome Assessments; Program Self-Studies & Audits Curriculum Committee Policies and Procedures
- McKinsey Study on University Positioning and expansion options, Brakeley-Briscoe Report on Advancement and Fund-raising
- Inclusive and transparent strategic planning process, with assistance of process technician, developed 2011-2017 Strategic Plan for expansion and diversification of university programs, faculty and income sources, based on evidence, SWOT, benchmark against institutions of similar size, mission

Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are areas to be addressed or improved for the Capacity & Preparatory Review? For the Educational Effectiveness Review?

- Assess effectiveness of 2005-2010 Strategic Plan
- Need to institutionalize and broaden participation in learning assessment and closing the loop on results of learning assessment
Summative Questions

1. Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?

A Subgroup of the AUA Accreditation Steering Committee composed of faculty and administrators directly involved in academic administration and operations and who are responsible for many aspects of assessment at the academic program and institutional level. The Worksheet was filled out through a consultative process and brainstorming at the Faculty Senate and Curriculum Committee, with assistance of the IRO, which includes representatives of all academic programs. This was followed by community “town meeting” discussion and, after which, the results were reviewed by the Board of Deans and the Worksheet was revised by the Subgroup.

2. What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?

Three themes emerged as key concerns:

- Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Success – aiming to institutionalize improvement of student learning and assure that the assessment-improvement loop is consistently and effectively closed.

- Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Learners – aiming to address the need for a core faculty, with a long-term commitment to the university and to clarify the core function of creative work, research, scholarship and service and its role in faculty development;

- Theme 3: Recalibrating our Mission for the Next Phase of Development – aiming to adjust the university’s mission and strategic plans to the changing realities in higher education in Armenia and the region and to assure that goals for expansion in connection with our new facilities are grounded in reliable data and aligned with market trends.

There was disagreement on whether Theme 3 should be a separate theme or should be integrated into the overall review process as an overarching set of considerations given the current transition to a new President after 14 years. By majority vote of the Accreditation Steering Committee and Board of Deans it was decided to focus on Themes 1 and 2.
What areas emerged as either institutional strengths or topics for further exploration that might be targeted as themes or topics to be explored in the review?

- Institutional strengths included quality education, reputation, continued alumni success, and impact of the university on policy and economic development.
- Areas that need further research: directions for consolidation and streamlining of existing operations and opportunities for growth and assuring financial stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the next steps in preparing for the accreditation review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Updating Self Study Guidelines, Audit Guidelines, SLA Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workshops for faculty on student learning assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation of 2011-2012 student learning assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation of multi-year contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Study faculty orientation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation and monitoring of strategic plan (undergraduate expansion, advancement plan, administration evaluations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUA Mission Statement

As an institution of higher learning, the American University of Armenia provides teaching, research, and service programs that prepare students and enable faculty and researchers to address the needs of Armenia and the surrounding region for sustainable development, in a setting that values and develops academic excellence, free inquiry, integrity, scholarship, leadership, and service to society.
1. PREAMBLE
The students, faculty and administration of AUA are all collectively and individually responsible for maintaining the academic integrity of this institution. This Code of Ethics governs the academic conduct of each student University-wide and it shall be used to govern and adjudicate all matters of student academic conduct to the extent it is practicable for it to do so.

Students at AUA are obligated to conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to the University's mission as an institution of higher education. Students are obligated to refrain from acts that they know, or should know, will impair the academic integrity of the University. Actions, which may be considered acceptable or normative outside of AUA, are not necessarily acceptable at AUA and shall not interfere in overall academic conduct. All shall be treated equally and be guided by the current code. This Code of Ethics may from time to time be revised and amended.

2. POLICY
If any provision of this document directly contradicts an ethics provision of an academic program, then the relevant provision in this document shall prevail. If this document is silent on any matter pertaining to student ethics, then the provision of the student’s academic program shall prevail on that particular matter.

3. RIGHTS
As members of the American University of Armenia community, students enjoy the following rights:

3.1. Equal Opportunity in Education
Every student has a right to be free from discrimination based on race, religion, ethnic origin, political affiliation, age, sex, disability or sexual orientation.

3.2. Right to Academic Freedom
Students have the right to freedom of expression as defined in the University statement on academic freedom, and a right to freedom of assembly and association, as long as the exercise of such freedoms does not interfere with the effective conduct of classes, complies with University policies, the Education Contract, RA laws, and respect for the rights of others.

3.3. Rights Concerning Educational Process
3.3.1 While students are required to know the material presented by the instructor, students are also free to reserve and express personal judgment in a constructive manner.
3.3.2 While faculty and administrators have decision making authority in educational matters, students may make suggestions in a constructive manner regarding revising and improving the educational process.

3.3.3 Students have the right to be informed of grading criteria and to fair evaluation by the instructor, as well as a right to appeal a grade based on mathematical error or misapplication of grading criteria.

3.4. Privacy Rights
Students have a right to protection against unauthorized disclosure of information contained in their financial, medical, and educational records.

3.5. Rights Pertaining to Student Organizations
3.5.1 Students shall be free to organize and join student organizations to promote their common interests within the framework of the Student Council. Student organizations shall be free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest in accordance with RA law.
3.5.2 Recognized student organizations may be afforded the privilege to use available University buildings, facilities and services in accordance with the University administrative policies and procedures.
3.6. Freedom from Harassment
Students have a right to be free from any kind of harassment by any member of the University's community and have the right to apply to the Ethics and Grievance Committee for redress.

3.7. Due Process
Students have a right to due process in any University proceeding against them. This includes the right to be heard, a right to review and decision by impartial persons or bodies, and a right to adequate notice.

3.8. Grievance Process
Students have a right to file a grievance regarding the violation of any student right with the Ethics and Grievance Committee in accordance with its procedures.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES
4.1. It shall be the responsibility of each student to become familiar with the provisions of this Code. Upon enrollment at AUA each student will be given a copy of the Code and will sign a form acknowledging that he/she has read, understood and agreed to follow this Code.

4.2. Each student is obligated to refrain from committing any act of academic dishonesty. These are acts that a student knows or under the circumstances should know impair the academic integrity of AUA, as described in detail in this Code.

4.3. A student who commits an act of academic dishonesty is subject to disciplinary action as described in this Code.

4.4. A faculty member who discovers a violation of this Code may impose the following measures:

4.4.1. oral warning to the student;
4.4.2. written warning to the student;
4.4.3. reduction in score in the academic evaluation involved or one of its components;
4.4.4. retake of the academic evaluation involved or one of its components;
4.4.5. failure in the course.

4.5. Disciplinary measures should be applied in a timely manner, as soon as practicable after the discovery of the violation.

4.6. Faculty should seek, as needed, the advice of the Dean (or his/her designee) on how to handle such violations. If the student is from a different program or department, faculty members are encouraged to confer with the Dean of that program (or his/her designee) about the student.

4.7. In a particularly serious case (e.g., involving a repeat offense), the faculty member may recommend that the Dean request that the student be suspended or dismissed from the program. The final decision on such matters shall be made by the Vice President (or his/her designee).

4.8. In general, students should address their concerns regarding disciplinary measures under this Code, first to the faculty member. If the student believes that there has been a serious error in the application of the disciplinary measure, the student may discuss the matter with the Dean (or Dean's designee).

4.9. After appeal to the Dean (or the Dean's designee), if a student believes that the disciplinary measure relating to the violation of academic integrity or misconduct is manifestly erroneous or grossly unfair, the student may appeal to the Ethics and Grievance Committee (EGC). In general, the EGC will show deference to the faculty and dean on substantive matters and may modify a measure only if the disciplinary measure was manifestly erroneous or grossly unfair.

4.10. Each Program/Department shall make an annual report at the end of each academic year, summarizing on a no-names basis the violations addressed and the corresponding disciplinary measures applied during that academic year.

5. DEFINITIONS
The following definitions apply to the terminology used in this Code:

5.1. Academic Integrity
Adherence to academic ethical principles and honesty
5.2. **Academic evaluation** includes:
- in-class examinations whether or not in writing
- laboratory reports
- take-home examinations
- research or term papers
- assignments, case studies and exercises
- any other academic work intended to evaluate a student's performance in a course

5.3. **Appropriate faculty member**
An appropriate faculty member is the instructor in whose class or under whose supervision the dispute has arisen.

5.4. **Academic dishonesty**
Any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for one's self or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the academic community, including misrepresentation of another's work as one's own.

5.5. **Academic misconduct**
Academic misconduct is a violation of the Student Code of Ethics. Academic misconduct is defined as any deliberate action that harms the academic ethics of the University in any other way than in the forgoing definitions. Academic misconduct shall include, but is not limited to:
- removing, defacing, or deliberately keeping from other students library materials that are on reserve for specific courses;
- making material misrepresentations in the context of an academic assignment;
- fabricating or altering information or data and presenting it as legitimate;
- failing to identify yourself honestly in the context of an academic obligation;
- providing false or misleading information to an instructor or any other University official;
- sabotaging or stealing another person's assignment, book, paper, notes, experiment, project, electronic hardware or software;
- improper access to, or electronically interfering with, the property of another person or the University via computer or other means;
- obtaining a copy of an exam or assignment prior to its approved release by the instructor;
- selling, distributing, website posting, or publishing course lecture notes, handouts, readers, recordings, or other information provided by an instructor, or using them for any commercial purpose without the express permission of the instructor;
- forgery of an instructor's signature on a letter of recommendation or any other document;
- submitting an altered transcript of grades to or from another institution;
- putting one's name on another person's exam or assignment;
- altering a previously graded exam or assignment for purposes of a grade appeal or gaining points in a re-grading process.

5.6. **Cheating**
Cheating is a violation of the Student Code of Ethics. Cheating shall include but is not limited to:
- using or referring to notes, books, devices or other sources of information during an Academic Evaluation when such use has not been expressly allowed by the faculty member who is conducting the examination;
- copying another student's answers on an Academic Evaluation;
- unauthorized conferring during an Academic Evaluation
- allowing another student to copy one's answers;
- acting as substitute for another or utilizing another as a substitute during an Academic Evaluation;
- preprogramming a calculator, cell phone, or other device to contain answers or other unauthorized information for exams;
- using unauthorized materials, prepared answers, written notes, or concealed information during an exam;
5.6.8. allowing others to do an assignment or portion of an assignment (e.g., group assignments) for you, including the use of a commercial term-paper service;
5.6.9. submission of the same assignment for more than one course without prior approval of all the instructors involved;

5.7. **Disciplinary Measures**

Disciplinary Measures are the action(s) taken to punish a person who committed violations of academic integrity, in particular. Depending on -- and consistent with -- the level of the infraction (severity of the offense), as mitigated or aggravated by circumstances and prior offenses measures that may be applied are as follows:

5.7.1. warning (verbal)
5.7.2. written warning (censure)
5.7.3. reduction in score
5.7.4. failure
5.7.5. suspension
5.7.6. dismissal

5.8. **Member of academic community**

A member of academic community is anyone who is related to, involved in, or responsible for the academic matters of AUA.

5.9. **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is a violation of the Student Code of Ethics. Plagiarism consists of using the words, ideas, concepts or data of another person without proper attribution. It may exist in circumstances where the student implies that he/she is the original source of the information. Plagiarism includes both direct use and the paraphrasing of words, thoughts or concepts of another without proper attribution. It shall include, but is not limited to:

5.9.1. copying of passages from electronic and/or copy works of others into one’s own homework, essay, term paper, or thesis without acknowledgment;
5.9.2. use of the views, opinions, or insights of another person without acknowledgment;
5.9.3. paraphrasing of another person's characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor, or other literary device without acknowledgment.
AUA STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom is basic to the institutional mission of the American University of Armenia. As an institution committed to academic freedom, AUA subscribes to the following principles:

- the right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the search for truth may lead
- the tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from political interference
- the obligation, as a social institution, to promote, through teaching and research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity. ¹

In accordance with those principles, members of the AUA community shall enjoy freedom to inquire, study, publish, teach, and learn. Attendant to that freedom are certain responsibilities that pertain to all members of the AUA community, and to faculty members in particular, namely, the obligation to be bound by professional standards, to be accurate, to exercise restraint, to show respect for the opinions of others, and to indicate that they do not speak for the institution. ²

No AUA faculty member or student shall be subject to any penalty or threat for exercising his or her academic freedom.

This Statement on Academic Freedom shall be implemented in accordance with the appended guidelines.

IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES FOR STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Oversight

The Faculty Council shall have the responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the status of academic freedom at AUA. The Council shall submit to the Dean of Faculty and the President an annual report on the status of academic freedom at the American University of Armenia. That report shall identify any relevant issues and recommend specific actions as needed.

Based on the annual report of the Faculty Council, the President shall make an annual report to the Board of Trustees on the status of academic freedom at the American University of Armenia.

Grievance Procedure

Any AUA faculty member or student who believes that his or her academic freedom has been infringed shall have the right to file a grievance in accordance with the established institutional grievance procedure.

(Adopted by the AUA Board of Trustees, September 13, 2001)

² American Association of University Professors. Academic Freedom, 1940
ETHICS & GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

CHARGE

The Ethics and Grievance Committee of the Faculty Senate shall have jurisdiction [or authority] to review, advise, and make recommendations on policies regarding ethical behavior, and to hear and resolve appeals brought by any member of the university against any other member of the university regarding violations of any of the various codes and policies of the university.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1: If a member of the Ethics & Grievance Committee is a party to a grievance being considered by the Committee, that member’s attendance shall be excused from any part of the meeting discussing the grievance in question.

Rule 2: Panel Composition: Factual investigation of a grievance shall be carried out by a Panel composed of 3 members of the Committee who can affirm that they are free of any bias towards the parties. A member who believes that their inclusion on the Panel would raise an appearance of bias must notify the Committee of the circumstances for the Committee’s consideration. Once formed, a party may ask the Committee to reconsider including a specific member or members in the Panel based on potential bias.

Rule 3: Confidentiality: Pursuant to the Faculty Handbook, and out of respect for the parties involved, all parties to the grievance and all members of the Ethics and Grievance Committee are obligated to keep confidential all aspects of any specific grievance, especially the names of the parties, the facts of the grievance, and any communications or procedures undertaken by the Committee toward resolution.

(a) "Confidentiality Notice": For clarity, any document containing substantive information about a grievance (including the names of the parties) shall be marked “Confidential” to assure against inadvertent circulation of the document to an unauthorized person, as per Rule 1 above or otherwise.

(b) Witnesses: In order to balance confidentiality concerns with the need to investigation a grievance, the obligation to keep confidential all aspects of any grievance shall be extended to any witness called by the Panel and the witness shall be informed of this obligation by the Panel.

(c) Breach of Confidentiality: For the protection of all involved individuals and for fairness in general, if a party to a grievance discloses information about the grievance to a person outside the circle of confidentiality, then the Committee may take disciplinary action against the disclosing party. This may include dismissal of the grievance without further proceedings, in the event that the unauthorized disclosure was made by complainant or complainant's witnesses.

(d) Transparency: For the protection of Committee members and in order to maintain an impartial process, any Committee member who discovers a breach of confidentiality must report such breach to the Committee.

Rule 4: Witnesses before the Panel: In an effort to maintain confidentiality, while at the same time conducting a fair investigation of the facts of a grievance, the Panel shall make every effort to limit the number of witnesses it must call upon while at the same time ensuring a full
investigation of the factual issues raised in the complaint. Parties may suggest appropriate
witnesses to the Panel. The Panel, acting as a whole, shall decide which witnesses to interview and
when. Interviews may be conducted in person or by e-mail, telephone or other similar technology,
as decided by the Panel.

Rule 5: Final Decisions: All final decisions shall be recorded in the form of a written
report. The report content and subsequent disposition of the report by the Committee depend on
whether the decision calls for disciplinary action.

1. No Disciplinary Action. If the Committee's final decision does not recommend any
disciplinary action, the grievance shall be dismissed and the parties shall be so informed in writing.
The final decision shall not be submitted to the President (or President's designee) ("President") and
the respondent's supervisor or placed in the respondent's file. The Committee shall retain a copy of
the final decision for its archive, but shall destroy the remaining evidence in the file.

2. Disciplinary Action. If the Committee's final decision calls for disciplinary action, the
Committee shall prepare a written summary of the decision, setting forth the recommended
disciplinary action, procedural history, essential facts, and rationale for the decision.

   2(a) If the final decision calls for disciplinary action involving contractual relations with
the employee (e.g., suspension or dismissal), the Committee's final decision shall be referred to the
President and deemed suspended in light of the President's disposition of the matter. The final
decision shall remain confidential, be retained in the Committee's archive, together with supporting
material, and sealed. The document containing the President's disposition of the matter shall
become the final decision. A copy of the final decision shall be placed in the disciplined party's
personnel file and delivered to the disciplined party, the disciplined party's supervisor and the
President. It shall continue to remain confidential.

   2(b) If the final decision calls for disciplinary action involving warning or censure, then
the final decision shall be implemented directly by the Committee. A copy of the final decision
shall be placed in the disciplined party's personnel file and delivered to the disciplined party, the
disciplined party's supervisor and the President. It shall continue to remain confidential.

3. Periodically, but no less than once a year, the Committee shall publish a list of the captions
(names of the parties) and disposition of grievances that resulted in disciplinary action (e.g., In re
Grievance against X, warning issued). In the annual report, the Committee may also provide
guidance to the university community, without names or identifying specifics, on claims that have
been dismissed, claims that have been satisfied, and how to avoid common infractions.

Rule 6: Mediation: When a grievance has been presented to the committee, the committee
will attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation before proceeding with the formal grievance
process.
Curriculum Committee Charge

The Curriculum Committee (CC) is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate (FS).

The Faculty Senate Bylaws Charter states, ‘The Faculty Senate is authorized to recommend to the president policies pertaining to courses, curriculum, and degree requirements, while the Board of Trustees retains final authority over the establishment of new degree programs.

The Faculty Handbook, under the section ‘Statement on Educational Effectiveness’, states, ‘In the next phase towards full accreditation, AUA degree programs must demonstrate that they have developed plans for evidence-based long term curricular designs that will serve as the institutional basis for assessing AUA’s ability and commitment to meet WASC guidelines for institutional capacity and educational effectiveness. AUA faculty are expected to be fully engaged in these processes.’

Charges of the Curriculum Committee are:

- to promote excellence in the educational programs
- to review, advise and make policy recommendations on matters related to curricula
- to conduct ongoing curricular evaluation
- to provide guidance, advocacy, and supervision by assuring that curricula are academically sound, comprehensive, and responsive to the evolving needs of the University, thus serving its mission, goals, and educational needs of the students
- to assist in the development of educational programs in accordance with the philosophy, policies and objectives of the University
- to encourage creativity, flexibility, and innovation in the curricular development of the University
- to review existing/proposed educational programs and curricula, and ensure they are consistent with AUA’s mission
- to strive for educational effectiveness while maintaining meaningful participation by all programs of the University in the creation, development, continuance, and when appropriate, recommend dissolution of educational programs and curricula

Unanimously adopted by the Faculty Senate at its June 27, 2005, meeting.
Student Learning Committee

Background:

AUA has set a standard of educational excellence in Armenia and strives to maintain and continuously improve its academic programs. Quality assurance, through the assessment and evaluation of teaching and student learning, has been key to achieving this goal. During the past two decades, and particularly over the past five years, AUA has formalized and systematized assessment and evaluation processes.

As it matures into its third decade, AUA needs to refine and institutionalize the mechanisms used for assessment and evaluation of student learning and the goals and objectives of the academic programs. This alignment will assure consistency from year to year within academic programs, across disciplines and departments, and with academic program assessment processes and the career needs of students. The results of student learning assessment will be used consistently, efficiently, and effectively in order to make appropriate, well-documented, timely, and tailored improvements in the delivery of education.

AUA needs to develop the resources and mechanisms required to diffuse an understanding of these issues and concepts so that assessment and evaluation become an integral part of the day-to-day activity and mindset of each member of the AUA faculty, including faculty with adjunct and visiting status.

Purpose:

- To develop resources and mechanisms to institutionalize assessment and evaluation of student learning across the university in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Research and the Administration;
- To oversee and coordinate Student Learning Assessments (SLA) for each program using direct and indirect evidence and monitor the integration of the findings of the SLAs into five-year cycle of academic program self-studies;
- To assure consistency from year-to-year within academic programs and across disciplines and programs;
- To share experience, expertise and insights across academic programs and disciplines with respect to assessment and evaluation of student learning via training, manuals, websites, archives on student learning assessment;
- To raise awareness, enhance skills, and diffuse understanding of student learning issues and concepts so that they become an integral part of the day-to-day activity and mindset of each member of the AUA faculty, including adjunct and visiting faculty;
- To monitor and assure that findings are implemented through timely and appropriate measures ("closing the loop"), including follow up assessment and evaluation of the educational effectiveness of measures implemented.
Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs

American University of Armenia

(2008-2011)
Introduction by the Provost

An integral part of AUA’s commitment to the improvement of student learning through continuous assessment is the self-study/audit cycle. Starting in 2008, the University will begin a new cycle that will end in 2011. (See Attachment 1 for the timeline. The staggered timeline was agreed to by the Deans during the January retreat.) In order to meet the needs of the University, the AUA Evaluation Plan calls for the regular review of all academic programs by the Curriculum Committee. The primary goals of the review process are to continuously enhance the academic programs and to move the University forward in meeting its mission and strategic plan.

In addition to the primary purposes of evaluation and improvement, the self-study reports of the academic programs and the subsequent audit reports of the Curriculum Committee will form the base for the two reports required by WASC for its on-site reviews of the University in 2012 and 2013. The AUA Guidelines for the self-study process have taken into consideration all WASC “criteria for review” (CFRs). I am attaching the newly revised WASC criteria for your information (see separate attachment).

The review process includes two steps: (1) The self-study and report of the academic program based on the AUA Educational Review Guidelines and (2) the audit of the academic program by the Curriculum Committee based on the self-study report. (The audit team, which in this cycle will include outside evaluators, reviews the appropriateness of the program’s mission, goals, objectives and learning outcomes, the extent to which all three have been met, and the overall quality of the program.)

The review process begins with the self-study. The Guidelines were developed to assist in this process. The purpose of the self-study is to allow the faculty, administration, students, alumni and other stakeholders of each academic program (1) to evaluate accomplishments and challenges, (2) to engage the academic program in strategic planning, and (3) to use data/information and analyses to make changes that improve the program and student learning.

Faculty members of the academic program, including adjunct and core visiting faculty, must be involved in the self-study process as must students, alumni, and other stakeholders such as employers of graduates. The Dean and faculty members decide how to conduct the self-study, who will write which portions of the report, and the timeline of activities.

Let me share with you some of the basics:

- The self-study is a year-long process that results in a report. A major part of this self-study effort is the improvement of the academic program. This is the time for you to make changes based on your analyses of the data and information you collect.

- Make sure to keep minutes of all faculty meetings and that the minutes document discussion of the self-study process.
• The self-study report needs to be concise, based on evidence, and well-argued. This is very much a self-evaluation based on data and information collected for the self-study. Data can include all sorts of statistics and trends, interviews and group discussions with students and alumni, and other collected information. Anecdotal evidence is not sufficient.

• The self-study report is in narrative format. Data and other information are presented in several required appendices. The appendices will form a separate large folder of documents.

• This is a process that is tied to the future and to the past – it is not just one more discrete report. This new self-study should take into consideration the reports prepared for the self-study in 2003-2004 and the reports of the 2006 audits and should mark progress that has been made along with obstacles and how they have or have not been overcome.

• The audit teams will be evaluating how the academic program has met its own recommendations as stated in the 2003-2004 self-studies and how it has dealt with the recommendations of the 2006 audit teams. Wherever possible, include how you have handled these two sets of recommendations when answering the Guideline questions.

• As a result of the year long self-study process, the academic and educational programs will make new changes that improve the programs. Make sure to include a discussion of the changes that have been made already as a result of this new self-study process. Include a discussion and/or list of planned future changes resulting from the self-study process.

• Use the table of contents and the order of contents provided in Attachment B. You may add but may not delete items.

• Make sure to answer all of the AUA Guideline questions. You must answer all questions in the narrative but not necessarily in the order indicated in the Guidelines.

• Add information that you believe is important.

• Two components of the self-study are on-going and you are engaged in them already – enrollment/student recruitment and assessment of student learning. All you will need to do is plug information into the self-study report.

• Do your best to limit the length of the self-study report to 20-25 pages, excluding appendices.

• ECRC and the Extension Program should consult with Diana Danelian about which components of the self-study process apply to these educational programs.

Most importantly, Diana Danelian is ready to assist you by locating and providing data that she has collected in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Diana’s Office maintains
data for each program on student and faculty demographics, degrees granted, enrollment, exit and alumni surveys, students and faculty full and part time, student-faculty ratio, and grades.

In addition to these regularly updated data, you may contact Diana to arrange for special reports – just make sure to make your requests in a timely manner. Diana also has a long list of resources on assessment that she will be happy to share with you.

Finally, please know that I am here for you and am ready to lend support in any way I can as we move through this new review cycle.

Not that we need it after the success of our last self-study cycle, but good luck to us all!
Components of the Self-Study Process and Report

Component 1: Program Description and Evolution

Mission

1. What is the mission of the academic program?
2. Does the academic program’s mission statement clearly describe the program’s purpose? How has it changed since the establishment of the program?
3. How well is the program’s mission aligned with the University’s mission and strategic plan?
4. What is the program’s place in the Armenian and regional markets?
5. How well does the program serve the community?

Overall Program Goals and Educational Objectives

1. What are the program’s goals, educational objectives/competencies, and learning outcomes? Are they consistent with the program’s mission and purpose? How are the educational objectives published?
2. Have goals and objectives changed since the last review? If so, please explain how and why they have changed.
3. How are the program goals tied to the University strategic plan?
4. How has the program contributed to the implementation of the strategic plan?
5. How do the program’s goals and strategic priorities relate to its curriculum, faculty teaching, and the expectations for faculty scholarly activities?
6. Where is the program now and where do you expect and want it to be in five years? (Attach the latest academic program strategic plan as an appendix.)

Component 2: Academic Program Profile and Processes

Governance

1. What is program’s administrative organization? How are the responsibilities of the Dean and the Associate/Assistant Dean and/or other administrative leaders decided?
2. How are curricular and other decisions made?
3. How does the policy on academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students operate in the program?
4. How does program administration assure that all students are treated fairly and equitably?
5. What are the procedures in place for addressing student conduct, grievances, and human subjects in research?
6. Are program requirements clearly published and understood by students, faculty, and staff?
**Students**

1. What are the program’s admission requirements and procedures? How were the requirements developed? Provide evidence of the quality and preparation of applicant pools over the past three years. *(The data on entrance scores for the past three years can be obtained from IRO and should be attached as an appendix.)*
2. After reviewing data on students and the quality of students during the past three years, what trends do you see?
3. What actions has the program taken to retain students?
4. What evidence is there that students able to complete the program within the University’s normal time limits?
5. How are students involved in the program’s decision-making?
6. Describe the program’s advising process. How are students challenged to meet high expectations? How is feedback provided to students so that they improve?
7. Are there opportunities for student-faculty communication outside the classroom? What efforts are being made to improve the quality of student advising? *(Include student handbooks or manuals as appendices.)*
8. What is the program’s grading policy? How is it communicated to students? How is course grading evaluated? How are problems such as grade inflation handled? How are grade appeals handled?
9. How does the program prepare students to enter the workplace?
10. How are student needs and satisfaction levels identified and used?
11. What types and levels of financial assistance are available for students?

**Faculty**

1. Is there a sufficient number of qualified faculty to sustain the program? How is faculty workload determined? *(Summarize faculty data in an appendix.)*
2. Are faculty credentials appropriate for the curriculum?
3. What are the program’s faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion processes? What are faculty turn-over trends?
4. How are annual faculty reviews used to improve student learning?
5. How are faculty included in taking collective responsibility for participating in the development, implementation, and assessment of objectives and learning outcomes?
6. How are faculty members included in program governance and strategic planning? *(Attach faculty minutes from the past three years in an appendix.)*
7. How is mentoring junior and visiting faculty conducted in the program?
8. What notable activities have the faculty been engaged in since the 2003-2004 self-study in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service?
9. What has the academic program done to support faculty development?

**Research**

1. How does the program’s research center provide students with research opportunities?
2. What is the relationship between the academic program and the research center?
3. Are there other opportunities for students to engage in research and scholarly activity? how have they been realized?
4. What are the notable awards and publications of faculty and students resulting from center activity? (Provide a list of awards, publications, and conference presentations as an appendix.)

Resources and support services

1. Describe and evaluate the department’s facilities, equipment and computer and communications resources.
2. How do AUA library holdings in the program’s field meet the needs of the program?
3. Is there adequate staff support to meet program goals?
4. Discuss and prioritize the program’s most important specific needs.

Component 3: Teaching and Academic Assessment

Curriculum

1. How does the curriculum meet the program’s mission, goals and objectives?
2. How are the mission, goals, objectives, and learning outcomes of the program communicated to students so that is clear?
3. What is the relationship of the program’s curriculum to the University strategic plan?
4. Are objectives and learning outcomes stated in all course syllabi? (Include all course objectives and learning outcomes in an appendix.)
5. How and how often is the curriculum reviewed by faculty, both informally and formally? (Include minutes of faculty meetings for the past three years.)
6. What is the capstone experience and how is it evaluated?
7. Does the program’s curriculum have an international perspective?
8. What are the program’s plans for improving the curriculum?

Academic assessment

1. What is the status of the program assessment plan? Provide evidence that all student learning outcomes of the program will be assessed by 2009. (Attach a copy of program’s assessment plan as an appendix).
2. How does the program assess student learning outcomes? (Attach copies of the program’s annual assessment reports as appendices).
3. How are faculty involved in the development and implementation of the program’s assessment plan?
4. How does the program assess student satisfaction with the program? How are results from exit and alumni surveys used for the assessment? (IRO will provide data on the academic program from student exit, alumni and employer surveys.)
5. “Closing the loop.” How has the assessment of learning outcomes been used to improve student learning and the effectiveness of the program?
6. How have assessments of student satisfaction been used to improve student learning and the effectiveness of the program?

Component 4: Enrollment
1. Insert enrollment/student recruitment plan here.
2. State how faculty are involved in the development and implementation of the plan.

Component 5: Overall Evaluation and Recommendations

1. What are the program’s strengths and major accomplishments within the last three years and in what ways has the program changed?
2. What is the program’s impact on the country and region? Include also information on major alumni accomplishments for the last three years.
3. What are the program’s weaknesses? Where areas could most use improvement? What challenges or obstacles make it difficult for the program to overcome these weaknesses? What further challenges do you foresee in the next five years?
4. What progress has the program made in addressing the recommendations of 2003-2004 self-study and the 2006 audit?
5. Which recommendations from the previous self-studies were not implemented, if any, and why?
6. Is there a continuing need for the program in the country and the region? Discuss the updated information on the market and competition from other institutions of higher learning in Armenia and the region from the Enrollment Plan.
7. What are the program’s main challenges and what are the recommendations for overcoming them? What recommendations have already been implemented as a result of the self-study process?
Required Appendices for the Report

Follow numbering and headings. You may add additional appendices to the end of the list.

1. Academic unit profile
   a. Student statistical summary (for the past three years: descriptive, GPA, PT/FT, international students, etc. Can be obtained from IRO Office.)
   b. Faculty statistical summary (for the past three years: list of faculty members, positions, PT/FT, citizenship, highest degree. Can be obtained from the IRO Office.)
   c. Faculty CVs for the past three years
2. Curriculum: Course list organized by program objectives/competencies with course objectives and learning outcomes listed for each course
3. Copy of the program’s assessment plan
4. Copies of the annual assessment reports
5. Level of preparation of admitted students - entrance scores for the past three years
6. Latest academic program strategic plan
7. Student handbook or manual
8. List of faculty publications, conference participations, awards, etc.
9. Copies of minutes of faculty meetings for the past three years.
Attachment A: Timeline for Completion of Self-Studies and Audits of Academic and Educational Programs

December 2008: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the Law Department, College of Health Sciences, and Extension Program (Because of the delay in the preparation of the Guidelines, the deadline may be extended to January 15, 2009.)

Spring/Summer/Fall Quarters 2009: Curriculum Committee audits of the Law Department, College of Health Sciences, and Extension Program

December 2009: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the Department of English, School of Business Management, and ECRC

Spring/Summer/Fall Quarters 2010: Curriculum Committee audits of the Department of English, School of Business Management, and ECRC

December 2010: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the School of Political Science and International Affairs and College of Engineering

Spring/Summer Quarters 2011: Curriculum Committee audits of the School of Political Science and International Affairs and College of Engineering

Fall 2011: Faculty Senate review of self-studies and audit reports

Spring 2012: AUA Board of Trustee review of self studies and audit reports
Attachment B: Required Table of Contents for the Self Study Report

Include all titles and subtitles in the order provided. You may add but not delete items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in the Self-Study Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Description and Evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall program goals and educational objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Profile and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Academic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic unit profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student statistical summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Faculty statistical summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Faculty CVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum: Course listing, course objectives and learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Annual assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entrance scores for the past three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. List of faculty accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Faculty meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An integral part of AUA’s commitment to the improvement of student learning through continuous assessment is the self-study/audit cycle. In order to meet the needs of the University, the AUA Evaluation Plan calls for the regular review of all academic programs by the Curriculum Committee. The primary goals of the review process are to continuously enhance the academic programs and to move the University forward in meeting its mission and strategic plan. During the years 2008 through 2011, the academic programs are engaged in the University’s third self-study round. (See Attachment 1 for the timeline.)

In addition to the primary purposes of evaluation and improvement, the self-study reports of the academic programs and the audit reports of the Curriculum Committee form the base for the two reports required by WASC for its on-site reviews of the University in 2012 and 2013. The AUA Guidelines for the self-study process have taken into consideration all WASC “criteria for review” (CFRs).

The review process includes two steps: (1) The self-study and report of the academic program based on the AUA Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs and (2) the audit review of the academic program by the Curriculum Committee based on the self-study report. The audit team, which in this cycle includes outside evaluators, reviews the appropriateness of the program’s mission, goals, objectives and learning outcomes, the extent to which all three have been met, and the overall quality of the program.

The review process begins with the self-study, which follows the AUA Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs. The purpose of the self-study is to allow the faculty, administration, students, alumni and other stakeholders of each academic program (1) to evaluate accomplishments and challenges, (2) to engage the academic program in strategic planning, and (3) to use data/information and analyses to make changes that improve the program and student learning.

**The Program Review Audit Process**

The program reviews are collegial and are based on the principles inherent in peer reviews. The purpose of the audit review process is to aid AUA in the continuous improvement of educational effectiveness.

1. The academic programs submit to the Curriculum Committee reports based on the year-long self study process. The reports follow all requirements of the AUA Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs. (See timeline in Attachment A.)

2. The Curriculum Committee performs the audit review in the year following the submission of the report. (See timeline in Attachment A.)
3. The Curriculum Committee appoints the members of the Audit Review Team. The CC Audit Review Team is made-up of three members of the AUA faculty plus one external reviewer. At least two members of the Team must be on the Curriculum Committee. Team members may not be on the faculty of the academic program being reviewed. The CC Audit Review Team follows all guidelines and reporting requirements in this document.

4. The participation of an external reviewer with the appropriate expertise will be piloted during the four years of the current self-study/audit process. The objective is to include in the work of the Audit Review Team an expert external reviewer not employed by the University in part or all of the audit review process. The external reviewer is nominated by the Audit Review Team and is appointed by the CC.

5. The Audit Review Team uses the self-study report, all documents provided with the report, and interviews with students, faculty, alumni, and other stakeholders inside and outside the University, and the 2006 CC audit report with its recommendations as the starting point for the audit review. The Audit Review Team may ask the Dean for additional data and information.

6. The Curriculum Committee works with the Dean in scheduling the Audit Review Team visits.

7. The Audit Review Team drafts a report according to the guidelines in this document and submits it to the Curriculum Committee for discussion.

8. The Audit Review Team submits the report to the Dean. The Dean shares the draft report with the faculty. The Audit Review Team meets with the Dean (in person or in conference call) and the President and Provost to discuss the report and to come to agreement on the recommendations.

9. The academic program under review may submit a reply to the Audit Team Review, and it is attached to the report.

10. The final Audit Review Team report is submitted to the President, Provost, and the Curriculum Committee. A copy is submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment which is responsible for following up on recommendations before the next educational effectiveness assessment cycle begins.

11. The CC submits the Audit Review Team report to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate considers the report, prepares a cover letter with the sense of the FS, and submits the report and cover letter to the Provost. (See timeline in Attachment A.)

12. The Provost submits the Audit Review Team report, the self-study report of the academic program, the FS cover letter, and other materials to the President and members of the AUA Board of Trustees at the end of each audit review. (See timeline in Attachment A.)
Educational Effectiveness Audit Review Guidelines and Reporting Format

These guidelines provide the matters that are to be addressed in the Review Team report and comprise the sections of the Audit Review report itself. The questions in each section below follow the specific requirements of the AUA Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs.

The report is accompanied by a transmittal letter which includes the names of the audit team members, a list of the documents that were reviewed, and a list of the meetings, including dates, with stakeholders of the academic program under review.

The Audit Review Team report begins with an executive summary of the Review Team’s findings and recommendations.

The report may include as appendices any other information the Audit Review Team deems appropriate.

The Audit Review report should address each section below with a summary and conclusion of the Team focused on major accomplishments, significant problems, and recommendations and must address how the recommendations of the 2006 audit have been used. The Audit Review report is not a replication of the self-study report.

Introduction

Self-Study Process

6. How were faculty members of the academic program, students, alumni, and other stakeholders involved in the self-study process?
7. How is the self-study based on data such as statistics and trends, interviews and group discussions with students and alumni, and collected information other than anecdotal evidence?
8. How does the report take into consideration the reports prepared for the self-study in 2003-2004 and the reports of the 2006?
9. Have all questions in the AUA Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Educational Programs been addressed? (If not, the Audit Review Team may ask for additional information.) Is the required table of contents complete?
10. Have all required documents been submitted as appendices? If not, why? (See checklist in Attachment B.)

Program Description and Evolution

Mission

1. What is the mission of the academic program and how has it changed since the establishment of the program?
2. How well is the program’s mission aligned with the University’s mission and strategic plan?
3. What is the relationship of the program’s curriculum to the program’s missions and the University strategic plan?
4. What is the program’s place in the Armenian and regional markets?
5. How well does the program serve the community?

**Overall Program Goals and Educational Objectives**

7. Are the program’s goals, educational objectives/competencies, and learning outcomes consistent with the program’s mission and purpose? Are the educational objectives accessible to students and faculty?
8. How have goals and objectives changed since the last review in 2006 and how are they tied to the implementation of the University strategic plan?
9. How do the program’s goals and strategic priorities relate to its curriculum, faculty teaching, and the expectations for faculty scholarly activities?
10. Does the strategic plan of the academic program demonstrate an understanding of where the program is now and where it wants to be in the next five years?

**Academic Program Profile and Processes**

**Governance**

7. Is the administrative organization and the relationships among administrators of the program adequate to meet its mission?
8. Are curricular and other decisions made using inclusive processes? How does the policy on academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students operate in the program?
9. How does program administration assure that all students are treated fairly and equitably?
10. What are the procedures in place for addressing student conduct, grievances, and human subjects in research?
11. Are program requirements clearly published and understood by students, faculty, and staff?
12. Recommendations.

**Students**

12. What are the program’s admission requirements and procedures? How were the requirements developed? What is the trend in the quality and preparation of applicant pools over the past three years.
13. Is retention of students a problem? If yes, what actions has the program taken to retain students? Are most students able to complete the program within the University’s normal time limits?
14. How are students challenged to meet high expectations through advisement? How is feedback provided to students so that they improve?
15. Are there opportunities for student-faculty communication outside the classroom? What efforts are being made to address the quality of student advising?
16. What is the program’s grading policy? How is it communicated to students? How is course grading evaluated? How are problems such as grade inflation handled? How are grade appeals handled?
17. How does the program prepare students to enter the workplace?
18. How are student needs and satisfaction levels identified and used?

Faculty

10. Is there a sufficient number of qualified faculty to sustain the program? How is faculty workload determined?
11. Are faculty credentials appropriate for the curriculum?
12. What are the program’s faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion processes? What are faculty turnover trends?
13. How are annual faculty reviews used to improve student learning?
14. How are faculty included in taking collective responsibility for participating in the development, implementation, and assessment of objectives and learning outcomes?
15. How are faculty members included in program governance and strategic planning?
16. How is mentoring junior and visiting faculty conducted in the program?
17. How have the faculty been engaged in scholarship and service since the 2006 self-study?
18. What has the academic program done to support faculty development?

Research

5. What is the relationship between the academic program and the research center?
6. How does the program’s research center provide students with research opportunities? Are there other opportunities for students to engage in research and scholarly activity? How have they been realized?
7. What are the notable publications and awards of faculty and students resulting from center activity?
8. Recommendations.

Resources and support services

5. How do AUA library holdings, facilities, equipment, and computer and communications resources meet the needs of the program?
6. Is there adequate staff support to meet program goals?
7. Recommendations.
Teaching and Academic Assessment

Curriculum

9. How does the curriculum meet the program’s mission, goals and objectives?
10. How are the mission, goals, objectives, and learning outcomes of the program communicated to students?
11. Are objectives and learning outcomes stated in all course syllabi?
12. How and how often is the curriculum reviewed by faculty, both informally and formally?
13. What is the capstone experience and how is it evaluated?
14. Does the program’s curriculum have an international perspective?
15. What are the program’s plans for improving the curriculum?

Academic assessment

7. How does the program assess student learning outcomes and what is the status of the program assessment plan?
8. How are faculty involved in the development and implementation of the program’s assessment plan?
9. How does the program assess student satisfaction with the program? How are results from exit and alumni surveys used for the assessment?
10. “Closing the loop.” How has the assessment of learning outcomes been used to improve student learning and the effectiveness of the program?
11. How have assessments of student satisfaction been used to improve student learning and the effectiveness of the program?
12. Recommendations.

Enrollment

3. How does the enrollment plan meet the goals of the academic program and the mission of the University?
4. What are the enrollment trends?
5. How are faculty involved in the development and implementation of the plan.

Overall Evaluation and Recommendations

4. What progress has the program made in addressing the recommendations of the 2006 self-study and audit? Which recommendations from the previous self-studies were not implemented, if any, and why?
5. What are the program’s strengths and major accomplishments within the last three years and in what ways has the program changed?
6. What is the program’s impact on the country and region?
7. What are the program’s weaknesses? Where areas could most use improvement? What challenges or obstacles make it difficult for the program to overcome these weaknesses? What further challenges can be foreseen in the next five years?
8. Is there a continuing need for the program in the country and the region?
9. What are the program’s main challenges and what are the recommendations for overcoming them? What recommendations have already been implemented as a result of the current self-study process?

Attachment A: Timeline for Completion of Self-Studies and Audits of Academic and Educational Programs

December 2008: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the Law Department, College of Health Sciences, and Extension Program (Because of the delay in the preparation of the Guidelines, the deadline may be extended to January 15, 2009.)

Fall Quarter 2009: Curriculum Committee audits of the Law Department, College of Health Sciences, and Extension Program

Winter Quarter 2010: Faculty Senate and Board of Trustee reviews of the audits of the Law Department, College of Health Sciences, and Extension Program

December 2009: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the Department of English Programs, School of Business Management, and ECRC

Winter/Spring Quarters 2010: Curriculum Committee audits of the Department of English Programs, School of Business Management, and ECRC

Fall Quarter 2011: Faculty Senate and Board of Trustee reviews of the audits of the Department of English Programs, School of Business Management, and ECRC

December 2010: Self-study reports completed and submitted by the School of Political Science and International Affairs and College of Engineering

Winter/Spring Quarters 2011: Curriculum Committee audits of the School of Political Science and International Affairs and College of Engineering

Fall Quarter 2011: Faculty Senate and Board of Trustee reviews of the audits of the School of Political Science and International Affairs and College of Engineering
## Attachment B: Required Appendices for the Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Check if submitted with report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student statistical summary (for the past three years: descriptive, GPA, PT/FT, international students, etc. Can be obtained from IRO Office.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty statistical summary (for the past three years: list of faculty members, positions, PT/FT, citizenship, highest degree. Can be obtained from the IRO Office,)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty CVs for the past three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum: Course list organized by program objectives/competencies with course objectives and learning outcomes listed for each course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of the program’s assessment plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of the annual assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of preparation of admitted students - entrance scores for the past three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest academic program strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student handbook or manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of faculty publications, conference participations, awards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of minutes of faculty meetings for the past three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other at discretion of the academic program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the College of Engineering (CoE)
Master of Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (IESM) program & Master of Computer and Information Science (CIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Topic: Revision and recalibration of the Program Goals (PGs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for both IESM and CIS programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To create program-specific PGs and SLOs for CoE’s two degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To ensure that the program-specific PGs and SLOs are measurable and relevant to the current demands of their respective fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The current PGs and SLOs are vague and not measurable. The PGs and SLOs are also shared by both masters programs and are not defined in a field-specific manner. Consequently, the old PGs and SLOs are not widely used, neither by faculty nor students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2011-2012 SLA aims to revise the PGs and SLOs so that they are clear, measureable, and aligned with the changes in the respective fields. In addition to guiding student learning as well as faculty instruction and assessment, the revision and recalibration of PGs and SLOs will provide a foundation for CoE’s efforts to institutionalize SLA by ensuring that 1) PGs and SLOs are calibrated and more widely used to improve learning and teaching, and 2) data collected from SLA process will be more informative for the purpose of instituting improvements “closing the loop.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Schedule:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Survey students, alumni, faculty, and employers to identify relevant program-specific PGs and SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop program-specific PGs with a corresponding set of measureable SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish PGs and SLOs on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include PGs and SLOs on all syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop course-specific rubrics for SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Share rubrics with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have faculty collectively assess students’ work in order to ensure calibration of rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administer student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administer faculty survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course-specific student portfolios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

**Student, Alumni, Faculty and Employer Survey:** Survey relevant stakeholders in order to identify program-specific PGs and SLOs.

**SLA Faculty Meetings:** Review and synthesize survey data and create program-specific PGs and SLOs.
**Creation and Calibration of Rubrics:** Faculty subcommittees in each department hold discussions to develop rubrics for new SLOs and calibrate assessment.

**Student Survey:** Assess students’ perspectives about how the new PGs and SLOs and the use of rubrics have influenced their learning as well as to assess course instruction and student learning as measured against the new SLOs.

**Faculty Survey:** Assess faculty’s perspectives about how the new PGs and SLOs have influenced student learning as well as their instruction and assessment.

**Student Portfolios:** Use rubrics to measure student learning and calibrate faculty use of rubrics.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* Dean appoints a faculty sub-committee, including Dean himself.

*For indirect evidence assessment:* Dean, together with the subcommittees from each program, will coordinate effort with the Institutional Research Manager.

**Closing the Loop:**

*Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*

- Revise curriculum and instruction methods to ensure alignment with new PGs and SLOs
- Add new courses that are relevant to the new PGs and SLOs
- Eliminate courses that are no longer relevant to the field and/or PGs and SLOs
- Guide hiring of faculty
- Revise PGs and SLOs
- Refine rubrics
Investigation Topic: “Closing the Loop – SLA 2011-2012” -- Assessing the impact of new Program Goals (PGs), Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and rubrics on student learning and faculty instruction in each of the two degree programs.

Objective:
- To “close the loop” on the 2011-2012 SLA by evaluating the impact of the newly-develop program-specific PGs, SLOs, and rubrics on the quality of capstone presentations and reports.
- To assess the impact of newly developed program-specific PGs, SLOs, and rubrics on faculty instruction and assessment on the capstone in particular and program in general.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of rubrics in empowering students to take charge of their learning and identify students’ own path for improvement in the capstone course in particular and program in general.

Rationale: Prior to 2011, the SLOs were neither measurable nor defined in a field-specific manner. In 2011-12, the SLA Plan was to develop redefined PGs, SLOs, and rubrics in order to institutionalize their use throughout CoE. The 2012-2013 SLA will examine the quality of capstone presentations and reports in order to assess how, if at all, the newly developed program-specific PGs, SLOs, and rubrics have improved faculty instruction and student learning. Findings from this SLA will enable CoE to refine PGs, SLOs, and rubrics as well as institutionalize additional ways to utilize these tools to improve instruction and learning.

Assessment Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review and evaluate capstone presentations and reports from 2010-2011 using newly developed SLOs and rubrics.</td>
<td>• Review and evaluate capstone presentations and reports from 2012-2013 using newly developed SLOs and rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administer alumni focus groups and interpret results</td>
<td>• Compare and interpret results from 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 capstone presentations and reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administer student focus groups and interpret results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administer faculty focus groups and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Assessment Methods:

Capstone Presentations and Reports:
- **Fall 2012**: Faculty collectively reviews and evaluates capstone presentations and reports from 2010-2011 using newly developed SLOs and rubrics.
- **Spring 2013**: Faculty collectively reviews and evaluates capstone presentations and reports from 2012-2013 using newly developed SLOs and rubrics. Faculty collectively compares and interprets results from 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 capstone presentations and reports.

Alumni Focus Groups: Alumni will be asked to look back on and evaluate their own capstone experience and work using the newly developed SLOs and rubrics.

Student Focus Groups: Students will be asked to reflect upon how, if at all, the newly developed PGs, SLOs, and rubrics supported or influenced their learning in the capstone in particular and in their coursework in general.

Faculty Focus Groups: Faculty will be asked to reflect upon the impact of the newly developed PGs, SLOs, and rubrics on their instruction and on student learning.

Assessment Team: Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* Dean works with the appointed faculty sub-committee, including Dean himself.

*For indirect evidence assessment:* Dean, together with the two subcommittees, will coordinate effort with the Institutional Research Manager.

Closing the Loop:
*Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*
- Refine PGs, SLOs and rubrics
- Refine capstone process (including curriculum, instruction, and schedule)
- Modify overall curriculum and instruction to prioritize and fulfill the new PGs and SLOs.
- Verify that the data collection from the SLA is useful for future analysis
SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the College of Health Sciences (CHS)
Master of Public Health (MPH) program

**Investigation Topic:** MPH Thesis or “Capstone” Project

**Objective:**
- To “close the loop” on the 2007 Learning Assessment Report by evaluating the effectiveness of the changes made to the MPH Thesis Project.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the MPH program in meeting the following student learning outcomes (SLOs):
  1. Assess the health needs of a defined population.
  2. Communicate public health messages to targeted audiences

**Rationale:** The Thesis project is an integral part of the MPH program, providing students with an opportunity to apply and integrate the core public health knowledge and professional skill in a “real world” setting. The project culminates in the submission of the scholarly paper and a public presentation. The 2011-2012 SLA will inform improvements to the capstone and overall curriculum.

**Assessment Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June-December 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the plan for the investigation for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review existing rubrics and questionnaires necessary for the assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct the direct and indirect assessment of the program learning outcomes based on the available data from 2009 and 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the SLO Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

**Capstone Project:** Thesis projects will be analyzed using the pre-existing rubrics to assess the SLOs under investigation. The assessment will be based on the relevant sections of the Thesis project papers and Thesis project presentations. The outcomes will be compared for two different academic years (2009 and 2011).

**MPH Program Evaluation Survey & AUA Exit Survey:** The End of MPH Program Evaluation surveys and AUA Exit Surveys will be analyzed. The outcomes will be compared for two different academic years (2009 and 2011)

**Assessment Team:**

*For direct and indirect evidence assessments:* The Associate Dean of the program appointed Dr. T. Harutyunyan and Dr. B. Crape will form a faculty sub-committee to conduct the assessment. They will be responsible for writing the first draft of the SLA report for 2011-2012, which will
be circulated among the CHS faculty for feedback.

**Closing the Loop:**

*Findings from the assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*

- Identify the areas in need of improvement in Thesis and overall curriculum
- Identify the methods to adjust and improve the program, including 1) improvements in teaching methods, and 2) improvements in the curriculum
- Support collegial discussions about curriculum and student learning
- Guide the selection of instructors for the program and advisers for the Thesis project
- Sustain program quality
SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the College of Health Sciences (CHS)
Master of Public Health (MPH) program

**Investigation Topic:** Students ability to identify, develop, analyze and implement health policy interventions

**Objective:**
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the MPH program in meeting the following student learning outcomes (SLOs):
  1. Develop, analyze, and implement targeted health policies and programs
  2. Assure the appropriateness and effectiveness of a given public health intervention

**Rationale:** The selected student learning outcomes form the core functions of public health professional practice and are achieved through several courses in the MPH program. The student portfolios provide the longitudinal documentation of student learning enhancement and therefore are well-suited to assess the development and integration of knowledge and skills across the curriculum. The establishment of student portfolios will enhance the SLA efforts in the MPH program in subsequent years.

**Assessment Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the plan for the investigation for 2012-2013 academic year, including the selection of courses for review</td>
<td>Review the rubrics, guides, student portfolios, and/or other instruments necessary for the assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct the direct and indirect assessment of the program learning outcomes based on the available data from the 2011-2013 MPH cohort</td>
<td>Prepare the SLO Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

**Student Portfolios:** Student portfolios from selected courses will be assessed utilizing pre-existing rubrics. Student portfolios will document development of students’ knowledge and skills form the 2011-2013 MPH cohort.

**End of First Year MPH Program:** An analysis of the information collected through the End of First Year of MPH Program focus group discussion for the 2011-2013 MPH cohort.

**Assessment Team:**

*For direct and indirect evidence assessments:* The Associate Dean of the program appointed Dr. T. Harutyunyan and Dr. B. Crape will form a faculty sub-committee to conduct the assessment. They will be responsible for writing the first draft of the SLA report for 2012-2013, which will be circulated among the CHS faculty for feedback.
Closing the Loop:  
Findings from the assessment methods will be integrated and used to:  
- Identify the areas in need of improvement in specific courses and across the curriculum  
- Identify the methods to adjust and improve the program, including 1) improvements in teaching methods, and 2) improvements in the curriculum  
- Support collegial discussions about curriculum and student learning  
- Guide the selection of instructors for the program and for specific courses  
- Sustain program quality  
Findings from the 2012-2013 assessment will be used as a basis for the comparative evaluation of these two student learning outcomes in subsequent years.
SLA Plan 2011-2012\(^1\) for the Department of English Programs (DEP)
Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Topic:</th>
<th>Language Education Independent Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To assess the effectiveness of the MA TEFL program in achieving the following student learning outcome (SLO): 5.1 To demonstrate an ability to conduct their own research employing appropriate methodologies and drawing reasonable conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To assess the extent to which the MA TEFL program prepares students to publish their research in professional journals and to present research at conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>The MA TEFL program prepares students to become professionals in EFL. This investigation will evaluate the effectiveness of the program in preparing students to be scholars, who can contribute new knowledge to the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Schedule:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop rubric to assess SLO 5.1 in capstone projects</td>
<td>• Share rubric with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and assess students’ capstone projects and their readiness for publication and/or conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct and interpret student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct and interpret student interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Assessment Methods:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capstone Projects:</strong></td>
<td>Capstone projects will be analyzed to whether or not students’ research is ready to publish and/or present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Survey:</strong></td>
<td>Student surveys will be administered to gather information regarding students’ success in publication/conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Interview:</strong></td>
<td>Student interviews will assess students’ perspective on their preparedness for publication/conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Team:</strong></td>
<td>Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The Department of English Programs utilized the SLA 2010-2011 to “close the loop” on the 2009-2010 SLA. As a result, the DEP plans to examine two separate student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the SLA 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.
**For direct evidence assessments:** Associate Dean and Faculty sub-committee to review capstone projects

**For indirect evidence assessment:** Associate Dean and Faculty work with IRO Manager to develop appropriate surveys and interview questions

**Closing the Loop:**
*Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*

- Modify capstone projects
- Modify capstone grading rubric
- Modify overall curriculum to improve student preparation for scholarly work
- Appoint a faculty member to guide students to conduct research and publish
# SLA Plan 2012-2013 for the Department of English Programs (DEP)
## Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Topic:</th>
<th>The Effectiveness of the Independent Teaching Internship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
<td>- To evaluate the effectiveness of the DEP’s Independent Teaching Experience in achieving the following student learning outcome (SLO): &lt;br&gt; 3.1 <em>Students should be able to demonstrate and employ modern and postmodern methods of teaching and develop relevant materials in the Practicum course as well as in their independent teaching in the EEC classes.</em>&lt;br&gt;- To evaluate the effectiveness of the grading rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>The Independent Teaching Internship is required of all MA TEFL students in their 2nd year. Although the internship is a key component of the MA TEFL capstone, it has never been formally evaluated. This investigation aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the 10-week internship in developing students’ abilities to use a variety of teaching methods and approaches and to develop appropriate instructional materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Schedule:</strong></td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Assessment Methods:

**Class Observations:** Faculty will observe student teaching, take notes, and use teaching grading rubric, in order to assess:
- Students use of varied teaching methods and approaches
- Students development of appropriate teaching materials
- Students overall preparedness for teaching
- Student teaching performance

**Student Interviews:** Students will share their perspective on their own preparedness for independent teaching and their ability to use varied teaching methods and approaches as well as to develop appropriate instructional materials.
**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* Associate Dean and Faculty sub-committee

*For indirect evidence assessment:* Associate Dean and Faculty committee working with IRO Manager to design appropriate interview questions

**Closing the Loop:**

*Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*

- Improve program’s teaching methods
- Modify Independent Teaching Internship
- Modify grading rubric
- Modify overall curriculum to improve student preparation for teaching
- Appoint a faculty member to guide students during the Independent Teaching Internship
SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the Department of Law

**Investigation Topic:** Which areas of substantive law knowledge are we teaching well? Which do students and the market really need? What changes, if any, are needed to our curriculum and instruction to achieve a better alignment of our program with student and market needs?

**Objective: Substantive Knowledge**

5.2 *Fundamental Substantive Law*

Owing to sufficient familiarity with fundamental norms of substantive law, the ability to cite and/or paraphrase the major legal norms without special research and the ability to identify issues and to efficiently focus on the relevant details of these norms for closer examination

- The Armenian Constitution
- The U.S. Constitution
- Armenian Criminal Code
- Armenian Civil Code
- Armenian Joint Stock Company Law
- Armenian Tax Legislation
- United Nations Declaration of Human Rights
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms
- Genocide Convention
- GRECO Conventions
- Foreign Corrupt Practices Act
- NY Convention of 1958

**Rationale:** Although practitioners need to research specific issues of law, a basic conversancy in the key areas, sources of law, issues and trends is a key to proficient and effective legal practice that LL.M. students should have. Practice in Armenia has evolved since our courses were designed in 2006 and our courses and the substantive law covered needs to keep pace.

In 2008 we looked at 5.1 (due process) and in passing at 5.2 and made few adjustments to our curriculum. In the fall 2012, AUA will be switching to a semester system. While total instruction hours will remain roughly the same, the segmentation of topics into courses is likely to change. This is an opportunity to realign the substantive law taught in our courses with the needs of students and the market.
Assessment Schedule:

Fall 2011

- Form SLA Committee from faculty
- Assemble portfolios from capstones & exams/projects
- Prepare questionnaires for alumni and employers
- Identify existing survey data about sub. law knowledge (e.g. exit surveys, alumni, employer, ABA ROLI)
- Prepare rubrics for portfolios
- Conduct analysis of portfolios
- Conduct focus groups or surveys with alumni and Employers
- Prepare report

Description of Assessment Methods:

Student Portfolios: Student portfolios will include capstone projects and exams.

Alumni Focus Groups: Alumni focus groups will gather information regarding what areas of substantive law should be prioritized in curriculum.

Employer Focus Groups: Employer focus groups will gather information regarding what areas of substantive law should be prioritized in curriculum.

Survey Data: Compile relevant survey data including exit surveys and alumni and employer surveys.

Assessment Team: Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

For direct evidence assessments: T. Samuelian, Dean, V. Bournazian Associate Dean, A. Mazmanyan, Assoc. Prof.; A. Baghdasaryan, Adjunct Lecturer

For indirect evidence assessment: T. Samuelian, Dean, V. Bournazian Associate Dean, A. Mazmanyan, Assoc. Prof.; A. Baghdasaryan, Adjunct Lecturer

Closing the Loop:

Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:

- Confirm or correct the 2008 SLA results
- Design new courses (perhaps redesign existing courses) to better align the curriculum with student and market needs
### Investigation Topic:
Are students proficient enough in comparative law advising proficiency upon graduation to meet practitioners’ and clients’ needs?

### Objective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2. Comparative Law Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ The ability to advise and explain, both local and foreign legal requirements, in a manner which is most understandable to either a local client or a foreign client, depending on their legal frame of reference, for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ common matters such as incorporation, purchases of real property or shares, loans, secured transactions, employment agreements, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ basic tax issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ basic intellectual property rights issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ basic environmental issues (e.g., zoning, pollution and toxic disposal, nature protection, public and worker safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ basic criminal law and criminal procedure matters (e.g., basic elements of crimes, standards of proof, right to counsel, limitations on detention, rights of suspect and accused, basic phases of criminal investigation and proceedings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ basic compliance with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and other anti-corruption measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rationale:
In Armenia, comparative law advising is a key practitioner skill for private practice as well as legal reform and research. We have not looked at this objective before, even though it is an essential legal skill. It is a required component of our capstone. An issue that is regularly raised by students in course evaluations and exit interviews/surveys is their desire for more comparative perspective in our classes, esp. comparisons with Armenian law. In the past, lack of materials and cases was an obstacle. Today, there are many more cases and materials available to inject an Armenian law perspective into classes.

### Assessment Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select portfolio of capstones, perhaps add comparative law exams</td>
<td>Prepare report and recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Assessment Methods:

**Student Portfolios:** Student work will be compiled in portfolio and analyzed using a rubric.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Team:</th>
<th>Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For direct evidence assessments:</td>
<td>A. Mazmanyan, Assoc. Prof., A. Baghdasaryan, Adjunct Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing the Loop:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make adjustments to various course components across to the law curriculum, including recommendations regarding instruction and how to integrate a comparative law perspective into various courses as appropriate in order to assure that comparative law skills are effectively learned by the students in the course of their two year LL.M. program. In particular, consider where more Armenian law could be injected into the curriculum to provide a useful comparative perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the School of Business and Management (SBM)
#### Master of Business Administration (MBA) Program

**Investigation Topic:** Oral Communication Skills

**Objective:**
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the BA301 Effective Communication in meeting the MBA program’s student learning outcome (SLO):
  4. To develop effective communication skills as business leaders

**Rationale:** The internal and external audit reports of the SBM’s 2010 Self Study Report recommended a more systematic approach to skills development throughout the MBA program. To this end, the new MBA curriculum, approved in April 2011, includes a 2-unit course entitled BA301 Effective Communication. The course will be offered in the first year of the program. The 2011-12 SLA will help SBM to improve the course curriculum and instruction and ensure that other core courses provide consistent opportunities for students to develop their oral communication skills.

**Assessment Schedule:**
- Spring 2012
  - Meet with faculty and Dean to design and plan the assessment (January)
  - Review and evaluate student portfolios (June)
  - Review and interpret course evaluations (June)
  - Report and Recommendations (June)

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

**Student Portfolios:** Student portfolios from 2-unit Effective Communication course will provide documentation of students’ work including presentation materials. Student portfolios will be evaluated and collectively reviewed by faculty and Dean using a rubric for oral communication.

**Course Evaluations:** Course evaluations for 2-unit Effective Communication course. Students will be asked to assess how, if at all, the Effective Communication course contributed to the development of their oral communication skills.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

For direct evidence assessments: Associate Dean will appoint a faculty sub-committee that will include the Associate Dean.

For indirect evidence assessment: Associate Dean will work with the Institutional Research Manager to conduct appropriate survey.

**Closing the Loop:** Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:
- Adjust BA301 Effective Communication course curriculum and instruction.
- Revise oral communication and presentation rubric.
- Review other core courses to ensure consistent development and assessment communication skills.
### SLA Plan 2012-2013 for the School of Business and Management (SBM)
#### Master of Business Administration (MBA) Program

**Investigation Topic:** Critical Thinking Skills

**Objective:**
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the MBA program in meeting the following student learning outcome (SLO):

  \[ \text{SLO 2: To encourage critical and creative thinking within a global business context} \]

**Rationale:** The 2010-2011 SLA assessed students’ oral communication and critical thinking skills through an intensive negotiation activity, which is an integral component of the capstone project. The 2012-2013 SLA will assess students critical thinking skills through the same capstone negotiation activity. This will enable SBM to “close the loop” on the 2010-2011 SLA by evaluating the effectiveness of instructional and curriculum changes on students’ critical thinking skills.

**Assessment Schedule:**

- **Spring 2012**
  - Meet with faculty and Dean to design and plan the assessment (January)
  - Review and evaluate students’ work and graded rubrics from 2010-2011 (May)
  - Review students’ work and evaluate work using critical thinking rubric (June)
  - Compare and interpret results (June)
  - Report and make recommendations for improvement (June)

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

Students’ Negotiation Work: Faculty will review a random sample of students work from the negotiation activity.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* Associate Dean will appoint a faculty sub-committee that will include the Associate Dean.

**Closing the Loop:**

Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:
- Modify negotiation activity and capstone curriculum and instruction
- Review other core courses to ensure consistent development and assessment of critical thinking skills.
- Revise rubric for critical thinking skills.
SLA Plan 2011-2012 for the School of Political Science and International (PSIA)

**Investigation Topic:** Continued Investigation of PSIA Learning Objective 5

**Objective:**
- To use direct evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of the PSIA program in meeting the following student learning outcome (SLO):
  
  5. *Understanding of social science research methodologies and policy analysis.*

- To compare with direct evidence the results from SLA 2010-2011 which used indirect evidence.

**Rationale:** The PSIA capstone project requires students to demonstrate both social science research and policy analysis. Moreover, as the culminating experience of the program, it enables the program to assess the effectiveness of not only the capstone course, but also the effectiveness of the curriculum in preparing students with expertise in research and policy analysis. The SLA 2011-2012 aims to build upon the SLA 2010-11, which assessed learning objective 5 using indirect assessment.

**Assessment Schedule:**

- **Fall 2011**
  - Assess capstones using pre-existing rubrics to evaluate learning objective 5

- **Spring 2012**
  - Reflect on and revise the rubrics for the capstone

**Description of Assessment Methods:**

**Capstone Projects:** An analysis of a random sample of capstone projects from years 2006, 2009, and 2011 using a pre-existing rubric.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* The Dean will appoint two faculty members to review randomly selected Master’s Essays and Internship Reports from 2006, 2009, and 2011. These reviews will be compared with the indirect assessment evidence from 2010.

**Closing the Loop:**

*Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:*

- Improve teaching methods
- Guide capstone adviser selection and training
- Identify the areas in need of improvement in the capstone and curriculum in general
- Improve the structure and content of the capstone course
- Develop new courses to address gaps in the curriculum
- Ensure consistency of performance standards
- Improve rubrics for evaluating objective 5
Investigation Topic: Improving the Quality of Capstone Projects

Objective:
- To “close the loop” on previous SLAs (2006 and 2011-2012) by implementing and assessing recommended changes to Capstone courses.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of these changes in terms of the quality of students’ capstones and the number of on-time submissions by evaluating capstone projects from 2006, 2012, and 2013.

Rationale: Although the capstone project is the culminating final requirement for the PSIA master’s program, the 2006 SLA indicated that the capstone projects needed improvement. Over the years, the capstone project remains an area of concern for two related reasons: 1) the weakness of capstone papers, and the consequent 2) late submission of capstone reports. The SLA 2012-2013 will close the loop on previous SLA (2006 and 2011-2012) by implementing and assessing the impact of recommended changes.

Assessment Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter and Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall and Spring 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Implement Improvement 1:** Initial presentation of the master’s essays and internship projects will be done earlier in the winter quarter so that students will receive feedback earlier in the process and can better develop their research design and preparation for their projects.

**Implement Improvement 2:** A group policy project will be introduced as a capstone option.

**Assessment:** Team appointed by Dean will assess capstone projects using existing rubrics

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

For direct evidence assessments: The Dean will appoint two faculty members to review randomly selected Master’s Essays and Internship Reports from 2006, 2009, and 2011. These reviews will be compared with the indirect assessment evidence from 2010.

**Closing the Loop:**
Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:
- Improve teaching methods employed in the program
- Guide capstone adviser selection and training
- Identify the areas in need of improvement in the capstone and the curriculum of the program in general
- Identify and develop new courses to address gaps in the curriculum
- Ensure consistency of performance standards
- Revise rubrics
- Improve structure and content of capstone
### Investigation Topic:
Evaluating Environmental Education of AUA Students

### Objective:
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the Acopian Center’s five courses in achieving the following student learning outcomes (SLOs):
  1. Development of general environmental knowledge
  2. Increased concern for the Armenia’s natural environment

### Rationale:
AUA students are required to take one of the five environmental courses offered by the Acopian Center for the Environment. The planned investigation will evaluate the effectiveness of the environmental education courses in reaching the identified SLOs and inform improvements made to these courses.

### Assessment Schedule:
- **Fall 2011**
  - Develop questionnaire
  - Compile, review and analysis of student portfolios
  - Conduct and interpret student survey

### Description of Assessment Methods:

**Student Portfolios:** A sample of students work in each of the five environmental courses will be compiled in student portfolios. These portfolios will be reviewed and analyzed by the Director and appointed faculty in order to assess the identified SLOs. Rubrics will be used to evaluate portfolios.

**Student Survey:** All the students will be provided with the questionnaire and asked to reflect upon the development of their environmental knowledge and how, if at all, their concern for Armenia’s environment has changed as a result of the course.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

*For direct evidence assessments:* A sample of students work in each of the five environmental courses will be compiled in student portfolios. These will be reviewed by the Director and appointed faculty.
For indirect evidence assessment: All the ACE faculty will be involved in development of questionnaire, and the Director with appointed faculty member will conduct the survey.

**Closing the Loop:** Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:

- Modify curriculum of the courses
- Develop new courses
- Improve teaching methods
- Improve student exit survey
## Investigation Topic

“Closing the Loop” Environmental Education of AUA Students

### Objective

- To “close the loop” on the SLA 2011-2012 by implementing the recommended changes to the Acopian Center’s five environmental courses.

- To assess the effectiveness of these changes on improving the following student learning outcomes (SLOs):
  1. Development of general environmental knowledge
  2. Increased concern for the Armenia’s natural environment

### Rationale

AUA students are required to take one of the five environmental courses offered by the Acopian Center for the Environment. The SLA (2011-2012) assessed the effectiveness of these courses in achieving the identified SLOs. The 2012-2013 SLA plans to “close the loop” on this prior investigation by implementing and evaluating the effectiveness of the recommended changes.

### Assessment Schedule

- **Fall 2012**
  - Compile, review and analyze student portfolios
  - Develop, administer, and interpret student survey

### Description of Assessment Methods

**Student Portfolios:** A sample of students work in each of the five environmental courses will be compiled in student portfolios. These portfolios will be reviewed and analyzed by the Director and appointed faculty in order to assess the identified SLOs. Portfolios will be assessed using a rubric. The portfolios 2012-2013 will be compared with portfolios 2011-2012 in order to identify if the changes enhanced student learning.

**Student Survey:** All students will be provided with a questionnaire comparable to the one provided in 2011-2012. The survey will ask students to reflect upon the development of their environmental knowledge and how, if at all, their concern for Armenia’s environment has changed as a result of the course. The results will be compared with the ones of 2011-2012.

**Assessment Team:** Assessment is overseen by the Student Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee
### For direct evidence assessments:
A sample of students work in each of the five environmental courses will be compiled in student portfolios. These will be reviewed by the Director and appointed faculty.

### For indirect evidence assessment:
The Director with appointed faculty member will interpret results from the student survey.

### Closing the Loop:
Findings from various assessment methods will be integrated and used to:
- Modify curriculum of the courses
- Improve teaching methods
- Revise student survey
College of Engineering¹

Computer and Information Science Program

The specific objectives of the Computer and Information Science program include:

1. to develop in the student the concepts of professional practice, innovation, enterprise and ethics
2. to provide a sound base in the core principles of Computer and Information Science
3. to make the student aware of technological trends and the emerging opportunities, as well as to instill in the student a sense of entrepreneurship to take advantage of these opportunities
4. to develop in the student the ability to work in teams and to be organized in their approach to work
5. to prepare the student for possible study at the Ph.D. level

Learning outcomes of Computer and Information Science program include:

1. Have a sound base in the core principles of the field; problem solving skills (objectives 2, 5)
2. Effective oral and written communication skills (objective 4, 5)
3. Awareness of new technologies and concepts of entrepreneurship (objectives 1, 3)
4. Ability for synthesis of knowledge and innovation (objectives 1, 5)
5. Awareness of concepts of professional practice; ability to work in a team setting (Objective 1, 4)
6. Preparation for Ph.D. work (objective 5)

¹ http://www.aua.am/aua/masters/ce/site2/programs.htm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIS Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Which year? (Circle One)</th>
<th>Methods of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effective oral and written communication skills</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work&lt;br&gt;Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work&lt;br&gt;External review of capstone projects or presentations&lt;br&gt;External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives&lt;br&gt;Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please check appropriate boxes
DEPARTMENT OF LAW

Core Competencies:

1. Legal Research
   1.1. Sources
   1.2. Weight
2. Legal Analysis
   2.1. Statutory Construction
   2.2. Precedent
   2.3. Legal Problem-solving
   2.4. Law in Context
3. Legal Writing & Advocacy
   3.1. Objective Writing
   3.2. Persuasive Writing
   3.3. Routine Documents
4. Practitioner Competencies
   4.1. Issue Spotting
   4.2. Comparative Law Advising
   4.3. Outside Expert Assistance
   4.4. Negotiation
   4.5. Advise on Dispute Resolution
   4.6. International Disputes
   4.7. International Relief
   4.8. International Best Practices
   4.9. Professional Ethics
5. Substantive Knowledge
   5.1. Due Process
   5.2. Fundamental Substantive Law

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Which year? (Circle One)</th>
<th>Methods of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Conduct legal research by means of research, proper citation, analysis of primary and secondary sources of law, and assessing the validity, relevance, weight, applicability of sources in relation to the topic of research. Outcome 1.1: The ability to research, properly cite, and analyze primary and secondary sources of both Armenian and English-language foreign law, including constitutions, statutes, regulations, court decisions, and treaties or conventions.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>External review of capstone projects or presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
<td>Graduate follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Which year? (Circle One)</td>
<td>Methods of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: Perform legal analysis by employing statutory construction, precedent, legal problem-solving and law in context.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.3 The ability to solve factual legal problems by: identifying standard legal arguments and policy rationales underlying a source of law and generating and evaluating the efficacy of counterarguments</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>External review of capstone projects or presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
<td>Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni |
| | | | Other (Please describe in detail) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Which year? (Circle One)</th>
<th>Methods of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3.</strong> Write an objective assessment of a factual legal problem, write a persuasive legal document, and draft in English basic legal documents.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3.1 Objective Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to write an objective assessment of a factual legal problem, such as a client advisory letter or a legal memorandum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>External review of capstone projects or presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Which year? (Circle One)</td>
<td>Methods of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4. Obtain such practitioner competencies as issue spotting, comparative law advising, outside expert assistance, negotiation, advise on dispute resolution, international disputes, international relief, international best practices, and professional ethics. Outcome 4.2: The ability to advise and explain, both local and foreign legal requirements, in a manner which is most understandable to either a local client or a foreign client, depending on their legal frame of reference, for common matters such as incorporation, purchases of real property or shares, loans, secured transactions, employment agreements, etc.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Direct: X Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct: Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Direct: External review of capstone projects or presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Direct: External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Direct: Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Which year? (Circle One)</td>
<td>Methods of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5: Understand, recognize elements and identify violations of both criminal and civil due process and obtain knowledge of fundamental substantive laws</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>• Quantitative and qualitative analyses of capstone experience or other written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 X</td>
<td>• Student, alumni and employer surveys, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>• Quantitative and qualitative analysis of portfolios of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>• Exit interview of graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• External review of capstone projects or presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009 X</td>
<td>• Job placement data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• Retention and graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• Graduate follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>• Other (Please describe in detail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Health Sciences²

Learning Objectives and Competences:

1. **Assess the health needs of a defined population.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characterize the major national and international public health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe risk factors for major causes of morbidity and mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and apply the leading conceptualizations of health and health indicators to the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, define, and measure a public health problem using both quantitative and qualitative measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize demographic and epidemiologic assessment techniques to characterize the distribution and burden of disease on a population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and critically evaluate health information systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the key biological, environmental, behavioral, cultural, and/or economic determinants of a given public health problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine appropriate use of data and statistical methods for problem identification and measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Develop, analyze, and implement targeted health policies and programs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the scope of public health issues and policies applicable to defined populations and to vulnerable subgroups of those populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe and critique the government’s role in health policy development and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate the process of public policy-making and how it affects the design, implementation and performance of health policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify policies and services appropriate to promote and maintain health or prevent injury and disease, for communities, families, and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate the fiscal, administrative, legal, social, and political implications of a strategy developed to solve a health problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate how advocacy, biases, politics, and information influence policy-making and program implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make relevant scientific, ethical, health and human rights, economic, administrative and/or political decisions based in light of available data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan to implement a policy that addresses organizational design and management; leadership; communication; financial planning and management; ethics, values, and human rights; and human resources management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Student Information Manual, Master of Public Health Program.
3. **Assure the appropriateness and effectiveness of a given public health intervention.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design a program evaluation that is methodologically sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop processes to monitor and evaluate programs for their effectiveness, quality, and freedom from unintended harms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply principles important in managing and improving health services organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply key concepts of human resource management to achieving the strategic objectives of health service organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate facility with appropriate database management and reporting systems for evaluation and monitoring of interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Communicate public health messages to targeted audiences.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use basic word processing, statistical/graphical, spreadsheets, and relational database software to convey the results of quantitative and qualitative analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and deliver effective oral and written presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present demographic, statistical, programmatic, and technical information accurately and effectively for professional and lay audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and use team-building skills that facilitate work team performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize and participate in groups to address specific public health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit input from individuals, organizations, government agencies, and communities to assure comprehensiveness of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective advocacy for programs and resources that further the health of the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assess the health needs of a defined population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop, analyze, and implement targeted health policies and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assure the appropriateness and effectiveness of a given public health intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communicate public health messages to targeted audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

This manual is designed to provide academic programs with the basic information needed for developing and implementing effective assessment plans of student learning. Its purpose is to provide explanatory information on various academic assessment processes. It includes a brief definition of assessment and its purpose, information on student learning objectives and outcomes, information on selecting assessment methods, assessment tips, and a glossary of assessment-related terms (see Appendix 2). Appendix 3 presents the current timeframe for AUA assessment.

Any feedback on this manual and its contents is welcome and should be directed to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at ddanel@aua.am or 512516.

Throughout the assessment process, the academic programs will be assisted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and the new Assessment Group. Appendix 4 provides a list of online resources on assessment of student learning.

Principles of Academic Assessment at AUA

What is assessment?
The tendency toward measurement of how well universities are serving their students - institutional effectiveness - is being felt in every area of higher education. Each institution is being called upon to demonstrate on a regular basis that students are acquiring the skills and knowledge stated in the objectives and expected outcomes of degree programs and that the institution is meeting its mission goals. (See Appendix 1.)

Assessment is an opportunity for AUA to engage in a reflective learning process for the purpose of improving institutional effectiveness and to demonstrate the desire to provide quality programs and services. Assessment activities are guided by the University’s mission and seek to improve the educational experiences of all AUA students.

Academic assessment at AUA is a systematic and continuous process to collect, analyze and use information to improve student learning.

Assessment is a collaborative process that must include faculty, students, alumni and other stakeholders, which provides them with opportunities to investigate and reflect on important questions about student learning. Assessment results are to be used to support curricular, planning, and other decision making processes at AUA.

Assessment Ethics

Information collected through assessment activities must be treated confidentially. No information should be released publicly in such a way as to permit identification of students or other individuals. Assessment results including strengths and areas for improvement as well as limitations of the assessment methodology must be accurately and honestly reported.
The AUA Program Assessment Process

The primary purpose of program assessment is to improve the quality of educational programs by improving student learning. Assessment activities are focused on student learning outcomes. Outcomes assessment is a systematic process for improvement, not simply a system of measurement. It is an academic program’s feedback system to better achieve program-level curricular goals.

Each academic program develops a set of student learning outcomes and maintains a four-year assessment plan ending in 2009 that ensures that all outcomes have been assessed. Deans report on assessment results to the Provost and Vice President and Office of Institutional Research on an annual basis. Assessment results are used by the University to support curricular, planning, and budgeting decision making processes.

Steps in the process include:

1. Creation of the departmental assessment plans
   a. identify outcomes being tested
   b. set timeline
   c. chose methods of assessment
   d. state expected results
2. Collection of evidence
3. Analysis and interpretation of the evidence
4. Report submission
5. Identification of strengths and areas for improvement
6. Implementation of changes for improvement
7. Reiteration of the assessment process
Identify Outcomes
The initial step in assessment of student learning outcomes is for each academic department to identify the expected outcomes, usually no more than five to seven, for each degree program. These outcomes specify what a graduate should know, be able to do, or value after completing the degree program. All academic programs identified learning objectives that were reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate during the 2006 audit.

Student Learning Objectives vs. Student Learning Outcomes
Some institutions require academic programs to identify student learning objectives while others insist on student learning outcomes. What is the difference between the two?

The difference is between what we intend students to learn and what students actually do learn. An educational objective would signify what faculty intend students to learn and the outcome would be what students actually did learn.

As defined by ABET:¹

- Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve.
- Program outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their matriculation through the program.

Student learning outcomes refer to the knowledge, abilities, and attitudes students demonstrate at the successful completion of the academic program.² They focus on the outputs, not on the inputs or processes.

In addition to the five or six objectives and outcomes of the academic programs, all AUA academic programs have identified also specific learning objectives and outcomes for each course in the curriculum.

Tips for Writing Student Learning Outcomes
- Outcomes should be specific to your academic program and should be stated in clear and definitive terms.
- Outcomes should be a reasonable statement of what the program can contribute in terms of student skills, knowledge and abilities.
- Outcomes should be clearly stated in terms of what exactly a student should know, be able to do, or value.

• Outcomes should be framed in such a way that they can be measured within a time period over which the program has some control.

Outcomes must be stated in terms that are clearly measurable either quantitatively or qualitatively - performance criteria, which are “specific, measurable statements identifying the performance(s) required to meet the outcome” (ABET).

When developing performance criteria, keep in mind two essential parts:
1. Subject content that is the focus of instruction (e.g., steps of the design process, chemical reaction, scientific method) and
2. Action verb that direct students to a specific performance (e.g., “list,” “analyze,” “apply”)

When preparing a rubric to assess the learning outcome, performance criteria developed for that outcome will be your evaluation criteria. See Appendices 5, 6, and 7 for more information on relation of objectives-outcomes-performance criteria and rubric development.

Established Methodologies

There is a wide variety of methods for determining whether or not a student has demonstrated learning of a particular outcome.

The most important selection criteria is whether the method will provide useful information that indicates if students are learning what we said they would learn by successful completion of the program. Assessment methods must be linked to educational objectives that support the program mission.

Direct vs. Indirect Assessment Methods
Assessment methods include both direct and indirect methods.

Direct assessment involves looking at actual samples of student work. Direct methods demonstrate what students have actually learned. Examples of such measures include but are not limited to:

- Quantitative and qualitative analyses of the capstone experience or other written work
- External review of capstone projects or presentations
- External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives
- Student work portfolios
- Performance on professional licensure or certification exams (if applicable)

Indirect assessment is gathering information through means other than looking at actual samples of student work. Indirect methods reflect on student learning rather than demonstrate it. Indirect methods can give information quickly, but may not provide real evidence of student learning. For example, during focus groups students may express that they learned well, but that does not mean that their perceptions are correct.

Examples of such measures include but are not limited to:
• Surveys
• Exit interviews and focus groups
• Retention and graduation rates
• Job placement data
• Feedback from students, graduates, or employers
• Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni

… when I first go to a doctor, I am handed a form to fill out with my name, address, insurance provider, and answers to various questions, such as: Has anyone in my family ever had cancer? Am I taking various medications, such as? Am I allergic to anything? Have I ever had a major operation, and if so, for what purpose?

That’s a survey, an indirect assessment.

It may also ask me why I am seeing the doctor and what my symptoms are? That, too, is a survey, and my answers are my perceptions of my condition. I may or may not be correct. It is an indirect assessment of my health. Then, I go in to the doctor, and he says to me, “How are you feeling?” I always answer, “Fine.” I always answer “fine” regardless of how I’m feeling: I don’t want to reveal anything too personal. My wife tells me I’m stupid. The doctor has just conducted an interview: an indirect assessment. He still doesn’t know whether I’m healthy or not.

So then he listens to my heart, he thumps my knee (nothing), and he looks in my ears and eyes. Then he has me leave a urine sample. He has a nurse take some blood samples.

Those are all direct assessments.

In short, his indirect assessments gave him some indications, but no evidence. He had to actually look at or listen to physical evidence to have a direct assessment.

So it is with our assessment of the curriculum. Students may have certain perceptions about what they’ve learned or not, but, until we look at the evidence—actual samples of their work—we really can’t be sure.”

http://www.skidmore.edu/administration/assessment/Direct_vs._Indirect.htm

Using a combination of direct and indirect measures is advisable because they offer complementary information.

**Collecting and Analyzing Evidence**

Collecting and analyzing evidence of the departmental progress in assessment is essential for
improving academic programs continuously.

Evidence
According to WASC, the term evidence means “substance of what is advanced to support a claim that something is true. Its characteristics include:

- Evidence is intentional and purposeful
- Evidence entails interpretation and reflection
- Evidence is integrated and holistic
- Evidence can be both quantitative and qualitative
- Evidence can be either direct or indirect.”

Evidence is not simply a pile of data. At its best, it should answer the burning questions of the department's faculty and staff.

Using Rubrics
Collected evidence must be analyzed. However, measurement of complex matters tends to be subjective as different individuals often have different ideas about what is being measured. This is where rubrics can help.

Rubrics are systematic scoring methods that use pre-determined criteria. They are “assessment tools for assessing parameters of learning that tend to be complex and subjective.” Rubrics help to make subjective measurements as objective, clear, and consistent as possible by defining the criteria on which performance should be judged. A valid rubric measures what it is intended to measure and increases the objectivity and reliability of scoring.

You might like exploring an online introduction to rubrics and articles about developing and using rubrics. Or you may want to see some sample rubrics at http://www.shambles.net/pages/staff/rubrics/ and http://www.winona.edu/AIR/rubrics.htm.

Making Improvements

The assessment should result in a determination of the extent to which program objectives have been met. The whole purpose of assessment activities is to improve student learning. If outcomes are lower than the performance expectations, changes may be needed in curriculum such as:

- Revision of content of existing courses
- Modification of delivery methods

---


4 TUTORIAL ON WRITING RUBRICS. http://edtech.tennessee.edu/~itce/Srubrics/rubrics.htm
• Modification of learning activities
• Addition or elimination of courses
• Sequencing courses differently

If student outcomes meet or exceed performance expectations, faculty may need to re-evaluate the learning objectives, assessment measures, or performance standards to ensure that they are appropriate. Results of assessment also should be integrated into the planning processes including identifying and allocating resources needed to improve student learning.

Useful tips

• Assessment should be an ongoing process, but do not try to assess all objectives at once! Plan to assess all your program’s objectives over a four-year cycle.
• Use both direct and indirect methods of assessment.
• Focus your major assessment efforts on the key concerns or questions the faculty have about the academic program.
• Build your assessment plan to provide the best data that your department can use. New measures are not always necessary. Use existing data whenever possible -- the use of assignments that are part of the existing curriculum is probably the easiest way to do so.
• Assessment plans will improve over time; if new questions arise after an assessment, go ahead and modify the plan.
• Encourage some faculty to use assessment research for their scholarship.
APPENDIX 1: Nine Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning

From the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum. This page can be retrieved from http://www.iuk.edu/~koctla/assessment/9principles.shtml.

1. **The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.** Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice, then, begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students and strive to help them achieve. Educational values should drive not only what we choose to assess but also how we do so. Where questions about educational mission and values are skipped over, assessment threatens to be an exercise in measuring what’s easy, rather than a process of improving what we really care about.

2. **Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.** Learning is a complex process. It entails not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it involves not only knowledge and abilities but values, attitudes, and habits of mind that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Assessment should reflect these understandings by employing a diverse array of methods, including those that call for actual performance, using them over time so as to reveal change, growth, and increasing degrees of integration. Such an approach aims for a more complete and accurate picture of learning, and therefore firmer bases for improving our students’ educational experience.

3. **Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.** Assessment is a goal-oriented process. It entails comparing educational performance with educational purposes and expectations--these derived from the institution’s mission, from faculty intentions in program and course design, and from knowledge of students’ own goals. Where program purposes lack specificity or agreement, assessment as a process pushes a campus toward clarity about where to aim and what standards to apply; assessment also prompts attention to where and how program goals will be taught and learned. Clear, shared, implementable goals are the cornerstone for assessment that is focused and useful.

4. **Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.** Information about outcomes is of high importance; where students “end up” matters greatly. But to improve outcomes, we need to know about student experience along the way--about the curricula, teaching, and kind of student effort that lead to particular outcomes. Assessment can help us understand which students learn best under what conditions; with such knowledge comes the capacity to improve the whole of their learning.

5. **Assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic.** Assessment is a process whose power is cumulative. Though isolated, “one-shot” assessment can be better than none, improvement over time is best fostered when assessment entails a linked series of cohorts of students; it may mean collecting the same examples of student performance or using the same instrument semester after
semester. The point is to monitor progress toward intended goals in a spirit of continuous improvement. Along the way, the assessment process itself should be evaluated and refined in light of emerging insights.

6. **Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.** Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment’s questions can’t be fully addressed without participation by student-affairs educators, librarians, administrators, and students. Assessment may also involve individuals from beyond the campus (alumni/ae, trustees, employers) whose experience can enrich the sense of appropriate aims and standards for learning. Thus understood, assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better-informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement.

7. **Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.** Assessment recognizes the value of information in the process of improvement. But to be useful, information must be connected to issues or questions that people really care about. This implies assessment approaches that produce evidence that relevant parties will find credible, suggestive, and applicable to decisions that need to be made. It means thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. The point of assessment is not to gather data and return “results”; it is a process that starts with the questions of decision-makers, that involves them in the gathering and interpreting of data, and that informs and helps guide continuous improvement.

8. **Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.** Assessment alone changes little. Its greatest contribution comes on campuses where the quality of teaching and learning is visibly valued and worked at. On such campuses, the push to improve educational performance is a visible and primary goal of leadership; improving the quality of undergraduate education is central to the institution’s planning, budgeting, and personnel decisions. On such campuses, information about learning outcomes is seen as an integral part of decision making, and avidly sought.

9. **Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.** There is a compelling public stake in education. As educators, we have a responsibility to the publics that support or depend on us to provide information about the ways in which our students meet goals and expectations. But that responsibility goes beyond the reporting of such information; our deeper obligation--to ourselves, our students, and society--is to improve. Those to whom educators are accountable have a corresponding obligation to support such attempts at improvement.

These principles were developed under the auspices of the AAHE Assessment Forum with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education with
additional support for publication and dissemination from the Exxon Education Foundation. Copies may be made without restriction. The authors are Alexander W. Astin, Trudy W. Banta, K. Patricia Cross, Elaine El-Khawas, Peter T. Ewell, Pat Hutchings, Theodore J. Marchese, Kay M. McClenny, Marcia Mentkowski, Margaret A. Miller, E. Thomas Moran, and Barbara D. Wright.
APPENDIX 2. GLOSSARY

Assessment: Academic assessment is a systematic and continuous process to collect, analyze and use information to improve student learning.

Direct Assessment: Direct assessment involves looking at actual samples of student work and demonstrates what students have actually learned.

Indirect Assessment: Indirect assessment is gathering information through means other than looking at actual samples of student work. Indirect methods reflect on student learning rather than demonstrate it.

Student Learning Outcomes: Student learning outcomes refer to the knowledge, abilities, and attitudes students demonstrate at the successful completion of their academic programs.

Program Educational Objectives: A statement of what a program intends to achieve or accomplish through certain activities or experiences; i.e., what a program provides or accomplishes for its students, faculty/staff or institution.

Program Assessment: A combination of assessments techniques, data collection and analysis about student achievement for learning outcomes at the classroom and course levels, and leading to improvements of the academic program.

Rubric: Rubric is a tool that helps to make subjective measurements as objective, clear, and consistent as possible by defining the criteria on which performance should be judged.

Assessment Plan: A document that outlines what will be assessed and how and when the assessment will occur. Assessment plans contain the program outcomes, timeline, assessment methods, and expected results.

Assessment Report: A document that summarizes the results of assessments during a specified period and outlines what actions will be taken as a result of those assessments. An assessment report contains the outcomes assessed, a summary of assessment results, a summary of how the results were disseminated and the proposed improvements for the program or curriculum.
APPENDIX 3: AUA TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

2006

The academic programs completed the first studies of student learning using direct evidence.

The 2006 audit process reviewed both direct evidence studies (conference-like papers) and indirect evidence (e.g., surveys, focus groups, in-depth interviews, employment statistics) collected and analyzed during the self-study process of 2003-2005.

2007

June 1: Academic programs submitted four year assessment plans

July 1: Academic programs submitted proposals for 2007 assessment activity

December 1: Academic programs submitted report on 2007 assessment activity

2008

April 1: Academic programs submit proposals for 2008 assessment activity

December 1: Academic programs submit report on 2008 assessment activity

2009

April 1: Academic programs submit proposals for 2009 assessment activity

December 1: Academic programs submit report on 2009 assessment activity
APPENDIX 4: LINKS TO SELECTED ASSESSMENT WEB SITES


Assessment at Truman State University - http://assessment.truman.edu/index.htm


California State University Website on Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes - http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/SLOA/


Designing Scoring Rubrics for Your Classroom, Craig A. Mertle, Bowling Green State University. http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25

Do Grades Make the Grade for Program Assessment? Assessment Tips With Gloria Rogers – www.abet.org/Linked%20Documents-UPDATE/Assessment/Assessment%20Tips4.pdf


Guidelines for Good Assessment of Student Learning at the Department or Program Level – www.apsanet.org/imgtest/GuidelinesforGoodAssessment.doc
Major Categories in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives -
http://faculty.washington.edu/krumme/guides/bloom.html

North Carolina State University : Internet Resources for Higher Education Outcomes Assessment -http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/assmt/resource.htm


Scoring Rubrics, California State University-Sacramento. http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Assessment/scorubrics.htm


University of Colorado ’s Assessment Methods Used by Academic Departments and Programs http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/ovview/mwithin.htm


Student Learning at CalPoly
APPENDIX 5: OBJECTIVE-OUTCOME-PERFORMANCE CRITERIA RELATIONSHIP (ABET)

- **Objective**: Work effectively with others
  - **Outcome**: Ability to function in a multi-disciplinary team
  - **Performance Criteria**:
    - Researches and gathers information
    - Fulfills duties of team roles
APPENDIX 6: RUBRIC TEMPLATE (ABET)

RUBRIC TEMPLATE
Student Outcome______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Criteria #1</th>
<th>Scale (Numeric w/descriptor)</th>
<th>Scale (Numeric w/descriptor)</th>
<th>Scale (Numeric w/descriptor)</th>
<th>Scale (Numeric w/descriptor)</th>
<th>Scale (Numeric w/descriptor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria #2</td>
<td>Identifyable performance characteristics reflecting this level</td>
<td>Identifyable performance characteristics reflecting this level</td>
<td>Identifyable performance characteristics reflecting this level</td>
<td>Identifyable performance characteristics reflecting this level</td>
<td>Identifyable performance characteristics reflecting this level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: EXAMPLE OF FILLED RUBRIC

OBJECTIVE: Work effectively with others

STUDENT OUTCOME: Ability to function in a multi-disciplinary team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Gather Information</td>
<td>Does not collect any information that relates to the topic.</td>
<td>Collects very little information--some relates to the topic.</td>
<td>Collects some basic information--most relates to the topic.</td>
<td>Collects a great deal of information--all relates to the topic.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill Team Role's Duties</td>
<td>Does not perform any duties of assigned team role.</td>
<td>Performs very little duties.</td>
<td>Performs nearly all duties.</td>
<td>Performs all duties of assigned team role.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Equally</td>
<td>Always relies on others to do the work.</td>
<td>Rarely does the assigned work--often needs reminding.</td>
<td>Usually does the assigned work--rarely needs reminding.</td>
<td>Always does the assigned work without having to be reminded.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to Other Teammates</td>
<td>Is always talking--never allows anyone else to speak.</td>
<td>Usually doing most of the talking--rarely allows others to speak.</td>
<td>Listens, but sometimes talks too much.</td>
<td>Listens and speaks a fair amount.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score 3.5
POLICY ON COURSE PROPOSAL AND MODIFICATION PROCESS

General Matters

The faculty of the academic programs shall make proposals for courses. Each graduate credit bearing course offered shall be reviewed and approved by: 1) the sponsoring program faculty through their established curriculum review process; and 2) the Faculty Senate through its Curriculum Committee. While deference in judgment to experts and those entrusted with teaching a course is expected, the curriculum (including its component courses) are the responsibility of the faculty of a program. It is the academic program, through its faculty processes, that determines the content and methods of courses offered, subject to the oversight of the Curriculum Committee. Any proposals or modifications that result in changes to degree requirements will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate; otherwise the Curriculum Committee shall report proposals or modifications to the Faculty Senate at its discretion.

New Courses

The faculty of one or more academic programs may propose a new course (i.e., a course which has not been offered or was offered as a “Special Studies” course and is now being formalized). The sponsoring programs(s) shall submit a course proposal to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the Curriculum Committee will then review the proposal.

1. The Curriculum Committee may request additional information in making its review.

2. The Curriculum Committee’s review shall assess the following factors:
   a) demonstrated need for the course; and
   b) compliance with the program’s own internal procedures for course proposals.

3. The Curriculum Committee may not substitute its judgment for those of the sponsoring program’s faculty in areas dependent on professional expertise

4. The Curriculum Committee may require changes in the description and supporting detail to conform to university policies and procedures and to sound educational practice

5. The Curriculum Committee may approve or disapprove a proposal, giving rationale for the decision and recommendations

6. Decisions of the Curriculum Committee may be appealed to the Faculty Senate by the sponsoring program

Course Changes

Course changes fall into one of two categories: administrative and substantive.

1. Administrative changes include minor edits to course descriptions, titles, etc. that require changes to the AUA Catalog. Such changes shall be within the purview of the program’s faculty, which shall report any such changes to the Curriculum Committee in a timely manner

2. Substantive changes include changes in course objectives, number of credits, requests to cancel a required course, and requests to discontinue a course. Substantive changes shall be presented to and reviewed by the Curriculum Committee in accordance with procedures for New Courses.
Proposal/Modifications should be submitted with the attached form as a coversheet, along with supporting documentation.

Course Proposal and Modification Form

Academic Program: ______________________

Course No. _______ Course Name: ____________________ Check if New

Nature of Change: Administrative: ☐ Substantive: ☐ Degree requirement change: ☐

For further information change classification, refer to the Course Proposal and Modification Process.

The Sponsoring Department should attach a Report and any supporting documents with the following information:

(1) Proposed Change (for new or modified courses attach a description):

(2) Rationale for Change:

(3) Procedural History (Describe key steps and dates in consultative process within the Sponsoring Program for the proposed change).

Decision of the Curriculum Committee for further action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If approval of Curriculum Committee required:*  

If Faculty Senate Approval required:

Upon completion of action by the Curriculum Committee, deposit this form with the Provost. *If not approved by Curriculum Committee, the Curriculum Committee will provide a written rationale for its decision.
POLICY ON THE DEFINITION OF CREDIT HOUR AND TIME STATUS

The University-wide definition is the Credit Hour. This definition will be the basis for academic discussions and determination of full and part-time status and tuition due. Should the university allow and academic programs elect to use a different definition from the university-wide standard, the credit value assigned to the course must be reported in both the standard and program specific format for information filed with the Curriculum Committee and must be clearly explained in the program’s academic information.

Credit Hour Policy

The unit of reference for academic credit at the American University of Armenia will be the “Credit Hour.” A credit hour is comprised of faculty-led discussion/lecture and student preparation outside of the classroom.

AUA’s academic calendar is planned around 15 weeks of instruction per semester.

A credit hour equals 15 academic hours\(^1\) of faculty-led instruction plus, on average and as a general guideline, an additional 30 hours of out-of-class student work.

Guidelines on Equivalents

- Faculty supervised laboratory sessions are roughly equivalent to ½ of a faculty led session (e.g., 30 academic hours over the course of one semester is equal one credit hour)
- For independent study time spent is roughly equal to ⅓ of a faculty led session (e.g., 45 academic hours over the course of one semester equals one credit hour)
- For courses that use a mix of teaching methods, the credit hours assigned to a given course will reflect the weighted value of these components.

Non-traditional/alternate formats

If a course is offered in alternate formats (such as on-line, compressed, correspondence, etc.) and carries the same name and course number, it shall carry the same credit value as the traditional classroom course and must ensure the same educational outcomes are achieved, regardless of how efficient it is with classroom/student time. If a course is only offered or first offered in a non-traditional format, the time spent will need to be estimated in terms of a traditional equivalent in assigning the credit hours.

Full-Time, Part-Time, Overload Status

Using the above definition, each credit unit requires a time commitment of approximately 3 hours per week. Full time: A typical expectation for full-time commitment is 40-50 hours per week. Thus an

\(^1\) One AUA academic hour equals 50 minutes of class time.
expected range for fulltime is from 12-18 credit hours/quarter. Full-time enrollment for Law students is 8 credit hours/quarter. Part-time: Part-time is defined as enrollment in less than 12 units per quarter. Overload: Exceeding an anticipated workload of 18 units (54 hours/week) is a heavy demand upon students; especially as graduate students have commitments outside their academic training. Students may elect to overload, taking a maximum of 22 units in a quarter, with the consent of their academic program. Academic programs may not plan/expect for students to enroll for more than 18 units in a given quarter. Any exception may be made for a course which is registered in one quarter but intentionally planned to be completed across several quarters. In this case, the credit value of that course may be averaged across those quarters in assessing the average credit load (e.g., a program expects students to register 20 credits in Spring quarter, but this includes a 3-credit course that is completed over the course of the year; the expected load for the remaining quarters that year is 17 units; thus the average load is 18)

**Tuition Calculation Method based on Credit Hours**

The university will base its assessment of tuition on these definitions of time status.

- Full-time students will pay a flat fee
- Part-time students will be assessed a per credit fee, calculated as the flat fee divided by the average full-time number of credits (12 credits)
- Students taking more than prescribed number of units per quarter in their program will be assessed a per unit fee for additional units (the fee will be waived when it is required by the program for normal progress as described above).
POLICY ON COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT

Effective with the review of program curricula in 2004, each credit-bearing course offered shall include certain standardized elements in the course syllabus/outline. These elements must be included in the materials distributed to students at the start of the course and must be consistent with the corresponding elements approved by the Curriculum Committee. Faculty shall submit a copy of their syllabi to the academic program office where it will be retained. The faculty member teaching the course shall prepare the syllabus in compliance with the academic program’s curriculum and must include the following elements:

Elements of course syllabus

A. Administrative
   a. Course title and number
   b. The number of credit hours
   c. Instructor information (name, contacts, office hours, etc)
   d. The prerequisites and co-requisites for the course
   e. Term
   f. Weekly/daily schedule of class sessions
   g. Assignment and test make-up procedures
   h. [Optional, but desirable] Objectives for each lecture/session

B. Academic
   a. Learning Objectives
   b. Learning Outcomes (i.e. list of competencies that the successful students should attain)
   c. Description of how the course will be taught (e.g. lecture, lab, lecture/lab, distance, etc.)
   d. Statement on how the students will be evaluated (e.g. class participation, assignments, exams, papers, etc.).
   e. Use of Library and other information resources
   f. University policies (Grade Appeals, Student Code of Ethics)
   g. Other relevant information

Adopted 2006
Updated 2011
POLICY ON GRADE APPEAL

Within 3 days of being notified of any specific grade (exam, assignment or course grade), a student may appeal the grade by discussing the matter with the instructor who issued the grade. Within 3 days of an instructor’s response, or if the instructor has not responded, the student may appeal the matter in writing to the Dean. The Dean shall confer with the instructor and the student. The Dean shall then render a final decision in writing on the appeal within 5 days from receiving the appeal. A grade may only be changed based on discovery of a mathematical error or for misapplication of a grading standard previously announced in the syllabus.
POLICY ON COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR AUA CATALOG

Elements of Catalog Description
a. Course title and number
b. The number of credit hours
c. Note if Pass / Fail (otherwise assumed to be letter grade)
d. The prerequisites and co-requisites for the course (if any)
e. Description (i.e. a summary of course objectives)

Example PH201. General Principles of Public Health Problem Solving (5 units). An introduction to the diverse profession of public health and a guiding paradigm for public health problems solving, this course emphasizes the development of essential skills in critical thinking and group process. Through lectures, problem exercises, and individual and group work, student groups will complete an analysis of a current public health problem, including recommended courses of action. Evaluation components consist of individual and group participation, an individual written critique and other written assignments, a group paper, and a group presentation.
RA Labor Code, #HO-124-N (adopted November 9, 2004, as amended through March 1, 2011)

Article 111. Termination of the fixed-period employment contract due to its expiration

(5) If the fixed-period employment contract is not terminated according to this article upon its expiration and the employment relations continue, then the contract is considered to be concluded for an indefinite period.
2010 RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

March 2011
INTRODUCTION

This is our sixth report summarizing the activities of the seven Research Centers at the American University of Armenia (AUA). It lists the major activities conducted at the various Centers during calendar year 2010.

The seven Centers are: Center for Health Services Research and Development (CHSR); Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis (TCPA); Acopian Center for the Environment (ACE); Engineering Research Center (ERC); Legal Resource Center (LRC); Center for Innovations, Excellence, Research and Development In TEFL (CIERD-TEFL); and the Center for Business Research and Development (CBRD).

The body of the report provides a brief introduction to each Center, stating its mission and goals. A summary narrative follows for each Center regarding its accomplishments in 2010. The reports from each Center may vary in length and/or detail depending on the nature of the research conducted at the Center. As in our 2009 Report, we have kept the list of contract/projects, conferences/professional presentations, reports and publications for each Center at the end of their summary presentations. We did not change the different styles of these listings. When available, we have also listed briefly, plans for 2011.

Below we provide highlights from several of the Research Centers. Details are in the body of the Report.

**CHSR:** The CHSR organized a series of Tobacco Control public events throughout 2010, including the first Conference “Tobacco or Health” in Armenia, student walk dedicated to the World No Tobacco Day, series of round table discussions in Yerevan, Gyumri, and Vanadzor about achievements and shortcomings of Tobacco Control legislation enforcement, and concluded the year with the first Smoke-Free Awards Ceremony to support and promote establishment of smoke-free worksites in Armenia. All these events were well covered by national and local TV channels and print media.

**TCPA:** TCPA assisted in organizing several activities (panel discussion, break-out sessions) in the framework of the Women’s Mentoring Program launched in December 2009 by the United States Embassy and AUA. This Program was initiated to encourage successful women working in Armenia to provide career advice, share experiences, and serve as role models for promising young students. The mentees in this program were AUA first and second year female students – those with a desire to learn from more experienced women.

**ACE:** The White Stork Project, which was started in 2006 and received the Whitley Award in 2007 (Britain’s highest conservation award), now received continuation funding from Whitley Fund for Nature for its innovative approach and important nation-wide conservation of wetlands.

**ERC:** Was very active in 2010 submitting proposals and negotiating agreements for R&D activities. Of the four proposals submitted, two were awarded (Renewable Energy Roadmap for Armenia, through the Danish Energy Management Team, and cooperation with NTX Research of Paris, France). The other two, A National Plan for Earthquake Risk Management in Armenia (World Bank) and Applications of Security of Biometrics and communications from Volkswagen Foundation of Germany have very high probability of being awarded in 2011.

**LRC:** Student Master’s Research contributes to Detention Law Reform

**CIERD-TEFL:** hosts IELTA Virtual Conference. With many thanks to British Council and IREX, the DEP held its first IATEFL (International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language) virtual conference on May 16, 2010. Participants included: Ema Ushioda on learner motivation; Dave Willis on grammar; Kieran Egan on students’ thinking; other sessions included sessions on fluency, business English, and Internet tools for teaching.

**CBRD:** The Center was revitalized and began its activities in January 2010 with projects ranging from the Government of Armenia to local and international businesses. Several white papers are underway for the projects completed in 2010. Additionally, the Center continued to collaborate and contribute to Turpanjian Rural Development Program.

Kenell Touryan  
Vice President of R&D  
March 29, 2011
The Center for Health Services Research and Development (CHSR) [www.auachsr.com] is an applied research and development center within the College. The CHSR was established in 1995 to respond to the region’s research and development needs in the multidisciplinary field of public health. The Zvart Avedisian-Onanian Endowment better positions the CHSR to succeed in its mission.

Below we give a summary description of several of ongoing CHSR activities.

1. **Primary Health Care Reform Project (USAID)**
   The Primary Healthcare Reform (PHCR) project, the largest project in the field of Primary Health Care (PHC) in Armenia so far, was a nationwide five-year (2005-2010) program aimed to increase the utilization of sustainable, high-quality primary healthcare services with an ultimate goal of improving health of the population of Armenia. The project was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under a contract awarded to Cardno Emerging Markets USA, Ltd. (Cardno), formerly Emerging Markets Group, Ltd in September 2005.

   The AUA Center for Health Services Research and Development (CHSR), a sub-contractor to Cardno, carried the primary responsibility for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the PHCR project. This responsibility was reached through two coordinated approaches: internal monitoring and external evaluation. While internal monitoring was mainly focused on Developing Project’s Performance Management Plan (PMP) indicators and monitoring those through internal data gathering, the external evaluations were built on a set of assessments that measured the project’s influence at its target sites and among its beneficiaries. The M&E assessments followed the project’s regional scale-up approach that expanded the reforms zonally throughout the country. The M&E team conducted 18 different assessments including baseline and follow-up surveys in target facilities (facilities resource assessments, facility and provider performance assessments) and among target communities (client satisfaction surveys, and health knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) surveys) in each zone, and a countrywide Household health survey to measure the project’s overall impact on the perceived health status and health seeking behavior of general population. The external evaluations sought to comprehensively measure the effect of the project through comparisons of baseline and follow-up data specific to project activities and level of intervention, and to contribute to better planning/designing of similar projects in future. In the meantime, the M&E activities provided the project team and its stakeholders timely performance feedback that shaped changes to program activities and contributed to the project’s documented improvements in almost all indicators.

   The M&E team’s dynamic, comprehensive, multi-perspective assessment approach matched design and sampling rigor to program goals, objectives, and resources. This approach resulted in a valid and effective framework for monitoring and evaluating the complex, multi-year PHCR project and documenting its success in meeting its objectives. One of the main lessons learned due to this experience was that robust monitoring and evaluation efforts are integral and crucial to assessing project progress and ensuring that future efforts are more efficient, more effective, and more sustainable.

2. **Public Health Services Assessment and Restructuring (World Health Organization)**
   In collaboration with the MOH and WHO Country Office the CHSR conducted a comprehensive Assessment of PH Services in Armenia (2008/2010). The objectives of this project included:
• To map out and analyse the current public health services, to identify their strengths and weaknesses in order to design a detailed strategy and plan for the reform and modernization of the PH services and for further integration of disease prevention and health promotion services at the primary health care level.

• To review the international evidence and to build up a modern understanding of public health services (definition, scope, boundaries, domains, areas, operations, services, players, integrative approaches, etc.);

• To learn about relevant experience and lessons learned from other European countries for improving the public health services of the health system;

• To discuss and agree on the policy options for reforming, streamlining, modernizing and upgrading the individual and population-based public health services.

The preliminary findings were presented at National MOH-WHO seminars in June and November 2009 and October 2010. CHSR translated the report into Armenian. The CHSR team closely worked with a group of experts from the MOH to finalize the report. The MOH submitted the final version of the report to the Prime Minister of Armenia.

3. CHSR Tobacco Control Projects:

FCTC “Building NGOs monitoring capacities to support FCTC implementation in Armenia”
Timeframe: June 1, 2008 – May 31, 2010

The goal of the project is to build monitoring capacities of non-governmental organizations involved in tobacco control in Armenia through an interactive training seminar and field work.

The CHSR/AUA has completed the implementation of the two-year project entitled “Building NGOs monitoring capacities to support FCTC implementation in Armenia”. The second year of the project has marked with efforts to achieve higher compliance with smoke-free legislation in Armenia, included smoke-free policy monitoring in Yerevan, Vanadzor and Gyumri. Based on monitoring results, the CHSR/AUA team organized a series of round table discussions with government and local authorities, administrators of educational, cultural and health facilities, as well as representatives of local non-governmental organizations. These events were well covered by national and local TV channels and print media to reflect on the achievements and shortcomings of tobacco control policy implementation in Armenia. Selected smoke free worksites received a Prize from the Coalition for Tobacco Free Armenia and CHSR, a Smoke-Free Flag with a Certificate of Achievement for their success in maintaining a smoke-free worksite. Those facilities that failed in maintaining a smoke-free worksite were provided a symbolic ashtray covered by a cap with a no-smoking sign such that no smoker could use the ashtray. This memento was designed to motivate them to become smoke-free. The Awards Ceremony aimed to support and promote establishment of smoke-free worksites in Armenia.

FAMRI-ARMENIA
Timeframe: July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2011

In 2008-2010, CHSR has collaborated with Johns Hopkins Institute for Global Tobacco Control (JH IGTC) on a three-year research grant project, aimed at reducing the SHS exposure in Armenia. The first phase of the project included a demonstration project in selected worksites in Yerevan (two hospitals and two universities). CHSR implemented a series of intervention activities to reduce the Second Hand Smoke (SHS) at the National Oncology Center and Armenian State Pedagogical University and evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention through baseline and follow up surveys and air measurements in the intervention and control
In 2009, CHSR worked closely with IGTC to develop the protocol of the clinical trial to reduce SHS exposure in homes and submitted IRB applications to JHU and AUA IRBs. In 2010, the CHSR conducted baseline measurements in 250 households with children 2-6 years old (125 intervention and 125 control households), conducted intervention in 125 households, and follow-up measurements. The Center for Excellence for Tobacco Control Research and Advocacy will be established in 2011, by the end of the third year of the project in collaboration with the JH IGTC to train collaborators in neighboring countries on the protocols developed in the demonstration project and the clinical trial.

CHSR and IGTC colleagues developed and presented several poster and oral presentations based on this project in different international conferences.

**FCTC Shadow Report**
The international Framework Convention Alliance has funded the CHSR/AUA to prepare a shadow report on the implementation of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) in Armenia to assess the extent to which the country fulfilled its obligations under the global public health treaty. The report will be based on already collected monitoring data and on the comparative analysis of the national tobacco control policy and the FCTC provisions. It is intended to serve a number of stakeholders, including the Ministry of Health and other governmental agencies, international health organizations, media and of course, the civil society.

**Tobacco or Health Conference in Armenia**
To celebrate the World No Tobacco Day, the Yerevan State Medical University (YSMU) and the American University of Armenia (AUA) convened the first “Tobacco or Health” Conference in Armenia on May 31, 2010. This was organized in response to the Petition from the group of physicians and public health professionals submitted to the Ministers of Health and Education and Science and Rector of the Yerevan State Medical University at the 2009 Armenian Medical World Congress in New York.

The Conference brought together medical and public health students, faculty, clinicians, public health professionals from Armenia and Diaspora as well as international experts to discuss the mounting evidence on health hazards of smoking and health professional's responsibility in countering the smoking epidemic in Armenia. This event was organized within the framework of the Yerevan State Medical University 90th anniversary celebration.

The leaders of two universities Dr. Gohar Kyalyan and Dr. Haroutune Armenian made opening remarks, and the Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Health Dr. Ara Babloyan and the Advisor to the Minister of Health Mr. Suren Krmoyan welcomed the participants of the Conference.

The conference covered public health and policy aspects of tobacco use, benefits of smoke-free hospitals, emphasized the evidence that tobacco is a major risk factor for many deadly diseases and the need for smoking cessation interventions in Armenia. World known experts in tobacco control Dr. Frances Stillman, Co-Director of the Johns Hopkins Global Tobacco Control, and Dr. Gregory Connolly, Chair of the Division of Public Health Practice at the Harvard School of Public Health (video address) shared their experience with the conference participants and suggested ways to make smoking history in Armenia.

**Student Walk Dedicated to the World No Tobacco Day**
The Student Council of the American University of Armenia (AUA) in collaboration with the students from other Universities, volunteers of the Armenian Red Cross Society, and CHSR organized a student walk dedicated to the World No Tobacco Day on May 31, 2010. The aim of the walk was to bring the tobacco epidemic to the attention of society and health specialists, to raise awareness about the health hazards of smoking and tobacco control legislation, and to
integrate youth in efforts to curb the tobacco epidemic in Armenia. The participants of the walk met near Cascade and walked toward the Yerevan State Medical University where participants of the first conference on “Tobacco or Health” joined the event. Then the participants walked along Abovyan Street to the Republic Square where posters exclaiming “No Smoking” and “Clean Air” made from empty cigarette boxes were used as petitions to the general public not to smoke. Leaflets about tobacco control legislation, the health hazards of smoking and second hand smoke were passed out during the walk and various activities, such as “flash mob” and exchange of cigarette packs with small gifts were utilized to draw public's attention to this urgent problem in Armenia.

4. **Protecting the Right of Women to Affordable and Quality Health care in Armenia: Evaluation of the Maternity Care Certificate Program (Counterpart International – Armenia office, Civic Advocacy Support Program)**

The goal of this project was to contribute to the MOH efforts to reduce/eliminate the practice of out-of-pocket, particularly informal, payments for maternity services that are guaranteed by public funding through government payments to hospitals assuring equal quality and access to health care and social benefits. This study highlighted the strong and weak components of the program and identified mechanisms for improvement through a qualitative assessment in Yerevan and three marzes of Armenia. In April 2010 CHSR organized a public policy round table to share the findings with the MOH, Parliament Health Committee, NGOs, students, graduates, and faculty. CHSR Director presented the findings of this study during a TV Program devoted the Obstetric Care State Certificate Program implementation in Armenia. Later, CHSR translated the report into Armenian and disseminated among the local and international stakeholders.

5. **Arpi Simonian Healthy nutrition and lifestyle Project in rural communities**

CHSR conducted community-level trainings in Healthy Nutrition and Lifestyle in Armenia in 2010. The objective of CHSR community-level trainings was to improve family and community practices through a peer health education in nutrition and healthy lifestyle. CHSR implemented it in seven rural and border communities of Shirak and Tavush marzes. CHSR conducted KAP surveys before implementation of trainings and 3 months after to assess the effectiveness of the intervention.

This will serve as an introductory project to expand these activities in the rural regions of Armenia by developing beyond the resources of the current funding.

6. **WHO TB Consultancy**

Dr. Crape provided short term consultancy to the WHO to contribute to their TB Reports.

7. **Garo Meghrigian Institute for Preventive Ophthalmology**

To celebrate the World Sight Day, October 14, 2010, Meghrigian Institute has started eye screenings among socially vulnerable school children to detect visual impairments and eye diseases and offer medical assistance. In September, Meghrigian Institute completed work in the Social Care Center for children of Achapnyak community in Yerevan. Detailed eye screening was carried out among 112 school children (6-17 years old). In October it targeted 75 school children from “Marry Ismirlyan Orphanage”. The next stop in November was at “Kharberd Specialized Orphanage”, where 158 children live and they all have special health needs. Meghrigian Institute organizes screenings and provides appropriate medical assistance to children with detected visual impairments or eye diseases, including eye glasses and medication.
The Meghrigian Institute is organizing Continuous Medical Education courses at the National Institute of Health (NIH) for the ophthalmologists and ophthalmic nurses working in polyclinics of Gegharkunik marz. NIH will organize the trainings based on the curriculum that the Meghrigian Institute developed.

In Winter-Spring, 2010-2011, Meghrigian Institute in collaboration with the Lions Regional Ophthalmic Unit (ROU) in Sevan is organizing outreach visits for adult population in remote and poor villages of Gegharkunik and Tavush marzes with focus on eye problems and cataract detection. After identification of villages the village population will be invited for eye screening to identify eye pathologies, prescribe glasses, and provide frames as needed. In case of having other than refractive error the ophthalmologist of Meghrigian Institute will refer the residents of these villages for detailed diagnosis and/or treatment to the ROU in Sevan. Outreach visits will be organized once a week on Thursdays. Two villages were covered in December, 2010, in Gegharkunik marz.

8. Voluntary Contributions to the Public Health Community
CHS faculty and research staff volunteered their time in different Working Groups to improve the health system in Armenia. Dr. Crape serves in the Technical WG for TB Control in Armenia next to the Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM). Dr. Crape and Dr. Petrosyan were also interviewers with others from the Ministry of Health and the Global Fund for positions related to Global Fund. Drs. Crape and Petrosyan served in the MOH WG on Health System Strengthening and TB Control services components of the Global Fund supported projects. Dr. Movsisyan serves in the MOH Working Group on Tobacco Control.

Projects/Contracts
1. Primary Health Care Reform Project funded by USAID. CHSR is a subcontractor with the Emerging Markets Group (EMG) consulting company, the primary implementer of the project (2005-2010).
5. Arpi Simonian Healthy nutrition and lifestyle Project in rural communities funded by Arpi Simonian (2010).
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Educational Materials:


The College of Health Sciences hosted five public seminars/workshops in 2010:

1. Chronic Disease Control and Health Impact Assessment Using the Example of the London Olympics 2012 (January)
2. Understanding Trauma: What it is and How it Impacts Individuals, Communities, and Societies (March)
4. Health Care in the US: a Public Health Perspective (September)
5. From Discovery to Application: an Alternative Perspective on Epidemiology (October)
TURPANJIAN CENTER FOR POLICY ANALYSIS (TCPA)

The Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis (TCPA) was established in 1995 by the AUA School of Political Science and International Affairs (PSIA) with the central mission of promoting knowledge and understanding through objective and independent research and policy analysis employing the latest methodologies. TCPA provides students and graduates with opportunities to participate in multidisciplinary applied research in a broad spectrum of contemporary social, political, and legal fields concerning Armenia. The Center's long-term objective matches that of the School -- to contribute directly to Armenia’s transition to a democratic state.

This report briefly summarizes the research activities of the Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis (TCPA) at the American University of Armenia (AUA) for 2010. The report begins with research and grant activities in 2010 and is followed by brief descriptions of other significant TCPA activities.

Research and Grant Activities

1. Women’s Mentoring Program
United States Embassy and American University of Armenia

On December 8, 2009, the U.S. Embassy in Armenia and the American University of Armenia launched a new women’s mentoring program. This Program was initiated to encourage successful women working in Armenia to provide career advice, share experiences, and serve as role models for promising young students. The mentees in this program were AUA first and second year female students – those with a desire to learn from more experienced women.

In 2010 TCPA assisted in organizing several activities in the framework of the Women’s Mentoring Program.

1.1. Panel Discussion “Women in Public Service”

The first event, a panel discussion entitled “Women in Public Service,” was organized on March 11, 2010. The panel discussion was attended by about 70 mentors and mentees representing a variety of spheres of Armenian political, social and cultural life. The panel discussion was moderated by AUA Provost and Vice President, Dr. Lucig Danielian. The speakers of the panel discussion, the U.S. Ambassador to Armenia Marie L. Yovanovitch, two female Members of the Armenian Parliament, Ms. Larisa Alaverdyan and Ms. Heghine Bisharyan, and Vice-Rector for Research of the Yerevan State Medical University, Ms. Magda Melkonyan, delivered opening remarks and presented several stories from their own lives illustrating their paths to success, challenges they have had to overcome, and lessons they have learned throughout their lives.

1.2. Program Evaluation by Mentors and Mentees

In August 2010 TCPA conducted evaluation of the Program. Self-administered evaluation forms (with a cover letter explaining the purposes of the evaluation) were sent by email to 43 mentors and 44 mentees. Both quantitative and qualitative data were input and analyzed using SPSS.
1.3. Final Activity

On November 30, 2010, about 50 mentors and mentees gathered together at the American University of Armenia to mark the closure of the Program. The final activity included break-out group discussions led by mentors and mentees on three important topics facing women today focused on career challenges for women, empowerment of women in Armenia and domestic violence against women. The break-out group discussions were followed by a general session where all participants had an opportunity to discuss issues of concern for women. This final activity coincided with the international 16 Days of Activism against Gender Violence Campaign in Armenia. The general session was followed by a Champagne Reception during which Ambassador Yovanovitch gave a toast and both mentors and mentees received Certificates of Participation.

2. Turpanjian Rural Development Program American University of Armenia

The purpose of the Turpanjian Rural Development Program (TRDP) at the American University of Armenia is to help the economic development of rural areas throughout Armenia and Artsakh through the provision of education and training and assistance to current and new businesses. TCPA was in charge of conducting an independent evaluation of the Young Entrepreneurs Program (YEP) organized by the TRDP Gyumri office on July 29, 2010.

In April 2010 the TRDP Gyumri office conducted a representative survey of the rural population of the Shirak Marz in order to measure their knowledge and attitudes regarding the Turpanjian Rural Development Program. TCPA assisted in the sampling design, questionnaire development, data entry and analysis of this study.

TCPA assisted in organizing the Fourth Annual Conference on Rural Development in the Republic of Armenia initiated by the AUA Turpanjian Rural Development Program. The event was opened by AUA President Emeritus and TRDP Chair, Dr. Haroutune Armenian. The main topics for panels were Business Social Responsibility and Social Engagement and Impact of Economic Downturn on Small Businesses. During the first panel the presenters spoke on corporate social responsibility in terms of benefits for businesses; ethics, philanthropy and PR as well as preconditions for rural development. The panelists of the second panel presented how to do business during uncertain times, spoke about financing micro businesses in Armenia and discussed how small and medium businesses of Armenia have survived the economic crisis. Panel discussions were followed by question-answer sessions. About 70 of TRDP beneficiaries displayed their products, posters and materials. This conference was held on October 8, 2010 at the Business Center of the American University of Armenia.

3. Support to Visiting Research Scholar

In 2010 TCPA continued to provide support for a visiting researcher: Kristin Cavoukian is a Ph.D. student from the Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Canada. Ms. Cavoukian is particularly interested in relations between the Republic of Armenia and ethnic Armenian around the world, whether living in diaspora or in historic Armenian lands outside the present-day republic.
Conferences and Seminars

Policies, Governance and Challenges
Summer Seminars on the European Union
Jean Monnet EU Center of Excellence, University of Rome Tor Vergata and Italian National School of Public Administration
June 21 – July 9, 2010
Rome, Italy

Participant: Mr. Armen Grigoryan (PSIA 2011 class)

International AIDS Conference
July 13-23, 2010
Vienna, Austria

Participant: Ms. Marine Margaryan (PSIA 2011 class)

Youth Exchange: Words, Steps, Rhythms through DiverCity
EU Youth in Action Programme
August 26 – September 4, 2010
Prague, Rajnochovice, Czech Republic

Participant: Ms. Marine Margaryan (PSIA 2011 class)

Perspectives 2020: Democracy in Europe - Principles and Challenges
Forum for the Future of Democracy, Council of Europe
October 19-21, 2010
Government Guest House, Yerevan, Armenia

Working session 1B: Theme 1: Law and Democracy
Should there be a ‘right to democracy’?
Moderator: Dr. Lucig Danielian

Domestic Violence in Armenia
Round Table Discussion
In the framework of the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women
December 1, 2010
Information Resource Center, U.S. Embassy, Yerevan, Armenia

Presentation:
Other Activities

1) The Center continued its direct support of the Graduate School through acquisition of technology, supplies, and books.

2) The Center continued to employ the best students and graduates of Political Science and International Affairs (PSIA) in research activities in 2010. The Center has a team of 25 trained interviewers to call upon on a project basis.

3) The Center continues to pursue new funding activities through networking and applications to new programs, sometimes as invited partners. Several formal applications were submitted for contracted work in 2010.

4) The Center continued in its support of Armenian and non-Armenian policy experts and researchers through meetings and participation in conferences and seminars.

5) The Center Director continued to provide Center support to a variety of Armenian organizations through membership on boards and councils including the Open Society Foundations-Armenia, Eurasia Foundation/Carnegie Corporation Caucasus Research Resource Center, Yerevan State University Graduate Program in Public Administration, and the Journal of Armenian Economic Policy.

6) The Center assisted the Open Society Foundations-Armenia in the selection of rigorous and innovative study proposals by Armenian junior and senior policy researchers in the framework of the Policy Fellowship Initiative.

7) The Center became a member of the UN Gender Theme Group, the purpose of which is to promote and support the mainstreaming of gender as a crosscutting issue in development agenda of Armenia, development partners’ activities and joint programming.

8) The Center provided support in organizing a trip of PSIA students and faculty to Artsakh. This three-day visit took place in September 2010 as a continuation of PSIA studies in geopolitics and international law. PSIA faculty members Mr. Vigen Sargsyan and Ms. Lusine Galajyan organized the visit and accompanied the study group.

9) The Center continued to sponsor panel discussions and public lectures by distinguished speakers in 2010:
List of Public Lectures and Discussions in 2010

1. April 22, 2010

95 Years Later - Looking Forward
Panel Discussion in Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide (with the AUA Department of Law)

Speakers: Prof. Vahan Bournazian (Associate Dean, AUA Department of Law), Mr. Alex Sardar (Vice President, Counterpart International and Chief of Party, USAID Civic Advocacy Support Program) and Dr. Thomas Samuelian (Dean, AUA Department of Law)
Moderator: Dr. Lucig Danielian (AUA Provost and Vice President)

Delivered presentations on different issues of the Armenian Genocide. Prof. Bournazian explained why the community of nations takes responsibility for crimes against humanity; Mr. Sardar discussed why the Armenian Genocide is an American issue, and Dr. Samuelian added a new perspective by specifying why reparations are necessary for the region to move forward.

2. June 9, 2010

Politics and Economics of Environmental Enterprises in Armenia: Case of Lusakert Biogas Plant
Open Talk and Discussion (with the AUA College of Engineering, School of Business and Management, and the Acopian Center for the Environment)

Speakers: Mr. Khachik Manukyan (Partner at Max Group Concern, the main owner of the Lusakert Biogas Plant) and Mr. Rolf Kevin (Representative of the Norwegian company, Vekst)
Opening remarks: Mr. Alen Amirkhanian (Lecturer, “Engineering Green Buildings,” AUA College of Engineering)

Talked about the business and politics of launching and running a complex environmental enterprise of this kind in Armenia

3. June 23, 2010

World War II as an Enhancer of Armenian-American Second Generation Identity
AUA Lecture

Mr. Gregory Aftandilian is a writer on Armenian-American history and a consultant on Middle East affairs.

Presented his recently published article which discusses encounters between Armenian-American soldiers and Soviet Armenian soldiers during WW II

4. September 10, 2010

Structural Transformation
Lecture (by the ROA Ministry of Economy, with the assistance of the World Bank)
Dr. Ricardo Hausmann is the Director of Harvard’s Center for International Development, Professor of the Practice of Economic Development at the Kennedy School of Government, former Minister of Planning of Venezuela and former member of the Board of the Central Bank of Venezuela.

Presented data on why some countries are rich and others are poor, while analyzing the distribution of per capita income across countries as well as the comparative advantage of nations. Professor Hausmann spoke about the importance of growth, while explaining whether or not Armenia is a growth miracle.

5. October 19, 2010

**Anticorruption Policies and Good Governance Public Lecture**

Mr. Robert J. Smolik is an expert in cross-cultural communication, democracy and governance, and economic development.

Presented three pillars of good governance that are important to ensure in order to be able to combat corruption: 1) system of checks and balances between different branches of government, 2) objective media, and 3) objective judiciary system. The key component to each of these pillars is transparency. He pointed out valuable tools to fight corruption: 1) enhancement of freedom of information legislation; 2) whistle blowing when protection is provided to people who make information about improper conduct in both the public and private sectors available; 3) a plea-bargaining practice when prosecutors can promise one person a deal in order to get at higher-level individuals in corruption.

6. December 2, 2010

**Film Screening and Open Discussion in Support of the International 16 Days of Activism against Gender Violence Campaign**

The AUA TCPA screened a short documentary film for the AUA community, *Zone of Silence*. The film was produced by Ms. Mariam Ohanyan, Director of the Liza Foundation, in 2009, and it discusses gender violence in rural Armenia. The film screening was followed with an open discussion led by Dr. Larisa Minasyan, Executive Director of Open Society Foundations-Armenia and Dr. Lucig Danielian, AUA Provost and Vice President. The film screening led to a discussion about domestic violence against women, which is an issue that affects both individuals and society at large.
ACOPIAN CENTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (ACE)

“The mission of ACE is to promote environmental concern for the natural environment in Armenia, through research, education, and public outreach.”

(Mission statement of the Acopian Environmental Conservation Centers)

Our Vision: To produce scientific data and conservation education that will help to protect Armenia’s biodiversity, our center:

6. Focuses on bird and butterfly species that are biological indicators for Armenia’s natural resource health and that serve as focal points for conservation goals.
7. Protects habitat necessary to support Armenia’s wild biodiversity of birds and plants.
8. Educates students at the American University and in all parts of Armenia about the biodiversity of Armenia and the importance of developing long-term, sustainable solutions for conserving it.
4. Partners with other conservation groups to encourage local, regional, and global cooperation for environmental protection and conservation of Armenia’s biodiversity and wild species.

RESEARCH PROJECTS 2010

1. White Stork Ecology and Conservation:

The White Stork Project, which was started in 2006 and received the Whitley Award in 2007 (Britain’s highest conservation award), now received continuation funding from Whitley Fund for Nature for its innovative approach and important nation-wide conservation of wetlands. The work continues to focus on using the very common and abundant white stork as a bio-indicator of environmental change and creates environmental awareness in Armenia by using Armenian villagers as citizen scientists or “nest neighbors”. The scientific long-term aspect of the study looks at the migration patterns and reproductive ecology of the white storks to determine long-term trends on potential impacts of climate change and the short-term impacts of pesticide and herbicide use near stork feeding and nesting sites. Current stage of the project aimed expansion of the scientific focus in order to determine relations between White Storks’ characteristics (such as abundance and reproductive success) and characteristics of water invertebrates (another water indicator) and other water birds (the main conservation target).

The conservation education aspect of the study involves using village families to collect data on the date of arrival of storks to the nest sites at their homes, number of nestlings, survival of nestlings, fledging dates, and out migration dates. Prior to each migration season ACE researchers distribute calendars to the villagers and instruct them on how to record the information. Each year after the storks emigrate to Africa ACE collects the calendars with the data and enters the information into the GIS database. During the summer season ACE staff also spends a week banding the nestlings so that we and others can track the success of the nestlings as they begin their migratory lifestyles. We use the method year by year starting from 2006, since that is the essence of monitoring.

Our center sponsored the process of providing “ecology corners” in the village schools where white storks have their nesting sites. Posters, books, slide shows and other informative materials will become part of these information centers. We have developed series of informative power point slide shows showing (1) connection between use of pesticides and the impact on wildlife and human biological systems, (2) connection between storks reproductive success and health of
surrounding wetlands, (3) connection between abundance of insectivore songbirds (in orchards) and abundance of agricultural pest species (insects).

The conservation section of the project received additional funding from Whitley Fund for Nature and WWF, and the project will be focused on development of community based monitoring and ecotourism in Lake Arpi National Park, one of the sites where White Storks are used as flagship species, leading monitoring of the other biodiversity groups.

2. Forest Indicators

The study of forest birds and butterflies was transformed into revealing of indicators of forest conditions and influence of climate change on mountain forest ecosystems. The study, which was extensively conducted in the forests of Southern Armenia was aimed at determination of correlations between necessary bird parameters (species composition, total abundance of birds, abundance of some sensitive species) and forest characteristics as well as between butterfly parameters (species composition, abundance of particular species) and aridization of the forest. The revealed correlations were used to develop detailed methodology for cost effective forest monitoring. The project was financed by UNDP/GEF “Analysis of forest pests and pestholes exacerbated by climate change and climate variability in Syunik Marz of Armenia and to identify the most applicable prevention measures for improving forest health management practices”

3. Monitoring of Butterflies of Armenia

We have carried out an extensive study of Bargoochat and Meghri mountain ridges in order to complete the data collection from these very interesting regions of Armenia. All the collected data are stored in ACE database and are in use for ACE publications.

4. A study of Levant Sparrowhawks in selected sites of Armenia

The project continued monitoring of the population density, habitat selection and the breeding success of Levant Sparrowhawks, one of the least known raptor species not only in Armenia but also around the world. Also we fit three of individuals with data loggers, the tool, which will let to obtain data on birds’ migration and wintering pattern.

5. Red-Data Book of Armenia

The final editing of the new Red Data Book of Armenia was conducted by ACE and the book was eventually published. After long-term break (over 20 years) this is a great success for Armenia.

Funded Projects for 2010

- Analysis of forest pests and pestholes exacerbated by climate change and climate variability in Syunik Marz of Armenia and to identify the most applicable prevention measures for improving forest health management practices. UNDP/GEF/00051202 Project
- A study of Levant Sparrowhawks in selected sites of Armenia. Hawk Mountain Sanctuary.
OUTREACH DEVELOPMENT

1. ACE conducted a second conference on GIS in Armenia.

2. ACE is reshaping its traditional Bird Identification Training Course, in order to make it more interesting for the general public and more beneficial for AUA.

3. ACE developed series of informative power point slide shows showing (1) connection between use of pesticides and the impact on wildlife and human biological systems, (2) connection between storks reproductive success and health of surrounding wetlands, (3) connection between abundance of insectivore songbirds (in orchards) and abundance of agricultural pest species (insects). The slide shows will be used by schools and environmental NGOs.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM AT AUA:

1. ACE awarded three certificates to AUA student who successfully completed the certificate program.

2. ACE provided courses in Environmental Policy, Sustainable Development, Environmental Ornithology, Environmental Science and Conservation, Environmental Economics for AUA students during 2010.

Lectures and Publications:

Scientific Articles


Books


Popular Articles


Lectures

8.1.3.1. Birds for monitoring the forest health and Butterflies for monitoring the Climate Change. Syunik, Armenia
ENGINEERING RESEARCH CENTER (ERC)

The Engineering Research Center (ERC) conducts basic and applied research in technologies that are relevant to the industrial development of Armenia and its region. These include: Information Technologies and Renewable Energy Resources. ERC brings together teams of AUA faculty and local scientists and engineers, collaborating on projects funded internally and externally. Qualified students, employed as research assistants, gain valuable experience working alongside their faculty and local experts.

The Center operates a number of research facilities, including a modern computer laboratory, an earthquake simulator, two strong-motion seismographs, a computer-controlled manufacturing laboratory, a solar monitoring station and recently acquired equipment for assembling small PEM hydrogen fuel cells.

ERC activities in 2009 were conducted among four groups: the Alternate Energy Technology Group, the Computer Information Systems (CIS) Group, the CAD/CAM team and the Advanced Technologies in Earthquake Resistant Construction Group. The Center made special effort to respond to announcements of grants and contracts, successfully negotiating several grants and contracts, some of which required collaboration with local institutes, or those in Europe and the USA.

1. Alternate Energy Activities

1.1. The PVSCAN project
Work on the PVSCAN (photovoltaic scanning) project was completed in December and the equipment has been shipped to National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). The device consists of several parts: precisely balanced high spin turntable (up to 4000rpm) with a very accurate (1 micrometer) probe arm; control and GUI software. It has a data acquisition system and 3-channel laser probe system with a detector attached to the turntable for scanning the surface of a wafer to determine defects in real time. The probe has yet to be manufactured by NREL and the software should be refined. The equipment should be tested at NREL in 2011. Three industrial partners (commercial wafer developers) are interested in using the PVSCAN.

1.2. The Freezewater project.
FREEZWATER is an abbreviation for a longer expression “Water Retention through Natural Freezing” and stands for keeping water in the form of ice on sufficiently high mountain altitudes by natural freezing during the winter period. Freezing can be achieved by dispersing the water on sufficiently large areas of appropriate profile and orientation using a pipeline network, in the prolonged periods of frost that are an essential climatic factor on high altitudes. The period of heavy melting of the virtual artificial glacier would fall on August which is the period of minimal natural water release from Aragats and maximal demand from the agricultural areas. Increase in the water yield of Aragats at this bottleneck period may help double the agricultural output of a large area surrounding the Aragats region and improve the living conditions in this densely populated area (at least 150 000 inhabitants).
If this project succeeds the results can be duplicated in other locations of the world.
During 2010 the site has been selected at altitude of 2857 meters, poles have been installed, water pipe-work has been roughly mounted, and the process of ice formation has been started. During the reporting period the ice formation was continued with substantial growth. Maintenance work is being continued, the pipe-work has been further developed, and monitoring work is continuing.
The conclusions we have reached from the Spring 2010 experimentation are:
   a. A better site should be decided for longevity of the glacier.
   b. A newer spray system should be implemented
   c. Glacier protecting cover should be used to increase the life of the glacier.
   d. The protecting cover can be used also for preserving naturally suitable volumes of snow or glaciers.

In the Fall of 2010 a new series of experiments were started to implement the aforementioned conclusions.

1.3. In August 2010, Dr Touryan contacted the Danish Energy Management team and offered the support of two AUA specialists in renewable technologies. This included Dr. Artak Hambarian and himself. After strong competition among 27 teams, DEM won the contract for developing a Roadmap for Armenia to bring renewable technologies to Armenia over the period 2010-2020. The first report was submitted in late December, 2010. The final report will be due June 1, 2011.

1.4. In 2009 the College of Engineering established certificate program in Alternate Energy Technologies, Energy Conservation, and Economics. The courses have been attended by students from IESM, CIS and SBA. The courses have led to several MS theses from the IESM students.

1.5. Mr Zaven Akian visited ERC in 2010 and provided the first $25K grant to have ERC hire two engineers (Varuzhan Melikyan and Hrair Azizbekyan) and complete the PVSCAN spin-table work in 2010.

Plans for 2011 include the following proposals:

1. Solar Cooker Marketing and Production in Armenia, to be submitted to appropriate funding agencies
2. Design and Construction of a «O» Emissions Solar System, together with Austrian, German, Russian, Portuguese and Armenian Partners, to be submitted to Cordis FP7 of EU.
3. Development of a Green Design Building for AUA. May involve a number of organizations in Armenia and in Europe.
4. Development of a concept and search funding for Reference Renewable Technologies Lab that brings the newest technologies, products to AUA, makes demonstrations, tries to replicate the design aiming local assembly or production.
2. **CAD-CAM Activities**

2.1. After returning from Florida, Sargis Zeytunyan continued the wind turbine project here, at AUA. With the team of IESM students, they prepared the 3D model, drawings, and Bill of Material documents for the revised version of the 25ft turbine. The documentation was sent to FSU on December 4, 2010. There is an agreement to continue the collaboration for the new configuration of the turbine.

2.2. CAD/CAM related practical projects should be done by IESM 2-year students as their Master thesis work. The topics of the projects are as follows:
- Automatic washing machine for PAB windows;
- Double-pallet parking garage for 2 cars (an Indian student from Durgapur, West Bengal is coming to participate as intern in this project);
- Study and implementation of Delta Tau’s CNC controller;
- Design of modular solar PV panels for roofing;
- Design and analysis of LED lamps for industrial premises.

2.3. We are waiting for the HAAS CNC milling machine installation in the CAD/CAM lab to start its exploration.

3. **Computer Information Systems (CIS) Team**

An ERC project for the COE Certificate programs has been initiated:

27 participants registered for 4 courses, among which 4 participants completed all 3 courses and received the Certificate in OOP.

3.1. Two CIS programming teams participated in the ACM ICPC Programming Olympiad at the national (sub-regional) level and qualified for the regional contest. Supported by ERC, the teams participated in the Regional ACM ICPC Olympiad, Tbilisi, Georgia, Nov 23-25 2010. With this activity a new direction in research in Software Engineering is started in the CIS program.

3.2. ERC supported participation and publications of two papers in the 4th Int.

3.3. Gurgen Khachatryan research and development activities in 2010:

- Project proposal “Application of Security to Biometrics and Communications” jointly with participation of AUA and University of Essen Germany has been submitted to Volkswagen foundation in July 2010. Project leaders: Prof. A.J. Han Vinck (University of Duisburg-Essen) and Prof. Gurgen Khachatrian (American University of Armenia). Status: Waiting for a final approval (we already have a positive response from reviewers).
- Started cooperation with NTX research (Paris, France). Project named ‘E-password application “started already in February 2011 for 6 months. Budget 10,000 USD.

**Plans for 2011 include the following:**

The new CIS Certificate in OOP starts in March 2011.
4. Advanced Technologies in Earthquake Resistant Construction Group

1.1. The World Bank (WB) urged AUA in early 2009 to form a team with GHI (Geohazards International) of Berkeley CA and the GHS (Geohazards Society) of New Delhi, to develop a comprehensive earthquake risk assessment project, both for Yerevan and New Delhi. The stage 2 proposal was submitted to WB in June 2010. Subsequently, WB requested the proposal be modified to allow the mitigation work be done only in Armenia, including several neighboring states. Help was to be provided by GHI and GHS. (A modified proposal was submitted in March 2011).

1.2. Prof. Melkumyan’s team was able to secure only one new contract in 2010 for 9,250,000 AMD on the development of the concept of bearing structure and earthquake response analysis of a 7-story residential experimental building to be constructed by new technology using so called “Eco Panels”. The program envisages comparative analysis of the behavior of this new type of structures with the conventional reinforce concrete walls.

The most important work of this Team in 2010 was the continuation of the activities related to the process of approval of the Technical Design for strengthening the key facilities for City Hall, Iasi, Iasi County. This work is going on within the framework of a World Bank financed “Hazard Risk Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness Project” in Romania. The work was finally recommended by the “Miyamoto International, Inc.” (USA) for acceptance by the Project Management Unit. What is most important is that in 2010 the Technical Design developed in retrofitting of the Iasi City Hall building using technology suggested by Prof. Melkumyan was approved by the Technical Committee for Seismic Risk Reduction (TCSRR) of the Government of Romania. However, the Technical Design, was only partially approved by local authorities, on the local level. After much disagreement between Melkumyan and the Iasu city <verificator>, the work was stopped in late June and the construction phase was discontinued.

College of Engineering (IESM/CIS) Presentations and Seminars by Faculty members

- Gurgen Khachatryan was invited as a visiting professor to Krasnoyarsk, Russia to Siberian Federal University in September 2010 where he gave a series of lectures on Applied Cryptography.
- Gurgen Khachatryan visited Brussels, Belgium in September 27-29 as an invited expert to participate in the conference related to ICT FP7 Work Program.
- Gurgen Khachatryan visited Madrid, Spain in September 30- October 3, 2010 to participate in the symposium “Natural Information Technologies” where he presented a paper “Adaptive Coding scheme for rapidly changing Communication Channels”.
- Conference of Young Scientists on Computer Science and Engineering, Lviv, Ukraine, Nov 25-27 2010:
The College of Engineering organized sixteen seminars at AUA on a variety of topics as listed below:

February 23:  Hovanes Manucharyan “Securing the Smart Grid”
April 19:  Jason Paul Kazarian “Information Technology: Armenian Progress in Infrastructure, Education, and Business”
April 27:  Amalya Mkhitaryan and Gegham Vardanyan “Mechatronics – New Way for World Engineering”
May 27:  Randal E.Knar “How to Have a Successful Interview”
May 31:  Zaven P.Akian “Applied Engineered Product Manufacturing”
June 23:  Arthur Berd “Risky Business”
June 28:  Armen Der Kiureghian “The Life and Art of Sumbat”
July 1:  Armen Avoyan “Two E-Health Initiatives in Armenia”
July 20:  Shahan Nercessian “Multi-Scale Image Fusion Using the Parameterized Logarithmic Image Processing Model”
October 11:  Gayane Nalbandyan “Medical record system software requirements discussion”
October 14:  Sargis Zeytunyan “Keuka Wind Turbine Project”
October 26:  Zaven Naghashyan “Developing software for formation and acquisition lexical units in certain limited languages”
November 8:  Hagop Panossian “Innovation, Invention & Technology Readiness Level”
November 24:  Huub Lelieveld, Piet Steenaard “Hygienic Design in Food Manufactory”
December 10:  Sargis Zeytunyan and 7 IESM2 students “KEUKA 25’ Wind Turbine 3D Design and Documentation”
LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER

Founded in 1997 along with Law Department, the Legal Resource Center (LRC) aims to address the needs of a developing legal environment, emphasizing outreach, access to up-to-date information, community service, and economic development as the cornerstone of its scholarly/research mission. Being a clearinghouse for international best practices is one of the center’s primary goals, consistent with the needs of the community, interests of the faculty, and mission of the university.

Being a source of solid legal information, making legal materials available online and in our library, and providing knowledgeable interpretation of international best practices is the kind of applied research that translates into impactful scholarship and service. Highlights in 2010, were the completion of the Patients’ Rights as Human Rights Training Program, Detention Rights Reform based on Student Masters' Research, Colloquium on Precedent for the Central Bank, continued Advocacy for the US-Armenia Double Tax Treaty, and the first Armenian Intellectual Property Moot Court Competition (2010-2011).

Introduction

The Legal Resource Center (LRC) is an integral part of the Department of Law (AUA Law). The two entities work hand-in-hand to promote international standards in legal education and research with a focus on law reform, legal-education reform, and legal information access through library and online sources. The LRC is the first legal research institution in Armenia to serve a broad spectrum of patrons and make available a varied collection of international, comparative, US, European, and western legal materials. The LRC maintains an extensive collection of printed and electronic reference materials covering all major fields of law, concentrating on comparative and international law. Other resources maintained at the LRC include official Armenian law bulletins, the IRTEK electronic library of Armenian law, and the US law research service. An important public service component to the LRC includes organizing seminars and conferences on important and current legal issues.

1. Research and Publications

1.1. Armenian Law Review – The Armenian Law Review is a web site that serves as a forum for law student and faculty publications on legal topics related to Armenia. These papers are of both practical and theoretical value. This web page also includes important links for conducting legal research in Armenia, including Armenian legal landmarks.

1.2. Citizens’ Guide to Legal Transactions – The largest body of systematic research in English in the area of procedural auditing of the legal system of Armenia, the Citizens’ Guide for Legal Transactions are of both practical and theoretical significance. The Guides offer practical advice and legal knowledge to the average Armenian citizen. They also provide a baseline for legal reform efforts and harmonization with European legal standards. The Guides is to empower average citizens and foreign investors with the knowledge and skills to conduct simple transactions for themselves. Armed with a summary of the rules, citizens are able to respond knowledgeably to bureaucrats who might otherwise complicate the transaction and frustrate the citizen creating a moral hazard. In this way, the Citizens’ Guide for Legal Transactions arms citizens through education to defend their rights and fight against corruption.
1.3. Arbitration Guide – Arbitration continues to be a high priority as an alternative to the RA courts system, since the Republic of Armenia adopted a new Arbitration Law in 2006. The LRC has made available in English and Armenian, the text of the law and a guide to arbitration and mediation, to assist practitioners, judges and investors.

1.4. Peer Reviewed Publications

- Kharatyan & Tashchyan, “Preventing Unlawful Detention in Armenia,” European Law Students Association, Selected Papers on European Law, 2010
  ist%5B%5D=Armenia

  www.elsevier.com/locate/postcomstud

1.5. Conferences and Seminars – During 2010 the LRC hosted or participated in a number of public events that gave AUA positive nationwide and diasporan press coverage:

- Colloquium on Precedent in Administrative Proceedings, presented by Dean Samuelian and Assoc. Dean Bournazian for 40 attorneys and administrators of the RA Central Bank – April 2011
- AUA April 24th Observance – Addresses by Dean Samuelian and Assoc. Dean Bournazian
- Obama 2008 and the Armenian-American Community with Anthony Barsamian (June 2010)
- International Conference on The Discovery of the Quedagh Merchant (Oct. 2010)
- Legal Aspects of Artsakh’s Self-Determination in the Context of Contemporary International Legal Challenges: Before and After Kosovo (Dec. 2010), Paper presented on the relationship of Self-Determination to Territorial Integrity in Light of the Kosovo Ruling by Dean Samuelian.

1.6. Scholarship through Public Service

One of the primary ways that the Law Department contributes to the advancement of legal thought in Armenia and dissemination of new ideas is through applied research and direct involvement in public discourse as well as hands-on legal advice. Each of our faculty are sought-after specialists in their fields, who contribute to the development of the Armenian legal environment not only through teaching and writing, but also through public speaking and legal practice. Below are some examples of the kinds of innovative and creative work that the AUA Legal Resource Center has provided in 2010:

- Pro bono advice to US Embassy Commercial Section on Double Tax Treaty between US and Armenia
- Pro bono advice to Ministry of Economy on intellectual property protection proposal.
- On-going research and policy support for various reparations and restoration claims regarding Armenian historical monuments
- Pro bono advice to Holy See of Etchmiadzin on protection of historical monuments abroad and freedom of religion matters.
2. **Grants:**

In 2010 the LRC completed the training materials for the newly published Practitioner’s Guide to Patients’ Rights as Human Rights. The training materials are unique inasmuch as they bring together professionals in both the medical and legal fields who may often be at odds with each other regarding malpractice issues. The training materials also teach local attorneys how to best use a practice guide, which is a new format for the legal profession in Armenia.

**Plans for 2011**

- Preparation of Legal Education Materials on the use of Precedent in Armenian courts and administrative bodies, including application of European Court and other international precedents in Armenian courts.


- Research on Law and Justice in Armenian Popular Culture, including historical and literary sources.

- Reparations for Crimes against Humanity, including Genocide, destruction of Cultural Heritage, confiscation and mutilation of cultural property

- Artsakh Self-Determination in light of the Kosovo Case and Sudan Referendum

- Remedies under Armenian Law in Comparative Perspective - research on common problems faced by citizens and investors and the kinds of remedies that are available under Armenian law, e.g., groundless traffic stop, overreaching labor audit, dispute over the authenticity of a will, etc.

- Law Reform and European Approximation - continuing advocacy of reform and administrative streamlining to improve Armenia's legal environment, which led to development of new course in European Harmonization first offered in the fall of 2010.
The Center was initially established in the academic year of 2003 within the Department of English Programs. Its mission is to conduct, encourage, publish and disseminate research with primary focus on promoting effective language teaching at all levels in Armenia and the region.

Specific goals of the Center include: conducting research on the teaching of English as a Foreign Language and the teaching of other languages; implementing relevant research findings to the Armenian context; facilitating interaction between center personnel and their counterparts in relevant educational systems; developing research projects that train and support TEFL students; educating and training TEFL professionals for academic and leadership positions; and supporting academic activities for faculty at AUA and elsewhere.

In addition, the Center provides opportunities for MA students to conduct their research in relation to their MA theses. The center also seeks opportunities to hold local, regional, and international conferences on issues related to applied linguistics.

The Center itself assumes special prominence given the current developmental setting of Department of English Programs (DEP) and the various projects that are underway. The Center sees itself as the official outreach arm of DEP, dedicated to initiating, mediating, and fostering research agendas and responding to inquiries for assistance in Armenia. To this end, this report summarizes the activities accomplished in 2010, given the complementary nature of research and development in language teaching.

1. Intramural Activities

1.1. Experimental English Classes (EEC)

The EEC, under the supervision of Rubina Gasparyan and participation of faculty members and MA students, is primarily designed to serve as the research center for MA and Certificate students.

Another mission of EEC is to provide opportunities for the children of AUA affiliates with the opportunity to learn English through communicative methods of language teaching. The course lasts 10 weeks, and classes meet 2 hours per session.

EEC classes are also open to all children to enjoy the most modern methods of communicative teaching of English. The number of students enrolled in EEC classes increased from 47 in the fall of 2008 to 500+ in the fall of 2010, and the trend is growing. In fact demand has been so high that a new level has been opened for those who want to perfect their knowledge.

1.2. English for General Purposes Classes (EGP)

The EGP program (Academic and General English Classes), under the supervision of Melissa Brown, continues to grow, with more than 100 students per term. In addition to our regular classes targeting potential AUA students, we have arranged special courses for the Ministry of Health staff (through the US Embassy in Georgia). The program plays a role in the MATEFL program as a site for observations during coursework, practicum teaching and observations, and research.
1.3. English classes for Ayb Foundation students
Starting in 2011, DEP will provide English language classes for Ayb Foundation High School gifted students. Fr. Mesrop Aramyan is leading the effort to prepare outstanding students for undergraduate study at top universities abroad. Obviously, one of the key skills for these students is Academic English. DEP is charged with teaching such courses. This effort is led by Melissa Brown.

1.4. TOEFL Supplemental Test
Melissa Brown coordinated the writing and administration of the TOEFL Supplemental Test (TST), a writing and speaking test administered to 167 AUA applicants who had taken the paper-based TOEFL.

2. Extramural Activities

2.1. Theatre
In cooperation with the Yerevan-Yonkers Community Theatre, the DEP produced its 3rd play, George Bernard Shaw’s *Arms and the Man*, in May 2010. The production was directed by DEP lecturer Melissa Brown. The cast and crew were made up of local students and members of the international community. Past productions include *The Matchmaker* by Thornton Wilder and *She Stoops to Conquer* by Oliver Goldsmith.

2.2. Academic Activities

2.2.1. Research
Irshat Madyarov has been conducting an *Exploratory Study of the Acquisition of English as a Foreign Language by Armenian Kindergarten Children*, December 2010.

Irshat Madyarov provided consultation services to the Center of Language Assessment as part of the TOEFL Board grant activities, June 2010.

Irshat Madyarov provided consultation services to the AYB Educational Center on their emerging Bilingual High School Curriculum, Spring-Fall 2010.

Lilianna Edilian carried out the evaluation of the practicum and the writing course. The collected data was then analyzed using the SPSS program, Summer 2010.

Lilianna Edilian directed research in: *English Language Needs Analysis for MA program at American University of Armenia*, a project started in 2009 and accomplished in 2010. Group project with Hossein Farhady, adviser, and Syuzi Gasparyan, assistant.

2.2.2. Publications
The faculty members of the DEP had notable accomplishments in the area of publishing. The list is as follows:


### 2.2.3. Papers presented at conferences

DEP Faculty left a good record in attending and presenting at international Conferences.

Rubina Gasparyan conducted workshops on the topic of *New Trends in Language Teaching and Testing*, designed to present recent approaches in language teaching and language testing and assessment. The participants were school teachers, university lecturers and test developers. Each workshop consisted of two sessions. (Co-presented with Dr. Hossein Farhady, June-July 2010).


Irshat Madyarov conducted five workshops based on the TOEFL Board grant. Two of the workshops were on *Technology-mediated Language Learning and Teaching* (June, 2010) and three were on *Language Assessment*, June & July 2010.

Catherine Buon conducted a workshop *Developing Tech-Savvy Instructors* at the IATEFL-TESOL France Conference in Paris, May 2010.


Catherine Buon conducted a workshop *Off the Wall Teaching Methods* at InterNapa College Professional Development Day, Famagusta, Cyprus, April 2010.

Lilianna Edilian participated in the 6th International ELT Research conference in Turkey. The theme of the conference was “*Current Trends in SLA Research and Language Teaching*”, May 2010.

### 2.2.4. Weekly Colloquia

The DEP weekly colloquia are held to discuss different aspects of applied linguistics. All colloquia are audio-recorded and converted into podcasts. The recorded sessions are now being uploaded online. In the near future, we plan to accompany many podcast episodes based on colloquia with interviews with accomplished experts in related areas to provide more quality material to podcast listeners – TEFL educators in the region and around the globe.

### 2.2.5. Learning center

The DEP had a rich collection of DVDs used for teaching purposes. These videos are used by the students in their leisure time to improve their language ability.

### 3. Services to the community
3.1. Academic Activities

3.1.1. IELTA Virtual Conference

With many thanks to British Council and IREX, the DEP held its first IATEFL (International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language) virtual conference on May 16, 2010. Participants included:

- Ema Ushioda on learner motivation
- Dave Willis on grammar
- Kieran Egan on students’ thinking

Other sessions included sessions on fluency, business English, and Internet tools for teaching.

Plans for 2011

1. The DEP, under the supervision of Irshat Madyarov, has initiated a research project to operate a couple of bilingual kindergartens in Armenia. This project will be conducted upon receiving grants from Fulbright student exchange program and potentially other research organizations.

2. The DEP is renewing its collaboration with the Association of Teachers of English in Armenia (AELTA). Irshat Madyarov and Catherine Buon are going to take part in professional development activities in and out of Yerevan. Two workshops will be conducted in March and April 2011 in Yeghnadzor and Vanadzor respectively. Two more workshops will be organized at AUA at the end of March and April 2011.

3. The DEP will participate in testing and hosting the 2011 English Olympiad. Some of the best English students in the country will take part in a language competition at the national level and DEP will design the exams as well as participate in the awards ceremony, with the Minister of Education of the RA.

4. The DEP is planning to host and organize a two-day Assessment and Research Mini-Conference in May 2011. Presenters will include:

- Dr. Lyle Bachman, world renowned Testing and Assessment specialist from UCLA
- Dr. Simeon Slovacek, Research Methods expert from Charter College of Education at Cal State LA
- Dr. Antony Kunnan, Dean of DEP, internationally known expert in Testing and Assessment, also from Charter College of Education at Cal State LA
- DEP Faculty members and graduate students.

The conference will be open to the public.

With the continuous development of the DEP, we are hopeful that the DEP is turning into a significant research center in the region.

CENTER FOR BUSINESS AND RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT (CBRD)

The Center for Business Research and Development (CBRD) was established to help the economic development of Armenia in its transition to a market economy. CBRD carries out organized research and development projects and consulting services to domestic and international organizations in Armenia through CBRD employees, teams of faculty, local...
experts, and graduate assistants. Following are summary description of completed and ongoing CBRD activities.

1. **Byblos Bank**
   With continued growth and presence in the Armenian market, the Byblos bank requested a customized training to be conducted for its middle to upper managers. Two training sessions were developed and delivered: *Customer Service and Support* and *Sales Training*.

2. **HSBC**
   CBRD conducted 360 reviews of several of HSBC Armenia’s executives. Additionally, training for upper management was delivered in the area of *Team Building and Leadership*.

3. **Ineco Bank**
   Ineco Bank, the third largest bank in Armenia has been facing new competitive issues. CBRD worked with the CEO and the head of HR and in 2010 delivered two training sessions -- *Customer Service and Leadership* and *Team Building*.

4. **Firestone**
   A new diamond polishing and manufacturing company entering the Armenian market requested several services from CBRD with the objective of establishing a strong team and organization. CBRD services ranged from site location identification, management identification and training, interviewing, recruiting of workforce and establishing organizational and import/export guidelines. To date, Firestone has recruited over 150 employees in Yerevan.

5. **Armenian Jewelry Association**
   CBRD assisted AJA in developing marketing collateral for Armenia, Russia and the U.S. Additionally, CBRD assisted AJA in conducting market analysis, competitive analysis, pricing and promotional activities by different countries and finally developed a website to be used in 2011 for the first annual Jewelry show in Armenia.

6. **Project Management Training Roadmap**
   Armenia lacks experts in the area of project management. Specifically, due to the lack of individuals with PMI certification, Armenia imports experts from the region to assist in delivering technical projects. SME/DNC funded CBRD to develop the roadmap for establishing Armenia as a PMI testing center and for developing the syllabi for each of the topical areas. This work is currently underway with Phase I (course documentation) completed.

7. **Gyumri Technology Incubator**
   With the Gyumri Techno City in its development phase, the Republic of Armenia is establishing an incubator in Gyumri. CBRD was awarded this project to develop three operating models, select one model with the assistance of all stakeholders and to develop a ten year organizational, financial and operation business plan. Phase I of the project (Model development and selection) has been completed and the team is currently working on Phase II of the project.
8. **Turpanjian Rural Development Program**

CBRD continued its support of TRDP. In March 2010, CBRD employees conducted a secret shopper visit to the three Bed and Breakfasts in Artsakh and provided their feedback and recommendation to the Executive Committee.

In October 2010, Dr. Ohanian presented at the 4th Annual TRDP Conference. The topic of her presentation was *Doing Business During Uncertain Times*. 
AUA POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RETENTION AND PROMOTION, AND FACULTY TITLES AS AMENDED (2011)

(Approved by the AUA Board of Trustees, September 2005; amended by the AUA Board of Trustees, February 2007; Amended by the Faculty Senate, June 16, 2011, and approved by the Provost)

General Considerations: Purpose

This document sets forth principles, procedures, criteria for appointment and promotion, and retention pertaining to faculty activities in the University.

Obligations of the University to its faculty members and of the faculty to the University

The obligations of the University to its faculty members are:

(a) To protect the right of each faculty member to academic freedom; that is, the right to pursue knowledge, to write, and to speak freely as responsible citizens without institutionally imposed restrictions. A faculty member must be judged as a scholar, and a teacher on the basis of legitimate intellectual and professional criteria and not on his/her political views, religious beliefs, or other matters of personal preference.

(b) To provide the intellectual environment for scholarly growth and achievement.

(c) To provide opportunity for academic advancement according to prescribed criteria and procedures.

The obligations of faculty members of the University are:

(a) To carry out duly assigned academic duties.

(b) To teach with the highest levels of professional competence and with intellectual and ethical honesty. See AUA Faculty Code of Conduct.

(c) To develop and improve their professional abilities and achievements in teaching, creative scholarship, and other aspects of their academic responsibilities.

(d) To participate in advisory or committee assignments necessary to the development of academic programs, in advising students, and in governance of the University and to share in its more general responsibilities to the University, the local community, and Armenia at large.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion

- Excellence in teaching, whether in the lecture hall, at a seminar, at the laboratory bench, or in the field. Excellence in teaching connotes an objective, current, accurate, and balanced command of the field being taught, effectiveness in communicating its essence, and the willingness to interact and exchange views with students at the highest levels of intellectual integrity. Promotion committees may seek and evaluate the advice of students, graduates, and peers on the teaching ability of specific faculty members.

- Creative scholarship is the substantive contribution of new knowledge or significant new applications of knowledge: (1) scholarship of discovery, (2) scholarship of integration, (3) scholarship of application, and (4) scholarship of teaching. This definition aims to value a broad spectrum of scholarship which allows for AUA to tailor recognition of faculty activities and efforts to match the
unique qualities and strengths of the university and each academic program. Scholarship of discovery means the traditional concept of scholarship vetted in peer reviewed journals and monographs. Scholarship of integration values cross-disciplinary work which produces or presents new, creative and innovative perspectives, including textbooks and reference works. Scholarship of application values the application of theory to practice in a specific or novel context which results in a new, creative and innovative understanding of universal knowledge. Scholarship of teaching values creative and innovative pedagogical approaches to curriculum, instruction and assessment including curriculum design or other activities beyond routine teaching responsibilities.

- University and Public Service: (1) active and effective participation in various administrative, advisory, and other responsibilities in the university and (2) excellence in discharging professional service responsibilities in the community, to professional and other organizations, and to the international community, as well as the faculty member’s national and international reputation as a professional and scholar.

The Faculty Senate will develop guidelines for such matters as peer review of faculty on these criteria including what evidence may be considered and how it may be weighed with due consideration to consistency and fairness across the academic programs.

Faculty Recruitment

(Note: These provisions do not apply to Visiting Faculty.) The University’s most valuable resource is the faculty and their intellectual talent and productivity. Each academic program forms a search committee appointed by the Dean for the recruitment of full-time faculty. No search can begin without the approval of the Provost. Overall responsibility for faculty recruitment lies with the search committee, with the recruitment process coordinated through the AUAC office Oakland, California. The search committee makes its recommendation to the Dean and the faculty of the academic program. This recommendation includes a ranking of the top candidates. The academic program decides on the top candidate in a formal meeting.

It is the responsibility of the Dean and the faculty of the academic program to conduct open and thorough searches to identify the best candidate for each faculty position. An effective search is important for several reasons. First, it casts the net as widely as possible to identify the best candidate for a position. Second, it ensures that all persons, regardless of gender, race, age or other factors have equal opportunity to be considered fairly. Finally, a search process establishes the chosen candidate as the best available person in the eyes of new colleagues.

A thorough search includes broad advertisement of the position by (1) advertisements in academic and professional journals, (2) web postings, and (3) personal contacts.

The search committee chair will provide evidence to the Dean of an open and thorough search for each faculty appointment or explanation of the circumstances that forced an abbreviated process. This explanation, if acceptable to the Dean, will be forwarded to the Appointment and Promotion Committee along with the rest of the candidate’s materials. The Appointment and Promotion Committee is a committee of the Faculty Senate.

Titles for Faculty

This section on titles for faculty and for non-faculty teaching positions was drafted by the Faculty Council. It was submitted to the AUAC Board of Trustees and accepted in principle.

As described below, faculty of the University will be appointed utilizing a rank and descriptor appropriate to their professional training and experience and their level of commitment to the University.
Professor
Designates faculty who have a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, an extensive record of teaching, research, publication, public service, and scholarly stature at the international level, or comparable attainments, as customary in that field in the United States.

Associate Professor
Designates faculty who have a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, as well as a record of at least three years’ teaching experience, a significant research and publication record, and a commitment to public service.

Assistant Professor
Designates faculty who have attained their Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, have teaching and research potential, and have a commitment to public service.

Senior Lecturer
Designates faculty engaged primarily in teaching (and teaching-related duties) and possessing exceptional qualifications or special skills meriting a special designation. Appointment at the Senior Lecturer rank is for those who have a graduate degree and at least two years’ teaching experience on the graduate level.

Lecturer
Designates faculty engaged primarily in teaching (and teaching-related duties). Appointment at the lecturer rank is generally for those who have completed a graduate degree and who are teaching graduate-level courses.

Adjunct
Designates those whose professional accomplishments qualify them for a ranked position on the faculty to teach or conduct research or project work in an area of special expertise and who have a recurring appointment or sustained commitment to AUA, but whose primary commitment is not to AUA. The term is used to modify the above academic titles (for example, Adjunct Assistant Professor).

Research
Designates those whose professional accomplishments qualify them for a ranked position on the faculty and whose primary professional engagement with the University is in research. The term is used to modify the above academic titles (for example, Research Assistant Professor).

Visiting
Designates temporary faculty whose appointment is for one or two quarters only. The term is used to modify the above academic titles (for example, Visiting Assistant Professor).

Emeritus/Emerita
Conferred upon full-time faculty members following retirement from the University by a period of at least six months. Conferred by the Board of Trustees, upon the recommendation of the appropriate department, the status is an honor that is given for exceptional contributions to the University’s programs and to recognize scientific and academic excellence. Emeriti faculty may be offered full-time or part-time employment with the University for a specified term, subject to the approval of the AUA President.

Titles for Non-faculty Teaching Positions

Instructor and Senior Instructor
Designates a person appointed to teach in a non-degree program. May be an entry-level position.
Appointment at the instructor rank is generally for those who have not yet completed their terminal degree. May be requested to engage in University and public service. Appointment at the Senior Instructor rank is for those who have at least two years’ teaching experience.

**Teaching Associate**
Designates a person who assists in teaching, under the supervision of a faculty member. Typically reserved for an AUA graduate, experienced second year graduate student, or equally qualified individual.

**Teaching Assistant**
Designates a person who assists in teaching, under the supervision of a faculty member. Typically reserved for a first or second year AUA graduate student or other similarly qualified individual.

**Initial Appointment to Faculty Positions**
A recommendation for appointment to the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor is made in a letter from the Dean to the President. It will be the responsibility of the Dean to inform candidates in writing when their applications have not been successful.

All professors are expected to have major responsibilities in their academic programs, in the University, and in the community.

All appointments are made by the President after review by the Appointment and Promotion Committee to ensure that all procedures are followed and that all criteria are applied. Appointment is for one academic year; however, longer contracts may be given by approval of the President.

**Reappointments**
Faculty members who are eligible for reappointment shall demonstrate evidence of contributions to those enumerated in the criteria in the “Criteria for Appointment and Promotion” section of this policy. The University’s faculty evaluation process, research and/or other scholarly work, and service to the University community shall be considered. It is the responsibility of the Dean to evaluate and recommend to the AUA President requests for renewal of contracts.

**Promotion to Higher Faculty Rank**
AUA does not currently have a tenure system for promotion and does not grant tenure. Faculty members start the promotion process by creating a dossier. The dossier includes a letter of intent, a written statement of accomplishments based on the criteria in the “Criteria for Appointment and Promotion” section of this policy, curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation from academics both on campus and at other institutions, sample publications, and materials that evaluate teaching. The dossier is presented to the Dean of the academic program and the Dean calls a faculty meeting during which the promotion request is evaluated and a decision is made in favor or not in favor of the request. The decision of the faculty of the academic program is forwarded to the Appointment and Promotion Committee, chaired by the Provost, which reviews the promotion request, makes a decision in favor or not in favor, and forwards the decision of the academic program and the decision of the Committee to the President. The Committee reviewing the dossier for promotion must be made-up of faculty with higher rank than the faculty member being considered for promotion. The AUA President makes the final decision on promotion.
CVs Deans
American University of Armenia
2011-2012

Robert A. Bagramian College of Health Sciences
Eric Guevorkian School of Business Management
Aram Z. Hajian College of Engineering
Antony John Kunnan Department of English Programs
Thomas J. Samuelian Law Department
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ROBERT A. BAGRAMIAN

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL DATA:
Home address: 3986 Penberton Drive, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105
Telephone: 734-647-4239
e-mail: robbagr@umich.edu

PRESENT POSITION:
Professor, School of Dentistry, University of Michigan
Dean, College of Health Sciences, American University of Armenia

EDUCATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954-56</td>
<td>Predent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>DrPH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position and Department/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-present</td>
<td>Professor, Schools of Dentistry and Public Health, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-present</td>
<td>Dean, College of Health Sciences, American University of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-88</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Department of Community Dentistry, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-90</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Department of Prevention and Health Care, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Acting Chair, Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Visiting Professor, National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Visiting Professor, School of Dental Medicine, University of Berne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Visiting Professor, National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of California, Medical Center

Associate Professor, Schools of Dentistry and Public Health 1972-75
University of Michigan

Assistant Professor, Schools of Dentistry and Public Health, 1969-71
University of Michigan

Associate Professor of Oral Medicine, Chung Shan Dental College, Taichung, Taiwan 1963-65

Lecturer, University of South Carolina 1963

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Director, Community Dental Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1981-97

Visiting Staff, Alameda County Health Department, Oakland, California 1983

Visiting Staff, Dental Unit, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland 1976

Public Health Dentist, Health Department, City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1966

Private Dental Practice, West Chester, Pennsylvania 1966

Dental Volunteer, Presbyterian Church, Taiwan, Republic of China 1963-65

Public Health Dentist, Dental Division, State Board of Health, Columbia, South Carolina 1962-63

Captain, U.S. Army Dental Corps, Fort Jackson, South Carolina 1960-62

HONORS:

John A. Kolmer Honorary Medical Society
Delta Omega
International College of Dentists
Sigma XI
Omicron Kappa Upsilon

9. American Dental Association/Colgate-Palmolive Award for Outstanding Service to the Public and the Profession 1999.

10. Michigan Campus Compact Faculty Community Service Learning Award 1999
International College of Dentists Indian Division Award.
40th Anniversary of Establishment of Dental Department, Changhua Christian Hospital, Changhua Taiwan.-Honored as founder. Nov/Dec 2004
Honored Guest – Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung Taiwan. Nov 2004
Honored Guest – Chinese Medical and Dental University, Taichung Taiwan. Nov 2004
Honored Guest – Chung San Medical & Dental University, Taichung Taiwan. Nov 2004
Invited as External Examiner for Preventive Dentistry and Dental Public Health.
National University of Singapore. May/June 2005

PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS:

American Dental Association
American Public Health Association
American Association of Dental Schools
American Association of Public Health Dentists
Federation Dentaire Internationale
International Association for Dental Research

DENTAL LICENSURE:
Michigan
Pennsylvania
South Carolina

SPECIALTY BOARD
Diplomate, American Board of Dental Public Health

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Peer-Reviewed Publications

Bagramian RA. Present status of fluoridation in the United States.

Bagramian RA. Dentistry in the United States.

Bagramian RA. The history and evolution of topical fluorides and their present status as a preventive measure to reduce the incidence of dental caries. Chapel Hill University of North Carolina School of Public Health 1967, 37 p typed thesis.

Bagramian RA. A dental mission in Taiwan.

Bagramian RA. An epidemiologic study of the relations between dental caries - experience and eating patterns of white and black high school students in the Northern and Southern United States.
Ann Arbor University of Michigan School of Public Health 1969, xx + 137 p.


Brooks Sharon, Bagramian RA. Project Head Start...a dental public health apprenticeship.


Brooks Sharon, Bagramian RA. Some problems encountered in administering Head Start, J Pub Health Dent 32:183-6, Summer 1972


Bagramian, RA. Geriatric Care. Dentist 38-42, July 1990


McNamara, J.A. and Bagramian, R.A. A Prospective Survey of Percutaneous Injuries in Orthodontic Assistants. Am J


Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications


Bagramian, RA. Department of State Health Care Provider Manual for Oral Health. 1990


Bagramian, R.A. Sodium fluoride and dicalcium phosphate dihydrate in a dual chambered tube. 2001 Colgate Review.


BOOKS


ABSTRACTS

Summers CJ, Bagramian RA, Russell AL. Dental caries in Caucasian and Black children living in Wayne County,


Lang WP, Bagramian RA. Orchestrating a local dental program in a local political arena. Amer Pub Health Assoc Montreal, Canada, Nov 1982.


Bagramian RA, Rick PD, Narendran S. Smokeless tobacco in college baseball players. Abstr Internat A Dent Res


Inglehart, M., Bagramian R., Pakula E. & Tedesco L. Advancement of Women in Academic and Research Careers and in Professional Societies. ADEA Women’s Leadership Conference. Montreal, September 20005.


Morin, KL, Bagramian, RA, Inglehart, MR. Mobile Dental Equipment-Dental and Dental Hygiene Administrators Perspectives. AADR 2007, New Orleans
Inglehart, MR, Bagramian, RA, Briskie, D, Feigal, R, Lawrence, L. Children’s Oral Health and Quality of Life-Parent Perspective. AADR 2007, New Orleans


ERIC GUEVORKIAN

6, rue Saint Paul Phone FR: 33 (0) 9 50 02 07 90
75004 PARIS Mobile AM: 374 (0) 94 25 46 11
FRANCE E-mail: eric.guevorkian@gmail.com

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

2011 - present: Interim Dean of School of Business & Management, THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA. 
Associate Dean of School of Business & Management.

2011: Assistant Dean of the School of Business & Management. In conjunction with the Dean, formulate and implement department policies; conduct department programming; develop curriculum and activities; supervise staff; serve as department representative before students, alumni, university administration and the general public.

Membership in University Committees: Faculty Senate, Curriculum Committee, University-wide Admissions Committee, Financial Aid Committee, Faculty Senate Extension Program Oversight Committee.

2009 - present: Director of Academic Administration, CENTRE EUROPEEN DES HAUTES ETUDES INTERNATIONALES, Paris, France (www.neweurocenter.org). This is the Paris campus of Baruch College of the City University of New York (CUNY). The Paris campus offered the AACSB-accredited Executive Master in Finance, taught exclusively in English with 2 intakes per year.

Main Achievements:

> Contributed to the opening of the Centre’s new office in Paris and established and supervised its operations.
> Prepared the launch of three additional Executive Masters and an Executive MBA program (due in 2011).
> Devised and implemented the Centre’s marketing plan.

2000-07 Founding Director, the Division of International Graduate Programs, ECOLE SUPERIEURE DES SCIENCES COMMERCIALES APPLIQUEES (ESLSCA), Paris, France (www.eslscra.fr). A private business school founded in 1949 and accredited by the French Ministry of Education. The Division:

Main Achievements:

> Introduced 3 specialization tracks within the MBA program; Finance, International Marketing, and Global Management (2000).
> Devised strategies to raise the admission standards.
> Introduced an International Student Orientation program (2001).
> Launched a Master in International Marketing with 2 study tracks; Strategic Marketing and Luxury Brand Management (2002)
Managed contacts with student recruitment agencies (China, India, etc.).
Represented the Division at various local and international student fairs.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Core Skills:

> Teaching undergraduate and graduate students and adjusting effectively the instruction material and teaching methods to each profile.
> Facilitating the development of "soft skills" such as teamwork and oral communications as integral part of the curriculum.
> Supervision of MBA/Master theses and internship reports.

1992-10: **AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PARIS**
1998-00 **PARSONS SCHOOL OF DESIGN – PARIS**
1998-00 **ESLSCA SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**
1994-00 **ESG - PARIS SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT**

Courses Taught:
Organizational Behavior and Analysis, Strategic Management, Management of International Business, and Human Resources Management.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1991-92 **VASPOUR INC.** U.S.A. Marketing Consultant.
1990-91 **FIRST AMERICAN BANK OF NEW YORK**, U.S.A. Credit Analyst.
1981-83 **ALEXANDER AGHAYAN & ASSOCIATES**, Iran. Corporate Legal Assistant.

QUALIFICATIONS

Education

Diplôme d’Etudes Approfondies (DEA) in Organizational Sociology
DEA thesis: *Decision Making Processes in the Educational Institution*

1990 **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY**, California, U.S.A.
Master of Business Administration
MBA project: *Overhead Cost Allocation Model at Signal Analysis Division, Hewlett Packard Corporation*, California, U.S.A.

1985 **NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**, Tehran, Iran.
Bachelor of Science in Economics

Languages

Fluent in English, French, Farsi and Armenian.
ARAM Z. HAJIAN
ahajian@aua.am

Education

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, Division of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Cambridge, MA
Ph.D. in Engineering Sciences, 1997
Master of Science in Engineering Sciences, 1993
  Taught several classes, laboratory sessions and supervised undergraduate research

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford, CA
Bachelor of Science (with distinction) in Mechanical Engineering, 1991

Employment

American University of Armenia (2007-present)
  • Dean, College of Engineering (Assist. Dean 2007-2008; Interim Dean 2008-2010)
  • Assistant Professor, Director of the Engineering Research Center
  • Resident academic head of two of the seven degree programs at AUA: Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (IESM) as well as Computer and Information Science (CIS)
  • Course instruction for CIS and IESM students, including: Software Project Management, Entrepreneurship and Human/Computer Interaction
  • Supervision of the staff and administration of all aspects of the two programs, including budgets, research, curriculum, staffing, and evaluation of the College.
  • Participation in various academic/administrative committees, including Faculty Senate (Chair, 2009 -10; Vice-Chair 2011), Presidential Search Committee, WASC Steering Committee, etc.

Arlex International, Yerevan (2000-07)
  • Managing Consultant on various hi-tech and business projects
  • Co-founder of the Momentum network of young professionals from Armenia participating in negotiation, leadership and culture change at the Conflict Management Group at Harvard University. Training curriculum based on Roger Fisher’s Getting to Yes as well as Michael Porter’s Competitiveness Strategy.
  • Invited lecturer by various NGO, government, and private sector entities to participate in conferences, deliver invited talks, and act as a selection committee judge (e.g. American Chamber of Commerce, Armenia2020, IREX, IESC, Urban Institute, World Summit on IT, All-Armenia E-Content National Competition)
  • Coordinator for a series of country competitiveness conferences during with American Chamber of Commerce (e.g. Culture as a Factor of County Competitiveness, IT Country Competitiveness, Diaspora as a Component of Competitiveness)

MadeinArmeniadiirect.com (2000-07)
  • Entrepreneurial Consultant to Armenian Office of www.madeinarmeniadiirect.com
  • E-commerce start-up team leader: wholesaling and retailing hand-made Armenian crafts to western markets
  • Strategic developer of Marriott Armenia Hotel gift shop

Japonica Intersectoral, Yerevan (2004-05)
  • Industrial research and professional trainer: Taught courses and developed curriculum on Critical
Thinking/Research/Writing for Japonica Intersectoral, a global best-practices/benchmarking research company.

**Daily Sports Ararat, Yerevan** (2001-02)
- On-line content manager for soccer news site (peak hits = 300,000/day)

**Exponent, Inc.** (1997-2000)
Senior Engineer, Biomechanics Group (San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston)
- Modeled complex, non-linear, multi degree-of-freedom biomechanical systems, with special emphasis on injury analysis in the context of accident reconstruction
- Produced expert reports in over a dozen states; several times named as an expert in court
- Biomechanics Group office manager, Boston 1999-2000

**Harvard University** (1991-97)
Division of Engineering and Applied Sciences, *Research Assistant, Teaching Fellow*
- Designed experiments to characterize the mechanical impedance of hands during dexterous tasks, tele-operated robotic systems, and virtual reality environments

**Scholarship, Research, and Community Service**

**Gyumri Information Technologies Center.** Member, Advisory Board. (2010-present)


**Gyumri Technopark Business Idea competition.** Member, jury. Competition organized by the Ministry of Economy. (2010)

*IT education and workforce preparedness in Armenia* (2009-10)
Enterprise Incubator Fund consultant to feasibility study conducted within the framework of the World Bank’s Technology Competitiveness Enhancement Project

**North-South Highway** (2009-present)
Large-scale civil engineering transportation and communication project sponsored by RA Government. Member, evaluation committee; Member, technical review board.

**Chess Academy, Yerevan** (2001-present)
- Co-founder; Member, Board of Directors of elite national chess training center
- Chief organizer of several International Tournaments and English-language web content, including Stepanakert 2004, 05; Team Internet Tournament (national teams of Russia, China, Armenia, France), Aronian-Kramnik Match 2007, Jermuk Grand Prix 2009, 2010; et al.
- Chair, Computers/Internet Committee of the Armenian Chess Federation (2009-present)

**Armenian High Tech Council of America,** Official Representative in Armenia. (2003-07)


__________, Drum Roll: Increasing Bandwidth through Passive Impedance Modulation. Invited presentation at MIT for Spring 1997 lecture series in Biomechanics and Neural Control of Movement led by Professor Neville Hogan.


ANTONY JOHN KUNNAN
Professor, TESOL Program/Applied and Advanced Studies in Education
California State University, Los Angeles
Phone: + 1-323-343-4334
E-mail: akunnan@calstatela.edu; akunnan@hku.hk

1. EDUCATION
Post-Graduate Diploma, English Language Teaching. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, India, 1980.
M.A. English Literature, Bangalore University, India, 1976
B.A. Social Sciences, Bangalore University, India, 1974

2. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS
Regular appointments
Professor, TESOL Program, CSULA, 2003-present
Chair, Division of Applied & Advanced Studies in Education, CSULA, 2004-2006
Assistant and Associate Professor, TESOL Program, CSULA, 1992-2002

Other appointments
Dean and Professor, Dept. of English, American University of Armenia, Yerevan, 2007-Present
Visiting Professor, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 2011-2012
Honorary Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, 2009-2013
Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, 2008-2009
Fulbright Scholar & Visiting Professor, Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan, 2006-2007
Visiting Professor, University of California, Los Angeles, Spring, 2002, 2003, 2011
Visiting Professor, University of Southern California, Summer, 2006
Visiting Lecturer, University of Cambridge, Summer, 2000
Visiting Assistant Professor, ICANA, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Summer, 1996
Lecturer, Regional Institute of English, Bangalore, India, 1980-1986
Senior Teacher, St. Germain High School, Bangalore, India, 1974-1980

3. HONORS AND AWARDS
Apple Lecturer, Teachers College, Columbia University, 2010.
Honorary Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, 2009-2013.
Fulbright Scholar & Visiting Professor, Tunghai University, Taiwan, 2006-2007.
President, International Language Testing Association, 2004 (elected).
Founding Editor, Language Assessment Quarterly, 2003-present.
4. RESEARCH AND TRAINING GRANTS & CONTRACTS as PI (Total: $1,071,300)
Grant, 2010: OfQual, U.K. “Language Accessibility Project” - $12,000.
Grant, 2009: ILTA. “Language Assessment Workshops in Armenia” - $3,000
Grant, 2009. TOEFL Board. “Language assessment training in Armenia” - $15,000
Grant, 1994, CSULA, “Test bias studies in language testing” - $5,800.

5. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SERVICE

Professional National & International Committees
Fulbright National Screening Committee for East Asia, English Teaching Assistants, 2010-2013.
Chair and Member, TOEFL Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Committee, 2001, 2002, 2010
Chair, Editorial Advisory Board, Language Assessment Quarterly, 2003-present.
Member, Fulbright Screening Committee for Junior & Senior Scholars, Taiwan, 2006.
Member, Best article in language testing, ILTA, 2005-2006.
Member, Best published paper in TESOL, 2005-2006.
Chair, ILTA Lifetime Achievement Award Committee, 2002-2004.
Member, Planning Committee, NAEP Foreign Language Assessment, 1999-2000.
Member, TOEFL Committee of Examiners, 1995-2001.

Professional Consultancies
Higher Education Grant in Mexico. Georgia State Univ. & Univ. of Puebla, Mexico, 2009-2012.

Services to Universities
Facility tenure and promotion evaluation: University of California, Los Angeles; Teachers College,
Columbia University; University of Minnesota; University of Hawai’i, Manoa; Hong Kong Polytechnic
University; University of Surrey; University of Sydney; University of Hong Kong; University Umm Al-
Qura, Saudi Arabia.
Doctoral dissertation evaluation:
University of Melbourne; University of Malaya; Hong Kong Polytechnic University; University of Hong Kong.

Manuscript and abstract reviews
Conferences: LTRC, AAAL, TESOL, AILA World Congress.
Universities: National Chung Chien University, Taiwan.

Conferences organized
Co-Chair (with L. Bachman & N. Carr), LTRC, Hungzhou, China, 2008.
Chair, Language Assessment Code of Ethics Conference, Pasadena, California, 2002.
Co-Chair, (with M. Spaan), LTRC Orlando, Florida, 1997.

6. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE
Series Editor, New Perspectives in Language Assessment (with James Purpura), 2011-2016.
Dean and Professor, Dept. of English, American University of Armenia, Yerevan, 2007-2011.
Founding Editor, Language Assessment Quarterly, 2003-present.
President, International Language Testing Association, 2004 (elected).

7. UNIVERSITY TEACHING & WORKSHOPS
Courses taught at CSULA, 1992-present
TESL 567A  Introduction to language assessment
TESL 567B  Classroom assessment, test validation, test fairness, assessing grammar
TESL 573AB  Quantitative approaches in SLA; language testing for immigration and citizenship
EDFN 500  Evaluation of educational research
EDFN 594  Research design and multivariate statistics [EFA, CFA, SEM]
ULRN 460  Classroom assessment

Seminars and workshops at other universities and centers, 1992-present
Differential Item Functioning, Language Training and Testing Center, Taipei, Taiwan. 2010
Structural modeling, University of Cambridge English to Speakers of Other Languages. 2008.
Methods of research and inquiry, University of Hong Kong. 2009.
Ethics in language assessment, Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan. 2006.
Statistical analysis, Dubai Men’s College, Dubai, United Arab Emirates. 2004.
Fairness and validation, University of California, Los Angeles. 2003.
Language assessment ethics, University of California, Los Angeles. 2002.
Introduction to language assessment development, USAID, Cairo, Egypt. 2000.
Test Development, CIEFL, Hyderabad, India. 1999.

8. PUBLICATIONS

Authored and Edited Books (6)

Under contract/In progress - Edited volumes (4)

Under contract/In progress – Book (1)

Under contract/In progress – Book Series

Edited Special Issues of Journals (3)

Journal articles, book chapters, encyclopedia entries (41)


**Book reviews (8)**


**Research Reports (15)**


Editorials, Interviews, Teleconferences, Notes, Interviews (16)


9. ACADEMIC TALKS, WORKSHOPS & PRESENTATIONS (84)

Plenary talks, invited talks and workshops, 1994-2011 (59)

2011

Language assessment for immigration and citizenship, Hong Kong Polytechnic University Multilingualism and language assessment. AILA [World Congress], Beijing, China.

Effects of high-stakes tests. Korean English Language Assessment Conference, Seoul, Korea.

Test evaluation model. Seoul National University, Korea.

2010

Test Fairness in test development. ALTE Conference/Charles Univ., Prague, Czech Republic.

Issues in Test Fairness. ALTE Conference/Charles Univ., Prague, Czech Republic.
What evidence do we need to evaluate language assessments? Hong Kong Polytechnic Univ.
Assessment Evaluation Framework. National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan.
Differential Item Functioning. Language Testing and Training Centre, Taipei, Taiwan.
Assessment data issues, Shanghai Jiatong University, China.
How are we to evaluate a test? Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.
How are we to evaluate a test? Applied Linguistics Program, UCLA.
How are we to evaluate a test? Apple Lecture, Teachers College, Columbia University, USA.
Language assessment for immigration and citizenship. Columbia University, USA.

2009
The U.S. Naturalization Test. American University of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia.
Structural equation modeling for educational researchers. University of Hong Kong.
Politics and legislation in citizenship testing in the U.S. SCALAR 12. CSU Fullerton, USA.

2008
Citizenship and testing for citizenship: The U.S. case. UCLA, USA.
Language assessment for citizenship & asylum, AAAL Conference, Washington, D.C., USA.
Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, LTRC. Hangzhou, China.

2007
How are we to evaluate a test? California State University, Fullerton, CA, USA
Statistical analyses for language assessment. LTRC, Barcelona, Spain. (with L. Bachman).
The U.S. Naturalization test redesign: Designing for failure? LTRC, Barcelona, Spain.
Cognitive Diagnostic feedback: Discussant. LTRC, Barcelona, Spain.
Test Development and Standard Setting, Bangalore, India.
Research Agenda for Test Evaluation, LTTC-National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

2006
Research methods in language assessment. Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China.
Code of Ethics, Practice and beyond. ALTE Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria.
ILTA Code of Ethics and Practice, ALTE Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria.
A model for test evaluation. National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.
Ethics in language assessment. Tunghai University Conference, Taichung, Taiwan.
Language Assessment Research Methods. National TsingHua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.
ILTA Code of Ethics, SCALAR Conference 9, CSU Fullerton, CA, USA.

2005
Language test development for teachers of English, Hindi, Urdu & Punjabi, Delhi, India.
Language test development of college teachers of English, Delhi University, India.
Micro and macro test evaluation. ALTE Conference, Berlin, Germany.
How are we to evaluate a test? American University at Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.
Statistical analyses for language assessment workshop, Dubai Men’s College, Dubai, UAE.

2004
Language assessment issues for teachers, CATESOL Conference. Los Angeles, USA.
Issues in language acquisition and assessment, AAAL Conference, Portland, Oregon, USA.

1999-2003
Response to validation of TOEFL tasks. TESOL Convention, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA.
Test Fairness. ALTE Conference, Budapest, Hungary.
Test Fairness. University of Cambridge, ESOL Examinations, U.K.
Classroom assessment for university professors. IELP-II, Cairo, (with S. Slovacek), Egypt.
National language testing reform. CIEFL, Hyderabad, India.
Recent developments in language testing. NCEE, Cairo, Egypt.
Fundamentals in language testing. CIEFL, Hyderabad, India.
Validation and fairness in language assessment. IELP-II, Cairo, Egypt.

1994-1998
Scale development for the examination of the impact of the IELTS. UCLES, U.K.
A framework for structural modeling research with UCLES data. UCLES, U.K.
Test taker characteristics and test performance. UCLES, Cambridge, U.K.
Using quantitative data analysis for test development and research. CIEFL Hyderabad, India.
Pedagogical seminar in language assessment for Vietnamese educators, UCLA.
Test Development and research approaches, CIEFL, Hyderabad, India.

Conference presentations, 1988-2006 (25)
Language examination reform project in India. LTRC, University of Melbourne, Australia. 2006.
How to aspire for the highest achievement? St. Germain High School, Bangalore, India. 2001.
Articulating the concept of test fairness. ALTE Conference, Barcelona, Spain. 2001.
Test Qualities: Expanding the engineering approach. LTRC, Vancouver, Canada. 2000.
A training model for training of language testing experts. LTRC, Tsukaba, Japan. 1999.
Fairness and justice for all. LTRC, Orlando, USA. 1997.
What does multiple-group structural modeling have to offer? LTRC, Orlando, USA. 1997.
English language tests for ethically right conduct. TESOL, Orlando, USA. 1997.
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1994  Direct Hire - University of Cincinnati School of Art
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2011
Introduction

During May-June 2011, the American University of Armenia conducted its annual University-wide Graduate Student Exit Survey. The survey was carried out by the AUA Office of Institutional Research (IRO) with the support of the Provost and Vice President and the academic departments.

The major objectives of the survey were to gather information from students on the level of student satisfaction with AUA graduate programs and to identify areas of possible improvement.

This report describes the methodology used for the survey and presents the findings in tables. At the end of this report, an Addendum is attached that includes data from five years of Exit Surveys, 2006 through 2011.

Methodology

Instrument Design and Timeline

The instrument includes questions on academic program and curriculum evaluation, educational experiences, and general satisfaction with academic programs and University services. Demographic questions were asked for purposes of analysis. Students were informed about the anonymity of their responses in an accompanying cover letter that provided instructions on how to complete the questionnaire.

Survey questionnaires were distributed on May 23, 2010, and survey responses were collected through June 14, 2011.

Sample, Response Rate, Procedures

The 2011 Graduate Student Exit Survey questionnaire was sent to 213 second-year students. The survey population included 36 students from the College of Engineering (CoE), 28 students from the Department of English Programs (DEP), 65 students from the School of Business and Management (SBM), 31 students from the School of Political Science and International Affairs (PSIA), 23 students from the College of Health Sciences (CHS) and 30 students from the Department of Law (LAW).

In order to obtain an adequate response rate, the following procedures were followed:

- A letter from the Institutional Research Office was sent to each graduating student with a request to complete the survey and an explanation of its importance.
- Self-administered questionnaires together with instructions were distributed by each academic program. A special box for collecting completed questionnaires was placed in each departmental office to assure the anonymity of responses.
- A reminder email message was sent by the IRO.

A total of 189 of 213 second year students participated in the survey, which denotes a response rate of 88.7 percent.
Upon completion of data collection, data was entered into an SPSS file and statistical analyses such as frequencies, cross-tabulations, and mean averages of the responses were performed.

**RESPONSE RATE AND BACKGROUND PROFILES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1a: Distribution of respondents by degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (MIESM)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (MBA)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPS)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Laws (LL.M.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Health (MPH)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1b: Response rate by academic program</th>
<th>Total # of students</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (MIESM)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (MBA)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPS)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Laws (LL.M.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Health (MPH)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Distribution by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Response rate frequency</th>
<th>Response rate percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: What was your employment status during most of your graduate education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time job</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time job</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked occasionally</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Do you or your family own a personal desktop or notebook computer that you use for AUA work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Where did you learn English before being admitted to AUA?
(Multiple responses permitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (out of 189)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private tutoring</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUA Extension Program</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUA Department of English Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied myself</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Which choice was AUA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First choice</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second choice</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third choice or lower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SATISFACTION WITH THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

### Table 7: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.95 (1=excellent and 5=very poor; missing values excluded)

### Table 8a: The sequence of courses was appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.34 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)
Table 8b: Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.02 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

Table 8c: Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.92 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)
### Table 8d: On the whole, faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.02 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)

### Table 8e: In general, faculty members prepared carefully for their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.97 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)
### Table 8f: In general, the courses I took were well taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.11 \((1=\text{strongly agree and } 5=\text{strongly disagree})\)

### Table 8g: There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.96 \((1=\text{strongly agree and } 5=\text{strongly disagree})\)
### Table 8h: Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.68 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

### Table 8i: Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.97 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)
Table 8j: There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 189 100.0

Mean = 2.25 (*1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree*)

Table 8k: The courses I took were valuable for my future career.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 189 100.0

Mean = 1.83 (*1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree*)
Table 8l: I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.83 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

Table 8m: My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.89 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)
Table 8n: My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.82 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

Table 8o: I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.80 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)
### Table 8p: If I had the opportunity to make the choice again, I would enroll in this program again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.98 *(1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)*

### Table 8q: I believe that the AUA grading system is fair.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.06 *(1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)*

---

*Measure added in 2011.*
Table 8r: I believe that the grading system of my academic program is fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=1.45 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)
Table 9: What are the three most important differences between AUA and other universities and colleges?

(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western style of education and teaching style</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given knowledge/skills and its applications in practice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level of education</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism of faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUA atmosphere and culture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair grading system/Fairness/Equity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (access to Internet, e-mail, student server, new technologies,</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and organizational management (staff, curriculum, policies,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and interaction between faculty and students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-speaking environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ attitude toward study</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption-free environment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign faculty members</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development opportunities (research, jobs, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of team work and individual learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered approach to learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher tuition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>405</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: What are the three things you liked most about AUA?  
*(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)*

| Quality of education/Western teaching style/Academic processes | 54 | 12.68 |
| Facilities/Resources/Library | 49 | 11.5 |
| Professors/Professionals/Experts in the field | 48 | 11.27 |
| Teaching methodology and interesting assignments | 34 | 7.98 |
| Relationship with faculty/Student-centered approach | 30 | 7.04 |
| AUA atmosphere and culture | 30 | 7.04 |
| My Department/School/Courses | 29 | 6.82 |
| Organizational management (staff, discipline/policies, schedules) | 21 | 4.94 |
| Community/Friends/Student life | 20 | 4.7 |
| AUA Building | 17 | 3.99 |
| Analytical thinking/problem solving | 17 | 3.99 |
| Fairness/Honesty/Equity | 16 | 3.76 |
| Career development opportunities (jobs, research, conferences, internships, networks, etc.) | 13 | 3.05 |
| Teamwork | 11 | 2.58 |
| Academic freedom/independence/values | 10 | 2.35 |
| Practicability of received knowledge | 7 | 1.64 |
| Financial aid programs | 6 | 1.41 |
| English-speaking environment | 5 | 1.17 |
| Foreign lecturers | 5 | 1.17 |
| Students’ attitude toward the study | 1 | 0.23 |
| Power | 1 | 0.23 |
| Security | 1 | 0.23 |
| Graduation Ceremony | 1 | 0.23 |
| **Total comments** | **426** | **100.0** |
Table 11: What are the three most important things AUA could do to improve the quality of the graduate experience?

*Open-ended question; Responses recoded*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of instructors</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More practical emphasis on study</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract more foreign professors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for internships, workshops, conferences, summer school, study tours, extracurricular activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program and courses improvements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective class management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and consider students’ opinions/Student Council</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve facilities (computer service, library, air conditioning, vending machines, cleaning)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve grading and student performance evaluation system</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve relationships between faculty, students and alumni</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Armenia-related assignments and courses (legal, business)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase standards for admission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with job placement and post-graduation career development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of elective courses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide sport and entertainment activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of more scholarships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have exchange programs with universities abroad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the overall quality of education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the communication system (interdepartmental, between the staff/faculty and students)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer narrow specializations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve services in cafeteria (food, prices)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on research/more research facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the service in Room 19 (Student Academic Affairs Office)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add PhD component</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on problem solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add English speaking classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the teaching materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer on-line registration possibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add computer program courses (SPSS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the overall student body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve theoretical section</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the number of students per class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the name of Industrial Engineering (the name is frightening people,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rename it in order to be attractive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve AUA website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>322</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTITUDES ON STUDENT LEARNING

**Table 12a: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?**  
(*Multiple responses permitted*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between ideas and practices</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical knowledge</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12b: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?**  
(*Multiple responses permitted*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between ideas and practices</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical knowledge</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Connections between ideas and practices</td>
<td>Theoretical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Was done</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIESM</td>
<td>13 (54%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>34 (70.83%)</td>
<td>26 (54.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>31 (64.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>22 (70.97%)</td>
<td>26 (83.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>19 (61.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.M.</td>
<td>17 (56.67%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>19 (63.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS CIS</td>
<td>8 (72.73%)</td>
<td>3 (27.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>3 (27.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA TEFL</td>
<td>20 (90.91%)</td>
<td>17 (77.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>9 (40.91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>13 (56.52%)</td>
<td>14 (60.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should be more</strong></td>
<td>13 (56.52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Distribution of responses by degree and percentage of total number for each degree
(Multiple responses permitted; Missing values and comments from ‘other’ category excluded)
Table 14: Means of how often during coursework students used the following activities on a scale of 1 to 7 by degree and university-wide.  
(*1=never and 7=always*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By departments</th>
<th>MIESM</th>
<th>MBA</th>
<th>MPS</th>
<th>LLM</th>
<th>MS CIS</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>TEFL</th>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>University-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing cases or situations in-depth</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Means of how much graduate education at AUA contributed to development of the following areas on scale of 1 to 7
(1=no contribution and 7=very significant contribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making presentations to forums typical of your field of study(^2)</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to function as part of a team</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan and carry out projects independently</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to critically analyze ideas and information</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve analytical problems</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting papers at conferences/seminars</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking skills</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network with others in the field</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing skills(^3)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Speaking skills(^4)</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to lead and guide others</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying scientific methods of inquiry</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting papers for publication</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Measure added in 2011.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Ibid.
## SATISFACTION WITH DEGREE PROGRAM SERVICES

### Table 16a: Student advising (e.g. guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.87 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

### Table 16b: Adequacy of support for research (e.g. research facilities such as labs and centers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.95 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
### Table 16c: Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean= 2.10 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

---

### Table 16d: Communication about academic policies and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean= 2.14 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
### Table 16e: Opportunities for formal student evaluation of instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.98 (*1= very satisfied and 5= very unsatisfied; missing values excluded*)

### Table 16f: Staff support in the degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.80 (*1= very satisfied and 5= very unsatisfied; missing values excluded*)
SATISFACTION WITH UNIVERSITY SERVICES

### Table 17a: Classroom facilities and equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.32 (1 = very satisfied and 5 = very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

### Table 17b: Services provided by Student Academic Affairs Office (Room 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.84 (1 = very satisfied and 5 = very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
### Table 17c: Financial aid services e.g. scholarships, loans, work study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.96 (*1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded*)

### Table 17d: Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17e: Library resources in the field of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean= 1.65 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

### Table 17f: Computer resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean= 1.70 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
### Table 17g: Food services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.35 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

### Table 17h: Career advising and planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.39 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
## EMPLOYMENT PLANS

### Table 18: What are your immediate employment plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Plan</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am seeking employment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am already employed in a position that I think is</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate for my degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am already employed but not in a position that I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think is appropriate for my degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will continue my graduate education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not seeking employment right now</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know yet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19: If you are seeking employment, which BEST describes your potential employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Employer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embassies and international organizations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-funded development projects and companies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and research institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses and enterprises</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian government and agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 20: Have you ever used the services offered at the AUA Alumni and Career Development Office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 20a: List of the services used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcements on vacancies, internships, lectures, trainings, conferences, summer schools</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in resume writing workshops, consultation on resume and cover letter writing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise for internship, summer school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in meetings with perspective employers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in job orientation sessions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

#### Table 21: Have you ever participated in AUA Extension Program courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing values</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 21a: Courses taken at AUA Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the course</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General English courses in six levels</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL IBT Preparation course</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL PBT Preparation course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English writing course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR and Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free English courses for aspirants (graduate students in the National Academy of Sciences)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for business communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the course</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking courses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings on business (banking, finance, stock market,</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologies, management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, fashion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation to ACCA exams</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unix (Linux)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database development courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal / grant writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE verbal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course on Islam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ADDENDUM A


## Table A: Student opinions about their graduate programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Combined Percentage Strongly Agree and Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sequence of courses was appropriate.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions. | 2006 | 2.17 | 70.9 |
| 2007 | 2.33 | 63.6 |
| 2008 | 2.04 | 76.9 |
| 2009 | 1.92 | 80.8 |
| 2010 | 2.02 | 75.0 |
| 2011 | 1.96 | 75.3 |

Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect. | 2006 | 1.83 | 88.0 |
| 2007 | 2.01 | 79.1 |
| 2008 | 1.71 | 91.7 |
| 2009 | 1.66 | 91.9 |
| 2010 | 1.84 | 88.6 |
| 2011 | 1.68 | 90.9 |

On the whole, faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses. | 2006 | 2.17 | 69.7 |
| 2007 | 2.36 | 63.8 |
| 2008 | 2.18 | 72.0 |
| 2009 | 2.15 | 74.0 |
| 2010 | 2.23 | 67.4 |
| 2011 | 2.02 | 80.6 |

There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty. | 2006 | 2.44 | 57.7 |
<p>| 2007 | 2.30 | 63.6 |
| 2008 | 1.97 | 77.8 |
| 2009 | 2.03 | 77.6 |
| 2010 | 2.30 | 61.4 |
| 2011 | 2.25 | 68.4 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, faculty members prepared carefully for their courses.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the courses I took were well taught.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courses I took were valuable for my future career.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>If I had the opportunity to make the choice again, I would enroll in this program again.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that the AUA grading system is fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that the grading system of my academic program is fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree; missing values excluded)

Table B: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I = excellent and 4 unsatisfactory; missing values excluded)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Multiple responses permitted)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between ideas and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?  
*Multiple responses permitted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem solving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing cases or situations in-depth</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student advising (e.g., guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequacy of support for research (e.g., research facilities such as labs and centers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications about academic policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for formal student evaluations of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of staff in the degree program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table G: Satisfaction with university services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom facilities and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources in your field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services provided by Room 19 (Student Academic Affairs Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services – scholarships, loans, work study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advising and planning (omitted in 2009 and 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)*

**Table H:** Means of how much graduate education at AUA contributed to development in the following areas on a scale of 1 to 7 *(1=no contribution and 7=very significant contribution; missing values are excluded)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to critically analyze ideas and information**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan and carry out projects independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve analytical problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to function as part of a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Presenting papers at conferences/seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speaking skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applying scientific methods of inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer skills</strong></td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to lead and guide others</strong></td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network with others in the field</strong></td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting papers for publication</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making presentations typical to your field of study</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English writing skills</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English speaking skills</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table J: What are your immediate employment plans?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Plan</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am seeking employment.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am already employed but not in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am already employed in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will continue my graduate education.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not seeking employment right now.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know yet.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table K: Which BEST describes your potential employer?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational and research institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign-funded development projects and companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embassies and international organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armenian Government</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armenian non-governmental organizations</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t know, N/A</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May 2010 through December 2010, focus on CPR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Learning Subcommittee (SLC) of the Curriculum Committee is</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established with charter and activities timeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In cooperation with the Provost, the SLC finalizes research questions</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for studies and for approval of the Curriculum Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In cooperation with the Institutional Research and Assessment Office,</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the SLC designs for Curriculum Committee approval and conducts studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of current assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>processes. AUA research center staff provide assistance in data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provost appoints Research and Scholarship Task Force made up of</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faculty and students and provides mission and goals. Provost and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selected academic administrators are members of the Task Force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task Force finalizes research questions for review of the Faculty</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate for its input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In cooperation with the Institutional Research and Assessment Office,</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Task Force designs and conducts studies. AUA research center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff provide assistance in data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President decides which core faculty contracts will move to multiple-year status. **Moved to Phase 3**

**Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning**
**Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SLC report on studies is completed and includes set of recommendations and resources required for implementation of improvements. Curriculum Committee finalizes draft recommendations and submits report to the Faculty Senate and Board of Deans with consensus developed for final version of report.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provost with the President identifies and provides available resources needed to support the assessment of student learning.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Recommendations of the SLC studies regarding changes to the current AUA procedures for the assessment of student learning are made by revising current processes.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Series of meetings with faculty, researchers, and students to discuss Task Force findings and recommendations toward a new model of research and scholarship for AUA.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Task Force report on studies is completed and includes recommendations and resources required. Recommendations include a new system for the recognition of faculty and student research. Report is distributed to Board of Deans, Faculty Senate, and Student Council for discussion and input for final report.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Task Force develops draft of standards for faculty research and scholarship for consideration of a general and open meeting of Faculty Senate. Draft is made available online for comment of faculty not on campus.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning**

**Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars**
**IP Milestones (updated Nov. 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SLC meets with the Board of Deans in series of meetings to introduce changes to AUA procedures for the assessment of student learning.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New process cycle for the assessment of student learning in place for all academic programs.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SLC works with the Faculty Senate and the Board of Deans to introduce revised procedures for the assessment of student learning to core faculty. Videoconferencing employed for core faculty not on campus for these meetings.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SLC and Office for Institutional Research and Assessment design learning assessment training modules for faculty. Module materials are made available online.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Training of faculty in assessment of student learning, including orientation for new and visiting faculty.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>President decides which core faculty contracts will move to multiple-year status.</em></td>
<td><strong>Moved from Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Task Force and Faculty Senate finalize new research and scholarship standards draft for faculty and sends to Board of Deans and President for discussion.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>President approves new standards for faculty research and scholarship and revises current AUA policies.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faculty contracts revised for implementation in 2012.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Faculty evaluation form and process revised for implementation in 2012.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Task Force and Provost hold series of meetings with faculty and students with participation of academic and research administrators on new model for scholarship and research and to come to consensus on methods for implementation.</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning**

**Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars**
## IP Milestones (updated Nov. 2011)

### June 2012 through September 2013, focus on EER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SLC conducts assessment at individual faculty and academic program</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>levels of implementation of revised processes to determine how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes of Theme 1 are being obtained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SLC assessment report submitted to the Curriculum Committee.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Final report submitted to the Faculty Senate and Board of Deans.</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pilots for faculty-student collaboration on research and collaboration</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implemented; examples might be teaching and research assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>models for collaborative research, including utilizing the capstones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Resources and plans are in place for the hiring of more faculty</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the 2013-2014 academic year and for faculty research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Task Force and Institutional Research and Assessment Office</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct assessment of implementation of recommendations for (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new model of scholarship and research for faculty and students and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) new research and scholarship standards for faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Assessment report submitted to the Board of Deans and Faculty</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EER Submission Date: July 13, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undergraduate Launch: September 2013 (Pending WASC Approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>EER Site Visit: October 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Themes**

- **Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning**
- **Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars**