

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 1

For Institutions Seeking Initial Accreditation

To United Arab Emirates University

November 10-12, 2015

Team Roster

Dr. Reed W. Dasenbrock, Chair
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Hawaii
Mr. Les Kong, Assistant Chair
Librarian, California State University, San Bernardino
Dr. Robert P. Allison, Vice President for Business & Finance
Vanguard University of Southern California, Retired
Dr. Anna M. DiStefano, Faculty
Fielding Graduate University

Dr. Richard Osborn, WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective judgment for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. Once an institution achieves either candidacy or initial accreditation, the team report and Commission Action Letter associated with the review that resulted in the granting of either candidacy or initial accreditation and the team reports and Commission Action Letters of any subsequent reviews will be made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 Report:	4
• Alignment with the Letter of Intent	
• Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report	
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Eligibility Review Committee Letter	4
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC'S STANDARDS	6
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	6
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	10
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability	18
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement	27
SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION UNDER THE 2013 HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION	34
SECTION IV. INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS	36
SECTION V. FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	36
APPENDICES	38
Four Federal Compliance Forms	

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

United Arab Emirates University (UAEU) was the first national university founded in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Founded in the oasis city of Al Ain (the fourth largest city in the UAE, and the second largest city in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi) in 1976, it is a very young university by international standards, but it is only five years younger than the United Arab Emirates itself, which was founded as a union of seven historically distinct but neighboring emirates which had been under British suzerainty for the preceding 150 years. The university is comprised of nine colleges (Business and Economics, Education, Engineering, Food and Agriculture, Humanities and Social Sciences, Information Technology, Law, Medicine and Health Sciences, and Science), which offer primarily bachelor degrees and a number of graduate degrees, including 39 masters, 2 professional doctorates (business and pharmacy), and 8 PhD degrees. As of 2014/2015, total enrollment was 13,046, with 94% of students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs. The university is predominantly female in its student demographics, as over 80% of the student body is female (*UAEU Data Drive, Item 4: Enrollments Data, 2014/2015*). UAEU's development since independence has been astonishing, with wealth created by oil production leading to world prominence in transportation and becoming an economic and now educational hub for the entire Middle East. The country's openness to trade and transportation has been matched by a comparable openness to education, with many international universities developing a presence in the UAE. Of the 78 universities now licensed to operate in the country, only three are federal universities, of which UAEU is clearly the most preeminent. Its ambition and trajectory is to be the leading national university and to attain international prominence as a research university.

Seeking WSCUC accreditation is clearly part of this ambition to play an international role based on being the leading national university of a prosperous and regionally and nationally important nation. This step follows successful American-based accreditation of several of its professional programs, *Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)*, *Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)* and the *Center for Quality Assurance in International Education (CQAIE)*, in conjunction with the *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)* for engineering, business and education respectively.

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 Report

UAEU submitted a Letter of Intent to Apply for Accreditation in November of 2014, which, as a WSCUC Vice President commented, was “thorough and responsive,” reporting that many of the recommendations from the letter granting eligibility had already been acted on and achieved. A first Seeking Accreditation Visit (SAV1) was therefore scheduled for Fall 2015. A very thorough self-study was submitted in time for the team's review in advance of the November 10-12, 2015 visit.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Eligibility Review Committee Letter

Following a decision by UAEU to seek WSCUC accreditation in 2011, things have moved quickly. In 2013, there was a “pre-eligibility diagnostic visit,” after which UAEU was invited to apply for eligibility. In 2014, it applied for eligibility, and was granted eligibility for five years, until August 22, 2019. The September 8, 2014 letter from WSCUC informing UAEU of this decision commended UAEU “for the high quality and depth of the application presented for eligibility” and found that 21 of the 23 criteria for eligibility had been met, with a 22nd met at a minimal level, and

efforts underway to bring this to full compliance along with the one criterion that had not been met. There were additional recommendations made concerning three other criteria; however, the letter did make the important point that “Eligibility criteria are not the same as the WSCUC Standards for Accreditation.”

Following the approval of eligibility, a SAV1 team was chosen including five members, with the team chair being Dorothy Leland, Chancellor of the University of California, Merced; the assistant team chair Les Kong from California State University, San Bernardino; with additional team members Reed Dasenbrock, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Hawaii at Manoa (and WSCUC Commissioner); Anna DiStefano, from Fielding Graduate University (and former WSCUC Commissioner); and Robert Allison, retired but most recently from Vanguard University of Southern California. However, due to tragic events at the UC Merced campus that led to one student death, Chancellor Leland was not able to make the trip at the last moment. Vice Chancellor Dasenbrock was therefore asked to take on the role of team chair, with other roles and responsibilities distributed as needed.

It is important to note that there were several possible options from this visit. Continuation of eligibility is one option, which would require a subsequent visit with all the options possible as a result of this visit. Approval of candidacy is another option, after which would come at least one more visit which would have the option of recommending accreditation or recommending the continuation of candidacy. Until a new process was approved by WSCUC in 2013, these would have been the only two options. However, it is now possible under the new policy to grant initial accreditation, foregoing the candidacy stage altogether. According to the guidance provided teams by WSCUC, Initial Accreditation should be granted only if the institution is in sufficient

compliance with all four of the Standards. This is a holistic judgment, and does not require the institution to be in compliance with each and every Criterion for Review (CFR). If the team does not consider the institution to have met each Standard, it recommends Candidacy and outlines the concrete steps it believes the university should take in order to meet each Standard in order to receive Initial Accreditation.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC'S STANDARDS

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

In advance of the onsite visit, the team reviewed material regarding this Standard on pages 16-30 of the institution's self-study. In addition, the team reviewed the university's strategic plan for 2014-2016 (which includes descriptions of UAEU's mission, vision, goals, and values [CFR 1.1]); the six institutional learning outcomes and various program learning outcomes as they are stated on the UAEU website; the program review policy and several sample program review reports; attrition and graduations rates posted on the website as well as a benchmarking report from May, 2015; the outcomes of three years of alumni surveys (2010-2013); and results of a 2013-2014 pilot study on employment rates of recent graduates.

The team reviewed the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics and Policy on Research Integrity and faculty grievance and discipline policies. The team also reviewed student and employee codes of conduct. The team reviewed a variety of materials related to the diversity of faculty and students, including attention to both nationality and gender distribution of both groups (CFR 1.4). The UAEU website contains information about degree program completion and graduation

requirements (CFR 1.2) and various policies on undergraduate registration, enrollment, and grading. The team was also given a sample of the UAEU transcript, and after receiving the intranet password, was able to review learning outcomes assessment reports covering 2003-2015 for a variety of programs in all the colleges (CFR 1.2).

The team examined the bylaws and membership of the *University Council* and the conflict-of-interest statement to be completed by each member (CFR 1.5). The team also reviewed copies of *KPMG* audits for FYs 2013 and 2014 (CFR 1.7).

The methods used by UAEU to complete the portion of the self-study about Standard 1 seemed appropriate, effective and of good quality, especially with regard to data gathering processes and systems. The quality and meaning of the retention and graduation data merited further discussion during the onsite visit. The 4-year graduation rates have averaged 49%, rising to 81% for 1.5 nominal degree durations (CFR 1.6). The university's analysis in its May 2015 report finds these rates acceptable based on benchmarking data. The team found this judgment also acceptable given admissions policies and comparable rates in other WSCUC-accredited public institutions. The extensive use of foundational courses in English, mathematics, and Arabic, and the inclusion of students in the foundation courses in the graduation data added to the complexity of the analysis. First-year retention rates and median time-to-completion rates appear more than satisfactory.

The team requested and promptly received password information needed to access learning outcomes assessment reports. They are extensive and formatted in a clearly accessible way. They span eight years of assessment. The sections on "closing the loop" were further discussed during

the onsite review. It was clear to the team that a culture of assessment is widespread throughout UAEU.

The Self-Review Summary and Synthesis/Reflection for Standard 1 expressed concerns by the institution about their tracking of meta-data regarding student and staff grievances and appeals. Also, during the course of the onsite visit, several individuals expressed concern that, although policies exist ensuring academic freedom, in practice it appears that some faculty believe that there may be retribution for non-Emirati faculty who are not in agreement with the UAEU administration. There also seems to be variability in the application of policies from one college to another. The team encourages the institution to address the consistent application of policies as well as the protection of those who may take unpopular positions on university matters. This attention is particularly important in an institution where non-Nationals do not have tenure (CFRs 1.3, and 1.7).

The UAEU work group for Standard 1 included mostly directors of academic support units. The university noted in its self-study that it needs to improve “communication, both inside and outside the institution, to actively engage students, faculty, and stakeholders in the process of reviewing institutional purposes and decision-making.” It also noted the need “to ensure that student success indicators are reviewed regularly and used in a continuous improvement cycle across the institution.”

During the onsite visit, the team met with the Vice-Chancellor and representatives of the *University Council* (in person with two local members and by phone with three public members from the US). The team also met with the *WSCUC Steering Committee* chaired by the Provost as well as

the *Senior Executive Council*. In addition, team representatives met with several university-wide committees composed of both administrative staff and faculty. Dialogue was open and free-flowing and led the team to conclude that WSCUC policies are widely shared and supported at UAEU (CFR 1.8).

Among the issues addressed in these conversations were the criteria for selection of institutions against which to benchmark performance. Some of these institutions have been identified as peers and others as aspirational. UAEU may wish to continue to evaluate these benchmarks in order to identify those institutions which best serve its goals for continued improved performance (CFR 1.7).

The university has a program to educate many of its most promising young scholars abroad in return for their joining the UAEU faculty upon completion of their studies. At the time of the visit, 71 individuals were being sponsored for doctorates with 66 of those in the United States. This program will support the continued diversification of the faculty, especially through the addition of Emirati women professors.

Suggestions:

1. The team encourages the institution to address the consistent application of policies as well as the protection of those who may take unpopular positions on university matters. This attention is particularly important in an institution where non-Nationals do not have tenure (CFRs 1.3, and 1.7).
2. UAEU may wish to continue to evaluate the various benchmarks it uses in order to identify those institutions which best serve its goals for continued improved performance (CFR 1.7).

Commendation

UAEU is to be commended for the thoroughness with which it has created the structures, systems, and policies to fulfill the WSCUC standards. In particular, the revision of its governance body as well as the thoroughness of its establishment of learning outcomes at the institutional and program levels is to be applauded.

Overall, the team found UAEU to be in *sufficient compliance* with Standard 1 for initial accreditation.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

At the highest level of university design, the academic programs at UAEU seem well designed and match American standards and expectations very closely, using as they acknowledge “a US-style degree taxonomy” (CFR 2.1). One feature that differs from an American model is the “foundation program” offering pre-university level students instruction in English, Arabic and math, but this seems like an intelligent adaptation to the fact that this is an English-medium university with mostly non-native speakers of English, some of whom will not be adequately prepared for the full university curriculum. The extent of the General Education Program is, in our experience, unprecedented in a university outside the United States, and it is well thought out and seems to be well executed. The undergraduate degree programs are at least 120 credit hours, though some are well above that (CFR 2.2).

The quality of some of the major undergraduate programs is assured by external specialized accreditation, by the *Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)* and the *Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)*, and UAEU was one of the first universities outside the US to earn *AACSB* accreditation for its business program (CFR 2.2). UAEU is committed to a strategy of seeking professional accreditation in every field where there

is specialized accreditation, and this aspiration represents a clear and ambitious commitment to quality assurance. Where such accreditation is not a possibility, UAEU has a well-developed and robust system of external program review, and this system has been in place long enough that the ‘loop’ is being closed and recommendations from program review are yielding clear changes and improvements in individual programs (CFR 2.7).

UAEU has developed robust assessment systems in keeping with WSCUC expectations (CFR 2.3). Entry-level criteria are clearly set, and it has recently adopted Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that map well onto the core competencies WSCUC expects graduates to exhibit. Each degree program has clear requirements for entry and graduation as well as program objectives and learning outcomes. There are clear procedures for learning outcomes assessment, and the institution has made excellent progress in creating a viable structure for assessment at multiple levels, including capable support staff. This clearly reflects the WSCUC model in terms of the scaffolding expected throughout the curriculum, with the extra requirement of matching the national Qualifications Framework.

Student success data is collected systematically, and this is not just an effort by the central administration, as the deans and faculty are involved in the data analysis. The efforts in this area are commendable, well supported, and informed by international best practices (CFR 2.10). A number of issues have been identified from analysis which will lead to further changes, exactly the cycle of using results that WSCUC hopes to see. Many students change majors, so this is being addressed through improvements in advising. The success of students who come through the foundation program remains a concern for the institution, and this relates to issues involving English proficiency in the student body which are discussed below.

So in all these respects UAEU is doing a very impressive job of using outcomes assessment and forms of quality assurance to create an environment in the undergraduate program in which student learning is promoted, evaluated, and is central to the work of the university.

The graduate program is clearly at a more nascent state, especially the PhD program. The mention of recent initiatives to “promote and support the development of a culture that values graduate education” implies that graduate education has not been fully valued and this culture is not fully developed. This seems to be accurate and is a reflection of the trajectory of growth of this new aspect of the institution. The initial design of a single PhD program across the institution does not seem at first glance to meet the spirit of WSCUC requirements, but it did not take long for UAEU to discard that initial approach. In 2014, the university modified that approach to allow specializations in specific fields. While it is too early to ascertain how this is working, it does seem to have focused the attention of individual departments as to whether they had adequate resources—especially the needed human resources in faculty—to successfully offer graduate degrees. While these developmental issues surrounding graduate education do not constitute evidence that UAEU does not merit initial accreditation, we do expect to hear more in the future about how the fields UAEU is developing in graduate education are being developed as well as how the culture of quality assurance so well established for undergraduate education is being extended to graduate education.

One issue called for in CFR 2.2 is a “coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees.” The robust system of learning objectives at every level does much of the work pointed to in this CFR, but there are perhaps dimensions of this CFR which UAEU should reflect on in the next few years. What makes the undergraduate experience at UAEU

distinctive in its national and regional context? To put this another way, UAEU has mastered all of the processes WSCUC expects institutions to put into place; the work that lies before it is the nature of the product WSCUC expects those processes to create. The team believes that UAEU has much of this present in nascent but imperfectly articulated form. For instance, it has a particular focus on internships (CFR 2.3), and it strikes the team that this might be raised above the level of a specific program that the university seems proud of to provide an aspect of the coherent philosophy needed for CFR 2.2. A particularly impressive part of the curricular design is the fact that the capstone experience is part of every undergraduate program and is conceived of as part of general education (CFR 2.5). This, like the focus on internships, is clearly a campus-wide instantiation of a high impact practice, and like the focus on internships, one might think that this could be a component of the coherent philosophy needed for CFR 2.2.

An area of concern is student proficiency in English (CFRs 2.5 and 2.6). It must be said first of all that UAEU does a remarkable job in a highly unusual, perhaps unique situation. Its medium of instruction, English, is not the national language, Arabic, and most of its students do their pre-tertiary education in Arabic-medium schools. At the same time, by national policy, it must take and educate all national students who meet its entrance requirements, and those are also set by national policy. The concern of the team before the visit was that those entrance requirements for English proficiency were set too low, as the 5.0 required *International English Language Testing System (IELTS)* score is low and below international benchmarks. Furthermore, although UAEU has strong support systems for English language learners and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses embedded in the curriculum, meeting the 5.0 score is the only cross-cutting English requirement. What the team learned to its relief was that this concern is shared, and many faculty

find the need to work on the quality of student writing in English takes away from time they would like to spend on the subjects of their course. There is a national conversation about raising the *IELTS* score for all three national universities, and this is a complex conversation, as unanimity needs to be reached. Furthermore, this higher standard will not be successful without parallel efforts to strengthen English instruction at the primary and secondary levels. The team believes the *IELTS* score should be raised and there should be a national imperative to raise all student achievement to the high level achieved by many UAEU students already, and that this fits in with the imagined path forward for the United Arab Emirates as a nation. However, while those developments are taking place, the team would suggest that UAEU consider whether the largely voluntary and non-credit support system for English instruction for students beyond the Foundation program needs to be strengthened and perhaps complemented by some required formal instruction for students testing near the 5.0 benchmark.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

UAEU has clearly set a target of growing into a major research university with research-active faculty. This goal is not just a matter of UAEU's impressive ambitions for itself but also of national policy: as the United Arab Emirates plans its post-peak oil transition from an oil- to a knowledge-based economy, it will need a research university to catalyze research and innovation. The Science and Innovation Park now being developed by UAEU is one contribution to this national direction and is a way of reminding national policy makers of the centrality of the research university to a knowledge economy. The team agrees that UAEU is well positioned to be UAE's entrant into the 'international league tables,' but this evolution of the university needs to be done with care to make sure that this focus, including the corollary of increased attention to graduate

programs, strengthens and does not take away from its historic core mission of the education of Emiratis (CFR 2.8).

The CFRs in this area are clearly met, as the university values scholarship and creative activity on the part of the faculty, and the faculty evaluation system links scholarship, teaching, and service.

The team believes, however, that there are issues involved in this evolution of the university which will demand attention, involving faculty workload (belonging primarily to Standard 3), and involving the structure of the government's funding for UAEU, which although extremely generous, has essentially been focused exclusively on undergraduate education. A research-active faculty and graduate teaching responsibilities go hand-in-hand, so more graduate assistantships and more funding that can support research assistantships will be necessary as the research mission evolves. However, research and graduate education on the one hand and undergraduate education on the other should not be conceived of as competing or warring parties, given the value research can have in and for undergraduate education (CFR 2.11).

Student Learning and Success

Previous sections have already mentioned the commendable efforts in tracking student success, and the university's institutional research function is both highly capable and well integrated into the university's efforts to improve student learning (CFR 2.10).

There is a rich menu of co-curricular activities, with impressive physical activity facilities and plenty of staff support for co-curricular activities (CFR 2.11). The self-study expresses concern about a lower level of student involvement in co-curricular activities than they would like to see, and the question of how to expand that involvement is an issue the university is wrestling with, as

is the question of how to fully assess co-curricular activities, and how to integrate that assessment with the overall learning outcomes and assessment effort (CFR 2.11). So there is work to be done here, but UAEU is well engaged in that work. The team believes that WSCUC's focus on the "meaning, quality and integrity of the degree" and the need for each institution to have a 'coherent philosophy' and sense of itself will aid in this process. UAEU is unusual, perhaps unique, in the UAE for having a strong residential component and in having a high percentage of its students living on campus and having 'gone away' to Al Ain for university, including from the Northern Emirates as well as from many other countries. The team believes that this aspect of campus life needs to be woven more thoroughly into UAEU's sense of itself, as it provides a factor differentiating UAEU in the complex educational market in the United Arab Emirates and the region.

UAEU's stature as a university that international students increasingly wish to attend is a matter of pride for the university that deserves attention outside the university as well. International alumni from universities that are magnets for international students are an important component of national soft-power: the students from the region and other parts of the world who attend UAEU who return home will play a valuable role in strengthening the UAE's links to other countries, so this aspect of the university's evolution deserves special commendation.

Program information and advising is clearly a very strong area for UAEU (CFR 2.12). Everything one would need to know is on the web, well organized, well displayed, and up to date. Student support services is another area where the budgetary strength of the university helps in that student support services are plentiful and without cost (CFR 2.13). There are few transfer students but

certainly the information available seems appropriate and transfer students are welcomed and treated well (CFR 2.14).

The entire area of Student Learning and Success is an area of great strength for UAEU. The institution is student-focused, proud of its students' success, and is a true home and reference point for its alumni.

Commendations:

1. UAEU is to be commended for its culture of assessment of its teaching and learning, as all course and program learning outcomes are aligned with institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) (CFR 2.3).
2. UAEU's efforts in the area of the collection and analysis of student learning and success data are commendable, well supported, and informed by international best practices (CFR 2.10).
3. UAEU is to be commended for its initiative in establishing the Science and Innovation Park to promote innovation and research in the UAE (CFR 2.8).

Recommendation:

It is recommended that UAEU pay renewed attention to students' and graduates' proficiency in English. The team recognizes that any change in admission requirements will require a national conversation, both about admission requirements and about English teaching in pre-tertiary education. If such change is not forthcoming, UAEU will probably need to consider curricular changes to ensure that student proficiency in English is adequate for student success (CFRs 2.2a, and 2.2b).

Overall, the team found UAEU to be in *sufficient compliance* with Standard 2 for initial accreditation.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

Faculty and Staff

UAEU has a cadre of faculty members in sufficient numbers who have sufficient background, and in sufficient numbers, to accommodate the number of students enrolled at the university. The annual teaching load summary report describes the faculty and staff loads, both in averages, and in detail. Generally, faculty members are expected to teach 24 credit hours per year, and instructors 30 credit hours per year. It should be noted that in most colleges of the university only two preparations are needed per term as most of the teaching staff teach separate sections of the same subject to both men and women. Instructors have no responsibilities other than instruction. In addition to teaching, faculty members are expected to do community service and research. A review of the faculty lists revealed that all faculty members and many instructors have terminal degrees in the areas where they teach. The faculty to student ratio, as calculated by UAEU, is approximately 13 to 1, and this compares favorably to the institutions which it has chosen as comparable institutions (CFR 3.1).

Overall faculty turnover data, as reported by the institution, indicated that the rate varies between three and five percent; however, turnover in the first several years appears to be much higher and UAEU should consider studying this area further. Disaggregating data by college (as well as by national origin) would be beneficial. Most academic department chairs reported that turnover in their areas was not a problem; however, some colleges disagreed, reporting that their turnover rate was higher than desirable. The team noted that as the university intentionally moves to more of a

graduate and research type of institution, teaching loads will need to be adjusted and additional research/teaching assistants will be needed (CFR 3.1).

Hiring, on-boarding, and the evaluation practices of the institution are consistent with fulfilling the institution's mission in a comparable fashion with those institutions UAEU compares itself to. Faculty vacancies are advertised widely including the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, its own website, and discipline-specific venues. The hiring department's faculty members participate in the process and make recommendations to the appropriate dean concerning hiring. The Academic Personnel Office ensures that all policies are followed and that the individual recommended for hire is qualified for the position. Some department chairs reported that the processing of faculty employment offers often take too long, and, as a result, excellent faculty members accept offers from other institutions. The university should consider evaluating this issue to determine if reengineering of the process is warranted (CFR 3.2).

Faculty evaluations contain significant elements of peer review, as well as reviews by chairs of departments, self-evaluation, and final review by college deans. The process allows for a grievance process should the individual not agree with the results of the process. Regular reviews are conducted biannually. For staff, the Human Resources (HR) Department has a standard review format that is online and is conducted annually (CFR 3.2).

The team found that wide differences currently exist between colleges with regards to sabbaticals, use of part-time faculty, and research funding. The written policies appear to be quite clear; however, it appears that new policies are not uniformly administered across the various colleges, and this has caused anxiety among some faculty members. Therefore, the team recommends that

the university investigate these issues in an effort to assure all colleges are equally and consistently implementing policies and procedures (CFR 3.2).

UAEU provides for faculty and staff development through both internal structures, such as the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and external training opportunities. The following table illustrates the training provided during the past two years; specialized courses are those courses often for specific areas such as the *National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)*, or leadership courses taught by the Ministry of Education. Approximately 50% of all staff received training in the Center for Continuing Education in the 2014 year, and the goal for 2015 is 85% (CFR 3.3).

Type of Courses	# trained 2014	# trained 2015 (9/30/2015)
General Competency Courses	469	214
Specialized Courses	428	432
Total Number	897	646

Faculty who have been invited to present papers at discipline specific conferences are supported financially to attend at least one such conference per year. In the recent past, professional development regarding the area of learning outcomes has been supported and individuals sent to the WSCUC conference on learning outcome development (*WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy*). Each college within the university has specifically budgeted funds to support this type of professional development. During the 2013-14 year, 514 faculty members were supported in overseas conferences (CFR 3.3).

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

UAEU has had a history of balanced budgets, and has an enviable level of support from the federal government of the United Arab Emirates. Currently the vast majority of the institution's revenue, over 90%, comes from the government, and to date it has had cause to believe that its revenues could increase as the institution becomes more research and graduate program intensive. The team noted that the financial reports do not conform to international generally accepted accounting principles (*GAAP*), but that Ernst & Young has been engaged to implement the systems necessary to bring the university financial reports into the proper reporting format. This project should be completed with 12 months. The university should be commended for implementing this project (CFR 3.4).

The financial resources flow from the nation's Ministry of Finance in two forms, one to support operational budgets, and one to support capital budgets. The institution is well supported by the UAE, and the support is visibly evident to all who visit the campus. The operational budgets, in a modified cash format, have shown healthy surpluses for the past three years. In addition, the university has operational budget commitments from the UAE government through 2016. The university is currently preparing its next five-year budget request for submission to the Ministry of Finance. Even though oil prices are significantly down worldwide and this downturn has affected government revenues, the UAE has the world's second largest sovereign fund that will be used as necessary to ensure sustainable revenues for the government's program, including the university (CFR 3.4).

The institutional budgeting process is carefully described in Appendix 3.4.2, "UAEU Budget Process." Budget allocations are made based upon the previous year's allocation with adjustments

for increased student numbers and for initiatives driven by the strategic plan. The *Budget Committee*, chaired by the Vice Chancellor, reviews budget requests in light of existing student enrollments and strategic plan initiatives and makes recommendations to the *Senior Executive Council* (CFR 3.4).

Currently, the Ministry of Finance only supports undergraduate education, allowing all undergraduates to attend for no cost. Graduate education is only supported by tuition and fees.

The university's complement of information resources appear to be sufficient to support the curricular needs of its various academic programs. A review of these resources revealed particular strengths, as one might expect, in engineering, business, the sciences, and energy. These include full text journal packages provided by information/database aggregators, as well as eBook collections. Free document delivery is provided to all faculty and students, as the Library has arrangements with other Gulf region libraries, as well as with the British Library. However, during the onsite visit, the team learned that overall budgetary support for the Library has been flat for some years. Information literacy instruction is requested intensively by business, information technology, and engineering faculty; however, other discipline areas, such as law and education, see little or no activity.

The approval of the Information Literacy 101 course as a general education requirement is a welcomed and positive development, which will help to ensure that all students will develop and master this essential core competency. Both the Library Strategic Plan and the Future UAEU Library Draft Proposal addressed areas that require further attention by the university -- increased focus on staff development; upgrading of the professional degree qualifications of librarians; better utilization of library space to provide for collaborative learning and event/programming initiatives;

digital archiving of special collections; increased outreach for information literacy to the colleges; and enhanced marketing of library services and collections to promote greater awareness and usage among the colleges. UAEU has been aware of these issues, and with this in mind, invited consultants from a well-known California institution prior to the WSCUC team visit to visit the campus and to provide recommendations as to future directions. It is recommended that UAEU further develop the staffing, collections, services, and infrastructure of its Library to better serve the needs of 21st century students and faculty (CFR 3.5).

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

The leadership of UAEU models and drives institutional performance. The university relies heavily upon key performance indicators (KPIs) to evaluate performance, and there exists a clear level of accountability and responsibility. Human resource policies require job descriptions for all faculty and staff in order to clearly delineate responsibilities of each position. Annual evaluations are required. The performance management system requires all supervisors to meet with the individuals within their supervision and establish annual performance goals that will be used in the annual performance review. In 2014 the University launched a new, online system, and the completion rate was approximately 72%. Already in 2015 the rate has exceeded 80% and the HR director believes the completion rate will rise to over 90%. Faculty members are also regularly evaluated. This is further discussed in subsequent paragraphs (CFR 3.6).

The university's decision-making structures and processes are clearly documented and can be found on the institutional website. For example, UAEU's organizational charts, policy documents, and job descriptions make clear the decision-making roles of individuals and committees. The web page entitled "By-laws, Policies, and Procedures" contains links to pages containing the

university's bylaws, and academic and administrative policies. Together, these documents provide a clear picture of how decision-making occurs within the organization. For example, these policies clearly document the role of senior staff, e.g., the provost, and how the various academic committees fit into the decision-making scheme. The Standing Committee Handbook describes the university's committee structure, and the roles and responsibilities of each committee. This document prescribes which committee or council is responsible for academic program changes, which decisions colleges can make, which decisions the *Senior Executive Council* can make, and what level of decisions must be referred to the *University Council* for action (CFR 3.7).

Clarity in decision-making is one of the values of the university. For example, "*Effectiveness in decision-making – We are committed to basing our decisions and plans on evidence and analysis, and adopting efficient systems and procedures.*" The team found that all levels within the institution appear to support this institutional value (CFR 3.7).

The institution has a full-time CEO, the Vice Chancellor, and a CFO. These two positions have job descriptions similar in nature to those found within the U.S. In addition, the remainder of the organization is staffed similarly to its counterparts in the U.S. that it considers to be comparable institutions (CFR 3.8).

The university should be commended for its expedited work in adopting changes that have brought the *University Council* (governing board) into compliance with WSCUC guidelines for independent boards. In addition, the UAEU board has adopted a "best practices" type of board self-assessment, and requires that this be accomplished every two years. The effectiveness of this assessment cannot be evaluated as this practice has just been implemented, and it will likely be almost two years before the first self-assessment is completed. Likewise, the *Council* bylaws

require that the *Council* evaluate the Vice Chancellor every two years. This too has not yet been accomplished, but will be completed within the next two years as well. The majority of its membership are no longer directly members of the government nor members of the university staff and faculty. Recently four new, highly regarded independent members have been appointed to the *University Council*. Several of these are among the best known and experienced higher educational leaders in the United States. These independent board members have reported to the team by conference call that the *Council* is maturing, and is in the process of adopting best practices. In addition, they reported that by the last meeting, board committees were in place and operating. This maturation process will provide an improved ability to have open and thoughtful *Council* discussions. The bylaws of the university prescribe the level of independence and how members of the *Council* are selected. Nevertheless, the team believes that continued attention to this process of creating a highly functioning board is needed (CFR 3.9).

Members of the faculty play a significant role in the establishment, evaluation, and transformation of the university's curriculum, although the degree of participation may vary among the university's colleges. A number of committees comprised mostly of faculty members along with academic administrators review all changes and/or additions to the curriculum. For example, the Undergraduate Program and Curriculum Committee, chaired by the Director of Program and Curriculum Office, a ranked academic administrator, and comprised of an appointed faculty member from each college review all proposals prior to submission to the *Academic Council*. The *Academic Council* is also comprised of both ranked academic administrators and appointed faculty members. This committee must approve changes, which, if approved, are then referred to the senior executive team for approval. No exclusively faculty committees, with elected

representatives, are present in the current decision making structure of the university. The team heard about differing levels of faculty involvement participation within different colleges, and the university may want to consider evaluating how each of the colleges has implemented policies intended to involve faculty in curriculum decisions (CFR 3.10).

Suggestions:

1. UAEU should consider studying faculty turnover data further and disaggregating this data by college, as well as by national origin (CFR 3.1).
2. The university should consider evaluating the issue of the length of time to process faculty employment offers to determine if reengineering of the process is warranted (CFR 3.2).
3. The team heard differing levels of faculty involvement participation within different colleges, and the university may want to consider evaluating how each of the colleges has implemented policies intended to involve faculty in curriculum decisions (CFR 3.10).

Commendations:

1. UAEU is to be commended for initiating the project to implement systems that will have its financial reports conform to international generally accepted accounting principles (*GAAP*) (CFR 3.4).
2. UAEU is to be commended for its investment in the construction and design of state of the art facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, and collaborative learning spaces. The physical campus is simply remarkable (CFR 3.5).

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the university investigate issues related to sabbaticals, use of part-time faculty, and research funding, in an effort to assure all colleges are equally implementing policies and procedures (CFR 3.2).
2. It is recommended that UAEU further develop the staffing, collections, services, and infrastructure of its Library, to better serve the needs of 21st century students and faculty (CFR 3.5).
3. It is recommended that UAEU continue the evolution of board governance in keeping with best international practices, as advocated by such organizations as the *Association of Governing Boards (AGB)* (CFR 3.9).
4. It is recommended that UAEU investigate, and to the extent possible, address the underlying conditions that are causing high faculty turnover, as it will need to retain

talented faculty for longer periods than at present to continue its emergence as a research university (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3).

5. The team commends UAEU for doing so much to promote the development of Emirati into capable university staff, faculty and administrators, but it is recommended that this policy be recognized as a form of affirmative action aligned with the government policy of ‘*emiratization*,’ and that this be openly acknowledged as a policy direction of the university (CFRs 1.6, and 3.2).
6. It is recommended that UAEU consider the commitment of resources necessary to support the move to a more focused emphasis on graduate studies and research, and how this fits with its primary mission of undergraduate education. The team understands that this depends at least in part upon a national conversation, and it believes that UAEU has a role to play in that national conversation (CFRs 3.4, and 3.5).

Overall, the team found UAEU to be in *sufficient compliance* with Standard 3 for initial accreditation.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

Quality Assurance Processes

UAEU has created policies, processes and structures to ensure that the university is systematically engaged in quality assurance and improvements efforts both for administrative and instructional functions. The Quality Assurance Framework document outlines institutional intent regarding continuous improvement and provides the responsibilities for various organizational units in ensuring that continual improvement is practiced. Overall responsibility is vested within the Vice Chancellor’s office, and is accomplished through the organizational element known as the *Planning Academic and Institutional Development Department*, or *PAIDD*. Three sections report to this department, the *Strategic Planning and Performance Management Section (SPPMS)*;

Institutional Quality and Excellence Section (IQES); and the *Institutional Research and Analysis Section (IRAS)*. The university utilizes the continuous improvement model known as *RADAR (Results, Approaches, Deploy, Assess and Refine)* to analyze processes and functions.

Several major projects were recently undertaken that illustrate the success of these administrative improvement programs. One example of these was the evaluation of a number of administrative functions that were seen as expensive and were believed to be performing at a below average level. These units were then analyzed to determine if they could be outsourced for less money while meeting or exceeding their current level of performance. As a result, the security, food service, grounds keeping, and office assistant functions were outsourced. Another example is that individual units are encouraged to evaluate their own functions. Two examples of this improvement effort are the Library and IT departments that routinely used survey data to evaluate the services these units provide. (The survey data would be even more useful if demographic information was included to determine the level of satisfaction among constituent groups, i.e., faculty, staff, and students.)

The university has recently identified comparative and aspirational universities with which comparative data can be collected and analyzed in order to benchmark its programs and services. This data then has been used to establish key performance indicators (KPIs) that are regularly collected and discussed.

UAEU also regularly engages outside help to evaluate its efforts and accomplishments. Prior to the visit by this team, the unit engaged two consultants from a well-known institution in California to evaluate the university's library operations. This forthcoming report is expected to recommend

a number of needed improvements and the university will be adjusting its operations to implement those recommendations (CFR 4.1).

The institutional research function is staffed with sufficient resources to accommodate the data and analysis needs of the university. The department is housed within the *Planning, Academic and Institutional Development Department (PAIDD)*, which reports directly to the Vice Chancellor. The department annually conducts numerous surveys, such as employee satisfaction, alumni perceptions, and student satisfaction surveys. These are frequently published and placed on the institutional website. The student survey revealed that the student complaint process needed improvement, and as a result, the Deputy Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs adopted *ISO 10002*, an international standard for receiving and processing student complaints. Another example was a faculty survey that revealed that faculty believed more decisions about promotions should be made at the departmental and college level; and as a result the process is now more decentralized. The UAEU annual statistical report contains a vast amount of carefully collected and analyzed data regarding such items as retention and graduation rates (CFR 4.2).

Continuous improvement is a central concept for the university as evidenced by its values, plans, and structures. For example, two of its institutional values deal directly with this issue:

***Leadership and Life-long Learning:** We foster and support innovation, initiative, excellence and striving for international best practice; we value a focus on student success, life-long learning and sharing of knowledge.*

***Effectiveness in Decision-making:** We are committed to basing our decisions and plans on evidence and analysis, and adopting efficient systems and procedures.*

During the visit, the team received contradictory reports regarding faculty turnover rates.

The team recommends that the institution ensure that data is carefully collected and

analyzed to ensure that all reports are accurate and provide the information that is most directly related to underlying issues before being distributed (CFR 4.2).

For UAEU, the Strategic Plan is the foundation of its quality improvement process, and is used to systematically guide the organization in the improvement effort. The *PAIDD* department conducts regular assessments in regards to goal accomplishment and reports these to the senior staff, as well as the UAE government. In addition to internal assessments, external consultants are used to evaluate the effectiveness of departments. The Student Life Division has also engaged external consultants to review many of its practices and significant changes were adopted as a result. Regular assessments of student learning outcomes (SLOs), and periodic program reviews are viewed as methods of improvement of the academic program. The institution views secondary accreditation as another way to provide external reviews to ensure that quality improvement is taking place (CFR 4.3).

The team found widespread evidence that the UAEU engages in pursuing on-going efforts to improve teaching and learning. For example, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) was established to:

To help the university to ensure a dynamic and effective learning experience for all UAEU students, by providing educators with professional development and support in educational technology, pedagogy and classroom teaching techniques, by encouraging and facilitating innovation, and by ensuring that assessment is an integral part of implementing new developments in teaching and learning.

The team noted that the CETL conducted eleven workshops and seminars in 2015 of which four were devoted to instructional pedagogy and seven to the use of instructional technology. Also, the

annual faculty review process of individual faculty members identifies those faculty members who need additional development in teaching. These faculty members are then referred to the CETL for assistance. The university is also engaged in a project called the Course Transformation process that is designed to improve learning within the institution. To date, 38 courses have been approved to undergo transformation, and significant resources are devoted to this task. No assessment of the success of the program was available at the time of the visit, as it is a very new program, but one which illustrates that the university is engaged in improving teaching and learning (CFR 4.4).

Another example of the use of collected and analyzed data to improve teaching was the collection of Calculus I grades, which indicated an abnormally high failure rate. This data was studied and changes made as a result of the study. The team suggests that the university annually prepare a summarized report which illustrates the efforts and results of this type of analysis (CFR 4.4).

The university engages its numerous constituencies in the formulation and evaluation of its various academic programs. Foremost among these constituencies is the government of the United Arab Emirates. UAEU's mission statement and Strategic Plan declare its intention of fulfilling the higher education needs of the country. Annually, the university is required to submit a report that describes its activities for the past year in fulfillment of these stated objectives. An example of how the university engages this constituency was the collaboration with several governmental units, including the *Abu Dhabi Food Control Authority* to develop a bachelor's degree in veterinary medicine. This governmental entity required additional qualified graduates in order to fulfill its own mission within the UAE. As a result, talks began between the agency and the university.

These discussions ultimately resulted in a proposal for a new program. The university also has numerous advisory boards that provide feedback to colleges within the university regarding its curriculum and views of it in the employer community. Each college has an advisory board, and many of the programs that have secondary accreditation also have advisory boards (CFR 4.5).

The Alumni Department is also active in soliciting information from former students and employers within the UAE in order to ensure its curriculum is preparing graduates who are able to meet the human resource needs of the country (CFR 4.5).

The new program proposal document is commendable and all new program proposals are required to complete the form, which addresses the issues of academic quality, student demand, the required resources, and the impact on the existing university departments. In determining academic quality, outside experts must be engaged to comment upon the proposal, thus providing another way to ensure academic quality (CFR 4.5).

UAEU engages its multiple constituencies in strategic planning. The process for the current strategic plan began in May 2012. The beginning step for this plan was: 1) the examination of previous addresses given by the Chancellor, especially the fall convocation address of 2011 which laid out the challenges for the university; 2) the two previous strategic plans; 3) the previous provost's paper on transforming UAEU. Under the leadership of the Deputy Provost these documents were transformed into draft vision, mission, values, and a long list of goals. The 18-month process was inclusive with all levels of the university having input on the refinement of the goals. Eleven handpicked working groups were created to continue the work, which ultimately ended with the approval of the draft plan by the *University Council*. This planning process has driven the 2014, 2015, and 2016 budget development processes. Subsequent to the development

of the plan, college deans and departmental directors created action plans to support the goals of the plan. The benchmarking efforts helped with the establishment of the metrics for the goals (CFR 4.6).

The next strategic plan, 2017-2021, was in progress during the visit. The team noted that this process, now led by the Director of *PAIDD*, is even more inclusive. Numerous members of the faculty and staff reported that the effort this time is even more participatory and filled with open discussions. The timing of the plan is for five years, as the Government now requires a five-year, versus three-year plan. When the plan is finalized it must also contain a proposed budget as that will then be the basis for the next five-year budget request (CFR 4.6)

UAEU is in a period of rapid change, driven in part by the government's desire to move the university to become a more research-intensive institution in order to better respond to the nation's national goals for economic development, to create more innovation within the country, and to create the leading university in the Middle East. This process of institutional improvement began first in 1988 with the Minister of Higher Education and Scientific Research's request to visiting American academic leaders to help move the institution to a level of quality found in the highest quality institutions in the U.S. Their recommendations placed the institution on a path of change, innovation, and development. The team noted that the institution superbly plans for the existing demand placed upon by its constituencies, but has done less thinking about how higher education may change in the next ten years. The current planning includes little in the way of blended and online delivery, insufficient utilization of its current learning management system, *Blackboard*, and the increased competition from private institutions within the UAE. The team recommends

that the institution begin thinking about and planning for a changing higher education landscape (CFR 4.7).

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the institution ensure that data is carefully collected and analyzed to ensure that all reports are accurate and provide the information that is most directly related to underlying issues before being distributed (CFR 4.2).
2. It is recommended that the institution begin thinking about and planning for a changing higher education landscape (CFR 4.7).

Overall, the team found UAEU to be in *sufficient compliance* with Standard 4 for initial accreditation.

SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION UNDER THE 2013 HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION

The quality of some of the major undergraduate programs (engineering, business, to name two examples) is assured by external specialized accreditation (CFR 2.2). UAEU is committed to a strategy of seeking professional accreditation in every field where there is specialized accreditation, and this is a clear commitment to quality assurance. Outside of these specialized accreditations, UAEU has a well-developed and robust system of external program review in place that is yielding clear changes and improvements in individual programs (CFR 2.7).

UAEU has developed robust assessment systems in keeping with WSCUC expectations (CFR 2.3). Entry-level criteria are clearly set, and it has recently adopted Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that map the core competencies specified by WSCUC. Each degree program has clear requirements for entry and graduation as well as program objectives and learning outcomes. There

are clear procedures for learning outcomes assessment, and the institution has made excellent progress in creating a viable structure for assessment at multiple levels.

Student success data is collected systematically by the central administration, as well as by the deans and faculty involved in the data analysis. The efforts in this area are commendable, well supported, and informed by international best practices (CFR 2.10). The success of students who come through the foundation program remains a concern for the institution, and this relates to issues involving English proficiency in the student body.

UAEU has created policies, processes and structures to ensure that the university is systematically engaged in quality assurance and improvements efforts both for administrative and instructional functions. The Quality Assurance Framework document outlines institutional intent regarding continuous improvement and provides the responsibilities for various organizational units in ensuring that continual improvement is practiced. The Strategic Plan is the foundation of UAEU's quality improvement process, and is used to systematically guide the organization in the improvement effort. In addition to internal assessments, external consultants are used to evaluate the effectiveness of departments. The current planning includes little in the way of blended and online delivery, and it doesn't address what seems to be insufficient utilization of its current learning management system, *Blackboard*, or the increasing competition from private institutions within the UAE. The team recommends that the institution begin thinking about and planning for a changing higher education landscape (CFR 4.7).

SECTION IV. INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators by UAEU was thorough, appropriate and demonstrated the level of learning achieved through extensive involvement by participants in WSCUC's Assessment Learning Academy.

SECTION V. FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

1. UAEU is to be commended for its commitment to educating Emiratis, especially females, to fulfill the aspirations of its citizenry and the nation. The team heard some concern on campus about the 'imbalance' in the overall numbers of male and female students at UAEU, but it also thinks the success of the university in educating women in all fields is remarkable and deserves praise.
2. UAEU is to be commended for its culture of assessment of its teaching and learning, as all course and program learning outcomes are aligned with institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) (CFR 2.3).
3. UAEU is to be commended for its superb preparation for the WSCUC visit. The self-study was one of the very best the team has ever seen, and the accreditation liaison officer and the WSCUC Steering Committee saw to every detail of the visit.
4. UAEU is to be commended for its commitment to WSCUC methodologies and processes and for its quick response to recommendations at every stage of the process (CFR 1.8).
5. UAEU is to be commended for its investment in the construction and design of state of the art facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, and collaborative learning spaces. The physical campus is simply remarkable (CFR 3.5).
6. UAEU is to be commended for its initiative in establishing the Science and Innovation Park to promote innovation and research in the UAE (CFR 2.8).
7. UAEU is to be commended for its embrace of the leading role it has in creating the future of the UAE itself: as the nation's economy transitions from an oil-based to a knowledge-based economy, it will need a major research university. UAEU is the only possible candidate to play that role, and it is positioning itself well in that regard.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that UAEU continue the evolution of board governance in keeping with best international practices, as advocated by such organizations as the *Association of Governing Boards (AGB)* (CFR 3.9).
2. It is recommended that UAEU investigate, and to the extent possible, address the underlying conditions that are causing high faculty turnover, as it will need to retain talented faculty for longer periods than at present to continue its emergence as a research university (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3).
3. The team commends UAEU for doing so much to promote the development of Emirati into capable university staff, faculty and administrators, but it is recommended that this policy be recognized as an appropriate form of affirmative action aligned with the government policy of ‘*emiratization*,’ and that this be openly acknowledged as a policy direction of the university (CFRs 1.6, and 3.2).
4. It is recommended that UAEU further develop the staffing, collections, services, and infrastructure of its Library, to better serve the needs of 21st century students and faculty (CFR 3.5).
5. It is recommended that UAEU pay renewed attention to students’ and graduates’ proficiency in English. The team recognizes that any change in admission requirements will require a national conversation, both about admission requirements and about English teaching in pre-tertiary education. If such change is not forthcoming, UAEU will probably need to consider curricular changes to ensure that student proficiency in English is adequate for student success (CFRs 2.2a, and 2.2b).
6. It is recommended that UAEU consider the commitment of resources necessary to support the move to a more focused emphasis on graduate studies and research, and how this fits with its primary mission of undergraduate education. The team understands that this depends at least in part upon a national conversation, and it believes that UAEU has a role to play in that national conversation (CFRs 3.4, and 3.5).

APPENDICES

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? http://www.uaeu.ac.ae/en/about/procedures/admissions_and_enrollment/pro-ae_07_en.pdf
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The UAEU self-study goes into considerable detail about how they review syllabi with an eye to this, outcomes, learning objectives and other issues
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The self-study also describes a QA process for this
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: UAEU does not teach on-line or hybrid courses
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 10
	What kinds of courses? Practica, internships, clinical training, industrial placement
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS x BA/BS x MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Nutrition, Engineering, Business, Translation Studies
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The Self-Study also describes their internal process for auditing such courses with an eye to the accuracy of the credit hour assignment as well as learning outcomes
	How many programs were reviewed? 5-7

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Degree programs at all levels
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, professional programs
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: All the degree programs reviewed correspond to American norms of degree duration and requirements.

Review Completed By: Reed Dasenbrock

Date: January 7, 2016

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO Yes, in the sense that the institution uses only employees to recruit and they are paid on salary, with no compensation accruing to individuals for numbers of students. Some differences between US law and UAE law may exist in terms of preferential treatment of UAE citizens over other nationalities.</p> <p>Comments: No payment for recruitment by the student.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO Yes, for each program the time to expected completion is shown.</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO Yes, free to UG and specifies cost of grad programs. See student account pages on web-site for complete details.</p> <p>Comments: I could not find information about the average length of any given program. All programs identified the number of courses, and the expected number of courses per year, but no analysis of the typical (average) time to degree was given, at least on the website itself. In the graduation rate information this can be obtained by percentages given for 4 year and 6 year graduation rates, by College, and by degree program. It is accessible from the website, without a sign in. The information is also found in the Faculty Handbook.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO Yes, on its website, and employment after graduation is also shown on the Alumni page of the web-site.</p> <p>Comments: The University reports that 44% of its baccalaureate graduates have a job within one year of graduation. The site also has a great deal of information of career services, etc.</p>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Robert P Allison

Date: November 12, 2015

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO <u>Yes.</u></p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? <u>Yes</u>, the procedure is indicated on the website under “Student Responsibilities.”</p> <p>Comments:</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO <u>Yes.</u></p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: Students file complaints via an online form, administered by “UAEU Cares.”</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input type="checkbox"/>YES <input type="checkbox"/>NO <u>Yes.</u></p> <p>Comments: The UAEU Cares site, and complaint form is available to students at: cares.uaeu.ac.ae. Complaints are usually resolved from 24-48 hours from the time of the complaints.</p>

Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Yes. Records of student complaints are maintained by UAEU Cares.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Unclear. If so, please describe briefly:
	Comments: Complaints were reviewed for a three-month period, and these dealt primarily with housing conditions (insect infestation), temperature of classrooms, and theft reports. Translations from Arabic were provided. It was unclear, however, if UAEU had developed effective ways to track and/or monitor student complaints over time.

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Les Kong

Date: November 12, 2015

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES If so, where? https://www.uaeu.ac.ae/en/admission/transfer_students.shtml and http://www.uaeu.ac.ae/en/about/procedures/admissions_and_enrollment/pro-ae_02_en.pdf
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES

	Comments:
--	-----------

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Anna DiStefano
Date: November 10, 2015