



The Quality Assessment and Assurance Division

The Self-Evaluation Process: Recommendations and Guidelines

July 2012

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Executive Summary	5
Chapter 1 - The Institution	5
Chapter 2 - The Parent Unit Operating the Study Programs under Evaluation	5
Chapter 3 - The Evaluated Department / Study Programs	6
Chapter 4 - Research	11
Chapter 5 - The Self-Evaluation Process, Summary and Conclusions	112
Chapter 6 - Implementation of previous QA recommendations	112
Chapter 7 Appendices	13
7.1 - The Study Program - Table 1	14
7.2 - Teaching Staff – Tables 2A-2D.....	15
7.3 - Average Score of Teaching Surveys -Table 3.....	18
Additional materials	200
Instructions for submitting the self-evaluation report and additional materials on CD (In Hebrew)	211
List 1 – Abbreviation of names of institutions (In Hebrew)	222
List 2 – A sample of the structure of the files on the CD.....	233

Introduction

Background

The Israeli system of higher education has undergone extensive transformation since the beginning of the 1990s. A period of impressive growth began at the older universities, which were joined by a long list of newer institutions of higher education of various kinds. The process of accreditation and authorization of the institutions and their study programs enables the system of higher education to assure their quality only at the founding stages; it does not provide a mechanism for monitoring the continuous process of quality improvement.

This situation requires special care, as reflected in the past two decades during which the issue of quality has become a key element of management performance. Branches of industry and service providers explored and established mechanisms of quality management as a tool of increasing efficiency, continuing improvement, profitability, promotion of teamwork and technological and intellectual innovation. ISOs, TQM, 6σ (6sigma), quality circles, etc. developed during this period testify to both practical implementation as well as a recognition of the fact that quality is an essential value.

The education system in general and specifically the higher education system have also undergone changes as a result of this trend. Beginning with the evaluation of study programs – Curriculum Assessment (CA), through research management and students' authority, the principles of "quality management" have occupied a reputable standing among the tools of systemic and organizational management. In the past decade, the issue of quality assurance and evaluation has been a focus of activity and interest on the part of national and international entities involved in higher education. A considerable number of countries have established organizations (many of which were founded by law) to be responsible for the important issue of assessing and assuring quality. This policy follows the global trend of assuring and assessing quality in higher education systems.

Taking into account worldwide trends and recognizing the importance of quality assessment processes in the higher education system, the Council for Higher Education decided at its meeting on June 3, 2003 to establish a system for assessing and assuring quality at institutions of higher education in Israel, in order to preserve and foster their quality as an essential need nationally and internationally.

The ongoing quality assessment activity implements this decision of the Council for Higher Education

General

The quality assurance activity of the Council for Higher Education is meant to serve as a catalyst towards creating a culture of ongoing quality assurance processes in institutions of higher education in Israel. The approach, adopted by the Council, consists of three stages:

1. Preparation of a self-evaluation report by the institution;
2. Evaluation by an external committee, appointed by the Council, including an on-site visit to the institution and a meeting with the heads of the institution;
3. A discussion by the Council and resolutions (including publication) in light of the report and the response of the institution;

The recommendations and guidelines for self-evaluation are meant to assist the institutions in carrying out the self-evaluation of the study programs and in defining the issues that should be dealt with in the framework of this activity (stage 1 above). The Council for Higher Education attaches much importance to this stage, as this activity is meant to cause the institutions of higher education and their parent units (faculties/schools/departments) to be "introspective", implying an examination and evaluation of their mission and goals and of the degree to which these have been achieved. In this framework, they will have to present their areas of strength and weakness, to consider possible ways of improving the quality of their academic studies and, as an outcome of the process, to enhance and promote the evaluated study program.

Self-evaluation process

1. The Self-Evaluation Team

The experience gathered throughout the world shows that an effective and efficient way to carry out a self-evaluation process and to prepare a comprehensive, exhaustive and useful self-evaluation report is through a **Self-Evaluation Team**, set up by the program under examination, to carry out the process and be responsible for the preparation of the self-evaluation report.

This team should be mostly composed of representatives from a number of sectors e.g. the unit's academic leadership, faculty, students and the technical-administrative staff. In some cases, leading personalities from other disciplines/departments (including external specialists) or any other individual who might contribute to the process can be invited to join the team. Naturally, it is recommended to consult with individuals from the units that have undergone the same or similar process.

The participation and involvement of all the staff members in this activity is one of the key elements in the self-evaluation process. Under no circumstances should this important task be assigned to one or a limited group of staff members.

2. The Self-Evaluation Report

The self-evaluation report is a central element in the self-evaluation process which should address itself critically and analytically to the points of strength and weakness within the institution, the parent unit and the study programs under examination. This process should involve an examination of various aspects that have a bearing upon its academic and administrative proceedings in relation to the following fundamental issues:

1. How does the parent unit define its identity?
2. What are its aims and goals?
3. What is being done in order to achieve those aims and goals?
4. What are the tools to evaluate the degree of success in achieving the aims and goals?
5. What is being done in order to strengthen weak areas?

Special attention should be paid to the conclusions drawn and to the presentation of the data that supports these conclusions. The institution and parent unit are requested to present the plan for future activities in light of the conclusions and to offer ways and means to implement and absorb changes.

The self-evaluation process and the report would relate to the study programs authorized to award an academic degree. It is not necessary to elaborate on the programs the institution has submitted or plans to submit to the Council for Higher Education.

Since the recommendations and guidelines for self-evaluation have been composed as a generic document, the institution is not obligated to address every question. Only relevant questions should be answered.

The Self Evaluation Report will include seven main sections:

1. **Executive Summary;**
2. **The institution;**
3. **The "Parent" Unit (School/Faculty) in which study programs under evaluation are taking place.**
4. **The Department/Study Programs under evaluation;**
5. **Research;**
6. **The self-evaluation process, summary and conclusions;**
7. **Implementation of previous QA recommendations.¹**
8. **Appendices**
(Additional materials - to be submitted separately).

The institution may, at its own discretion, add any further necessary relevant information and necessary relevant appendices, not mentioned in the recommendations and guidelines, to the report.

¹ This section is relevant to programs that were previously evaluated in the CHE quality assessment process.

The External Evaluation Committees of the Council for Higher Education may request further information that has not been indicated in the Guidelines.

3. Guidelines for report submission

In order to facilitate the activity of the external evaluation committees, we would appreciate it if the institutions would follow the instructions below:

- ✦ Submit the reports and appendices **in English**, since the majority of the evaluation committee members (including the committees' chairs) are not Hebrew speakers.
- ✦ Submit 15 hard copies of the report, which do not exceed 100 pages. **We recommend submitting the report in a double-sided format.**
- ✦ Preserve the order of the chapters, headings and question numbers as specified in the Guidelines as much as possible. Please cite the relevant question (and its number) before the relevant answer (citing the subject alone is not sufficient).
- ✦ Explain the abbreviations unique to the specific institution when they appear in the text for the first time
- ✦ Submit the appendices on a CD-ROM (please submit 15 copies of the CD). In addition, the CD-ROM should contain the body of the self-evaluation report. The detailed guidelines for submitting of the materials on CD-ROM appear on page 21.
- ✦ Send the self-evaluation report to the Quality Assessment Division at the Council for Higher Education signed by the head of the institution (President/Rector) at the appointed time.

Executive Summary²

- A short summary of the main strengths and weaknesses that were pointed out in the self-evaluation process.
- A short description of the actions the Institution, the Parent Unit and the Department are going to take in order to improve the weak points that were found.
- A brief statement as to the extent which the Study Program has achieved its mission, goals and learning outcomes, and whether the outcomes comply with its mission statement. Are the Institution, Parent Unit and Department satisfied with the outcomes of the Study Program?
- If the study program has previously gone through the CHE quality assessment process – please briefly describe the main changes that have been made in the program since the last evaluation.

Chapter 1 - The Institution

- 1.1 A **brief** summary describing the institution and its development since its establishment, including details of the campus(es) where the institution's teaching activities take place (number and location), names of the faculties /schools/departments in the institution, the **overall** number of students studying towards academic degrees in the institution according to faculty and degree (first degree, second degree with thesis, second degree without thesis, doctoral degree), the date of recognition by the Council for Higher Education.
- 1.2 Mission statement of the institution, its aims and goals.
- 1.3 A description and chart of the institution's organizational structure, and the names of holders of senior academic and administrative positions

Chapter 2 - The Parent Unit Operating the Study Programs under Evaluation³

- 2.1 The name of the parent unit and a **brief** summary of its "history", its activities and development in the period of its existence.
- 2.2 Mission statement of the parent unit, its aims and goals.
- 2.3 Description and chart of the unit's academic and administrative organizational structure (including relevant committees), names of holders of senior academic and administrative positions and list of departments/study programs operating in its framework.
- 2.4 Please provide in the format of a table, the number of students in each one of the Unit's departments who are studying and have studied in the unit in each of the last five years according the level of degree (first, second with thesis, without thesis, doctoral).
- 2.5 Please provide in the format of a table, the number of students who have graduated in each one of the Unit's departments in each of the last five years according the level of degree (first degree, second degree with thesis, without thesis, doctoral degree).
- 2.6 Who decides (internal/external bodies) on the rationale, mission and goals of the parent unit and of the study programs? What were the considerations behind these decisions and are they periodically re-examined and, if deemed necessary, changed? What were the changes made (if any)? How are the mission, goals and changes brought to the attention of the teaching staff, the students and the institution's authorities?
- 2.7 What is the Parent Unit's perception of the evaluated Study Program/Department within its greater framework? Is the Study Program represented in the Parent Unit's decision-making bodies?

We recommend that chapters 1 and 2 be prepared by the institution and the "parent" unit (faculty/school) to be included in the Self-Evaluation Report.

² The length of the Executive Summary should be about one page.

³ In this chapter, please relate to the broader organizational framework in which the evaluated study program operates. If there is no such framework, please note it. Then answer paragraph 2.5 and 2.6 (only), and then move on to chapter 3.

Chapter 3 - The Evaluated Department / Study Programs

Note: In this chapter we require separate reference to each of the study programs under examination at each of the levels taught (first, second, doctoral degree). The identical data for all the programs will appear only once.

3.1. The Goals, Structure, Contents and scope of the Study Programs/ Department

- 3.1.1. The name of the department / study programs, a **brief** summary describing its development since its establishment. Please attach a copy of the academic diploma awarded to students.
- 3.1.2. Please describe the mission statement of the department / study programs, its aims and goals.
- 3.1.3. Please describe the study program's structure and content, including specializations/tracks within the program, division of courses according to number of credits and fields within the discipline. How are the mission statement, aims and goals of the program reflected in the study program?
- 3.1.4. What is the Strategic Plan of the department and its study programs? **Please attach the Strategic Plan.**
- 3.1.5. Internationalization: are there any international features (e.g. students exchange, teaching in English etc.) in the department?
- 3.1.6. Description and chart of the academic and administrative organizational structure of the departments and its study program/s (including relevant committees and names of senior administration).
- 3.1.7. Location: the campus where the study program is taught (if the institution operates on a number of campuses). If the study program is offered on more than one campus, is the level of the program uniform on different campuses, and what measures are taken in order to ensure this?
- 3.1.8. Please provide in the format of **Table 7.1** (page 14) the structure of the study program its content, and scope (years of study, semesters, hours per year and credits) and the distribution of the studies throughout the academic year. Does the study program supply courses to other units?
- 3.1.9. Specify what bodies are responsible for the planning and managing of the study program. What are the mechanisms responsible for introducing changes and updating the study program, and how do they operate. If fundamental changes have been introduced into the study program during the last five years, please specify what they are.
- 3.1.10. Describe the mechanism for coordinating and examining the contents that are, in fact, being taught, if such a mechanism exists.
- 3.1.11. Are non-academic bodies involved in the running and the activities of the parent unit and study program? If so, what are these bodies and what is the mutual relationship between them and the leadership of the parent unit (for instance, the mutual relationship between the Business School and the Manufacturers' Association or Industrial Factories)?
- 3.1.12. To what extent does the department collaborate with other departments within/outside the institution?
- 3.1.13. What are the future development plans of the evaluated study program, and how were they decided upon?
- 3.1.14. In summary, to what extent has the program achieved its mission and goals? What are its strengths and weakness?

To this section, please attach the following information:

1. **The full study program in the format of Table 7.1 (that appears in chapter 7 of this document on page 14)**
2. **Copy of the diploma awarded upon completion of studies (including any appendices to the diploma, such as Diploma Supplement).**

3.2. Teaching and Learning Outcomes

3.2.1. Teaching

- 3.2.1.1 Does the Department have a structured system for evaluating teaching? If 'yes', please specify what the process includes. How are the results of the evaluation activities used, specifically, the negative findings about faculty members' teaching?
- 3.2.1.2 How does the unit foster excellence in teaching? How are excellent teachers rewarded?
- 3.2.1.3 Does the institution have a center for the enhancement of teaching? If not, does the institution/unit/department offer the teaching faculty systematic activity, such as courses/in-services/training/instruction and guidance programs in order to improve the quality of teaching?
- 3.2.1.4 Do new faculty members receive special support? Does the department have a mentoring program for new faculty? If 'yes' – please specify.
- 3.2.1.5 Please provide in the format of Table 7.3 (page 18) as an appendix to the report, the rankings of the courses as found in the results of the teaching surveys given by the program in the last 5 years (those of faculty members and those of adjuncts). Please divide the information by obligatory courses, electives, seminars, and labs/workshops. Please specify any other methods of evaluation.
- 3.2.1.6 Describe the use of information technology in teaching and learning: methods, scope, types of courses etc.

3.2.2. Learning Outcomes⁴

- 3.2.2.1 What are the program's intended Learning Outcomes (LO)? How were they set and where are they stated? Are LO defined in the course syllabi?
- 3.2.2.2 Describe the methods applied to measure Learning Outcomes according to the following:

A. Examinations and exercises

1. Describe the method of examinations and their character, the relative weight of each type of examination in the program (written/oral/open/multiple-choice etc.).
2. Who writes the examinations and exercises and how is their validity assessed?
3. Who grades the examinations and exercises? Please describe the feedback given to students, apart from the grade.
4. Please present the distribution of the final grades over the last three years in the format of a histogram (in all degree levels)

B. Written assignments (seminar papers, projects, theses, dissertations, etc.)

1. Describe the types of written assignments and other projects required in the program, their contents and scope.
2. Who writes the assignments and how is the validity of the assignments assessed?
3. Who grades the written assignments?
4. What methods are applied to evaluate written assignments and projects? What kind of feedback, apart from the grade, is given to the students?
5. What is the average grade given to the graduates of the program in the final project/ final seminar/thesis in each of the last three years? Please present (in the format of histogram) the grades distribution of the final project/final seminar/thesis.

C. Training and field work

1. Describe the training/field work required in the program, their contents and scope. Please provide us with a list of places of training including the number of students in each place.
2. What methods are applied to evaluate training/field work? What kind of feedback is given to the students?
3. Please specify the number and percentage of graduates who graduated with honors.

D. Other - any other methods applied to measure the achievements of the students.

- 3.2.3. **In summary**, to what extent have the methods applied to measure the teaching and learning outcomes achieved their goals? Do you think that the intended LO were achieved by the students?

Please attach in the form of Table 7.3 (page 18) the rankings of the courses as found in the results of the teaching surveys given by the program in the last 5 years to this section (faculty members as well as adjuncts). Please divide the information by mandatory courses, electives, seminars and labs/workshops.

To this section, please attach the following appendix on a CD: 5-10 examples of Thesis; 5-10 examples of Dissertations (and relevant publications); 5-10 examples of final projects.

⁴ Definition of learning outcomes (LO) established by the Bologna working group on qualifications: *“LO are what a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to do at the end of a period of learning.”*

3.3. Students

- 3.3.1 What are the entry requirements/criteria for the program (first degree and advanced degrees), including the "on probation" status.
- 3.3.2 In the format of a histogram, please present the range of psychometric test scores or the equivalent as well as the range of matriculation averages of the students that were admitted to the program in the last five years. If there is a discrepancy between the admission criteria and the de facto admission data please elaborate.
- 3.3.3 Please submit data concerning the number of students in a format of a table in the last five years (divided by degree) as follows: a. Numbers of applicants (הגישו מועמדות); b. number of admitted students (התקבלו) and students admitted on probation; c. number of students who started studying in the program (ההלך ללמוד בפועל); d. number of students that completed their studies, including those admitted "on probation".
- 3.3.4 Describe the selection and admission process, the criteria of advancement from year to year and for completion of the studies, including the requirements for being entitled to receive an academic degree. Is there a policy of affirmative action and standards for the admittance of candidates with special needs? In case such policy and standards have been established, please describe them. How are the admission criteria decided upon, and to what extent are the criteria and procedures for admission related to the aims of the program? What have been the lowest admission data (psychometric score and matriculation grades) for the program?
- 3.3.5 What is the drop-out rate of students from the program in each of the study years over the last five years, and what are the reasons for their leaving (academic/financial/other)? Is there satisfaction with the drop-out rate? If not, what steps does the unit take in order to change it?
- 3.3.6 To what extent are the program's students involved in research projects of the staff members? Specify in which projects, the number of students involved and the scope of their involvement. Is there a procedure for encouraging students to carry out independent research of their own?
- 3.3.7 Counselling systems:
- 3.3.7.1 Describe the system of academic counselling for students before and during the period of study (including reference to the structuring and approval of the study curriculum). Do students with special needs receive special support? If so, please specify.
- 3.3.7.2 Are counselling and assistance provided to students with regard to possible directions for their future professional careers? If so, describe these procedures. Are there work placement services for the graduates? If so, please describe this activity.
- 3.3.8 What are the mechanisms that deal with student complaints? Please provide a list of students' complaints over the last two years and the way they were resolved.
- 3.3.9 What financial assistance is provided to students with financial problems and to outstanding students? What other types of financial support is available to students?
- 3.3.10 Alumni: do the institution and/or the department maintain contact with their alumni, employers, and employment market? Please specify the extent of integration of alumni into the labour market (especially relevant when the study program is "professional"): where have they found employment, what positions do they hold, how much time has elapsed between graduation and employment, and how many students continue their studies to advanced degrees or other areas (specify area of study and degree level). Relevant surveys would be appreciated.
- 3.3.11 In summary, what are the strengths and weakness of the issues specified above?

3.4 **Human Resources**

3.4.1 **Teaching Staff**

- 3.4.1.1 Describe the profile of the program's teaching staff in the format of the tables 7.2A through 7.2D (pages 15-17).
- 3.4.1.2 How are the faculty members divided into areas of specialty in the discipline.
- 3.4.1.3 What specializations and skills (including experience and training) are required of the staff members teaching in the study program, including those who teach practical courses/practical training.
- 3.4.1.4 What steps are taken to ensure that staff members are updated, academically and professionally, with regard to the program?
- 3.4.1.5 What are the rules, criteria and procedures for appointing the head of the study program and the academic staff, including tenure and promotion, the standard duration of service at each position, renewal of appointment in elected positions and dismissals? What steps are taken to ensure that the faculty are informed of these policies and procedures? Are you satisfied with these procedures?
- 3.4.1.6 What is the definition of the position of the head of the study program? What credentials (experience and education) are required for this position?
- 3.4.1.7 How is full employment defined in the institution for senior and junior staff, and how many hours are they required to teach in each of the study programs?
- 3.4.1.8 Are staff members obliged to serve as advisors for final projects, theses and dissertations? Is there a limitation of a maximum number of graduate students per faculty? Are there criteria for assigning advisors to different research projects?
- 3.4.1.9 What is the policy regarding recruiting and absorbing teaching staff (senior as well as junior) and what are the plans for the **future** recruitment to the study program? How are these plans made and by whom?

3.4.2 **Technical and administrative staff**

Describe the technical and administrative staff, including the number of staff members and their job descriptions. What kind of support does the technical and administrative staff provide for the academic activity?

- 3.4.3 **In summary**, what are the points of strength and weakness of the human resources (teaching staff, technical and administrative staff)?

To this section, please attach the following information:

Tables 7.2A through 7.2D (in chapter 6 of this document, pages 15-17) detailing senior and junior teaching faculty employed, external senior and junior teaching staff, teaching and research assistants, post-doctoral staff members.

3.5 **Infrastructure**

- 3.5.1 Where the unit is physically located in the institution, in which building, and where does the study program under evaluation operate? Do other study programs share the building?
- 3.5.2 Please describe the overall physical infrastructure that serves the unit and the study program under evaluation. Please refer to classrooms, computerization, administrative and academic faculty offices; to what extent does this infrastructure enable the parent unit to operate the study program according to the set aims and goals?
- 3.5.3 **Laboratories**
What laboratories serve the program, who makes use of them, how are they equipped, and how many seats do they have?
- 3.5.4 **Library and Information Technology (IT)**
- 3.5.4.1 Describe the library including computerized databases, which serves the students and the teaching staff of the study program, its strengths and weaknesses.
- 3.5.4.2 **Accessibility**: Do the institution and the study program take steps to enable the convenient access of the students with special needs to the study material and the different facilities, e.g. classrooms, laboratories, library? If part of the programs takes place on different campuses, how is equal opportunity of access to the facilities and equipment at the main campus ensured for all students?
- 3.5.4.3 In summary, what are the points of strength and weakness of the physical infrastructure?

Diagrams of the building, a map of the institution and a list of special equipment and other relevant materials may be added to this section.

Chapter 4 - Research

Due to the difference in character and research efforts of the various programs under evaluation, each institution should handle this chapter in accordance with its **stated mission**.

- 4.1 What is the department's perception of research, and what are the expected outcomes?
 - 4.2 What are the department's special strengths and uniqueness in research?
 - 4.3 Please list the leading journals in the field (including ranking, if possible).
 - 4.4 What are the research funds (in \$) of the institution, faculty/school, evaluated unit/study program in each of the last five years according to the source of funding: competitive sources (government/non-government), non-competitive public funds, other non-competitive funds (non-government), internal funds, donations. ⁵ Please refer also to the research infrastructure: research laboratories, specialized equipment and budget for maintenance (level and sources of funding).
 - 4.5 Please list grants, honors, fellowships/scholarships, etc received by faculty (senior and junior). list of Chairs, research institutes, research centres and research facilities established in the last five years, including specialized laboratories.
 - 4.6 Please provide data on research students (master degree with thesis, doctoral degree): overall number (internal/external), sources of funding, level of funding, number of graduates (of the university, faculty/school, parent unit/study program) in each of the last five years.
 - 4.7 Please provide a list of publications in the last five years (only by the teaching staff of the evaluated study program) according to refereed journals, books (originals or editions), professional journals, conference proceedings, professional reports, prizes etc. Please include data on impact factor.
 - 4.8 Is there a commercialization unit in the institution? Briefly describe its function: number of patents registered and where have they been registered.
 - 4.9 Please list cooperation activities by department members both in Israel and abroad.
 - 4.10 Please list the major consulting activities done by faculty.
 - 4.11 What is the level of synergy between research strengths and teaching needs at the various degree levels?
 - 4.12 In summary, what are the points of strength and weakness of the research, and are you satisfied with the research outcomes of your department?
-

⁵ When converting currencies, please note the exchange rate used.

Chapter 5 - The Self-Evaluation Process, Summary and Conclusions

- 5.1. Please describe the way that the current **Self-Evaluation process** was conducted, including methods used by the parent unit and the department/study programs in its self-evaluation process, direct and indirect participants in the process etc. What are your conclusions regarding the process and its results?
- 5.2. Describe the consolidation process of the **Self-Evaluation Report**, including its preparation and final approval (including a description of the contributions of staff members to the process).
- 5.3. If a mechanism/structure has been decided upon for the future treatment of weaknesses that were highlighted by the self-evaluation activity, please specify it while referring to those within the institution who would be responsible to follow up on this activity. Please refer to the question: how do the institution and the parent unit intend to deal in the future with quality assessment and its implementation?
- 5.4. Is the full Self-Evaluation Report accessible? If 'yes' - to whom it is accessible and to what extent?

Chapter 6 - Implementation of previous QA recommendations

If the evaluated department/study programs have been reviewed in the past by a CHE evaluation committee, please describe the main changes that were made as a result of the recommendations, such as strategic planning, mission and goals, curriculum, faculty, student body etc.

Chapter 7

Appendices*

(* These appendices will appear in the body of the report)

7.2 - Teaching Staff – Tables no. 2A-2D
Academic Year of Evaluation* - (200...)

***The data must refer only to the academic year during which the quality assessment is taking place**

Table 2A
Senior Academic Staff Employed¹

Name of Staff Member			Employment Rank (Full/associate Prof; Senior Lecture; Lecture).	Part of Full time Position in the Institution ²		Part of Full Time Position in the Program		Additional Employment (outside the institution)			Area of Specialization	Courses taught by the staff member			Additional Tasks in Institution	No. of Grad Students supervised ³	
				Weekly Hours	Per Cent	Weekly Hours	Per Cent	Name of Employer	Part of Full Time Position			Name of Course	Weekly Hours	Total Weekly Hours for Staff member		Master students	Ph.D students
First	Family	Academic Degree															
												1.					
												2.					
												3.					
												1.					
												2.					
												3.					
												1.					
												2.					
												3.					
												1.					
												2.					
												3.					
												1.					
												2.					
												3.					

¹ Senior academic staff include (according to the PBC/VATAT definitions) the following 4 degrees: Lacturer; Senior Lecturer; Associate Professor; Full professor.

² In case the employment status in the instituion and in the program are identical, this data can appear only once (please specify that this data is identical).

³ These columns are relevant only if the program has a masters and doctoral degrees.

Table 2B
Junior Academic Staff Employed

Name of staff member			Employment Rank	Part of Full Time Position in the Institution ¹		Part of Full Time Position in the Program		Additional Employment (outside the institution)			Area of Specialization	Courses taught by the staff member			Additional Tasks in Institution
				Weekly Hours	Per Cent	Weekly Hours	Per Cent	Name of Employer	Part of Full Time Position			Name of Course	Weekly Hours	Total Weekly Hours for Staff member	
First	Family	Academic Degree							Weekly Hours	Per Cent					
												1.			
												2.			
												3.			
												1.			
												2.			
												3.			
												1.			
												2.			
												3.			
												1.			
												2.			
												3.			
												1.			
												2.			
												3.			

¹ In case the employment status in the instituion and in the program are identical, this data can appear only once (please specify that this data is identical)

Additional materials - (to be submitted on CD-ROM)

1 – The institution or academic unit yearbook and the registration guide **(in Hebrew)**.

2 – Relevant rules and regulations, e.g. code of study, code of discipline, ethical code, procedure for termination of studies, examination procedures and procedure of appeal, rules applying to tuition fees and financial assistance, code of appointments **(in Hebrew)**.

3 – Detailed syllabi, including the name of the lecturer, the requirements of each course, its subject and bibliography, how the course grade is composed and expected learning outcomes in each of the study programs under evaluation. Please note that only the syllabi of the courses that are taught in the academic year during which the quality assessment is taking place should appear in this section **(in English)**.

4 – Updated curricula vitae of staff members, including education, academic and other positions, research areas and list of publications **(in English)**.

5 – **Examples** of Master's theses, PhD dissertations (and relevant publications) and group projects. Please include 5-10 examples of each. **(in English/Hebrew)**.

6 - Any document that supports the information contained in the self-evaluation report, at the discretion of the institution **(in Hebrew/English)**.

הנחיות להצגת דו"ח ההערכה העצמית והחומרים הנוספים ע"ג CD

אנו מבקשים ליצור אחידות בתקליטורים על מנת להקל על חברי הוועדות לנווט בהם. נודה לכם אם תקפידו על ההוראות הבאות:

1. כללי

נבקש כי הפרטים הבאים יופיעו בשפה האנגלית:

- על גבי התקליטור – יש לציין את שם המוסד, שם המחלקה ואת התאריך.
- מסמך שיצורף לתקליטור, ויכלול:
 - פרטי המוסד, המחלקה ואיש הקשר.
 - תוכן עניינים לתקליטור, הכולל את שמות התיקיות ושמות הקבצים בכל תיקייה.
- (רצ"ב דוגמא לתוכן עניינים). נודה לכם אם תוכן עניינים זה יופיע בתוך התקליטור עצמו כקובץ נפרד.
- שמות התיקיות.
 שמות התיקיות ייבנו על פי הפורמט הבא: Institute__ folder name __dd__mm__yyyy
 לדוגמא: *HUJI_syllabi_28_12_2006*
 (ראה רשימת שמות מוסדות מקוצרת בהמשך).
- שמות הקבצים.
 שמות הקבצים צריכים לבטא את תוכנם. כך, קבצים בתיקיית קורות חיים יזוהו לפי שמות אנשי הסגל.
 שימו לב, כי תוכן הקובץ יכול להיות בעברית (לגבי חומרים עליהם לא חלה חובת הגשה באנגלית, כגון שנתונים ותקנונים), אך נבקש לתת שמות לקבצים באנגלית בלבד.

2. קבצים

- הקבצים יותאמו לקריאה באמצעות Acrobat Reader:
 - Word יוסב לפורמט pdf;
 - Excel יוסב בפורמט pdf;
 - קבצים מסוגים אחרים (למשל, בתוכנות PowerPoint, SPSS, Project, Visio או תוכנות יעודיות של המוסד), יוסבו לפורמט pdf, או לפורמט של תמונה (כגון jpeg).
- אנו מבקשים להמיר את הקבצים באמצעות Acrobat Writer לקבצים מסוג pdf, ולא לסרוק אותם.
בנוסף, נבקש שלא לכלול קבצים מסוג hidden.
- כדי להקל על פתיחת הקבצים, נבקש כי גודלו של כל קובץ לא יעלה על **20mb**, גם אם הדבר מצריך פיצולם של קבצים.
- נבקש כי כל פריט יובא בקובץ נפרד. למשל, בתיקיית סילבוסים, סילבוס של כל קורס יופיע כקובץ עצמאי.

רשימה 1 – קיצורים של שמות המוסדות**List 1 – Abbreviation of names of institutions**

HUJI	האוניברסיטה העברית
TAU	אוניברסיטת ת"א
BGU	אוניברסיטת בן גוריון
BIU	אוניברסיטת בר-אילן
HU	אוניברסיטת חיפה
OU	האוניברסיטה הפתוחה
TECH	הטכניון
WEIZ	מכון ויצמן למדע
COLM	המסלול האקדמי של המכללה למנהל
IDC	המרכז הבינתחומי הרצליה
NETA	המכללה האקדמית נתניה
HADA	המכללה האקדמית הדסה
ONO	הקריה האקדמית קרית אונו
SMC	שערי משפט
CLB	המרכז האקדמי למשפט ועסקים
JCE	המכללה האקדמית להנדסה בירושלים

רשימה 2 – דוגמא למבנה התיקיות והקבצים בתקליטור

List 2 – A sample of the structure of the files on the CD

Institute _ Evaluation Report _dd _mm _yyyy

Evaluation Report.pdf

Institute _ YearBook&RegistGuide _dd _mm _yyyy

Yearbook2006/7_Heb.pdf

Registration Guide_Heb.pdf

Institute Name _ Rules and procedures _dd _mm _yyyy

Study Code_Heb.pdf

Disciplinary Code_Heb.pdf

Promotions Code_Heb.pdf

Tuition Fees_Heb

Studies Termination_Heb

Ethical Code_Heb

Institute _ Syllabi _dd _mm _yyyy

The folder should contain detailed syllabi in English: Each course in separate file. The name of the file should be similar to the name of the course.

Examples:

Introduction to Behavioral studies.pdf

Mechanics of Materials.pdf

Institute _ CV _dd _mm _yyyy

The folder should contain updated CVs of the staff members in English: Each CV in separate file. The name of the file should be similar to the name of the staff member.

Examples:

Avraham Levi.pdf

David Cohen.pdf

Institute _ Extras _dd _mm _yyyy

This folder should contain any document that supports the information contained in the self-evaluation report, at the discretion of the institution.
