



**Committee for the Evaluation of Psychology and Behavioral  
Sciences Studies**

**The Academic College of Judea and Samaria  
In Ariel**

**The Department of Behavioral Sciences  
Evaluation Report**

**October 2009**

**Contents**

**Chapter 1:**

Background.....3

**Chapter 2:**

Committee Procedures.....5

**Chapter 3:**

Evaluation of the Department of Behavioral Sciences at the College of  
Judea and Samaria.....6

**Appendices:**       Appendix 1- The Committee's letter of appointment  
                          Appendix 2- Schedule of the site visit

## **Chapter 1- Background**

At its meeting on October 31, 2006 the Council for Higher Education (CHE) decided to evaluate study programs in the field of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences during the academic year 2006-2007.

Following the decision of the CHE, the Minister of Education, who serves ex officio as the Chair of the CHE, appointed a committee for the evaluation of the academic quality of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences studies on April 29, 2008. On October 7 the committee was expanded and it currently comprises the following members<sup>1</sup>:

- **Prof. Susan Andersen, Department of Psychology, New York University, U.S.A- Committee Chair**
- **Prof. Victor Azarya, The Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Hebrew University (emeritus), Israel**
- **Prof. Yinon Cohen, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, U.S.A and Departments of Sociology & Anthropology and Labor Studies, Tel Aviv University, Israel**
- **Prof. Susan Goldin-Meadow, Department of Psychology, University of Chicago, U.S.A**
- **Prof. Avishai Henik, Department of Psychology, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel**
- **Prof. Morris Moscovitch, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Canada**
- **Prof. Steven J. Sherman, Department of Psychology, Indiana University, U.S.A**
- **Prof. Varda Shoham, Department of Psychology, University of Arizona, U.S.A**
- **Prof. Seymour Spilerman, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, U.S.A**
- **Prof. Sidney Strauss - Chief Scientist at the Israeli Ministry of Education (previously- Department of Psychology, Tel Aviv University), Israel**

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to the fact that there were 12 departments undergoing evaluation, committee members divided the visits amongst themselves.

- **Prof. Barbara Tversky, Department of Psychology, Stanford University, U.S.A**

**Ms. Alisa Elon- Coordinator of the Committee on behalf of the CHE.**

Within the framework of its activity, the Committee was requested to submit the following documents to the CHE:

1. A final report for each of the institutions which would include an evaluation of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences study programs, as well as the Committee's findings and recommendations.
2.
  - 2.1 A general report regarding the status of the evaluated field of study in Israeli institutions of higher education.
  - 2.2 Recommendations for standards in the evaluated field of study.

The Committee's letter of appointment is attached as **Appendix 1**.

The first stage of the quality assessment process consisted of self-evaluation, including the preparation of a self-evaluation report by the institutions under evaluation. This process was conducted in accordance with the CHE's guidelines as specified in the document entitled "The Self-Evaluation Process: Recommendations and Guidelines" (December 2006).

## **Chapter 2-Committee Procedures**

During May – June 2008 Committee members conducted a full-day visit to five of the twelve institutions whose Psychology and Behavioral Science study programs the committee was requested to examine. The committee visited the remaining seven institutions during December 2008.

During these meetings, the Committee met with the relevant officials at each institution, as well as with faculty members, students and alumni, and also conducted a tour of the campus.

***This report deals with the Department of Behavioral Sciences at the College of Judea and Samaria (CJS).***

The Committee's visit to the college took place on December 29, 2008.

The following members of the committee participated in the visit to the College of Judea and Samaria:

- **Prof. Barbara Tversky – Chair of visit**
- **Prof. Victor Azarya**
- **Prof. Avishai Henik**
- **Prof. Steven J. Sherman**

The schedule of the visit, including the list of participants representing the institution, is attached as **Appendix 2**.

The members of the committee thank the management of the institution and the department for the self-evaluation report and for their hospitality towards the Committee during its visit.

## **Chapter 3- Evaluation of the Department of Behavioral Sciences at the College of Judea and Samaria**

### **Background**

The College of Judea and Samaria in Ariel was established in 1982 as an extension of Bar-Ilan University.

In 1996, the CHE accredited the college, giving it the authority to award academic degrees as an autonomous institution.

The institution's self-evaluation report states that in the academic year 2006-7 the total number of students at the College of Judea and Samaria was 7,107.

The College's Department of Behavioral Sciences operates as part of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities.

The Department of Behavioral Sciences was established in 1994 and the BA in Behavioral Sciences was accredited by the CHE in 1998<sup>2</sup>.

According to the institution's self-evaluation report, 724 students were studying for a BA degree in the Behavioral Sciences program during the academic year 2006-7.

### **1. Mission and Goals**

According to the self-evaluation report, CJS aims to provide academic education in applied disciplines, to provide a second chance to students whose high school records are weak and to disadvantaged groups, and to conduct high quality applied research. In addition, according to the Dean, "this institution had from first day an objective to become a university." As a consequence, there is stress on research and on building graduate programs, at least in part, they said, to "look more like a university." These aspirations run counter to the mandate for colleges with the CHE and to some extent, compromise the undergraduate program by stretching faculty responsibilities too thin.

According to the President, "this department is very important to us," among the top 6 of the 20 departments in the College. The Dean regards the Department of Behavioral Sciences as the strongest in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities. The administration said that early on, decision-making was centralized and top-down, with the goal of gradually transferring decision-making to the departments, a more democratic, participatory approach. In the eyes of the Dean, the Behavioral Sciences program has enough senior faculty to take responsibility for itself.

---

<sup>2</sup> The committee only evaluated the BA degree in Behavioral Sciences because this was the only degree which had full accreditation at the time of the evaluation.

Consistent with these goals, the Department of Behavioral Science, a part of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, aims to train students to enter the work force and to enter graduate programs in the behavioral sciences. The department has a qualified faculty whose members teach a solid range of courses in psychology with some sociology and anthropology; they also provide desired training in methods and research. Although the department's evaluation of recent graduates indicates that the department has generally been successful in achieving these goals, there are no hard data on evaluations by or outcomes of graduates. According to the alumni and students who met with the committee, only a very small minority of those interested in graduate studies in psychology achieve the minimum score on the mit'am (graduate psychology entrance exam) that would allow acceptance. Others continue to graduate programs in related helping professions such as special education.

The self-evaluation report lists a number of weaknesses in the program: 1. the heavy teaching load of the faculty; 2. the lack of funding for faculty research; 3. the age distribution of faculty. The first two concerns are general to colleges, and, in fact, research funding seems relatively better at CJS. The age distribution of faculty is of concern for the future success of the department. Current faculty consists primarily of many faculty retired from Israeli universities and young, recent PhD's. It will be necessary to achieve a more even distribution of faculty levels in the coming years. Replacing aging faculty provides CJS with an opportunity as the pool of young talent in Israel is excellent, and CJS should aim for the best. It will also be necessary to groom younger faculty to assume leadership positions in the department.

The diversity of the student population in age, preparation, socio-economic status, etc. presents both a strength and a challenge. It is difficult to teach courses effectively with such heterogeneous classes, especially given that class size is larger than ideal. The department is struggling to find the right balance between the goals of preparing students for graduate training and educating students who lack good high school preparation.

In addition to the evaluated program, members of the department are involved in other programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, including dual major programs in Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology. At the graduate level, the department now includes MA's in Rehabilitation Psychology and Organizational-Social-Vocational Psychology. The committee is concerned that these programs stretch the resources of the department too thin. To add to the concern, more programs are in the planning.

## **2. Program of Study**

The undergraduate program in Behavioral Sciences is based on psychology (52 units) with some sociology and anthropology (20 units each) and no economics.

Within Psychology, students take an additional 20 units in one of four tracks that are considered specialization fields, namely Organizational Psychology, Educational Psychology, Criminology, and Experimental Psychology/Mind Sciences. It is notable that most of the specialization fields are applications of the behavioral sciences. In addition, students take 8 units of empirical research, 12 units of Jewish Heritage (a college-wide requirement), and 16 units of elective courses in Psychology and Sociology, a grand total of 128 units. The backgrounds of the faculty are adequate to teach the required courses. In principle, the topics of the courses in Psychology give adequate coverage of the field. According to the syllabi, they are appropriately based on current central textbooks, mostly in English. An exception that needs attention is the courses in Psychopathology; these must be thoroughly revised in order to be based on current practice that is, scientifically informed theories, diagnoses, and treatments.

Research methods and statistics are given in the first two years of the program as part of an 'integrative course' that is, according to one faculty member, "an unusual way of teaching these subjects," differing from the usual curriculum where statistics is taught first to provide the foundation for later courses in research methods. Although this is an interesting approach, exactly how it is done was not clear either from the course syllabus or from discussions with faculty. The undergraduate curriculum must provide students with some hands-on research experience, including designing and implementing research as well as analyzing data. A complete understanding of the theories and facts of the behavioral sciences depends on knowing how research questions are developed and tested.

The new specialization in Experimental Psychology-Mind Sciences is impressive in terms of the depth and range of courses that are offered. The latter stood out also in our discussion with the students. Student praise for this program is all the more impressive as the program is challenging. In contrast, the specialization in Educational Psychology, according to the students, seems to be much weaker.

Despite the basic curriculum in psychology, the students complained that in the first two years of their studies, the reading material was in many cases in Hebrew and was not comparable to the material required at other institutions, which is mostly in English. It was our impression that they felt that their abilities were not as respected or challenged as much as they should be. The students noted that they are not adequately prepared for the mit'am, the examination in psychology required for entrance to MA programs in psychology. Although the mit'am may have its limitations, it is accepted by all universities as a measure of knowledge in psychology and employed as one of the criteria for acceptance to the various MA programs. One student said, and the others concurred, that only one student out of the 20 who took the exam achieved a high enough score to enter graduate school; this is probably an overestimate as many students did not feel prepared enough to take the exam. Students noted that in addition to deeper course

content, they need better preparation in English and in statistics and methodology to meet requirements for graduate programs in psychology. It was not clear that the faculty is aware of these problems.

According to the faculty, some courses include current journal articles in English. It is especially important to maintain and even enrich the analysis of articles in English because proficiency in professional English, including analysis of theory and empirical research, is a weakness noted both by faculty and by students. Because English is the world-wide language of Behavioral Sciences, proficiency in English is needed for professional life and for graduate studies. Teaching these skills in content courses is to be preferred to teaching them in a dedicated course as the content, theory, concepts, and vocabulary of articles are meaningful only in a larger context. However, if incoming students are weak in basic skills in English, the college might consider requiring strength in English for admission.

Through the courses in statistics and empirical research students learn basic statistical methods and participate in all aspects of research, from devising hypotheses and experiments to analyzing and interpreting data. This hands-on exposure to research is essential to undergraduate education in behavioral science to allow students to learn what kinds of research questions can be investigated and how, as well as how data impact hypotheses and theories. Some students participate in faculty research, which is also desirable.

The required courses in Sociology and Anthropology include basic introductions to both and courses in Israeli Society. The committee recommends that the two currently mandatory courses in Family in an Age of Change and Religion and Society be included in a cluster of required courses, from which students would select two (2 units each). The cluster should also include courses in such core topics as Stratification, Ethnicity, Organizations and Communities, Political Sociology that are not currently offered and hence need to be developed. All these courses should also be included in the list of electives along with the courses in Leisure Culture in Israeli Society and The Israeli Educational System: Sociological Aspects.

The program in Behavioral Sciences is not truly interdisciplinary in that there are few if any courses that attempt to integrate the different perspectives each discipline provides.

The leadership of the department indicated that they would like to offer a double major instead of a single major in Behavioral Sciences, that is, they would like to offer a BA in psychology. Although there may be enough strength in psychology to support a single major in psychology, the committee sees a number of difficulties with such a move. The department does not have sufficient strength in sociology for a single major. Depending on service courses received from the separate multi-disciplinary studies department is not feasible because that

department has a very large number of students of its own and hence no teaching manpower to spare. In addition, diverting faculty resources to a psychology BA would weaken the Behavioral Sciences major and threaten its integrity. One advantage of a major in psychology, typical of universities, is that it allows students to complement their studies in psychology with a range of other disciplines, such as linguistics, computer science, philosophy, biology, and statistics. However, such opportunities are quite limited in colleges since they do not usually offer the full range of academic majors.

### **3. Faculty and Teaching**

The academic senior staff consists of 26 faculty: some devote full time to the department and others have joint appointments in other departments (e.g., Industrial Engineering or Multidisciplinary Studies). Some are at the early stages of their academic careers and others are faculty retired from other institutions. Research (e.g., publications, grant support) varies among the faculty. Some are very involved in research and others not. Much of faculty research is in various applied areas of psychology such as clinical, organizational, rehabilitation, or applied cognitive psychology. This raises some concern about adequate coverage of the basic core disciplines in the behavioral sciences from which the applied fields draw. In addition there are sociologists, anthropologists and criminologists. The teaching load here, and at colleges in general, is heavy, 12 hours a week, leaving little time for research.

Faculty morale seems high. In general, faculty members seem satisfied with their work at CJS, and with their support from the administration. They feel that they are part of an important venture and that they contribute to educating the students and to the development of the institution. However, they do not appear to be well-informed about what is expected of them for promotion. Adjunct faculty with whom we met felt that they get the required support from other faculty in the department and from the institution. But most (if not all) preferred to be eventually hired by the department as regular faculty members and did not seem to know what is expected of them and what are the chances that this might occur. More clarity and transparency is needed regarding faculty appointment and promotion at all levels.

### **4. Students and Learning**

The BA program in Behavioral Sciences admits approximately 85% of those who apply, and approximately 73% of those admitted enroll in the program. Acceptance is based on a weighted average of the psychometric and matriculation scores. According to the chair of the department they are accepted if their matriculation average is 93 or if their psychometric score is 550. Students with lower achievements (roughly 10% lower than the scores above) may be accepted by a special admission committee.

On the whole, the undergraduates seemed happy to be studying at this college. They reported that the relations among them are supportive, both academically and socially. In general, they felt they are well treated and their education is good. Their reasons for coming to the college seemed to be based on proximity and word of mouth. However, when asked, they openly expressed concerns. The most serious is the level of learning. They were not sure that the level of studies and, in particular, the reading requirements of courses in the first two years of studies were comparable to those in other institutions. As noted earlier, several students said that their cohort did not do as well as expected on the mit'am examination for entry to graduate school. Many thought that reading material should be in English and should challenge their abilities. They pointed to deficiencies in wireless access on campus and to the library, with details below under infrastructure.

## **5. Research**

Research is relatively well-developed at CJS, an impressive feature of the College. Many faculty have research funds; these come from a variety of sources, national, international, and the College. The topics of the research include psychobiological bases of behavior, perception, cognition, health psychology, developmental disorders, and various sociological and educational issues. Faculty CVs show that they publish their research, some in salient journals with high citation indices but many in Hebrew journals or in specialized journals. The College publishes a journal, albeit in Hebrew, Sugiot Hevratot BeYisrael (in English: Social Issues in Israel). The quantity of research is impressive given the heavy teaching requirements, though the administration mentioned that faculty with ongoing research are given teaching relief. Regular faculty members do not have built-in sabbatical rights, similar to colleges and unlike universities. Their tenure system, though, is similar to those of research universities: those who are not offered tenure within a certain period of time (7 years) have to leave the institution. The impressive amount of research, despite difficult objective conditions, is explained in large part by the fact that many faculty members had well-established research programs before joining CJS, and continue collaborations with researchers and graduate students at other universities. This is a model that can serve to augment research in colleges.

Many research projects involve students, giving them valuable experience in participating in creating knowledge in the field. The College supplies researchers with laboratory space though equipment typically comes from grants. The faculty told us that if they apply for external funds and get a good rating but no funds, the College provides funds.

## **6. Infrastructure**

Department facilities are spread across several buildings quite far from each other on a hilly campus, not ideal. A new building that would increase space and consolidate facilities is in the planning, and a new, much larger library is expected to be completed in two years. Given that, classroom space seems adequate and classrooms are equipped with visual aids. Full-time faculty members have their own offices and part-time faculty share, not a problem, as they are on campus only part-time. The research laboratories are located in other buildings and seem adequate to the needs of the faculty.

There are computer facilities on the other side of campus and in the library. However, students felt that there were not enough computers available to them. They also noted that the wireless connections often have problems and that the lack of availability of printers was a big problem. Although the current library has working space, computers, and many text volumes, the facility did not seem adequate, especially to the needs of the students on campus. The students with whom the committee met described the library as noisy and lacking a sufficient number of computers. There were few hard copies of psychology journals but no journals in sociology appeared in their Leading Journals Index mentioned in their self-evaluation report, a serious problem. Although the library had an impressive set of databases to which it subscribed, including PSYCINFO, ProQuest, and Web of Science, students complained that they could only access the abstracts of journal articles and not the full text. However, the faculty assured us that, from the library (but not from home), the full texts of articles could be easily accessed. In general, the faculty felt that the library facilities were quite good for students, but students did not share this view. It would help greatly if students had access to library resources at other colleges and universities throughout Israel.

## **7. Recommendations and Suggestions**

Overall, the college impressed us as a happy place. The faculty seemed proud of and committed to their location and mission. The students, too, were happy with their studies at CJS, in spite of certain reservations. Some of this is undoubtedly due to the support and regard the department receives from the administration. The committee appreciates the department's mission and offers the recommendations below to enhance the quality of the department and the undergraduate education it provides. Points are ordered largely by their priority, although some of issues are of equal importance and urgency (e.g., should be begun or even completed in the first year). On balance, we suggest a 12 to 24 month window for completing the recommended improvements, in some cases with a follow up at 36 months. The committee's rationale for the recommendations and suggestions is above.

## **1. Undergraduate Program**

A. The courses in psychopathology must be updated to current standards, that is, they must be based on evidence-based theories, diagnoses, and treatments. A committee to revise these courses should be established in the first year, with new syllabi and readings instituted the second year.

B. The program in Educational Psychology needs to be enriched and updated (or disbanded). The core of a program in educational psychology within a behavioral sciences department should include rigorous advanced work in such topics as learning and memory, problem solving, thinking, transfer, cognitive development, social factors in learning, and learning disabilities and their brain and behavioral bases. A committee should be established within a year to enrich and update the program. The changes in courses and requirements should be instituted within two years after that.

C. Skills in reading and analyzing literature in English need to be augmented. Proficiency in English is needed for professional life and for graduate studies. The curriculum committee should insure that current textbooks in English are adopted in many if not most of the basic required courses and that readings in English are incorporated into most advanced courses.

D. The pool of mandatory courses in Sociology and Anthropology needs to be enlarged from the current courses, Family in an Age of Change and Religion and Society, to include courses in such core topics as Stratification, Ethnicity, Organizations and Communities, Political Sociology that are not currently offered and hence need to be developed. Students would select two from that pool. These courses should also be included in the list of elective courses along with the current courses in Leisure Culture in Israeli Society and The Israeli Educational System: Sociological Aspects. The new courses should be developed within a year, and the change in requirements instituted as soon as the courses can be offered.

E. The courses in statistics and research methods need to be reexamined to make sure that they are comparable to similar training in the universities. In addition, the department should insure that every student has hands-on experience with research. A committee should examine these issues, preferably with input from recent graduates of the program, and develop an augmented program within a year. The new program should be ready the second year.

F. At least one course integrating the various views in behavioral sciences should be added to the curriculum. The planning of the course should be done within a year and a course added in the second year.

G. The department as a whole should carefully consider raising the levels of the courses to better prepare students for employment and graduate training and to make them more competitive for graduate school. Concurrently, the department should consider raising its entrance requirements.

H. Related to the previous point, the department should consider instituting an honors program for especially promising students interested in research and graduate school, with special seminars and research experience. This would

help to challenge the best students who are kept back by the college's mission to train students who are less well prepared for college.

I. The faculty seemed unaware of certain problems the students pointed to, for example, need for challenge in courses, need for better training in English and in statistics, library and computer facilities. Specifically, the faculty seemed to think that these were not problems, but the students thought otherwise. The committee recommends that the faculty regularly survey the students regarding these general educational issues to inform them so they can make the necessary changes. The survey should be prepared within a year and administered the second year.

## **2. Infrastructure**

A. Library. Efforts should be made to insure that students have access to the journals and other publications they need, both hard copies, and where available, especially e-copies. There are no sociology journals in the library, a serious deficiency. The College should consider a consortium with other colleges and/or universities to defray costs, as well as arrangements with nearby universities for student access to library materials. Discussions of these issues by a committee or the department as a whole should begin within a year. Better access to journals should be accomplished within a year.

B. The students reported a lack of computers and printers and insufficient wireless connections. Discussions of these issues should take place within a year and improvements instituted the second year.

## **3. Faculty**

A. Many senior members of the faculty will soon retire, leaving a gap in leadership. These retirements provide an opportunity to develop a vision for the department and hire new faculty in emerging areas such as brain sciences and evidence-based clinical practice, as well as areas central to behavioral sciences but in need of augmentation in the department, such as basic cognitive, social, and developmental psychology. At the same time, the department may wish to phase out (or restructure) its weaker programs, such as educational psychology. The committee understands that the department wishes to focus on applications of behavioral science; however, expertise in the core is necessary for apt applications. A committee should be established in the first year to develop a vision for the department that will represent emerging directions in the field, prepare for imminent retirements, and plan for future hiring.

B. New Programs. As noted, the department has plans to open MA programs as well as new BA programs. Although the committee is supposed to evaluate only existing programs, it would like to stress that in order to open new programs, the department will need more faculty members who are appropriate to the tasks.

In addition, the committee believes that the department should carefully consider the implications of creating a BA program in Psychology on the

Behavioral Sciences Program. Such a program is likely to draw many students from the BSD as well as stretching the resources of the faculty.

**4. Alumni Survey.** The committee recommends that the department conduct a survey of alumni. The survey can ask former students about their further education, their employment, how they found their jobs, how their BA education contributed to their further education and their jobs, strengths and weaknesses of the BA program, and more. This will be useful for planning purposes and for keeping the department up to date with needed improvements and changes.

a. The committee recommends that the department develop a strategic plan for the alumni survey in the second year and implement the plan in the third year.

**5. Alumni Association.** The committee also suggests that the department establish ongoing contacts with alumni to build an alumni culture, which can be valuable to the institution and to the department. If the department were to establish a newsletter for alumni and to organize communities of graduates, perhaps by current employment or geographic region, this would keep students involved with the college. Alumni groups often offer financial support to their alma maters as well, and support them in other ways too, making it in the college's best interest to have ongoing alumni contacts that can foster this.

**Signed By:**

*Barbara Tversky*

---

**Prof. Barbara Tversky  
Chair of visit**

*Victor Azarya*

---

**Prof. Victor Azarya**

*Avishai Henik*

---

**Prof. Avishai Henik**

*Steven J. Sherman*

---

**Prof. Steven J. sherman**

# APPENDIX 1



18/11/2008  
14612824

**Professor Susan M. Andersen**  
**Professor of Psychology**  
**Director, Doctoral Program in Social Psychology**  
**Department of Psychology**  
**New York University**  
**USA**

Dear Professor Andersen,

The State of Israel undertook an ambitious project when the Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE) established a quality assessment and assurance system for Israeli higher education. Its stated goals are: to enhance and ensure the quality of academic studies; to provide the public with information regarding the quality of study programs in institutions of higher education throughout Israel; and to ensure the continued integration of the Israeli system of higher education in the international academic arena. Involvement of world-renowned academicians in this process is essential, particularly as our nation reaches maturity in its 60<sup>th</sup> year.

This most important initiative reaches out to scientists in the international arena in a national effort to meet the critical challenges that confront the Israeli higher educational system today. The formulation of international evaluation committees represents an opportunity to express our common sense of concern and to assess the current and future status of education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. It also establishes a structure for an ongoing consultative process among scientists around the globe on common academic dilemmas and prospects.

I therefore deeply appreciate your willingness to join us in this crucial endeavor. It is with great pleasure that I hereby appoint you to serve as the Chair of the Council for Higher Education's Committee for the Evaluation of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Studies.

The composition of the Committee will be as follows: Prof. Susan Andersen - Chair, Prof. Victor Azarya, Prof. Yinon Cohen, Prof. Susan Goldin-Meadow, Prof. Avishai Henik, Prof. Morris Moscovitch, Prof. Steven J. Sherman, Prof. Varda Shoham, Prof. Seymour Spilerman, Prof. Sidney Strauss and Prof. Barbara Tversky.

Ms. Alisa Elon will coordinate the Committee's activities.



In your capacity as a member of the Evaluation Committee, you will be requested to function in accordance with the enclosed appendix.

I wish you much success in your role as a member of this most important committee.

Sincerely,

**Professor YuK-Tamir**  
**Minister of Education**

**and Chairperson of the Council for Higher Education**

*Enclosures:* Appendix to the Appointment Letter of Evaluation Committees

cc: Ms. Riki Mendelzvaig, Secretary of the Council for Higher Education  
Ms. Michal Neumann, Head of the Quality Assessment Unit  
Ms. Alisa Elon, Committee Coordinator

## **Appendix to the Letter of Appointment for Evaluation Committees (Study Programs)**

### **1. General**

On June 3, 2003 the Council for Higher Education (CHE) decided to establish a system for quality assessment and assurance in Israeli higher education. Within this framework, study-programs are to be evaluated every six years and institutions every eight years. The quality assessment system came into effect in the academic year of 2004-2005.

The main objectives of the quality assessment activity are:

- To enhance the quality of higher education in Israel;
- To create an awareness within institutions of higher education in Israel of the importance of quality evaluation and to develop internal self-evaluation mechanisms on a regular basis;
- To provide the public with information regarding the quality of study programs in institutions of higher education throughout Israel;
- To ensure the continued integration of the Israeli system of higher education in the international academic arena.

**It is not the CHE's intention to rank the institutions of higher education according to the results of the quality assessment processes. The evaluation committee should refrain from formal comparisons.**

### **2. The Work of the Evaluation Committee**

- 2.1 The committee shall hold meetings, as needed, before visiting the institution, in order to evaluate the material received.
- 2.2 The committee shall visit the institution and the academic unit being evaluated – if possible - within 3-4 months of receiving the self-evaluation report. The purpose of the visit is to verify and update the information submitted in the self-evaluation report, clarify matters where necessary, inspect the educational environment and facilities first hand, etc. During the visit, the committee will meet with the heads of the institution, faculty members, students, the administrative staff, and any other persons it considers necessary.
- 2.3 In a meeting at the beginning of the visit, the committee will meet with the heads of the institution (president/rector, dean), the heads of the academic unit and the study-programs, in order to explain the purpose of the visit. At the end

of the visit, the committee will summarize its findings, and formulate its recommendations.

- 2.4 The duration of the visits (at least one full day) will be coordinated with the chairperson of the committee.
- 2.5 Following the visit, the committee will write its final report, including its recommendations, which will be delivered to the institution and the academic unit for their response.
- 2.6 In the event that a member of the committee is also a faculty member in an institution being evaluated, he will not take part in discussions regarding that institution.

### **3. The Individual Reports**

- 3.1 The final reports of the evaluation committee shall address every institution separately.
- 3.2 The final reports shall include recommendations on topics listed in the guidelines for self-evaluation, such as:
  - The goals and aims of the evaluated academic unit and study programs.
  - The study program.
  - The academic staff.
  - The students.
  - The organizational structure.
  - The broader organizational structure (school/faculty) in which the academic unit and study program operate.
  - The infrastructure (both physical and administrative) available to the study program.
  - Internal mechanisms for quality assessment.
  - Other topics to be decided upon by the evaluation committee.

### **4. The structure of the reports**

#### ***4.1 Part A – General background and an executive summary:***

- 4.1.1 General background concerning the evaluation process, the names of the members of the committee, a general description of the institution and the academic unit being assessed, and the committee's work.
- 4.1.2 An executive summary that will include a description of the strengths and weaknesses of the academic unit and program being evaluated.

#### ***4.2 Part B – In-depth description of subjects examined:***

- 4.2.1 This part will be composed according to the topics examined by the evaluation committee, and based on the self-evaluation report submitted by the institution.
- 4.2.2 For each topic examined the report will present a summary of the findings, the relevant information and analysis.

#### ***4.3 Part C – Recommendations:***

- 4.3.1 Comprehensive conclusions and recommendations regarding the evaluated academic unit and the study program according to the topics in part B.
- 4.3.2 Recommendations may be classified according to the following categories:
  - ***Congratulatory remarks and minimal changes recommended, if any.***

- ***Desirable changes recommended*** at the institution's convenience and follow-up in the next cycle of evaluations.
- ***Important/needed changes requested for ensuring appropriate academic quality*** within a reasonable time, in coordination with the institution (1-3 years)
- ***Essential and urgent changes required, on which continued authorization will be contingent*** (immediately or up to one year).
- ***A combination of any of the above.***

#### **4.4 Part D - Appendices:**

The appendices shall contain the committee's letter of appointment and the schedule of the on-site visit.

### **5. The General report**

In addition to the individual reports concerning each study program, the committee shall submit to the CHE the following documents:

- 5.1 A general report regarding the status of the evaluated field of study within the Israeli institutions of higher education.
- 5.2 Recommendations for standards in the evaluated field of study.

**We urge the committee to clearly list its specific recommendations for each one of the topics (both in the individual reports and in the general report) and to prioritize these recommendations, in order to ease the eventual monitoring of their implementation.**

\*\*\*\*\*

# APPENDIX 2

## Suggestion for site-visit schedule

4

**All meeting will be held in building 3 a-, second floor.**

**29/12/08**

| Time        | Subject   | Participants  |
|-------------|---|---|
| 09:00-9:30  | Opening session:<br>The heads of the institution              | <b>President:</b> Prof. Dan Meyerstein<br><b>Deputy President (Rector):</b> Prof. Michael Zinigrad<br><b>Vice President and Dean of Research &amp; Development:</b> Prof. David Wolf<br><b>Head, Quality Assessment System:</b> Dr. Nitza Davidovitch   |
| 09:30-10:00 | Meeting with academic leadership of Faculty                   | <b>Dean, Faculty of the Social Sciences and Humanities:</b> Prof. Israel Nebenzahl<br><b>Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Head of program :</b> Prof. Noah Milgram  |
| 10:00-10:45 | Meeting with the School's/department's academic leadership    | <b>Department Head:</b> Prof. Eitan Elaad<br><br><b>B.A studies:</b><br><b>Sociology &amp; Anthropology:</b> Prof. Dan Soen<br><b>Organizational Minor:</b> Dr. Lior Oren, Dr. Aryeh Lazar<br><b>Educational Minor:</b> Prof. Roberta Milgram<br><b>Criminology Minor:</b> Prof. Sarah Ben-David<br><b>Experimental Psychology-Brain Sciences Minor:</b> Prof. Ester Fride.<br><br><b>M.A. studies:</b><br><b>Coordinator, Organizational Psychology:</b> Dr Hagassah Litman-Ovadiah, Dr. Aryeh Lazar<br><b>Coordinator, Rehabilitation Psychology:</b> Dr. Dana Margalit |
| 10:45-11:15 | Meeting with <b>professors.</b>                               | Prof. Eitan Elaad , Prof. Dan Soen, Prof. Sarah Ben David, Prof. Roberta Milgram, Prof. Ester Fride   |
| 11:15-12:00 | <b>full time senior faculty and committee representatives</b> | <b>Heads, B.A. Admissions Committee:</b> Dr. Izack Kandel, (head), Dr. Abira Reizer, Dr. Diana Cohenca , Dr. Aryeh Lazar, Dr. Hadassah Litman-Ovadiah.<br><b>Curriculum/teaching Committee :</b> Dr. Elian Zomerfeld, (head), Dr. Shmuel Shaki, , Dr. Ariela Gigi, Dr. Lior Oren, Dr. Shiri Schonbach-Medina<br>Dr. Roni Mesh, Dr. Moshe Levy ,Dr. Michael Wagner ,Dr. Miriam Billig, , Dr. Shimon Kahan, Dr. Talia Shay.   |
| 12:00-12:30 | Meeting with The Adjunct Faculty                              | Dr. Tatiana Bergman, Dr. Guy Or, Dr. Shiri Lavi , Ms. Daniela Karni, Ms. Ayelet Plus Ms. Rivka Lifshitz   |
| 13:00-13:30 | Closed lunch of Visiting                                      | Committee Members   |
| 13:30-14:15 | Meeting with undergraduate students                           | Rotem Cavia, Natali Riskin, Leah Levkovitz, Evelyn Baruch, Ruthi Tasfay, Daniella Nusan, Hiba Jabara.   |
| 14:15-15:00 | Meeting with graduate students                                | Shvut Kola, Michal Miller, Avinoach Bar-Levi, Naomi Levy, Meital Raviv  |
| 15:00-15:45 | Tour at the institution                                       | laboratories, library, faculty facilities   |
| 15:45-16:15 | Closed meeting of the Committee                               |   |
| 16:15-16:45 | meeting with heads of the institution                         | <b>President:</b> Prof. Dan Meyerstein<br><b>Deputy President (Rector):</b> Prof. Michael Zinigrad<br><b>Vice President and Dean for R&amp;D:</b> Prof. David Wolf<br><b>Dean, Faculty of the Social Sciences and Humanities:</b> Prof. Israel Nebenzahl<br><b>Dean, School of Graduate Studies:</b> Prof. Noah Milgram<br><b>Department Head:</b> Prof. Eitan Elaad<br><b>Head, Quality Assessment System:</b> Dr. Nitza Davidovitch<br><b>General Administration CEO:</b> Mr. Yoram Shay  |