



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

**Ruppin Academic Center**  
**The Department of Behavioral Sciences**  
**Evaluation Report**

**August 2009**

**Contents**

**Chapter 1:**

Background.....3

**Chapter 2:**

Committee Procedures.....5

**Chapter 3:**

Evaluation of the Department of Behavioral Sciences at Ruppin Academic Center.....6

**Appendices:**

Appendix 1- The Committee's letter of appointment

Appendix 2- Schedule of the site visit

**Ruppin Academic Center  
The Department of Behavioral Sciences  
Report**

**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**

---

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

- **Prof. Sidney Strauss - Chief Scientist at the Israeli Ministry of Education (previously- Department of Psychology, Tel Aviv University), Israel**
- **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, 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.
  - 2.1 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 Ruppin Academic Center (RAC).***

The Committee's visit to the college took place on December 30, 2008.

The following members of the committee participated in the visit to the Ruppin Academic Center:

- **Prof. Barbara Tversky – Chair of visit**
- **Prof. Victor Azarya**
- **Prof. Yinon Cohen**
- **Prof. Steven J. Sherman**
- **Prof. Sidney Strauss**

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 Ruppin Academic Center**

### **Background**

The Ruppin Academic Center is located in Emek Hefer in central Israel. In 1979 the center was accredited by the CHE as an academic institution authorized to award academic degrees.

The self-evaluation report states that the total number of students at the center during the academic year 2006-7 was 3,567.

The Department of Behavioral Sciences is one of three departments in the School of Social Sciences and Management. It was established in 1995 and received permanent accreditation from the CHE in 2005.

According to the institution's self-evaluation report, the number of students studying for a BA degree in the Behavioral Sciences program during the academic year 2006-7 was 351.

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

The Ruppin Academic Center (RAC) consists of three schools, one of which, the School of Social Sciences and Management, houses the Department of Behavioral Sciences (BSD). The mission of this School, as stated in the self-evaluation report, is to provide teaching, scholarship, and service that enhance appreciation and understanding of the behavioral, social, and natural mosaic of life and promote engagement of students in shaping the world. As the president of the College said, "We want to be the best college in Israel and not another university in it," thus also stressing her view, shared by the Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE), that colleges have a different mission from universities. According to the president, the Department of Behavioral Sciences in the School of Social Sciences and Management is one of the best if not the best departments in Ruppin.

The mission of the BSD is to offer a sound program in the behavioral sciences, with courses in psychology, sociology, and anthropology that promote interdisciplinary perspectives. To this end, the department's program includes theoretical, methodological, experiential, and research learning. This training is meant to enable graduates to find employment in jobs related to the behavioral sciences or to pursue advanced degrees. In this, the BSD has had success. Some graduates of the BSD continue to advanced degrees. Very few continue to MA programs in Clinical Psychology, despite aspirations to do so. Many graduates report being gainfully employed, most in areas related to the behavioral sciences.

Another goal of the department is to express sensitivity to disadvantaged groups and to issues of fairness and justice in society. To do this, the BSD reaches out to students from disadvantaged backgrounds or with learning disabilities through

an affirmative action program. Finally, the BSD aims to establish a friendly and cooperative atmosphere among administration, faculty, and students. In short, the BSD considers itself to be both an agent of intellectual development and a vehicle for economic and social mobility.

Beyond these general goals, the BSD also has specific development plans for the future. These include adding new MA programs, Clinical Psychology and Organizational Behavior, among them, to the already existing program on Immigration and Social Integration. The Department also plans to institute separate BAs in Psychology and in Social Work. These are ambitious plans, which cannot be accomplished without considerable additional resources.

## **2. Program of Study**

The undergraduate program in Behavioral Sciences consists of 74 required courses: 16 units of Psychology, 16 units of Sociology and Anthropology, 4 units of field studies, 26 units of joint studies, 6 units each of seminar and practicum. In addition, students currently (after a program revision in 2006-7) select 46 units within one of two tracks: Psychology or Sociology and Anthropology. Since the reorganization, approximately 60% of students have selected the Psychology track and 40% the Sociology/Anthropology track. The average class size is 40. Students with a language or learning problem are assisted by an upper-level student-tutor.

Course syllabi are first proposed to the track head and then approved by the teaching committee. Many courses are now taught by adjuncts, not an acceptable solution for the long term. Most, but not all, of the content courses use standard recent textbooks, often in English. Many also assign recent journal articles in English. Using up-to-date well-written, and comprehensive textbook or an up-to-date, comprehensive, and well-edited set of readings should be standard in all content courses. Assuring that students acquire proficiency in analyzing professional literature in English is important and appropriate because most of the behavioral science literature world-wide is published in English. Students will need those skills in graduate school and in their professional lives. Both students and faculty noted that students need strength in comprehending and critiquing professional literature in English. It is possible that some students lack general proficiency in English; if so, the college should assure that students get basic skills in English perhaps as an entrance requirement. To be sure, high quality articles and books are increasingly available in Hebrew, especially in sociology and anthropology, and we do not want to discourage their use. But, ultimately, it is important for all students to learn to analyze and evaluate theory, concepts, and arguments in the professional literature in English.

Although courses in most of the basic areas of psychology are among the required courses, there is one egregious omission, a basic course in cognitive psychology. Such a course should be required, in the committee's view, as it provides foundation on the basic processes in perception, memory, concept formation, reasoning, and judgment that are fundamental to social, personality,

developmental, and abnormal psychology. In addition, there is a need to shore up a core area in psychology, with social psychology and/or developmental psychology as first priority candidates.

The faculty is justifiably proud of its program in experiential learning in which students do field work in the community (e.g., hospitals or mental health agencies) with populations that need help, supervised both by an agency member and a faculty member. Students found these courses to be a meaningful way to connect to and deepen their understanding of the abstract concepts and theories they learn in courses. Some found jobs through this experience and many found the experience critical in choosing a career track.

Given the successes of the experiential learning program and the interests of the students and faculty, the committee feels it should be broadened from primarily clinical settings to institutions and settings related to social and developmental psychology as well as human factors. Such settings are widely available and would provide students with valuable experience in applying psychology to non-clinical situations.

Through the course in research methodology and the research seminar, students have first-hand experience in all aspects of research from devising hypotheses and experiments to analyzing and interpreting data and writing a research report. This is essential to undergraduate education in behavioral science as it allows students to learn what kinds of research questions can be investigated and how, as well as how data impact hypotheses and theories. Students also have opportunities to participate in faculty research, which is also desirable.

Although the required core of the Behavioral Sciences program is quite balanced between Psychology on the one hand and Sociology and Anthropology on the other, there is no economics, and there is, according to the faculty, only one course that presents varying behavioral science perspectives on the same issues, that is, only one course integrates the disciplines. Thus the program is multi-disciplinary at best, not truly interdisciplinary. The faculty reported benefiting from their interdisciplinary contacts in ways that affect their thinking and their research. They would like to offer more interdisciplinary courses; a desire the committee believes would benefit both faculty and students and should be realized.

The committee noted that the BSD was trying to stem grade inflation. While applauding this effort, the committee thought that this issue must be addressed at a more general inter-institution level in order not to disadvantage their own students when they apply for advanced degrees.

As noted, there are plans to open several MA programs as well as several additional BA programs in psychology and social work. To realize these plans will require hiring more faculty. In addition, such a move would threaten the viability of the Behavioral Sciences Program. It is likely that many or most students currently enrolled in the BSD would choose to major in Psychology and others in Social Work, decreasing enrollment considerably. This would compromise the successes of the BSD. More generally, given that faculty members say they are

already stretched by their current teaching and administrative responsibilities, opening additional programs does not seem wise without a large influx of human and other resources.

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

The atmosphere among the faculty is congenial and open. They feel that they are supported and valued by the College. They reported that they found the self-evaluation experience useful, and that they are still benefitting from the reflection it stimulated. There is a good mix of psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists in the department, reflected in a balanced set of courses. The blend of age and experience among the teaching staff is healthy: there is one emeritus professor from a university, one professor from the college, and several beginning their academic careers. Adjuncts teach the practicum and experiential courses, as well as some of the core courses. Although the adjuncts value and enjoy their connections with the college and their teaching, the percentage of courses (around 50%) taught by adjuncts rather than regular faculty is higher than ideal.

The committee noted favorably that teaching is evaluated and that awards for teaching excellence are part of the college culture. This is especially important because colleges are expected to emphasize teaching. Along with this, some committee members thought that the BSD might expand its teaching evaluations to include additional means, e.g., peer evaluation of teaching.

As is generally true in colleges, the teaching load is high, though lower than at some colleges. The younger faculty members seem especially burdened as they are new to teaching, so have fewer courses already prepared, and need to establish research programs as well. Teaching assistants and adjunct teachers report that they are underpaid or overworked or both.

There was some lack of clarity regarding tenure. The faculty did not seem clear on tenure requirements. The college administration and faculty alike are aware of the tension and inconsistency between the teaching priority over research in colleges and the necessity of research publications for promotion. The committee does not support the idea raised in discussions with the faculty, that the faculty be divided into those with a research focus (1/3) and those with a teaching focus (2/3) as this would compromise the collegial atmosphere in the department by creating a two-tier faculty. It would also compromise the idea that teaching and research are integrated.

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

The BSD currently has 351 enrolled students. According to the self-evaluation report, students are admitted to the Behavioral Science degree program on the basis of either the psychometric score (at least 585) or matriculation grades (at least 99). The actual data from admitted students show an average psychometric score of 560 and an average matriculation grade of 93. Because of the strong

affirmative action component of the program and the desire to accept students whose previous preparation was disadvantaged, the cutoffs are often lowered. It appears that the vast majority of students who apply to the program are accepted, and virtually all of the students who are accepted (130 in 2006-2007) enter the program (123 in 2006-2007). This may be due in part to pre-application communication between prospective students and the department about criteria for admission, information about the program, etc.

The drop-out rate is about 9%; students typically drop out in the first year for personal issues and not because of academic problems.

The department and the college should consider raising entrance requirements for the BSD. Some students thought this would be a good idea because it would raise the level of teaching and learning. This would make students better prepared and more competitive for graduate programs, especially in psychology. Students from colleges must compete with psychology students from the universities, where entrance requirements are far higher. These disparities could become more problematic should the department open an MA in Clinical Psychology, as planned, as there would naturally be pressure to accept its own undergraduates. However, these BSD students would be in competition with students from universities with higher admissions standards and with BA degrees in psychology.

Some students reported not being sure why they chose RAC. Many reported enrolling because it is close to where they live (over 70% come from nearby towns and cities) or because of word of mouth. Another reason students reporting selecting Ruppin was that they believed their matriculation or psychometric scores were not high enough to enter a psychology program in a university.

Both current and former students were generally very happy with the program. They took pride in it and expressed a strong attachment to it. They had positive things to say about the courses, the instruction, and especially about the positive open atmosphere of the department and the close association among students and between students and faculty. Teachers were described as excellent, highly committed, and accessible, in person, by email, and by phone. In addition, students appreciated the support that was available to students with learning disabilities.

Nevertheless, students did see some weaknesses in the program and made some suggestions about how to address them. Many felt that their own abilities in English and that of their peers were insufficient. They suggested more requirements of reading articles and books in English, more use of English during classes, and perhaps even courses taught in English. The students also expressed concern regarding the department's attempts to resist grade inflation by setting 83 as the highest average course score. Students felt, correctly in the committee's opinion, that this put them at a disadvantage compared to students from other colleges and universities, and that it reduced their chances of being admitted to graduate programs.

Finally, some students desired more rigorous courses and training (e.g., more discussion sections and more challenging homework on which they got feedback). Students felt that some courses were geared toward the weakest students in the course, and this reduced the depth of training and education for the better students. Faculty should pay attention to these concerns.

## **5. Research**

The administration of the college and the department took pride in the research conducted by the faculty. As the report noted, and the committee concurs, research is important to keep faculty up-to-date on their teaching. It also plays a central role in faculty promotion and in educating students. For these reasons, the Department encourages faculty research and facilitates it through the Research Authority Committee, which aids in finding research sources. The College gives awards for research excellence; notably, three department members received such awards. It also provides funds for seed money, attending conferences, membership in professional organizations, and journal subscriptions on a competitive basis. It does not, however, offer regular sabbaticals, which some faculty members felt were needed, not only for their research activities but also for recharging their energy for future years of teaching.

There are research laboratories in personality and psychopathology, cognitive psychology, and immigration and integration, with funding from Israeli and international sources. That said, the research facilities are not sufficient. Some research is done in collaboration with researchers at nearby universities, which is an excellent model for accomplishing research in colleges. Some faculty publish papers in internationally known journals. Some research projects involve students, giving them valuable experience in participating in creating knowledge in the field.

## **6. Infrastructure**

The campus has a kibbutz feel, low buildings distributed spaciouly on a grassy, hilly area. A sculpture garden with works by new immigrants adds charm. The main activities of the department take place in two non-adjacent buildings. The infrastructure needed for teaching, research, and administration is for the most part very good. All full-time faculty members and some part time faculty have their own separate offices. Part-time faculty and adjunct teachers share office space to use when they are on campus. The head administrator of the department has her own office adjacent to the departmental office, which is open 5 days a week until 4 pm, and staffed by two secretaries.

Two faculty members have laboratories that are not large but seem sufficient for their needs. More laboratory facilities will undoubtedly be needed. Classrooms are shared across departments. They are spacious and well-equipped with computers and projectors. The computer center serves the entire campus with a total of 259 computers in 10 computer labs. Much of the campus is conveniently covered by a wireless network.

The library for the entire college is located in a new 5,000 sq. meters attractive building, it is somewhat crowded, perhaps because a third floor of the library is yet to be opened. The students reported some deficiencies, which need attention: a lack of journals, hard copy and electronic, and difficulties in downloading articles (most likely because of network problems).

## **7. Recommendations and Suggestions**

The committee was impressed with the spirit, energy, and atmosphere of respect of the administration of the college and the department and its members. They feel they are on a collaborative and worthy mission. It is clear that great thought has been put into designing the college and the department curriculum, as well as into the self-evaluation. The committee was also pleased with the openness of their meetings at all levels, and the receptiveness of all involved. It also noted with satisfaction the balance achieved in the program between its psychology and its sociology/anthropology components. 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. Too many of the core courses are taught by adjuncts rather than full-time faculty. Within a year, a committee should be formed to recruit a new faculty member in a core area of psychology, preferably basic social or developmental psychology but also possibly basic cognitive psychology, with an appointment the following year.

B. A state-of-the-art basic course in Cognitive Psychology should be a requirement. There is already a course in Cognitive Psychology, in need of upgrading. Hence, this should take a year to institute.

C. Students should be required to take at least one course that integrates the various disciplinary approaches around a topic, such as the individual in society, the developing child, immigration and absorption, cultural effects. A committee to consider possible courses should be established within a year, with courses offered the following year.

D. Settings for the experiential learning program should be broadened to include applications of social, developmental, and cognitive psychology. A committee to enable these settings should be established within a year, and the settings should become available in the second year.

E. Proficiency in analyzing behavioral science material in English is needed for professional work and for graduate school. The curriculum committee should make sure that a well-written, up-to-date, comprehensive text in English is used for at least one, and preferably more, of the required courses, especially in psychology, and that relevant articles in English are discussed in at least one, but preferably more, of the advanced courses, especially the research seminars.

F. The department should carry out biennial internal reviews of syllabi with the intention to upgrade the courses. This could be done with colleagues from other colleges and from universities, who have expertise in the areas of the courses under review. Concurrently, the department should consider raising its entrance requirements.

G. 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.

## **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. 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. Laboratory Facilities. Efforts should be made to increase laboratory facilities so that each faculty member can comfortably conduct research. Involvement in research is an important factor in undergraduate training. A committee should be established within a year to address the problem, with measures taken to increase research space the following year.

## **3. Faculty**

A. Clear decisions and guidelines about promotion and tenure should be made by the RAC administration, along with the administration of the BSD, within a year. To insure transparency, these guidelines should be made available to all faculty as soon as they are final.

B. The proportion of adjunct teachers should not exceed 40% of the faculty, and ideally, be lower. See previous recommendation (1A) to add a regular faculty member.

C. The administration should make efforts to provide regular sabbaticals for all regular faculty.

D. 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. The committee hopes that the accreditation committee, appointed by the CHE, will make sure that the Department has a sufficient number of faculty. Relying on adjuncts for permanent programs is not an appropriate solution.

In addition, the committee believes that the department should carefully consider the implications of creating BA programs in Psychology and in Social Work on the Behavioral Sciences Program. These new programs are 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 on a regular basis. The survey can ask former students about

their further education, their employment, how they found their jobs, how their education contributes to their further education and their jobs, and more. The results 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**

*Yinon Cohen*

---

**Prof. Yinon Cohen**

*Steven J. Sherman*

---

**Prof. Steven J. sherman**

*Sidney Strauss*

---

**Prof. Sidney Strauss**

# 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 – The Department of Behavioral Sciences –**

**Ruppin Academic Center 30.12.08**

Time	Subject	Participants	Location
09:00-09:30	Opening session: The heads of the institution	<b>Prof. Shosh Arad</b> - President  <b>Prof. Ehud Menipaz</b> - Head of Quality Assessment System	*Meeting - room
09:30-10:00	Meeting with academic leadership of Faculty	<b>Prof. Ehud Menipaz</b> – Dean of School of Social Sciences and Management	*Meeting - room
10:00-10:45	Meeting with the School's/department's academic leadership	<b>Dr. Eyal Gamliel</b> - Head of department <b>Prof. Ada Zohar</b> – Head of the Psychology track <b>Prof. Moshe Shokeid</b> – Head of the MA program in Immigration and Social Integration <b>Dr. Efrat Ben-Ze'ev</b> – Head of the Sociology and Anthropology track	*Meeting - room
10:45-11:30	Meeting with <b>full time and part time senior faculty</b> and committees' representatives	<b>Prof. Ada Zohar</b> - teaching committee, operational committee. <b>Prof. Moshe Shokeid</b> - teaching committee. <b>Dr. Efrat Ben-Ze'ev</b> - teaching committee, operational committee. <b>Dr. Efrat Neter</b> - teaching committee, ethics committee. <b>Dr. Michal Morag</b> - teaching committee. <b>Dr. Rafael Youngman</b> - teaching committee, ethics committee. <b>Ms. Neta Gorsky</b> - secretary of teaching, admission and operational committees.	*Meeting - room
	Meeting with <b>full time junior faculty</b>	None	
11:30-12:15	Meeting with <b>part time faculty (junior)</b>	<b>Junior part time faculty:</b> <b>Ms. Lilac Lev-Ari</b> - Ph.D. Candidate <b>Mr. Gadi Nissim</b> - Ph.D. Candidate	*Meeting - room
12:15-13:00	Meeting with adjuncts	<b>Dr. Nili Hillman</b> <b>Dr. Merav Yogev Falach</b> <b>Dr. Irit Sharir</b> <b>Ms. Iris Carmel</b> <b>Mr. Eyal Peer</b>	*Meeting - room
13:00-13:30	Closed lunch of committee members		*Meeting – room

Time	Subject	Participants	Location
13:30-14:15	Meeting with undergraduate students	<u>First Year:</u> <b>Ms. Idit Libensohn</b> <b>Mr. Oren Leibovitch</b> <u>Second Year:</u> <b>Ms. Gali Newman</b> <b>Ms. Atar Shai</b> <u>Third Year:</u> <b>Ms. Sivan Ben Yehuda</b> <b>Ms. Nizan Gazit</b> <b>Ms. Melkamo Angoach</b>	*Meeting - room
	Meeting with graduate students	None	
14:15-15:00	Meeting with alumni	<b>Ms. Yifat Gonen Ben Anat</b> <b>Mr. Yehuda Granas</b> <b>Ms. Daphna Lotan Balleli</b> <b>Mr. Yoni Levitsky</b> <b>Ms. Liron Tzuberi</b>	*Meeting - room
15:00-15:30	Tour at the institution	Classrooms, library, faculty facilities	Campus
15:30-16:00	Closed meeting of the Committee		*Meeting - room
16:00-16:30	Summation meeting with heads of the institution	<b>Prof. Shosh Arad - President</b> <b>Prof. Ehud Menipaz - Head of Quality Assessment System and the Dean of School of Social Sciences and Management</b> <b>Dr. Eyal Gamliel - Head of department</b> <b>CPA Anat Manor - CFO</b>	*Meeting - room

\*The Meeting-room is located in the Library building.