



**Committee for the Evaluation of Middle Eastern Studies Programs**

**University of Haifa**  
**Department of Middle Eastern History**  
**Evaluation Report**

**December 2010**

## **Contents**

### **Chapter 1:**

Background 3

### **Chapter 2:**

Committee Procedures 4

### **Chapter 3:**

Evaluation of Middle Eastern Studies Program at the University of Haifa 5

### **Chapter 4:**

General Recommendations and Timetable 11

**Appendices:** Appendix 1- The Committee's letter of appointment

Appendix 2- Schedule of the site visit

## **Chapter 1- Background**

During its meeting on October 7, 2008, the Council for Higher Education (hereafter: the CHE) decided to evaluate departments in the fields of Middle Eastern History and, in the case of Hebrew University, the Department of Arabic Languages and Literature, during the academic year 2009 – 2010.

Following the decision of the CHE, the Minister of Education who serves ex officio as a Chairperson of the CHE, appointed a committee consisting of:

- **Professor Dale F. Eickelman – Dartmouth College, USA, Committee Chair**
- **Professor Emmanuel Sivan – Hebrew University, Israel (co-chair)<sup>1</sup>**
- **Professor Jere L. Bacharach – University of Washington, Seattle, USA**
- **Professor Richard W. Bulliet – Columbia University, USA**
- **Professor Ilai Alon –Tel Aviv University, Israel<sup>2</sup>**

**Ms. Marissa Gross - Coordinator of the Committee on behalf of the CHE.**

Within the framework of its activity, the Committee was requested to:

- Examine the self-evaluation reports, which were submitted by institutions that provide study programs in Middle East History/Studies and in the case of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, also the Department of Arabic Language and Literature.
- Present the CHE with final reports for the evaluated academic units and study programs – a separate report for each institution, including the committee’s findings and recommendations.
- Submit to the CHE a general report regarding its opinion as to the examined field within the Israeli system of higher education with recommended standards.

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” (October 2008).

---

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Sivan did not participate in the review of the Hebrew University to avoid a conflict of interest.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Alon did not participate in the review of Tel Aviv University to avoid a conflict of interest.

## **Chapter 2-Committee Procedures**

The Committee held its first formal meetings on April 23, 2010. At this meeting committee members were given an overview of higher education in Israel and a description of the Israeli CHE. They also discussed Middle Eastern Studies programs in Israel and fundamental issues concerning the committee's quality assessment activity. Committee members had received copies of the departmental reports before this date.

During April-May 2010 committee members conducted full day visits to five institutions (six departments) whose Middle Eastern Studies programs the committee was requested to examine.

***This report deals with the History of the Middle East Department at the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Haifa.***

The Committee's visit to the University of Haifa took place on May 3-4, 2010.

The committee spent two days of intensive meetings with opportunities to see the libraries and other facilities, meetings with appropriate administrators, tenure and tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, and BA, MA and PhD students. In every case we wish to thank the appropriate individuals for their involvement in our proceedings as their input allowed us to explore in significantly greater depth many of the issues raised in the self-study reports.

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

### **Chapter 3: Evaluation of Middle Eastern Studies Program at the University of Haifa**

*\* This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the visit to the institution, and does not take account of any subsequent changes. The Report records the conclusions reached by the Evaluation Committee based on the documentation provided by the institution, information gained through interviews, discussion and observation as well as other information available to the Committee.*

#### *1. Background*

The Department of Middle Eastern History at the University of Haifa was founded in 1966, and initiated a Master's program in 1974 and a PhD program in 1989. During the 2008-2009 school year, 327 BA students, 39 Master's students, 23 doctoral students were enrolled in the Department. In total, the Department has 15 senior faculty members and 15 external lecturers.

#### *2. Teaching staff*

The Department's founding faculty members built the program on the tradition of excellence of the Hebrew University. The current faculty members continue that tradition, including the founders' (non-exclusive) focus on modern history. A period of change is in the offing, however, as two-thirds of the current senior faculty will retire over the next few years. Strategic planning to replace these faculty members must begin immediately and replacement positions must be created if the Department is not to lose its international and domestic standing. Volunteer work by retired faculty has bought some time, but once the next wave of retirements begin, the sustainability of quality programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will endanger the Department's standing.

Turning this generational transition into an opportunity is the challenge embedded in the 2008 decision of the Departmental Council to propose changing the unit's name to the Department of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies. The University of Haifa has not yet acted on this proposed name change.

Various members of the Department expressed the view that country-focused teaching was a core departmental activity that should be taken into consideration in recruiting new faculty, emphasizing research expertise on certain countries. For example, a specialist on Egypt should replace a retiring expert on that country to avoid a gap in the Department's coverage of Egypt.

On the other hand, in keeping with the proposed name change and the thematic diversity of the research carried out and strongly supported by the current faculty, other professors suggested that new faculty members should be recruited for their ability to bring diverse social science and humanities perspectives into the teaching and guidance of students. However, given the likelihood that faculty replacement will not include a significant increase in departmental staffing, these two prescriptions for dealing with the generational transition may be in conflict with one another. Unfortunately, one suggested way of resolving the problem, namely, hiring

high quality social scientists that simultaneously qualify as specialists on the past century or so of the history and politics of a target country, does not correspond to the current patterns of training. That is, a first-class specialist on the petroleum economics of the Middle East is unlikely also to have specialized knowledge of the tribal and dynastic history of Saudi Arabia or other oil-producing states. Narrowly defining the parameters of a job search usually yields too limited a pool of applicants to assure an excellent appointment. Excellence should be the prime desideratum in hiring, not niche filling.

The Department should engage immediately in concrete strategic thinking on its future and to work with a supportive central administration. This is an especially challenging task when so many members face near-term retirement. Decisions on the future direction of departments should not depend on senior faculty who may have a vested interest in seeing their own specializations perpetuated with the same terms of reference. Younger members of the Department should be given a significant voice in planning and the Department's mission statement must be brought into line with the resultant plan. As it currently stands, the self-study focuses on Departmental history and does not indicate recent strategic thinking about the Department's inevitable transitions in the near future. The self study indicates that the Departmental faculty study the history and politics of most Middle Eastern countries. This general statement is accurate, although equating politics with history is not acceptable to scholars in political science. Administrative approval of the Department's proposed name change should be held in abeyance until an acceptable strategic plan is presented that resolves the issues mentioned above.

In keeping with the overview of the current state of Middle East Studies presented in its General Report, the Committee is of the opinion that country-by-country coverage is an outmoded approach to studying the region. Greater disciplinary breadth should be built into the next generation of departmental staffing, and so should a more capacious notion of the Middle East as a region where social, intellectual, political, religious, cultural, and economic currents from many world regions intersect in a significant fashion. Students should not be encouraged inadvertently to think that detailed studies of the political events of a single country over a narrowly fixed span of years represent the cutting edge of Middle East Studies in their current form. Many students liked this approach, recognizing the quality of their instructors, but also recognized that the limitations of such an approach in terms of contemporary challenges in Middle East studies. Syllabi in some cases appeared out of date, perhaps in part because courses based narrowly on specific countries keep recent seminal work based elsewhere on the periphery of current concerns.

A parallel problem arises with the inclusion of Islamic Studies in the proposed renaming of the Department. The publications and research interests of the current faculty occasionally focus on aspects of Islam as a religion, but on the whole the Department is overwhelmingly oriented toward modern political matters with earlier periods of social and economic history as a secondary strength. The term "Islamic Studies" implies much more, including the Qur'an, *tafsir*, and *hadith*; *fiqh* and *shari'a*; Sufism; and modern Islamic movements. While these topics may be covered to some degree in required introductory courses, it is hard to see the Department making a satisfactory claim to coverage in this field without faculty members whose research and primary source knowledge are primarily focused on Islam. Adding an Islamic component to the

already problematic desire to retain country coverage and expand social science perspectives is unrealistic.

### *3. Teaching program*

This Department has experienced a dramatic decline in BA enrollment since 2004-2005, the earliest year for which figures were made available to the Committee. Faculty members attribute this shrinkage to an overall nationwide decline in humanities enrollments and thus seem resigned to the situation. The figures raise questions as to whether this is a satisfactory explanation. Between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009 the number of BA students who were not part of the two military programs, Havazalot and Maltak, went down by 42%, and the number of BA graduates by 50%. In the Faculty of Humanities as a whole, the corresponding numbers are a 13% decline in enrollment and a 21% *increase*<sup>3</sup> in graduates. While some departments posted declines in the same range as Middle East History, e.g. Art History, or worse, e.g. French Language and Literature, one department, Asian Studies, experienced an impressive growth of 26%. The Department most closely related to Middle East History—Arabic Language and Literature—saw an enrollment decline of only 23%. While it may be argued that Israel's relations with East Asia and South Asia have grown in importance in recent years, it would be hard to maintain that the importance of Israel's relations with the Middle East have diminished over that time period. Moreover, given the focus on political narrative characteristic of many of the department's courses, it could be argued that the Middle Eastern History figures should be compared to social science enrollment figures (with which this Committee was not provided) rather than to humanities enrollments.

Compounding the problem of lagging popularity is the Department's seemingly high dropout rate: between 33.7% and 46.6% over the years 2002-2003 and 2006-2007. Without comparative figures for the humanities as a whole it is hard to determine how significant these percentages are. However, the total numbers of students enrolled for the later years appears to include Havazalot and Maltak students who are presumably not as affected as other students by the "academic, financial, or personal" factors cited as reasons for dropping out.

The interpretation the Committee puts on these figures is that despite the obvious salience of the modern Middle East for Israeli university students, this Department is not attracting as many majors as it should. In fact, without the Havazalot enrollments, from which only Haifa benefits, the enrollment trajectory of the Department at the BA level would be dire. The question must be asked, therefore, whether the program as it currently stands appeals to undergraduates. We note, for example, a substantial reliance on country surveys with only a sprinkling of thematic offerings. We also note with astonishment that of the three courses offered on Iran, only the one on cinema is open to all students. The other two are listed as "Maltak only." These observations, based on the course listings provided to the committee, may be off the mark, but

---

<sup>3</sup> The department-by-department figures for graduates given by the university are consistent with the overall drop in enrollment. The Faculty of Humanities increase in graduates comes exclusively from special programs for civil servants, the Israel Electric Company, the Human Services Department, military intelligence officers, police, and Maltak army officers, the last-named program now relocated to Bar Ilan University.

they persuade the committee that a reconsideration of the BA curriculum should be included in the strategic planning process.

As for the MA and PhD programs, the entering enrollments are holding up well, but the dropout rate—66.7% for the MA—is a matter of concern. Stricter admission standards and better monitoring may alleviate the problem, but consideration might also be given to offering some more general and less narrowly focused elective seminars.

#### *4. Students:*

The Committee met with students at all three instructional levels (BA, MA, PhD). The BA students represented a broad range of interests. All but one of them was doing a double major with the second fields including geography, economics, history, philosophy, and political science. The students found that the double major allowed them greater opportunities for future employment. The Committee also considers double majors to be a good use of university resources, challenging students to integrate the knowledge and scholarship of two complementary fields. Within Middle East studies, some students felt that there were significant benefits in having courses on specific countries offered by country specialists. During discussions, however, these same students acknowledged the impossibility of having enough faculty to specialize on everything from Iran to Iraq, Syria to Sudan and North Africa, and that there was also a need for those who dealt with non-state actors, e.g. Hamas and Hezbollah, as well as overarching themes such as comparative economic development and demographic trends that encompassed not only the Middle East and North Africa but also disciplinary trends in other world regions.

The Havazot students who live together and have their career lines set represent a special case and involve contract negotiations between Haifa University and the IDF. Our only recommendation for undergraduates would be that Havazot students, like their civilian counterparts, have adequate exposure to region-wide if not international topics such as modern Islamic movements in addition to their intensive training in specific front-line states. We leave it to the university to decide the strengths and weaknesses of offering a semi-autonomous program within the university for military intelligence officers that is evidently better staffed and financed than parallel programs for non-Havazot students. Elsewhere in the world, such officers are mainstreamed with highly competitive civilian students. Security and military specialists elsewhere view this integration of military with civilian degree candidates positively. Strong university programs should preclude the need for diverting resources to “special” military or corporate students—the Departmental faculty is already stretched to the limit—and away from the mainstream curriculum. A greater integration will benefit both the “special” students and talented civilian ones alike.

The undergraduates gave the faculty members high marks for accessibility and counseling. The committee noted that students appeared to receive appropriate feedback on their major seminar papers, but the feedback on ordinary coursework appears to be less. This Committee lacks sufficient student and faculty feedback to know this for certain.

The quantity of appropriate readings in Hebrew, including those published by the Open University, was not deemed adequate by students or faculty and much of the material appeared dated. Students lamented the unavailability of more work relevant to their studies in Hebrew. Students and faculty at all five institutions reviewed indicated that there was a lack of adequate instructional materials in Hebrew for advanced level undergraduate and graduate coursework. Faculty members at all institutions reviewed commented on the decline in the level of English-language instruction in pre-university training, just as there has been a decline in pre-university Arabic-language instruction. Undergraduate students in particular indicated the difficulty of reading English-language texts. At the faculty level, several instructors noted the tension between the University's demands that for promotion publications in languages other than Hebrew and attention to student needs, which might include participation in translation projects. The Committee concludes that greater attention needs to be paid to making adequate instructional materials available in undergraduate courses, but that advanced undergraduate and honors students as well as graduate students should be encouraged to incorporate English-language materials (as well as in other languages when relevant) into their research.

Students strongly recommended that the Haifa faculty consider offering an introductory course that covered Islam and Muslims outside the Middle East and North Africa. The addition of such a course, incorporating the role of Muslims in Europe, Asia, and North America, would bring Haifa course offerings more in line with their counterparts at universities elsewhere.

The MA students, like the range of topics selected for theses completed over the last five years, were impressive in terms of the range of topics selected. The students we met appeared articulate, engaged and hard working. They recognized the inherent tension between country specializations and the need to acquire broader overviews of the region if not global issues. These students stated that their biggest challenge was to find appropriate faculty members to work with them on selected topics since the number of faculty were limited. They praised the willingness of retired faculty members who remained actively involved in overseeing MA theses. This Committee hopes that Haifa can continue to encourage its retired faculty to support its students and, possibly, set up a modest research/travel fund for them as a way of recognizing the importance of their continuing contribution to the education of the next generation of Haifa University graduate students. This is only a short-term solution. The University of Haifa urgently needs to replace faculty retired over the last decade if it intends to retain its current international standing in Middle East studies.

The MA students spoke positively about the opportunities of working with faculty at other institutions such as the Central Asian program at Tel Aviv University and the role of the inter-university Turkish Circle, a voluntary initiative. The role of these students in the monthly departmental seminar was not clear. The Department could create a better *esprit de corps* among its students by requiring participation in the Department seminar and, if possible, setting up a meeting once or twice a term where all the MA students could meet as a group.

Like their counterparts at other Israeli institutions, the PhD students highlighted the lack of adequate financial support for doctoral studies and how hard it is financially to pursue doctoral studies. This is a national problem that impacts virtually every discipline in Israel. We are confident that the paucity of adequate resources has been repeatedly brought to the attention

of the CHE and the Ministry of Finance. Working with available resources or their own funds, students spoke highly of the Israel-wide annual workshop held at Ben Gurion University for students in Middle East Studies and for the journal in Hebrew, *Jama'a*, edited by BGU students that accepts peer-reviewed contributions from graduate students in Middle Eastern studies throughout Israel. The Haifa students also valued their membership in the Middle East Studies Association of Israel. They were anxious about opportunities for future employment in Israel in a field related to their studies, but this is a national problem not unique to them or to their specific field of study.

The doctoral dissertation topics discussed with the Committee reflected the growing awareness of the emerging generation of Israeli scholars of comparative and international topics not confined to the Middle East as defined in geographic terms, as in the recent past. One thesis concerned the Palestinian diaspora in the US. Another student was studying Muslim student movements in Cuba and Iran, as well as among Palestinians. He demonstrated that Palestinian students picked up symbols originating among student movements elsewhere. The importance of this type of finding is more than an academic exercise as the Ph.D. student discovered when giving a presentation to Israeli policy specialists where he was able to show them how new signs and symbols which were appearing among Palestinians had links to Muslim movements in other parts of the world.

In general, student MA and PhD dissertations appear oriented toward contemporary and twentieth-century projects. Some are country-specific, as are graduate research projects at institutions in North America and Europe, although in Haifa as elsewhere there appears to be a trend toward topics that are not geographically specific.

##### *5. Research:*

The publication record of the University of Haifa faculty members, including the recently retired, is strong one and, as reflected in the CVs available to the Committee, many of the retired faculty members remain highly active. Unfortunately the restrictions placed on new hires over the last few years and perhaps the shift in priorities of senior faculty has resulted in a diminishing of the international presence and visibility of Haifa's Department of Middle East History. This is a result of the restrictions on hiring faced by all Israeli universities. The Committee not only supports making new appointments in areas we have described elsewhere in our report, but would encourage the University of Haifa administration to set aside additional funds for new and continuing faculty to participate in international activities and to hold appropriate conferences on the Haifa campus for the benefit of students and faculty alike.

##### *6. Library and infrastructure*

The Committee was highly impressed by the quality of the University of Haifa library, and faculty and students from all programs in Israel that we visited regarded it as the best and most useful library in Israel for the purpose of Middle Eastern studies. The Committee's recommendations deal not with the University of Haifa in particular but with the overall

servicing of needs for books and research tools nationwide and will be found in the General Report.

Other space and infrastructural elements appear satisfactory.

#### **Chapter 4: Recommendations and timetable**

##### 1. Immediate

Develop a strategic plan for replacing retiring faculty that realistically addresses the choices that must be made between disciplinary diversity, country coverage, and inclusion of Islamic subjects. Keep the issue of the change in the Department's name in abeyance until a satisfactory self-assessment is completed. Other Departments in Israel face a similar situation because of the virtual freeze in hiring over the past decade. However, deferred action in the case of Haifa may result in the precipitous decline of a strong program currently sustained by the kindness of retiree volunteers.

##### 2. Intermediate

Review the BA and MA curricula as faculty changes occur to see whether a thematic and more topically diverse array of courses might stem the decline in enrollments and reduce dropout rates. Some other universities seem confident that they can increase enrollments in this field, and the committee sees no reason why Haifa, particularly given its library resources, should not also have a more positive view of increasing enrollments without compromising academic standards.

##### 3. Long term

Pursuant to suggestions that are contained in the Committee's general report, Haifa should seek to play a constructive part in the evolution of programs for library cooperation, less commonly taught languages, centers of excellence dealing with currently understudied areas, such as Central Asia and the Caucasus, South and Southeast Asia, and Muslim diaspora communities in Europe and North America.

**Signed by:**



---

Prof. Dale F. Eickelman,  
Chair



---

Prof. Ilai Alon



---

Prof. Jere Bacharach



---

Prof. Richard W. Bulliet

## Appendix 1: Letter of Appointment



March 23rd, 2010

Prof. Dale Eickelman  
Department of Anthropology  
Dartmouth College  
USA

שר החינוך  
**Minister of Education**  
وزير التربية والتعليم

Dear Professor Eickelman,

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.

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 Middle Eastern Studies.

The composition of the Committee will be as follows: Prof. Dale Eickelman (Chair), Prof. Emmanuel Sivan (Co-Chair), Prof. Ilai Alon, Prof. Jere Bacharach, and Prof. Richard Bulliet.

Ms. Marissa Gross will coordinate the Committee's activities.

In your capacity as the chair 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,

Gideon Sa'ar  
Minister of Education,  
Chairperson, 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. Marissa Gross, Committee Coordinator

---

רח' שבטי ישראל 34 ירושלים מיקוד 91911 • טל' 02-5602330 • פקסמיליה 02-5602246  
34 Shivtei Israel St' 91911 Jerusalem. Tel. 02-5602330. Fax 02-5602246  
شارع شبيطي يسرائيل 34 . اورشليم القدس 91911 . هاتف 02-5602330 فاكس 02-5602246  
כתובת אתר ממשל זמין: <http://gov.il>  
כתובת אתר המשרד: <http://www.education.gov.il>

---



November 2009

## **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, which came into effect in the academic year of 2004-2005. Within this framework, study-programs are to be evaluated approximately every six

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 to the importance of quality evaluation and to develop an internal culture of self-evaluation, as well as the required mechanisms;
- 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 (hereinafter "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 institutions and the academic units being evaluated – if possible - within 4-6 months of receiving the self-evaluation reports. 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, alumni, administrative staff, and any other persons it considers necessary.

2.3 The duration of the visits (at least one full day) will be coordinated with the chairperson of the Committee.

2.4 Following the visit, the Committee will submit the CHE with:

1. A final report on each of the evaluated departments,
2. A general reports on the state of the discipline in the Israeli higher education system.  
The general report will include recommendations to the CHE for standards and potential state-wide changes in the evaluated field of study.

2.5 The reports will be sent to the institutions and the academic units for their response.

2.6 The reports and Committee's findings will be submitted to the CHE and discussed within its various forums.

### **3. Conflict of Interest Policy**

3.1 In order to avoid situations that may question the credibility and integrity of the evaluation process, and in order to maintain its ethical, professional and impartial manner, before issuing their Letter of Appointment members and chairperson of the evaluation Committee will sign a Declaration on Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality.

3.2 In the event that a member of the Committee is also a current or former faculty member at an institution being evaluated, he/she will not take part in any visits or discussions regarding that institution.

### **4. The Individual Reports**

4.1 The final reports of the evaluation Committee shall address every institution separately.

4.2 The final reports shall include recommendations on topics listed in the guidelines for self-evaluation, including:

- The goals, aims and mission statement of the evaluated academic unit and study programs
- The study program
- The academic faculty
- The students
- The organizational structure
- Research
- 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

### **5. The Recommended Structure of the Reports**

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

5.1 General background concerning the evaluation process; the names of the members of the Committee and its coordinator; and a short overview of the Committee's procedures.

5.2 A general description of the institution and the academic unit being evaluated.

5.3 An executive summary that will include a brief description of the strengths and weaknesses of the academic unit and program being evaluated.

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

5.4 This section will be based on evidence gathered from the self-evaluation report and the topics examined by the Committee during the site visit.

5.5 For each topic examined, the report will present a summary of the Committee's findings, the relevant information, and their analysis.

***Part C –Recommendations:***

5.6 This section will include comprehensive conclusions and recommendations regarding the evaluated academic unit and the study program according to the topics in part B.

5.7 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.***

***Part D - Appendices:***

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

**6. The General report**

In addition to the individual reports concerning each study program, the Committee shall submit to the CHE a general report regarding the status of the evaluated field of study within the Israeli institutions of higher education. The report should also evaluate the state and status of Israeli faculty members and students in the international arena (in the field), as well as offer recommendations to the CHE for standards and potential state-wide changes in the evaluated field of study.

**We urge the Committees 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: Site Visit Schedule



החוג להיסטוריה של המזרח התיכון | לשכת הרקטור  
Department of Middle Eastern History | Office of the Rector

### Schedule of Site Visit May 3-4, 2010

#### Monday May 3, 2010:

Time	Subject	Participants	Room / Location
09:00-09:30	Opening session with the heads of the institution and the senior staff member appointed to deal with quality assessment	<b>Prof. Yossi Ben-Artzi</b> , Rector <b>Prof. David Faraggi</b> , Vice Rector <b>Ms. Ruchama Elad-Yarum</b> , Assistant to the Vice-Rector <b>Ms. Michal Daloya</b> , Office of the Rector	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
09:30-10:00	Meeting with the heads of the Humanities Faculty	<b>Prof. Menahem Mor</b> , Dean of Faculty of Humanities	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
10:00-10:45	Meeting with the heads of the Department of Middle Eastern history	<b>Dr. Michael Eppel</b> , Head of the Department of Middle Eastern history	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
10:45-11:30	Meeting with representatives of relevant departmental committees*	<b>Prof. Kais Firro</b> , Head of PhD program; <b>Dr. Mahmud Yazbak</b> , Head of MA program; <b>Dr. Itzhak Weismann</b> , Head of BA program	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
11:30-12:30	Meeting with Senior Academic Faculty*	Prof. Gad Gilbar Prof. Amalia Levanoni Prof. Kais Firro Prof. Onn Winckler Prof. Uri M. Kupferschmidt Dr. Soli Shahvar Dr. Shosh Ben-Ari Dr. Yair Hirschfeld Dr. Itzhak Weismann Dr. Fruma Zachs Dr. Mahmud Yazbak Dr. Yuval Ben-Bassat	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
12:30-13:15	Lunch (closed working meeting in the same room)		Eshkol Tower Room 1520

Time	Subject	Participants	Room / Location
13:15-14:15	Tour of campus: - Library - Ezri Center for Iranian and Gulf Studies	Library - <b>Dr. Soli Shahvar</b> , Department staff member in charge of the University library and archives, and <b>Ms. Yardena Lewenberg</b> , Library staff, will accompany <u>Ezri Center</u> - <b>Dr. Soli Shahvar</b> , Head of Ezri Center, will accompany	
14:15-15:00	Meeting with Junior academic faculty*	Mr. Aamer Mresat, Mr. Ofer Gal Paz, Mr. Avraham Moshe, Ms. Sivan Ben-Ari, Mr. Ziv Orenstein	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
15:00-15:30	Meeting with adjunct lecturers*	Mr. Abraham Bukay Ms. Nechama Manor Ms. Sheila Mousai Dr. Eran Segal	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
15:30-16:00	Closed-door working meeting of the evaluation committee		Eshkol Tower Room 1520

**Tuesday May 4, 2010:**

Time	Subject	Participants	Room / Location
09:00-09:45	Meeting with BA students**	Mr. Elay Koren (1 <sup>st</sup> Year) Mr. Alexander Rozenman (1 <sup>st</sup> Year) Mr. Yair Viner (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Omri Eilat (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year) Ms. Rona Mihalovitch (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year) Ms. Aya Evron (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year) Ms. Tal Grinberg (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year)	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
09:45-10:30	Meeting with MA students**	Ms. Sharona Zelbeshtin (1 <sup>st</sup> Year) Ms. Rima Farah (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Majdy Taha (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Matan Ratner (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Idan Orenstein (1 <sup>st</sup> Year) Ms. Yael Shimon (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Asaf Iofe (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year) Ms. Limor Youngman (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year)	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
10:30-11:15	Meeting with PhD students**	Mr. Ido Zerkovich (3 <sup>rd</sup> Year) Ms. Merav Or Emergi (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year) Mr. Roy Cahanovitz (2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
11:15-12:30	Closed-door working meeting of the evaluation committee		Eshkol Tower Room 1520

Time	Subject	Participants	Room / Location
12:30-13:15	Lunch (closed working meeting in the same room)		Eshkol Tower Room 1520
13:15-14:00	Summation meeting with heads of the institution and of the Dept. of Middle Eastern Studies	<b>Prof. David Faraggi</b> , Vice Rector <b>Prof. Menahem Mor</b> , Dean of Faculty of Humanities <b>Dr. Michael Eppel</b> , Head of the Department of Middle Eastern History <b>Ms. Ruchama Elad-Yarum</b> , Assistant to the Vice-Rector <b>Ms. Michal Daloya</b> , Office of the Rector	Eshkol Tower Room 1520
14:00-16:00	Closed-door working meeting of the evaluation committee		Eshkol Tower Room 1520

**Committee Members:**

- Prof. Dale Eickelman – Dartmouth College, USA, Committee Chair
- Prof. Emmanuel Sivan – Hebrew University, Israel, Co-Chair
- Prof. Jere Bacharach – University of Washington, USA
- Prof. Richard Bulliet – Columbia University, USA
- Prof. Ilai Alon – Tel Aviv University, Israel

**CHE Representative:**

- Ms. Marissa Gross – Committee Coordinator

\* The heads of the institution and academic unit Or their representatives will not attend these meetings.