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1. List of Selected KPIs

1. Stakeholder evaluation ratings of the Mission Statement and Objectives
2. Stakeholder evaluation of the Policy Handbook, including administrative flow chart and job responsibilities
3. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.
4. Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year.
5. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification within the institution of standards of student achievement during the year.
6. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification of standards of student achievement by people external to the institution during the year.
7. Ratio of students to teaching staff (Based on full time equivalents)
8. Students overall rating on the quality of their courses.
9. Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications.
10. Percentage of students entering programs who successfully complete first year.
11. Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time.
12. Proportion of students entering post graduate programs who complete those programs in specified time.
13. Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are: (a) employed (b) enrolled in further study (c) not seeking employment or further study
14. Ratio of students to administrative staff
15. Proportion of total operating funds (other than accommodation and student allowances) allocated to provision of student services.
16. Student evaluation of academic and career counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five point scale).

17. Stakeholder evaluation of library and media center. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the library & media center, including:
   a) Staff assistance
   b) Current and up-to-date
   c) Copy & print facilities
   d) Functionality of equipment
   e) Atmosphere or climate for studying
   f) Availability of study sites

18. Number of web site publication and journal subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered.

19. Stakeholder evaluation of the digital library. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the digital library, including:
   a) User friendly website
   b) Availability of the digital databases
   c) Accessibility for users
   d) Library skill training

20. Annual expenditure on IT budget, including:
   a) Percentage of the total Institution, or College, or Program budget allocated for IT
   b) Percentage of IT budget allocated per program for institutional or per student for programmatic.
   c) Percentage of IT budget allocated for software licenses.
   d) Percentage of IT budget allocated for IT security;
   e) Percentage of IT budge allocated for IT maintenance.

21. Stakeholder evaluation of the IT services. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of:
   a) IT availability
   b) Security
   c) Maintenance
   d) Accessibility
   e) Support systems
   f) Software and up-dates
   g) Age of hardware
22. Stakeholder evaluation of
   a) Websites
   b) e-learning services
   c) Hardware and software
   d) Accessibility
   e) Learning and Teaching
   f) Assessment and service
   g) Web-based electronic data management system or electronic resources

23. Total operating expenditure (other than accommodation and student allowances) per student.

24. Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement.

25. Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year.

26. Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent member of teaching staff

27. Number of citations in refereed journals in the previous year per full time equivalent teaching staff

28. Proportion of full time member of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year

29. Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent members of teaching staff

30. Research income from external sources in the past year as a proportion of the number of full time teaching staff members.

31. Proportion of the total, annual operational budget dedicated to research.

32. Proportion of full time teaching and other staff actively engaged in community service activities

33. Number of community education programs provided as a proportion of the number of departments

2. The KPI Achievements for Computer Science & Information Program Compared With External Benchmark
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAAA Standards</th>
<th>KP I Code</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Benchmark</th>
<th>Internal Benchmark (1)</th>
<th>Internal Benchmark (2)</th>
<th>Extern Benchmark</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>S1. 1</td>
<td>1. Stakeholder evaluation ratings of the Mission Statement and Objectives</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2. 1</td>
<td>2. Stakeholder evaluation of the Policy Handbook, including administrative flow chart and job responsibilities.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>S3. 1</td>
<td>3. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>73.4 %</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>28.6 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance and</td>
<td>S3. 2</td>
<td>4. Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year.</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73.6 %</td>
<td>77.3 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3. 3</td>
<td>5. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification within the institution of standards of student achievement during the year.</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3. 4</td>
<td>6. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification of standards of student achievement by people external to the institution during the year.</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>S4.1</th>
<th>S4.2</th>
<th>S4.3</th>
<th>S4.4</th>
<th>S4.5</th>
<th>S4.6</th>
<th>S4.7</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Co</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Ratio of students to teaching staff.</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de</td>
<td>(Based on full time equivalents)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Students overall rating on the quality of their courses.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Percentage of students entering programs who successfully complete first year.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Proportion of students entering post graduate programs who complete those programs in specified time.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. employed</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. enrolled in further study</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. not seeking employment or further study</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34.04%</td>
<td>28.72%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Ratio of students to administrative staff</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Proportion of total operating funds (other than accommodation and student allowances) allocated to provision of student services.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Student evaluation of academic and career counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standards**

**Learning and Teaching**

**Student Administration and Support Services**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAAA Standards</th>
<th>KP I Code</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target Bench mark</th>
<th>Actual Bench mark</th>
<th>Intern Benc h Mark (1)</th>
<th>Intern Benc h Mark (2)</th>
<th>Extern Benc h mark</th>
<th>New Target Benc h mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard 6 Learning Resources** | S6. 1    | 17. Stakeholder evaluation of library and media center. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the library & media center, including:  
a) Staff assistance,  
b) Current and up-to-date  
c) Copy & print facilities,  
d) Functionality of equipment,  
e) Atmosphere or climate for studying  
f) Availability of study sites, and  
g) Any other quality indicators of service on a five-point scale of an annual survey.) | N/A               | N/ A             | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A               | N/A                   |
|                 | S6. 2    | 18. Number of web site publication and journal subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered | 125: 1            | 300 /3 = 100     | 300/ 3 = 100         | 10:1                   | N/A               | 125 :1                |
|                 | S6. 3    | 19. Stakeholder evaluation of the digital library. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the digital library, including:  
a) User friendly website  
b) Availability of the digital databases,  
c) Accessibility for users,  
d) Library skill training and  
e) Any other quality indicators of service on a five-point scale of an annual survey.) | N/A               | N/ A             | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A               | N/A                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA A Standards</th>
<th>KP I Code</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Benchmark</th>
<th>Internal Benchmark (1)</th>
<th>Internal Benchmark (2)</th>
<th>Extern benchmark</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>S7.1</td>
<td>20. Annual expenditure on IT budget, including: a) Percentage of the total Institution, or College, or Program budget allocated for IT; b) Percentage of IT budget allocated per program for institutional or per student for programmatic; c) Percentage of IT budget allocated for software licenses; d) Percentage of IT budget allocated for IT security; e) Percentage of IT budget allocated for IT maintenance.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6000:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>S7.2</td>
<td>21. Stakeholder evaluation of the IT services. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of: a) IT availability, b) Security, c) Maintenance, d) Accessibility e) Support systems, f) Software and up-dates, g) Age of hardware, and h) Other viable indicators of service on a five-point scale of an annual survey.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>S7.3</td>
<td>22. Stakeholder evaluation of a) Websites, b) e-learning services c) Hardware and software d) Accessibility e) Learning and Teaching f) Assessment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and service
g) Web-based electronic data
management system or electronic
resources (for example: institutional
website providing resource sharing,
 networking & relevant information,
including e-learning, interactive learning
& teaching between students & faculty
on a five point scale of an annual survey).

| Standard 8 | S8.1 23. Total operating expenditure (other than accommodation and student allowances) per student. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Standard 9 | S9.1 24. Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23% | 5% |
| S9.2 25. Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 29% | 100% |
| Standard 10 | S10.1 26. Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent member of teaching staff. | 15 | 2 | 0 | 77 | 4 | 20 |
| S10.2 27. Number of citations in refereed journals in the previous year per full time equivalent teaching staff. | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4 | 1.8 | N/A |
| S10.3 28. Proportion of full time member of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year. | 30% | 10% | 0% | 50% | 21% | 40% |
| S10.4 29. Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent members of teaching staff. | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 36% | 50% |
| 30. Research income from external | 30% of | 0% | 0% | 5% | 60% of |
3. The KPI Achievements for Computer Science & Information Program Compared With the External Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAAA KPI Reference Number</th>
<th>S1.1</th>
<th>Institution/Program Reference Number</th>
<th>S1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI: 1. Stakeholder evaluation ratings of the Mission Statement and Objectives</td>
<td>(Average rating on how well the mission is known or the proportion of policy decisions that refer to the mission among criteria for the decision made on a five point scale).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Benchmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actual Comp. Dep 1435 H</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis:
Stakeholder evaluation ratings of the Mission Statement and Objectives have been measured via the average ratings of staff members and students to the questionnaire

1- "The mission statement should be clear enough to provide criteria for evaluation of progress towards the achievement of the program goals and objectives."

2- "Statements of major objectives should be accompanied by specification of clearly defined and measurable indicators that are used to judge the extent to which objectives are being achieved."

3- "The mission should establish directions for the development of the program that are appropriate for a program of its type and the needs of students in Saudi Arabia."

4- "Goals for the development of the program should be consistent with and support the mission."

Evaluation of the Mission Statement and Objectives:
Strengths:

1- The mission statements and objectives are clear and appropriate.

2- The mission coincides with the main functions of the college.

3- The mission is aligned with the university mission.

4- The mission has been developed after wide consultation with internal and external stakeholders.
5- The mission is the main base of full strategic and operational plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAAA KPI Reference Number</th>
<th>Institution/Program Reference Number</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Sample Target</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>New Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>KPI 2.</td>
<td>Stakeholder evaluation of the Policy Handbook, including administrative flow chart and job responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>New Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1435 H</td>
<td>1434 H</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

- NCAAA KPI Reference Number S3.1
- Institution/Program Reference Number S3.1
- KPI 3. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>New Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73.49%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- NCAAA KPI Reference Number S3.1
- Institution/Program Reference Number S3.1
- KPI 3. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.
Analysis:
The average response to this item was 73.49% only in the male section while the target benchmark was 80%. This percentage is lower than expected which indicate that there is some drawbacks in students' learning experience.

Recommendations:
1- Improve the student level of both subjects: English and Computer.
2- Linking the process of teaching with the practical application domain as possible

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S3.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S3.2
KPI:
4. Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Analysis:
This indicator was estimated based on the survey used to evaluate the courses by students during the last year 1434 using the NCAAA form. Clearly it is shown that the actual benchmark was 75%; it is approximately the same as the last year and the internal benchmarks, but it is lower than the external benchmark. Because of the preparatory year. It means that not all courses were sure evaluated during the last year.

Recommendations
• Establishment for awareness programs (workshops or lectures) to spread the culture of quality among the students.
### Analysis

This indicator was estimated based on the survey used to evaluate the courses by students during the last year 2014 using the NCAAA form. Clearly it is shown that the actual benchmark was 100%; so it meets the target benchmark. It means that all courses were evaluated during the last year. While the external did not consider this KPI so it is (N/A).

### Recommendations

- Establishment for awareness programs (workshops or lectures) to spread the culture of quality among the students.

### NCAAA KPI Reference Number S3.4

Institution/Program Reference Number S3.4

**KPI:**

6. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification of standards of student achievement by people external to the institution during the year.
Analysis
It is shown that the actual benchmark was 100%; so it meets the target benchmark. This means that there was independent verification of standards of student achievement by people (evaluators) external of all programs in the college.

Recommendations
Keeping on bringing external evaluators for verification of standards of student achievement.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S4.1
Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.1
KPI:
7. Ratio of students to teaching staff  (Based on full time equivalents)
Analysis:

Evaluation of the Ratio of students to teaching staff

Appropriateness of students/teaching staff ratio has been calculated in first term 1435/1436. Where the Computer Science & Information program consists of 17 teaching staff + 1 demonstrator. At the same semester the total enrolled students were 72 students.

Strengths:

1- The teaching staff will have more time for student.
2- The students will have more hands-on time with his teacher
3- Different teaching strategies and learning styles can be accommodated.
4- Increasing the social and mental Student-teacher values.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S4.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.2

KPI:
8. Students overall rating on the quality of their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

**Evaluation of the Students overall rating on the quality of their courses have been accounted via the average ratings of students to the course evaluation survey:**

1- The course outline (including the knowledge and skills the course was designed to develop) was made clear to me

2- Sources of help for me during the course including faculty office hours and reference material, were made clear to me

3- My instructor(s) were fully committed to the delivery of the course. - e.g. classes started on time, instructor always present, material well prepared

4- Course materials were of up to date and useful. - texts, handouts, references etc

**Strengths:**
NCAAA KPI Reference Number S4.3
Institution/Program Reference Number S4.3
KPI:
9. Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:
The proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications have been calculated in first term 1435/1436. Where it has been found that 94% of the teaching staff has a verified doctoral qualification.

Strengths:
1- Teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications have more experience of education process.
2- Various highly skilled teaching staff within the education process earns it effectiveness.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number S4.4
Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.4

KPI:
10. Percentage of students entering programs who successfully complete first year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
This indicator shows that the actual benchmark (40%), which is less than the target benchmark but it’s better than the internal benchmark (last year and Math department benchmark), while the external benchmark Tabuk University was N/A.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S4.5

Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.5

KPI:
11. Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp.</th>
<th>Internal Comp.</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep.</th>
<th>External Tabuk</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis
This indicator shows that the actual benchmark is very low while the internal benchmark (Math Department) is almost near the target benchmark.

Recommendations:
1- Students must be encouraged by a academic advisors to get through the department program in minimum time

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S4.6
Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.6
KPI:
12. Proportion of students entering post graduate programs who complete those programs in specified time.
Analysis
This indicator shows that the actual benchmark is 11.2% which is almost half of the Target benchmark but it is better than last year.

NCAAAA KPI Reference Number  S4.7
Institution/Program Reference Number  S4.7
KPI:
13. Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are: (a) employed  (b) enrolled in further study (c) not seeking employment or further study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34.04%</td>
<td>28.72%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis
The result of employed part of this KPI, the actual benchmark was almost equal to Target benchmark and there was no difference regards to last year or the other internal benchmarks (Math Dep.) but it still better than the external benchmark (Tabuk University).

The result of enrolled in further study part of this KPI, the actual benchmark is less than external (Tabuk University), and last year was much better.

Recommendations
1- Support the graduated student with some specialized high-level training courses that helps to raise the employment opportunities for our graduated students.

2- Work to set up partnerships with the business sector.

NCAAAA KPI Reference Number  S5.1
Institution/Program Reference Number  S5.1
KPI:
14. Ratio of students to administrative staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
This indicator shows that the actual benchmark need more improvement in comparison with the target benchmarks and last year or even the internal (Math Dep.)

Recommendations

1- The university can Increase accepting number of students through Increasing administrative staff.
**Institution/Program Reference Number**  S5.2

**KPI:**
15. Proportion of total operating funds (other than accommodation and student allowances) allocated to provision of student services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S5.3

**Institution/Program Reference Number**  S5.3

**KPI:**
16. Student evaluation of academic and career counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five point scale).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

The result for this KPI, the actual benchmark was nearly equal to the target benchmark and the external (Tabuk University)

**Recommendations**
1-Improve Academic Advising activities work.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S6.1

**Institution/Program Reference Number**  S6.1

**KPI:**
17. Stakeholder evaluation of library and media center. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the library & media center, including:
   a) Staff assistance
   b) Current and up-to-date
   c) Copy & print facilities
   d) Functionality of equipment,
   e) Atmosphere or climate for studying
   f) Availability of study sites, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

NCAAA KPI Reference Number S6.2
Institution/Program Reference Number S6.2
KPI:
18. Number of web site publication and journal subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125:1</td>
<td>300/3 = 100</td>
<td>300/3 = 100</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>125:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

actual benchmark needed a little improvement to achieve the target benchmark

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S6.3
Institution/Program Reference Number  S6.3
KPI:
(Average overall rating of the adequacy of the digital library, including:
   a) User friendly website
   b) Availability of the digital databases,
   c) Accessibility for users
   d) Library skill training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep.1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
Institution/Program Reference Number  S7.1

KPI:
20. Annual expenditure on IT budget, including:
   a) Percentage of the total Institution, or College, or Program budget allocated for IT;
   b) Percentage of IT budget allocated per program for institutional for programmatic;
   c) Percentage of IT budget allocated for software licenses;
   d) Percentage of IT budget allocated for IT security;
   e) Percentage of IT budget allocated for IT maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Actual Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Actual External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6000:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S7.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S7.2

KPI:
21. Stakeholder evaluation of the IT services. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of:
   a) IT availability,
   b) Security, Accessibility
   c) Maintenance,
   d) Support systems,
   e) Software and up-dates,
   f) Age of hardware, and
   g) Other viable indicators of service on a five-point scale of an annual survey.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Actual Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Actual External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis

**NCAAA KPI Reference Number S7.3**

**Institution/Program Reference Number S7.3**

**KPI:** 22. Stakeholder evaluation of

- a) Websites, 
- b) e-learning services
- c) Hardware and software
- d) Accessibility
- e) Learning and Teaching
- f) Assessment and service
- g) Web-based electronic data management system or electronic resources (for example: institutional website providing resource sharing, networking & relevant information, including e-learning, interactive learning & teaching between students & faculty on a five point scale of an annual survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

### NCAAA KPI Reference Number S8.1

**Institution/Program Reference Number S8.1**

**KPI:** 23. Total operating expenditure (other than accommodation and student allowances) per student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435 H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

NCAAA KPI Reference Number S9.1
Institution/Program Reference Number S9.1
KPI:
24. Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

The actual benchmarks show that no teaching staff left the institution last year for reasons other than age retirement

NCAAA KPI Reference Number S9.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S9.2
KPI:
25. Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

It is shown that the actual benchmark was 100%; so it meets the target benchmark.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S10.1
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.1
KPI:
26. Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent
member of teaching staff. (Publications based on the formula in the Higher Council Bylaw excluding conference presentations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Through this KPI, it is clear shown that the actual benchmark is less than the target benchmarks, but it is better than the last year which is 0%. However, the actual benchmark is much less than internal benchmark (Math Dep.).

Recommendations

1- Increasing efficiency research groups.
2- Increasing support the scientific research.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number S10.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.2
KPI:
27. Number of citations in refereed journals in the previous year per full time equivalent teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S10.3
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.3
KPI:
28. Proportion of full time member of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Through this KPI, it is clear shown that the actual benchmark is less than the target benchmarks, but it is better than the last year which is 0%. However, the actual benchmark is much less than the internal benchmark (Math Dep.).

Recommendations
1- Increasing efficiency research groups.
2- Establish postgraduate programs

**NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S10.4**
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.4
KPI:
29. Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent members of teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Through this KPI, it is shown that the actual benchmark and the internal benchmarks (last year and Math Dep.) was zero.

Recommendations
1-Encourage the teaching staff for participating in academic conferences and support them.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S10.5
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.5
KPI:
30. Research income from external sources in the past year as a proportion of the number of full time teaching staff members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% of Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>External Tabuk University 1433H</td>
<td>60% of Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through this KPI, it is shown that the actual benchmark is zero.

Recommendations

- Increasing efficiency research groups and encourage them to apply through external sources.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S10.6
Institution/Program Reference Number  S10.6
KPI:
31. Proportion of the total, annual operational budget dedicated to research.
NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S11.1
Institution/Program Reference Number  S11.1
KPI:
32. Proportion of full time teaching and other staff actively engaged in community service activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

It is shown that the actual benchmark was 100%; so it meets the target benchmark.

NCAAA KPI Reference Number  S11.2
Institution/Program Reference Number  S11.2
KPI:
33. Number of community education programs provided as a proportion of the
number of departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Comp. Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>Internal Comp. Dep. 1434H</th>
<th>Internal Math Dep. 1435H</th>
<th>External Tabuk University 1433H</th>
<th>New Target Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Through this KPI, it is shown that the actual benchmark is less than the target benchmarks. However, the actual benchmark is equal to internal benchmarks (last year and Math Dept.) .

Recommendations
1-Increasing number of community education programs to encourage the employers in order to complete their study.