



Annual Program Report (APR)

Institution:QAcademic Department :HProgramme :HSpecification Approved Date :

College of Education in Zulfi. Physics Department. Bachelor of Education in Physics (B. Ed in Physics). : 14/11/1437 H

Muharram 1437 H

This form compatible with NCAAA Edition



| 1. Institution: Majmaah | University Date of Report : | 14 \ 11 \ 1437 H | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 2. College : | College of Education in Zulfi | | |
| Department : | Physics Department. | | |
| 3. Dean : Dr.Rashed Hamoud Althanian Department Head: Dr. Fatema Alzahraa Mohammed | | | |
| Campus Branch/Location | Annroval Ry | Date | |
| Main Campus1: College of Education inZulfi –Female Departments:main Building2: Primary - middle - secondary school (in the level 8 from study plan) in Zulfi city. | Faculty Dean | In the start of the year. | |

A. Program Identification and General Information

| 1. Program title : | Bachelor of Education in Physics | Code : | PHYS |
|--|----------------------------------|--------|------|
| Name and position of person completing the APR | | | |
| Dr. Fatema Alzahraa Mohammed, Department Head. | | | |
| Academic year to which this report applies. | | | |



B. Statistical Information

| 1. Number of students who started the program in the year concerned : 16 | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| 2. (a) Number of students who completed the program in the year concerned: | | |
| Completed the final year of the program: 14 | | |
| Completed major tracks within the program (<i>if applicable</i>) not | z olicable | |
| 2. (b) Completed an intermediate award specified as an early exit point <i>(if any)</i> | | |
| 3. Apparent completion rate : | | |
| (a) Percentage of students who completed the program,(Number shown in 2 (a) as a percentage of the number that started the program in that student intake.) | 29.1% | |
| (b) Percentage of students who completed an intermediate award (if any) (e.g. Associate degree within a bachelor degree program) (Number shown in 2 (b) as a percentage of the number that started the program leading to that award in that student intake) | Ν | |
| Comment on any special or unusual factors that might have affected the completion rates (e.g. Transfers between intermediate and full program, transfers to or from other programs). Shortage of student's awareness about of credit hours systems. Insufficiency in application of study plan as it is. | apparent | |
| • The students that delayed to the ending of the program requirements | because | |
| the closure of some courses, during the program years. | | |
| 4. Enrollment Management and Cohort Analysis (Table 1) Cohort Analysis refers to tracking a specific group of students who begin a given year in a program and following them until they graduate (How many students actually start a program and stay in the program until completion). A cohort here refers to the total number of students enrolled in the program at the beginning of each academic year, immediately after the preparatory year. No new students may be added or transfer into a given cohort. Any students that withdraw from a cohort may not return or be added again to the cohort. Cohort Analysis (Illustration): Table 1 provides complete tracking information for the most recent cohort to complete the program, beginning with their first year and tracking them until graduation (students that withdraw are subtracted and no new students are added). Update the years as needed. | | |



| Not Available for Employment | | Available for Employment | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Destination Further Study | Further Study | Other Reasons | Employed in Subject Field | Other Employment | Unemployed |
| Number | - | - | 1 | - | 5 |
| Percent of Respondents | | | | | |
| Analysis: List the strengths and recommendations | | | | | |
| In process | | | | | |

C. Program Context

1 - Significant changes within the institution affecting the program (*if any*) during the past year.

- continued acceptance of the female students of the kindergarten and special education in the faculty

- Open admission to the Faculty of Science in Zulfi, Computer Department for female students.
- Open acceptance of the preparatory year courses for medical students for their numbers to attend dental faculty in Zulfi.

Implications for the program

lack of access to the department of students toward modern departments.

2 - Significant changes external to the institution affecting the program (*if any*) during the past year.

Stop the employment or weakness of the program graduates.

Implications for the program

Desire of students toward modern departments according to the needs of the labor market.

D. Course Information Summary

1. Course Results. Describe and analyze how the individual NCAAA "Course Reports" are utilized to assess the program and to ensure ongoing quality assurance (eg. Analysis of course completion rates, grade distributions, and trend studies.)

(a.) Describe how the individual course reports are used to evaluate the program.

1. Do we see any frequently differences by staff members exceed 25%?

2. Does the teaching strategies and assessment methods of the courses effective or not?

3. Analysis of the factors that affects the results of students and discuss them with staff members in the

first meeting.

4. Review the strengths and weaknesses points of the courses from the private student's questionnaire.

(b.) Analyze the completion rates, grade distributions, and trends to determine strengths and recommendations for improvement.

(1.) Completion rate analysis:

Lack of awareness among the students about study plan in the beginning of the program make them

needing an extra semester to complete the plan

(2.) Grade distribution analysis:

1. The average students success rate in all courses for the first semester equal to 77.67%, ranging

from 50 to 100% and a single decision only 11.11% in PHYS124 course.

2. The average students success rate in all courses for the second semester equal to 91.55 %, ranging

from 46.67 to 100% .

(3.) Trend analysis (a study of the differences, changes, or developments over time; normally several semesters or years):

1. Not yet been completed (will determine in the first meeting of the Council of the year 1437/1438). AH).

2. Analysis of Significant Results or Variations (25% or more).

List any courses where completion rates, grade distribution, or trends are significantly skewed, high or low results, or departed from policies on grades or assessments. For each course indicate what was done to investigate, the reason for the significant result, and what action has been taken.

| A. Course | Computational physics 1 |
|--|--|
| Significant result or variation | 100 % |
| Investigation undertaken | - |
| Reason for significant result | The large number of assignments the students made a good job so you do |
| or variation | not find the students failed. |
| | The course in 7 th level. |
| Action taken (if required) | Increasing the course tasks. |
| B. Course | Mathematical physics 3 |
| Significant result or variation | 100 % |
| Investigation undertaken | - |
| Reason for significant result | The large number of assignments the students made a good job so you do |
| or variation | not find the students failed. |
| | The course in 4 th level secondly after two another courses in the same |
| | mathematical branch. |
| Action taken (if required) | Increasing the course tasks. |
| C. Course | Classical Mechanical 1 |
| Significant result or variation | 10 % |
| Investigation undertaken | Discussion with teacher. |
| Reason for significant result or variation | Low level of students in mathematical skills in this course. |
| Action taken (if required) | More excurses, more tasks, revision of course specification. |

(Attach additional summaries if necessary)

4. Delivery of Planned Courses

(a) List any courses that were planned but not taught during this academic year and indicate the reason and what will need to be done if any compensating action is required.

| Course title and code | Explanation | Compensating action if required |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|

| والمحمقة | |
|----------|--|
| | |

PHYS213

Closed its section.

| (b) Compensating Action Required for Units of Work Not Taught in Courses that were Offered. (Complete only where units not taught were of sufficient importance to require some compensating action) | | |
|--|---|--|
| Course - | | |
| Unit of work | - | |
| Reason | - | |
| Compensating action if required | - | |

E. Program Management and Administration

| List difficulties (<i>if any</i>) encountered in management of the program | Impact of difficulties on the achievement of the program objectives | Proposed action to avoid future difficulties in Response |
|--|---|--|
| The closure of some sections from the college administration because it is small students number. | Lateness of the Students in the completion of the study plan on the determined time. | Opening the sections. |
| The changeable in college tabulator after distribution it to staff members | Redistribution of courses to staff members. | The administration's commitment to including previously sent. |
| Lack of rooms for theoretical exercises associated with the theoretical lectures. | Loss of students time in the search for a place or a lack of concentration at the presence of student labs | The need to provide teaching halls for the theoretical exercises hours. |
| Faculty members overstocked in the same room. | Failure to performance the academic advisor employment, listing complaints from students effectively. | The necessary to providing a private room for the academic advising in the department. |

| Blurred the university vision for the department about continuity, change its trajectory or attachable to the Faculty of Science. | Adversely affect to the performance of the department , also its members and the students | Clarify the vision of the university administration. |
|---|---|---|
| The Overlapping between the units work and the lack of integration among them. | Repetition of the work done by the department members. | Making an integrated action plan for all the units with each other by coordination meetings. |
| Weakness of the continuous meetings between the academic departments and the head of quality center. | Along time to doing the required work and may be is an incomplete. | The necessary for doing meetings between the academic departments and the head of quality center, to cooperate in the implementation of the required tasks , unify work and working on its development, and preservation of the right of outstanding initiatives. |

F. Summary Program Evaluation

| 1. Graduating Students Evaluation (To be reported on in years when surveys are undertaken) | | |
|---|----------|--|
| Date of Survey 14 / 1 / 1437 H . | | |
| <u>Attach : survey report</u> Not allowed yet | | |
| a. List most important recommendations for | Analysis | |

improvement, strengths and suggestions

(e.g. Assessment, action already taken, other considerations, strengths and recommendation for improvement.)

| 1- Regular meetings to follow up graduates | - the data base for the graduates in the |
|---|--|
| of the program in the college for clarify | unit of graduates by the department . |
| what is the newest, is useful for graduates | - named staff to connecting with |
| and helps them in the development of their | graduates and follow-up them. |
| self. | - Tell them the news of the new |
| 2- Provide appropriate opportunities for | possible locations for the employment |
| graduates. | or ads within the Kingdom. |
| 3- Work meetings with stockholders and | - Inviting them to attend training |
| community institutions to discuss its | courses within the college. |
| opinion on the study plan for the | - Work training courses for students |
| Department of Physics. | expected to graduate. |
| 4- | |

b. Changes proposed in the program (*if any*) in response to this analysis and feedback.

2. Other Evaluation (e.g. Evaluations by employers or other stakeholders, external review) **Describe evaluation process**.

| Attach review/survey report | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| a. List most important recommendations for | e.g.Analysis of recommendations for | | | |
| improvement, strengths and suggestions for | improvement: (Are recommendations valid and what | | | |
| improvement. | action will be taken, action already taken, or other considerations?) | | | |
| Not allowed yet | - | | | |
| b. Changes proposed in the program (if any) |) in response to this feedback. | | | |
| - Not allowed yet | | | | |
| 3. Ratings on Sub-Standards of Standard | 4 by program faculty and teaching staff; 4.1 | | | |
| to 4.10. | | | | |
| (a) Standard 4 Sub-Standards. Are the "Best Practices" followed; Yes or No? Provide a revised rating for each sub-standard. Indicate action proposed to improve | | | | |

performance (if any).

| Sub- Standards | Best Practices Followed (Y/N) | 5 Star Rating | List priorities for improvement. |
|-------------------|--|------------------|--|
| 4.1 | Y | *** | Doing the questionnaires to companies and graduates and other employers. |
| 4.2 | Y | *** | |
| 4.3 | Y | *** | Identifying KPI's which include quality standards for learning outcomes for all courses of the program. An annual and comprehensive evaluation must be done at least every five years |
| 4.4 | Y | **** | |
| 4.5 | Y | *** | Doing work files to the Academic Advising process. |
| 4.6 | Y | *** | Developing appropriate mechanisms for reviewing the effectiveness of various teaching strategies will used in courses. |
| 4.7 | Y | **** | |
| 4.8 | Y | *** | |
| 4.9 | Y | *** | Specification for field experience, and planning for development. -reviewing of the verification process of the work of questionnaires about field experience. -Evaluation of field experience, by submitted a report containing a summary of the strengths and points requiring development, and implementation priorities. |
| 4.10 | Not applicable | - | |
| Analysis of | f Sub-standards | List the str | enoths and recommendations for improvement |

Analysis of Sub-standards. List the strengths and recommendations for improvement of the program's self-evaluation of following best practices.

Accreditation of program and courses specification in department meetings. Training of the staff.

G. Program Course Evaluation

| 1. List courses taught during the year. Indicate for each course whether student evaluations were undertaken and/or other evaluations made of quality of teaching. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---|-------------------|----|
| For each cou | urse indicate if ac | tion is | planne | d to improve teaching. | | 0 |
| Course Code / Course Title | | Stu Evalu | dent ations | Other Evaluation | Action Planned | |
| | | Yes | No | (speerly) | Yes | No |
| MATH111 | Calculus (1) | | | - | | |
| CHEM111 | General Chemistry (1) | | \checkmark | - | | |
| PHYS111 | General Physics (1) | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS121 | Mathematical Physics (1) | \checkmark | | Internal revision by department Staff members. | | |
| PHYS122 | Classical Mechanics (1) | | | - | | |
| PHYS123 | General Physics (2) | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS124 | Optics | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS126 | Optics Lab. | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS212 | Mathematical Physics (2) | \checkmark | | Internal revision by department Staff members. | | |
| PHYS213 | General Physics (3) | | \checkmark | - | | |
| PHYS214 | Thermodynamics | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS215 | Classical Mechanics (2) | | | - | | |
| PHYS221 | Mathematical Physics (3) | | | - | | |
| PHYS222 | Electricity and Magnetism (1) | | | - | | |
| PHYS223 | Wave motion and Vibrations | \checkmark | | Internal revision by department Staff members. | | |
| PHYS224 | Modern Physics | | | | | |
| PHYS311 | Quantum Mechanics (1) | | | - | | |
| PHYS312 | Electricity and Magnetism (2) | | | Internal revision by department Staff members. | | |
| PHYS313 | Electronics (1) | \checkmark | | - | | |
| PHYS314 | Electrodynamics | \checkmark | | Internal revision by department Staff members. | | |

teorogi (Leoda



(Add items or attach list if necessary)

2. List courses taught by this program this year and for this program that are in other programs.

| Level | Course Code | Course Title | Number of sections | Credit Hours | College or Department |
|---------|----------------|--|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Level 1 | SALM100* | Islamic University Requisites | | 2 | Islamic studies Department |
| | ARAB101 | Linguistic Skills Per General requirement University Requisites | | 2 | Arabic Department |
| | **** | | | 2 | Educational Sciences |
| | EDU 116 | Teaching Techniques and | | 2 | Department |

| Level | Course Code | Course Title | Number of sections | Credit Hours | College or Department | |
|---------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | Communications Skills | | | | |
| | EDU 117 | Fundamentals of Islamic Education | | 2 | | |
| | EDU 118 | The System and Policy of Education in KSA | Per | 2 | | |
| | CHEM 111 | General Chemistry (1) | requirement | 2 | Chemistry Department | |
| | MATH 111 | Calculus (1) | | 2 | Mathematical Department | |
| | PHYS 111 | General Physics (1) | 5 | 2 | Physics Department (for MATH. and CHEM. Departments) | |
| | SALM100* | Islamic University Requisites | Per | 2 | Islamic studies Department | |
| | EDU 126 | Developmental Psychology | requirement | 2 | Educational Sciences Department | |
| Level 2 | PHYS 123 | General Physics (2) | 2 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 124 | Optics | 1 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 126 | Optics Lab. | 1 | 1 | Physics | |
| | PHYS 121 | Mathematical Physics (1) | 1 | 4 | Department | |
| | PHYS 122 | Classical Mechanics (1) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | **** | General University Requisites | | 2 | Educational | |
| Level 3 | EDU 216 | Psychological Health | Per requirement | 2 | Sciences | |
| | evel 3 EDU 217 EDU 217 EDU 217 Educational Research | | • | 2 | Department | |
| | PHYS 213 | General Physics (3) | 1 | 3 | Physics | |
| | PHYS 214 | Thermodynamics | 1 | 3 | Department | |

tanaal itaala

| Level | Course Code | Course Title | Number of sections | Credit Hours | College or Department | |
|---------|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | PHYS 212 | Mathematical Physics (2) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 215 | Classical Mechanics (2) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | SALM100* | Islamic University Requisites | Per | 2 | Islamic studies Department | |
| | EDU 226 | Educational Psychology | requirement | 2 | Educational Sciences Department | |
| Level 4 | PHYS 223 | Wave motion and Vibrations | 1 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 222 | Electricity and Magnetism (1) | 1 | 4 | Physics | |
| | PHYS 224 | Modern Physics | 1 | 3 | Department | |
| | PHYS 221 | Mathematical Physics (3) | 1 | 4 | | |
| | EDU 316 | Administration and Educational planning | Per | 2 | Educational | |
| | EDU 317 Production of learning Resources | | requirement | 2 | Department | |
| Level 5 | PHYS 313 | Electronics (1) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 314 | Electrodynamics | 1 | 4 | | |
| | PHYS 312 | Electricity and Magnetism (2) | 1 | 4 | Physics Department | |
| | PHYS 311 | Quantum Mechanics (1) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | EDU 326 | Teaching Strategies | | 2 | Educational | |
| Level 6 | EDU 327 | Educational Curricula | Per requirement | 2 | Sciences Department | |
| | PHYS 387 | Elective course* Nanotechnology | 1 | 2 | | |
| | PHYS 324 | Electronics 2 | 1 | 3 | | |
| | PHYS 322 | Quantum Mechanics 2 | 1 | 3 | Physics Department | |
| | PHYS 321 | Statistical Physics | 1 | 3 | Department | |
| | PHYS 323 | Solid State Physics (1) | 1 | 3 | | |

Clarge Dilector

| Level | Course Code | Course Title | Number of sections | Credit Hours | College or Department | |
|---------|----------------|--|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | EDU 416 | Modern Trends in Teaching Strategy | Per | 2 | Educational Sciences | |
| | EDU 417 | Educational Evaluation | requirement | 2 | Department | |
| Level 7 | PHYS 413 | Atomic and molecular Spectra | 1 | 4 | | |
| | PHYS 411 | Computational Physics (1) | 1 | 3 | Physics | |
| | PHYS 415 | Nuclear Physics (1) | 1 | 4 | Department | |
| | PHYS 412 | Solid State Physics (2) | 1 | 3 | | |
| | EDU 427 | Practicum | Per requirement | 6 | Educational Sciences Department | |
| | PHYS 391 | Elective course* Biophysics | 1 | 2 | | |
| Level 8 | PHYS 424 | Laser Physics and its Applications | 1 | 3 | Physics Doportmont | |
| | PHYS 421 | Computational Physics (2) | 1 | 3 | Department | |
| | PHYS 423 | Nuclear Physics (2) | 1 | 4 | | |

3. Program Learning Outcome Assessment :

Design a program learning outcome assessment plan using the NCAAA accreditation four year cycle. By the end of the four year cycle all program learning outcomes are to be assessed using KPIs with benchmarks and analysis, national or international standardized testing if available, rubrics, exams and grade analysis, or some alternative scientific measure of student performance.

| KPI # | NQF Learning Domains and Learning Outcomes | Method of Assessment for LOs | Date of Assessment | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1.0 | Knowledge | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Recognize the basics, principles, and theories of physics, in the different branches. | • Homework. | (through the semester) | | | |

| 1 2 | Name the basic concepts of Education in | • Group | (through the semester) | | |
|-----|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1.4 | Islamic studies. | • Discussion | (through the semester) | | |
| | <u>Define</u> the basic concepts in physics, | • Mid-term exam | (the 7 th /8 th week) | | |
| 1.3 | Education assistance, such as mathematics, chemistry, and computer. | • Practical Exam | (14 th week) | | |
| | | • Final Exam | (15 th week) | | |
| 2.0 | Cog | nitive Skills | | | |
| • 1 | Use the principles and theories of | • Homework. | (through the semester) | | |
| 2.1 | different branches. | • Group | (through the semester) | | |
| 2.2 | <u>Use</u> of various hardware components of the physical laboratory to <u>conduct</u> physical | • Discussion | (through the semester) | | |
| | experiments. | • Mid-term exam | (the $7^{\text{th}}/8^{\text{th}}$ week) | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2.3 | <u>Apply</u> the knowledge gained and the use of modern teaching strategies in explaining the | • Practical Exam | (14 th week) | | |
| | physical systems. | • Final Exam | (15 th week) | | |
| 3.0 | Interpersonal | Skills & Responsibility | | | |
| | Take into account the ethical and | • Showing students | | | |
| 3.1 | issues related to the teaching profession | • activities in the class. | | | |
| | Apply the professional and ethical principles | XX 1 1 | (through the semester) | | |
| | to the teaching profession. | • Work in a team. | | | |
| 3.2 | Develop the cooperative learning through | | | | |
| 4.0 | Communication, Inform | mation Technology, Nur | nerical | | |
| 4.1 | <u>Use</u> computer programs in physical systems applications. | Showing students activities in the class | (through the semester) | | |
| 4.2 | Take responsibility for self-learning and lead the team. | • Practical exam. | (14 th week) | | |
| 5.0 | Ps | ychomotor | | | |
| 5.1 | Not Applicable | | | | |

Provide an analysis of the Program Learning Outcome Assessment Cycle (List strengths and recommendations for improvement).

Provide "direct assessments" for the current year's program learning outcomes, according to the dates provided above (G.2). A KPI Assessment Table is provided below. Each learning outcome should utilize a



separate KPI table. Over the four (five/six) year cycle, all program learning

Provide "direct assessments" for the current year's program learning outcomes, according to the dates provided above (G.2). A key performance indicator (KPI) table is provided below. Each learning outcome should utilize a separate KPI table. Over the four (five/six) year cycle, all program learning outcomes are to be assessed and reported in the Annual Program Report(s).

Note: Programs are to provide their own KPIs for directly measuring student performance.

The KPI Assessment Table is used to document directly assessed program learning outcomes. Each program learning outcome should use a separate table. Direct assessments methods may include: national or international standardized test results, rubrics, exams and learning outcome grade analysis, or learning achievement using an alternative scientific assessment system (copy the KPI Assessment Table and paste to make additional tables as needed).

| VDI#. | Drogrom VDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| KP1#: | Program KP1 : |
| | |
| •••••••••••••••••• | |
| A gaogement Voor + 1426/1427 | Dragrom Learning Outcomer |
| Assessment rear: 1430/1437 | Program Learning Outcome: |
| | |
| | |
| ••••••••••••••••• | |
| | |
| NQF Learning Domain | |
| Target Bonchmark | |
| Target Denchmark | |
| KPI Actual Benchmark | |
| | |
| Internal Benchmark | |
| | |
| External Benchmark | |
| Now Target Benchmark | |
| New Target Denemiark | |
| Analysis: (List strengths and recon | nmendations) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| •••••• | |

KPI Assessment Table

4. Orientation programs for new teaching staff

| Orientation programs provided ? | Yes \checkmark | NO | - | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----|---|--|
| If offered how many participated ? | 2 | | | |
| a. Brief Description | | | | |

A meeting was held by both Dean and vice dean with the newest faculty members to welcome them, giving them the required information about how we working good, display some of the regulations pertaining to academic work and alerts to be observed.

b. List recommendations for improvement by teaching staff. Not Allowed

c. If orientation programs were not provided, give reasons.

5. Professional Development Activities for Faculty, Teaching and Other Staff

| a Activities Provided | | How many Participated | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| a. Activities r rovided | Teaching Staff | Other Staff | | |
| E-learning training courses (D2L System). | 12 | - | | |
| A variety of training courses provided by the Training Unit | 6 | - | | |
| A variety of training courses in the measurement and evaluation models | 5 | - | | |
| Training courses and variety lectures provided by the Training Unit | 6 | - | | |
| Variety of lectures introduce by scientific research unit | 6 | - | | |
| training Courses provided by the Institute of Management in Riyadh | - | 6 | | |

b. Summary analysis on usefulness of activities based on participant's evaluations or other evaluation methods.

These training has the benefits of the development of staff in the teaching processes and assessment, the

use of modern technologies in education, such as D2L and scientific research.

H. Independent Opinion on Quality of the Program

(e.g. head of another similar department/ program offering comment on evidence received and conclusions reached)



Program KPI and Assessment Table

| KPI # | KPIS | KPI Target Benchmark | KPI Actual Benchmark | KPI Internal Benchmarks | KPI External Benchmark s | KPI Analysis | KPI New Target Benchmark |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Stakeholder ratings of the Mission statement and Objectives. | 70 % | 72 % | 55 % | - | Very good | 80 % |
| 2 | Teaching and other staff evaluation of the Policy Handbook, including administrative flow chart and job responsibilities (Average rating on the adequacy of the | 70 % | 72.5 % | 72.5 % | _ | Very good | 75 % |
| 3 | Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.(Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five | 75 % | 75 % | 78 % | _ | Very good | 80 % |
| 4 | Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year. | 100 % | 100 % | 76 % | _ | excellent | 100 % |
| 5 | Ratio of students to administrative staff | 1:10 | 1:8 | 1:8 | - | Very good | 1:8 |
| 6 | Students overall rating on the quality of their courses. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career courselling on a five point scale) | 70% | 80 % | 81.5 % | _ | good | 82 % |
| 7 | Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications. | 50 % | 58 % | 63.% | - | Very good | 65 % |
| 8 | Percentage of students entering programs who successfully complete first year | 80 % | 100 % | 100 % | - | Very good | 80 % |
| 9 | Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are: | 50 % 30 % %20 | 20 % 0 % 80 % | 20 % 0 % 80 % | - | frailer | 50 % 30 % %20 |
| 10 | Student evaluation of academic counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five point scale) | 75 % | 82 % | 73 % | | Very good | 80 % |

| 11 | Stakeholder evaluation of library and media center. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the library & media cente | 60 % | 70 % | _ | _ | Very good | 70 % |
|----|--|------|--------|--------|---|--------------|------|
| 12 | 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) | 75 % | 70 % | 75 % | - | good | 75 % |
| 13 | Stakeholder evaluation of E-learning services. | 70 % | 83.3 % | - | - | Very good | 70 % |
| 14 | Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement. | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | - | excellent | 0 % |
| 15 | Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year | 80 % | 100 % | 100 % | _ | excellent | 80 % |
| 16 | Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent member of teaching staff. | 5 | 3 | 3 | _ | middle | 5 |
| 17 | Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent members of teaching staff | 10 | 2 | 1 | - | failed | 5 |
| 18 | Proportion of full time teaching and other staff actively engaged in community service activities. | 50 % | 36 % | 29.5 % | _ | good | 50 % |

Whole Program Analysis of KPIs and Benchmarks: (list strengths and recommendations)

Note the rise in the rates of some of the KPI's for this year 36-1437 H as shown below: -

- Stakeholder ratings of the Mission statement and Objectives inductor as well as the Stakeholder evaluation of E-learning services.
- The improvement plan aims to raise the proportion of community service index for the year 36/37 for the year 35/36.
- High students to assess the quality of learning experiences in the program to 75% in the second semester inductor this is consistent

with the minimum target for this year.

• High inductor year students assess the quality of courses to 80% in the second semester above the minimum target for this year.

NOTE The following definitions are provided to guide the completion of the above table for Program KPI and Assessment.

<u>KPI</u> refers to the key performance indicators the program used in its SSRP. This includes both the NCAAA suggested KPIs chosen and all additional KPIs determined by the program (including 50% of the NCAAA suggested KPIs and all others).

Target Benchmark refers to the anticipated or desired outcome (goal or aim) for each KPI.

Finding Benchmark refers to the actual outcome determined when the KPI is measured or calculated.

Internal Benchmarks refer to comparable benchmarks (actual findings) from inside the program (like data results from previous years or data results from other departments within the same college).

External Benchmarks refer to comparable benchmarks (actual findings) from similar programs that are outside the program (like from similar programs that are national or international).

<u>KPI Analysis</u> refers to a comparison and contrast of the benchmarks to determine strengths and recommendations for improvement.

New Target Benchmark refers to the establishment of a new anticipated or desired outcome for the KPI that is based on the KPI analysis.

Program Action Plan Table

In process.

| Directions: | Based on the " | 'Analysis of KPI | is and Benchmarks | " provided in the | e above Program | KPI and Assessme | ent Table, list the |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| recommend | lations identifi | ed and proceed | l to establish a con | tinuous improve | ment action plan | 1. | |

| No. | Recommendations | Actions | Assessment Mechanism or Criteria | Responsible Person | Start Date | Completion Date | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | 1 In process. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actio | n Plan Analysis (List the strengths a | nd recommendation | s for improvement | of the Program Acti | on Plan). | | | | | |
| | In process. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

I. Action Plan Progress Report

| 1. Progress on Implementation of Previous Year's Action Plans | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Actions Planned | ions Planned Planned Completion Date Person Responsible Completed | | If Not Complete, Give Reasons | | | | | | |
| In process. | | | | | | | | | |
| b | | | | | | | | | |
| c | | | | | | | | | |
| d | | | | | | | | | |

| Program Chair / | Coordinator Name : | Dr. Fatema Al | zahraa N | Iohamed | |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|------------------|--------------|
| Signature : | | | Date Re | eport Completed: | 19/11/1437 H |
| Received by: | | | Dean/D | epartment Head | |
| Signature: | | | Date: | 19/11/1437 H | |