Internal Reviewing Form

Program Quality Reviewing Report

Academic department	Date of Reviewing (Semester/Year)		Program Name	Day and Time	
Electrical Engineering	2	2016	Electrical Engineering	Monday 10\5\2016	9:00-12:00

1- Documentation

NCAAA documents

No	Item	yes	No	Detailed Information			Notes	Recommendations
1	Program Specifications	X		The document is approved	Y es	N o ☐	- Written very well, but still needs revision for minor mistakes. - Sharing courses are important. - All written teaching methods or assessment methods must have evidences of implementation. - Examples: e-learning- periodicals – internet- seminars	- Use correct verbs when you write about Outcomes (see NCAA guidelines for this NCAAA section). - CLO needs to be revised. • Revise the plans for each course • Do not mix between NCAAA form and ABET
2	Course Specifications	X		The document is approved	Y es	N o ☐	- If the course	

#	Document	X	Criteria	Yes	No	Comments
			The document is approved	Yes ☑	No ☐	- includes lab sessions, list in details what are these topics? - Pay attention to the Senior Design courses, they are very important and must have design aspects, showing student ability to conduct experiments, analysis of results.
3	Course Report	X	The document analyzed and there is an action plan	Yes ☐	No ☑	- Generally, there is confusion between CLO and SLO. Please revise. - Every Course report should end with recommendation. - CR + CS must be built and checked together for matching and consistency. - Add student survey to the report
4	Program Annual Report (For last two years)	X	The document is approved	Yes ☑	No ☐	
		X	The document analyzed and there is an action plans	Yes ☑	No ☐	- PYP: Check and ensure the accuracy of the provided information! - Generally, need to be written according to the course reports. Please enhance the quality of this folder.

#	Item			Description	Yes / No	Comments / Recommendations
5	Course File (For the last three years)	X		The files are completed as hard and soft copies	Y ■ / N □	- Archiving and documentation are poor and not well organize. - Put the files on the shelves in logic order, sort be levels or Tracks - Remove duplicated materials from all course files. - Use one date system; and as recommended AD for the inside documents and both H and AD in the front page. - Files should be handy and access easily. - Separate each part in the file and have a list of contents in the first page. - Needs code and labels
6	Program SSR		X	The document is approved	Y ■ / N □	- Needs revision, especially college information,
7	Self-Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Programs	X		The document is approved	Y □ / N ■	- Available, but needs revision, all sub-items must be ends with setting priorities as required and independent reviewer. Stars look high and the way of 1- Should be available for 3 years 2- Needs through review and correction.

No.	Item			Description	Yes / No	Notes	Recommendation
							estimating and calculating the stars need deep revision. Please compare 2 reports to see the progress and write action plan according to the analysis.,	
8	Organizational Chart of the program *This item has been added after the visit*		X	The document is approved	-- / --	The reviewing committee did not check the forms of committees and units in the department	Documents will be checked in the future
NCAAA Requirements							
1	Course Evaluation Survey	X		Analyzed for the last two years with action plan	Yes ■ / No □	Done for all programs	Action plan should be written for two years
2	Program Evaluation Survey	X		Analyzed for the last two years with action plan	Yes ■ / No □	Done for all programs	An action plan should be written for two years
3	Experience Evaluation Survey	X		Analyzed for the last two years with action plan	Yes ■ / No □	Not analyzed data or recommendation for 2015\2016	Results of surveys should be analyzed and an action plan should be written
4	Advisory Board	X		There are at least two meetings with minutes	Yes □ / No ■	---	---

5	KPIs and Rubrics for SLO	X			
			The main topics in meeting discussed the critical issues for program	Y es ☑ N o ☐	---
			The KPIs and Rubrics are defined for all SLOs and approved	Y es ☐ N o ☐	- Use the well defined KPI's available for Electrical Engineering in NCAAA, you do not need to add to them. - External benchmark needed - Staff should recognize the difference between KPI and Assessment methods.
	Program KPIs	X	There is a benchmark	Y es ☑ N o ☐	
			KPIs are measured for the last two years and improvement action plan is prepared	Y es ☑ N o ☐	Check NCAAA – LO – Engineering
			The KPIs of the current, target and benchmark are defined	Y es ☑ N o ☐	
	The consistency with NQF	X	X		
			There is a report about the consistency of Program features and learning outcomes with the NQF	Y es ☑ N o ☐	- Follow NCAAA requirements for this, benchmark might need decision, to keep the current BM or select EE department form It is important to prepare this file in the nearest time.

ABET Documents

#	Document			KSA?		
1	Faculty vitae	X	Is filled for All Faculty members using the approved form	Yes ■	No ☐	Well done, just update and remove those who left. — Update
2	lab equipment	X	Is filled for All Labs using the approved form	Yes ■	No ☐	Please complete the file, and ensure that you have a list of equipment for all the labs, not only the running ones. — Try to have an annual report about labs and its maintenances and requirements, accidents, etc.
3	Course Syllabus	X	Is filled for All Faculty members using the approved form	Yes ■	No ☐	--- — Review CLO's
4	Faculty Report	X	Is filled for All Faculty members using the approved form	Yes ■	No ☐	Should be based on CR. It has to update according to PS and CS — - A workshop for MIE faculty members on how to write CLOs must be arranged - CLOs must be revised.
5	Documentation and archiving	X	Documents are organized and documented	Yes ■	No ☐	---

ABET Requirements

#	Requirement			KSA?		
1	Direct assessment of program SLO	X	All SLO are evaluated for the first semester	Yes ■	No ☐	---
			All SLO are evaluated for the second semester	Y ☐	N ■	In progress

#	Item		Description	Yes / No	Notes
			Summary of the result and action plan is discussed by the quality committee based on the faculty reports from the first semester	Yes ■ No □	---
2	Indirect Assessment	X	All SLOs are evaluated using Indirect assessment	Yes ■ No □	---
3	Exit Review	X	All SLOs are evaluated using Exit review	Yes □ No ■	— Seek a method to conduct this survey using something else rather than telephone!. You can use email, or any better evidence. Faculty member should not fill the questionnaire by himself under any circumstances. / Evidence must be accurate
College Requirements					
1	Follow-Up Table	X	There is a report	Yes ■ No □	The follow-up table provided by Quality deanship and modified by / This part is outstanding in EE. We do recommend that all programs are doing similar.

2	X	There is a recommendations	Yes ☐ No ■	the vice-deanship for Quality and documentation is used
3	X	There is an action plan	Yes ■ No ☐	

2- Main Comments of reviewing process:

1	Quality awareness and organization are excellent in this program, thanks goes to the head of the department and the staff.
2	Approval process is in place and well done.
3	Course reports are not filled with analyses, recommendations and action plans
4	Achieving and documentation need more work
5	Self-Evaluation Scales needs revision
6	There is a good system of evaluation and assessment process for SLOs

3- Recommendations

1	A presentation about course report by faculty members to show their action and recommendation regarding students feedback and the results of evaluation
2	SLOs evaluation results should be used in the course report
3	The course report should be the only source of feedback data regarding the implementation of course specifications.
4	CLOs should be used instead of SLOs.

| 5 | Preparatory year should be followed and Results of course should be evaluated separately for programs and recommendation and action plan should be included |
| 6 | The evaluation and assessment process for ABET and NCAAA should be the same. |

Reviewing Committee Members:
1- Dr. Abdullah Almuhaisen (Vice-dean of Quality and developing)
2- Dr. Abdel-Rahman Al-Qawasmi (Coordinator of Academic accreditation committee)
3- Dr. Sameh Mohammed (Coordinator of Quality Assurance unit)
4- Dr. Jamal Smida (Internal Consult: College of Applied science

Report prepared by:	Dr. Abdullah Almuhaisen Dr. Gamal Somida Dr. Abdel Rahman AlQwasmi Dr. Sameh S Ahmed	Approved by:	*Dr. A. Almuhaisen*
Date:	10/5/2016	Date:	11/5/2016
Signature:	*G. Somida* *Almuhaisen* *AlQwasmi* *SaMeH*	Signature	

Copy to:
1- Dean of the college
1- Program Coordinator (Head of Department)
2- ADU