

Program Quality Reviewing Report (Internal Review)

Academic departmen		Mechanical and l	d Industrial Eng.	Progra	m Name	Mechanical and	l and Industrial Eng.
Year	2016-17	Semester	Fall	Date	18.10.2016	Time	01:30-02:00

1. Documentation Records

	Approved document Course Specifications Approved document Yes \(\square\) No Approved document Yes \(\square\) No dates	1 Program Specifications ■Yes □No Approved document □Yes ■No Not traced	NCAAA documents	No Item Requirement Observations
Approved document	■Yes □No	□Yes ■No		
	is CLOs should be revised	If it's already there, should be kept in Archiving Room		s Recommendations

, m		
X	\wp :	
96	A	
-	N	
) maah	6	
94	ζ.	1.0
M.	V.	A .
-	h -	1.00
	۷.	/ATTA
-	=	NUL Z/
Dulve	\triangle	158 PT
	$_{2}$	W.G.
-	L .	
٩.	K)	1111
Ф	ĮΨ	111
-5	h	(9
F	۷.	
-		
~ 1	1	

r -	Ī				т —
00	7	6	O.	4	
Organizational Chart of the program	Self-Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Programs	Program SSR	Course File (For the last three years)	Program Annual Report (For last two years)	
□Yes □No	Yes [No	■Yes □No	■Yes □No	■Yes □No	
Approved document	Approved document	Approved document	Completed as hard and soft copies	Approved document Analysis and an action plan	
□Yes □No	□Yes ■No	□Yes ■No	■Yes □No	□Yes ■No □Yes □No	
	 Very high star rating Independent opinion missing Criteria 4 missing 	 Check if old Format used? Old data is used Some Data is copied from other College without change Star part not analyzed 	 Contents not properly arranged No Course Material Many items missing 	 Old format used Student Survey not included 	• No result analysis
	Should be revised completely	Should be revised completely	Emphasis should be given to prepare the Course Files properly		



								744
6		5	4		ω	2	н_	NCA
Program KPIs		KPIs and Rubrics for SLO	Advisory Board		Experience Evaluation Survey	Program Evaluation Survey	Course Evaluation Survey	NCAAA Requirements
Yes No		■Yes □No	■Yes □No		■Yes □No	Yes No	□yes ■No	
The measured KPIs for the last two years and action plan with improvements	A benchmark	Defined and approved for all SLOs	Critical issues for program as main topic of discussion	At least two meetings with minutes	Analysis and an action plan for last 2 years	Analysis and an action plan for last 2 years	Analysis and an action plan for last 2 years	
□yes □No	□yes □No	■Yes □No	□Yes ■No	□Yes ■No	□Yes ■No	□Yes ■No	□Yes □No	
	There is a benchmark but not included in the archiving room		No seen	No meeting minutes	Old ReportNo analysis	Old ReportNo analysis		
Action plan needed	All updated documents should be included in the Archiving room		Critical issues should be reported	Meeting minutes should be attached	New report should be prepared	New report should be prepared		



4	ω	2	1	ABE	7	
Faculty Report	Course Syllabus	Lab equipment	Faculty vitae	ABET Documents	The consistency with NQF	
Yes ONo	Yes UNo	■Yes □No	■Yes □No		■Yes □No	
Filled by all Faculty members on the approved form	Filled by all faculty members on the approved form	Filled for all labs on the approved form	Filled by all faculty members on the approved form		A report about the consistency of Program features and learning outcomes with the NQF	The KPIs of the current, target and benchmark
Yes UNo	■Yes □No	■Yes □No	■yes □No		□Yes ■No	□Yes □No
 No instructor's signature Recommendation and action plan not consistent with the result 						
There is a misunderstanding in filling the FR. It is recommended to make an internal workshop for the faculty					A report should be provided	Analysis required



5	Documentation and archiving	■Yes □No	Organized documentation	Yes UNo	
ABE	ABET Requirements				
			Evaluation of all SLO for the first semester	■Yes □No	There is an evaluation but should be included in the archiving room
A	Direct assessment of		Evaluation of all SLO for the second semester	■Yes □No	
þæ	program SLO	Yes Live	Summary of the results and action plan and discussion by the quality committee based on the faculty reports from the first semester	□Yes ■No	All faculty results should be discussed and an action plan should be written
2	Indirect Assessment of program SLO	■Yes □No	Evaluation of all SLOs using Indirect assessment	■Yes □No	
ω	Exit Review	□Yes ■No	Evaluation of all SLOs using Exit review	□Yes □No	Exit review should be conducted and analyzed
Coll	College Requirements				



	ω		2	
	Follow-Up Table		Brochure of Department	Graduates Database
	□Yes ■No		□Yes □No	□Yes □No
An action plan	☐Yes ■No Recommendations	A report	A brochure stating vision, mission, PEO, goals, course structure of department	☐Yes ☐No ☐Updated database
□Yes □No	□Yes □No	□Yes □No	□Yes □No	□Yes □No
			Not checked	Not checked
T T	prepared as per the Vice Deanship requirements	Follow-up table should be		

2. Website Updating Record

Web	Web Checklist				
_	Vision/ Mission and Program Objectives	□yes □No	Updated	□yes □No	Not checked
2	Organizational Chart	□Yes □No	Updated	□Yes □No	Not checked
w	Faculty	□Yes □No	Updated	□Yes □No	Not checked
4	Departmental Committees	□Yes □No	Updated	□Yes □No	Not checked
2	Quality Committees	□Yes □No	Updated	□Yes □No	Not checked
6	Course Syllabi	□Yes □No	Updated	□Yes □No	Not checked



10 Alumn	9 Re	8 Pro	7 Co
umni	Research/ Projects	Program Annual Report	Course Reports
□Yes □No	□yes □No	□yes □No	□Yes □No
Updated	Updated	Updated	Updated
□Yes □No	□Yes □No	□Yes □No	□yes □No
Not checked	Not checked	Not checked	Not checked

3. Instructor Awareness:

		The second second	
Majmaah University has	Response	onse	Comments
Vision and mission	■ Yes	□N ₀	
Training Unit in Deanship for Quality and skills development (What Workshops/seminars have you attended)	☐ Yes	No	
College of Engineering has			
vision/mission	■ Yes	□ No	
Undergrad Catalog	□Yes	No	
Training Unit in the Vice-Deanship for Quality and Development	☐ Yes	■ No	
Academic Accreditation Unit under in the Vice-Deanship for	☐ Yes	No No	
Department has			
Vision/ Mission	■ Yes	□No	No keywords
Program Objectives/ Student Learning Outcome (SLO) (what are the SLOs?)	□Yes	No	



]	1	
Board of Advisors	☐ Yes	No	Instructors didn't know that there is an advisory board
			for the department.
D2L System	■ Yes	□ No	
Assessment Guide	Yes	ON D	
anual for each lab	Yes	□ No	
Ouality Committee	■ Yes	□ No	
Curriculum Development Committee	Yes	□No	
continuous quality improvement process	☐ Yes	□ No	Not checked
A Course has			
Course Learning Outcome (CLO). (What are the CLOs of your course, what are the SLOs assessed in your course)	☐ Yes	No	
 CLOs are assessed for each course using direct (exams, etc.) and indirect assessment (surveys, etc.). (How do you do the survey?, when do you do the assessments?) 	Yes	□No	Do not know SLOs. But they know CLOs.
	Yes	□N _o	
The Instructor			
has academic Advising responsibilities	Yes	□ No	
completes Course Report for each section	Yes	□ No	
updates Course Portfolio	Yes		



4. Miscellaneous

Diff	Different Requirements					
_	Instructor's Time Table	Vec No	Office Hours	Yes UNo		
_	hanged on the door	Yes Livo	Contact details	I GS CINO		
			Do you know the mission of the program?	□Yes ■No	They don't have idea about Mission of the Program	They should be given briefing about Mission of the Program
			Are you participating in the quality work? (i.e., filling surveys, etc.)	□Yes ■No		Different surveys should be filled by the students
2	Student Awareness	■Yes □No	Is there a syllabus for the courses?	■Yes □No		
			Are you aware of the contents of the course in the syllabus?	■Yes □No		
			Is the academic advising useful?	■Yes □No		
			Do you receive feedback on your academic work?	■Yes □No		



5. Main Comments of reviewing process:

9	∞ ·	6	5	4	ω	2	
No indication that Department Council discuss all the reports and recommendations received from various sources, such as the board of advisors feedback, course reports recommendations, etc.	Programs needs a development plan with follow up procedure. No indication that Department Council discuss all the reports and recommendations received from various sources, such as the board	Surveys and analysis Reports are older. Old data, No analysis Faculty Reports are not signed and recommendations and action plans are not consistent with the result	Self-Evaluation Scales Document does not have Independent Opinion; CRITERIA 4 is missing	Program SSR is incomplete: old data is used; some parts are copied from other college without changes; no STAR analysis	Course files are not up to the mark	Student surveys and their analysis not included in the course report	CLOs are not consistent

6. Recommendations:



7	6	2	4	ယ
Department Council needs to discuss the reports and recommendations received from various sources, such as the board of advisors feedback, course reports recommendations, etc.	Development plan and Follow up tables should be prepared.	Analysis of all Surveys required	Self-Evaluation Report should revised completely	Program SSR should revised completely

Reviewing Committee Members:

- 1- 1- Dr. Syed M. Abbas
- 2- Dr. Abdel Rahman AlQawasmi
- 3- Dr. Sameh S. Ahmed

Signature:	Date:	Report prepared by:
me se the	20/10/2016	Dr. Syed M. Abbas; Dr. Abdel Rehman AlQawasmi; Dr. Sameh S. Ahmed;
Signature:	Date:	Approved by:
- Carlon	25/10/ 2016	Dr. A. Almuhaisen

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