



ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM KPIS

College of engineering
Nairan Universitv

MARCH 15, 2018

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis		
							Strengths	Improvement	
S01 Mission Goals and Objectives									
S1.1	1. Stakeholders' awareness ratings of the Mission Statement and Objectives (Average rating on how well the mission is known to teaching staff, and undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, on a five-point scale in an annual survey).	Overall	79%	80%	82%	N.A	81%	As listed below:	Satisfied and need to compare with benchmarks internally and externally
		a-Teaching staff	93%	80%	92%	N.A	95%	-They were involved in developing the vision and mission - The responded are 100%	Satisfied and need to compare with benchmarks internally and externally
		b-Undergrad uate students	70%	80%	72%	N.A	80%	- Students are easy to be reached. - Electronic-questionnaire - High technical skills of the students	The level of satisfaction of student is below the target level. The vision and mission need to be widely distributed among the students.
		c-Graduate students	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
S1-2	2. The approval decision to adopt and document the vision and mission from program and college council.	Minutes of meeting	Minutes of meeting	Minutes of meeting	N.A	Null			Completed
S1-3	3. The proportion of alignment between the university, college and the program mission statement	95%	90%	95%	N.A		Provided by the quality unite of the college.	Satisfied and need to compare with benchmarks internally and externally	
S1-4	4. The number of decisions and decrees made with reference to the mission of the program	70%	75%	70%	N.A				Decrees of program council need to be related to the mission statement

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - <u>Civil Eng.</u> 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S02 Program Administration								
S2-1	5. Stakeholder evaluation of the Policy Handbook, including administrative flow chart and job responsibilities (Average rating on the adequacy of the Policy Handbook on a five- point scale in an annual survey of teaching staff and final year students).	84%	85%	75.2%	N.A	85%	The guideline was prepared by a committee related to one of the university projects.	Satisfied and need to compare with benchmarks internally and externally
	Teaching staff	88.9%	90%	88%		90%		
	Final year students	78%	85%	63%		85%		
S2-2	6. Documents that define the policies and authorities	Documents	Documents	Documents	N.A	Documents		
S03 Management of Program Quality Assurance								
S3.1	7. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the program. (Average rating of the overall quality of their program on a five-point scale in an annual survey final year students.)	76.4%	80%	76.6%	N.A	80%		Need to compare with benchmarks internally and externally
S3.2	8. Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year. during the year.	100%	80%	100%	N.A	100%	As it is compulsory	Satisfied, all courses are evaluated by each students using online questioner

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S04 Learning and Teaching								
S4.1	9. Ratio of students to teaching staff. (Based on full time equivalents)	1: 10.6	Theoretical courses: 1: 12	1:12	N.A	Theoretical courses: 1: 12		Required to compare with benchmarks internally and externally.
			Studio Courses: 1: 6	NA	NA	Studio Courses: 1: 6		
S4.2	10. Students overall rating on the quality of their courses. (Average rating of students on a five-point scale on overall evaluation of courses.)	80%	78%	76.6%	N.A	87%		Encourage the staff to communicate effectively with the students
S4.3	11. Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications.	64%	70%	86%	N.A	70%		Required to compare with benchmarks internally and externally.
S4.4	12. Percentage of students entering program whom successfully complete first year.	60%	80%	100%	N.A			Open first year courses in the summer semester
S4.5	13. Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time.	0%	40%	45.5%	N.A	20%		Not Satisfied, action plan should consider this point. Open more courses in the summer semester

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S4.6	14. Proportion of graduates from postgraduate program:	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	There is NO post-graduate program provided
S4.7	15. 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	45% 0% 0%	50% 10% 0%	57% 0% 0%	N.A	60% 10% 0%		The achieved proportion is higher than the targeted one. However, it is required to compare with benchmarks internally and externally.
S4.8	16. Ratio of students to teaching staff. (Based on program)	1: 10.6	Theoretical courses: 1: 12	1:12	N.A	Theoretical courses: 1: 12		
			Studio Courses: 1: 6	N.A	N.A	Studio Courses: 1: 6		
S4.9	17. Satisfaction of employment for professional and personal skills of the graduates of the program. (average)	60%	75%	55%	N.A	57%		Improve the satisfaction rate of the employers about the professional and personal skills of the Architectural engineering program graduates.
S05 Student Administration and Support Services								
S5.1	18. Ratio of students to administrative staff	12:1	45:1	N.A	N.A	45:1	The ratio of students to	To support the program with at least two

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
							administrative staff was 12:1, which is much higher than the target ratio of 45.1. (Assuming the current administrative staff of the college is serving the department)	administrative staff.
S5.2	19. The percentage of students participating in non-curricular activities	20%	40%	62%	N.A		None	Students should be encouraged to participate in none curricular activities
S5.3	20. Student evaluation of academic and career counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five-point scale in an annual survey of final year students.	64%	80%	40%	N.A	70%	The point of the strength is that lot off student are highly satisfied with mechanism implemented by the department to help students getting the right academic advising. Another point of the strength shown with student's satisfaction on the	To review the vocational guidance mechanism for students and improve the rules and regulations entrusted to them. • To increase the efficiency of academic guidance for students by increasing the hours of academic guidance and the provision of advanced training courses for academic tutors, in order to reach 70% of the new target for the next academic

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
							level of helps and supports provided by their academic advisors during the registration period.	year. • To encourage students and encourage them to participate in various student activities such as sports, cultural ... etc
S06 Learning Resources								
S6.1	21. 17. Stakeholder evaluation of library and media centre. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the library & media centre, 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 a- g) Any other quality indicators of service on a five- point scale of an annual survey.)	60%	75%	68.75%	N.A	70%		Text books must be increased. Increase the printing services.
S6.2	Number of book titles held in the library as a proportion of the number of students.	0.65 : 1	10 : 1	1:20	N.A	0.65 : 1		Textbooks must be covered for all courses offered by the program.
S6.3	23. 19. Stakeholder evaluation of the digital library. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of the digital library, including: a) User friendly website	80%	95%	77.76%	NA	85%		More Training on the use of digital library skills should be done

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
	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.)							
S07 Facilities and Equipment								
S7.1	24. 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	NA	NA	N.A	NA	NA		
S7.2	25. Stakeholder evaluation of the IT services. (Average overall rating of the adequacy of: a) IT availabilit, b) Security, c) Maintenance,	85%	90%	85%	NA	90%		

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
	d) Accessibility e) Support systems, f) Software and up-dates, g) Age of hardware, and a- h) Other viable indicators of service on a five- point scale of an annual survey.)							
S7.3	26. Stakeholder evaluation of a) Websites, b) e-learning services c) Hardware and software d) Accessibility e) Learning and Teaching f) Assessment and service a- 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).	80%	90%	70%	N.A	85%		Satisfied
S7.4	27. Number of accessible computer terminals per student.	1:5	1:10	1:6	N.A	1:5		Software required for the courses must be installed in the computer Lab.

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)								
KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S08 Financial Planning and Management								
S8.1	28. The percentage of teaching staff satisfaction with financial management system and the adequacy of the available budget for the program	58%	60%	58%	NA	60	The results of the questionnaire showed good satisfaction for the financial management system and the adequacy of the available budget for the program and the level of satisfaction were greater than 50%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Mechanisms are needed to allocate a proportion of the budget for departmental operation per academic year. •The coordinator of department or head of department must submit annual budget proposals for the program •Detailed annual reports on the program budget should be prepared by the program administration
S09 Employment Processes								
S9.1	29. Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement.	0%	0%	7%	N.A	Not required		Satisfied
S9.2	30. Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year.	1:2	1:1	1:0.60	N.A	Not required		All new staff members need to attend workshops.
S10 Research								

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S10.1	31-Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent teaching staff. (Publications based on the formula in the Higher Council Bylaw excluding conference presentations)	9	1:2	11	N.A	Not required	The accessibility to the resources such as computers and physics labs that help to conduct a scientific research.	Encouraging faculty members and providing opportunities to develop their research capacities and active participation in this field, both inside and outside the Kingdom, by providing adequate moral and material support and facilitating the related procedures by the University administration.
S10.2	32-Number of citations in refereed journals in the previous year per full time equivalent faculty members.	170	150	50	N.A	200		
S10.3	33-Proportion of full time member of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year.	50%	75%	30%	N.A	90% -100%		
S10.4	34-Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent faculty members.	0	N.A	0	N.A	1/ Staff P		
S10.5	35-Research income from external sources in the past year as a proportion of the number of full time faculty members.	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A		
S10.6	36. Proportion of the total, annual operational budget dedicated to research.	N.A	N.A	1:2.2	N.A	N.A		
S11 Relationships with the Community								
S11.1	37-Proportion of full time teaching and other staff actively engaged in community service activities.	Less 20%	50%	0	N.A		The presence of faculty	Strengthening the relationship and

Architectural Engineering Program KPIs and Assessment Table, (ARE- KPIs)

KPI Code	List of Program KPIs Approved by the Institution	KPI Actual Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI Target Benchmark	KPI Internal Benchmark - Civil Eng. 1438/1437	KPI External Benchmark 1438/1437	KPI New Target Benchmark 1439/1438	KPI Analysis	
							Strengths	Improvement
S11.2	38. Number of community education programs, consultancy, and training provided by the program.			3			members in the department with various engineering abilities.	exchange of visits between the College, the Department and between government institutions and civil society organizations.

Introduction:

The KPIs listed in this document have been identified by the National Commission for Academic Accreditation & Assessment, in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for use within institutions. Architectural engineering (ARE) program at Najran University has added some additional KPIs.

Based on the KPIs that cover the NCAAA's eleven benchmarks, which are the minimum indicators to be measured periodically (quarterly or annually) and based on the Target Benchmark, this report evaluates the KPIs of Architectural Engineering Program for the academic year 1437/38 H. It is reporting the measurement of the (Actual Benchmark) and comparing it with the Internal Benchmark, to stand on the continuous improvement of the ARE program, in order to determine the achievement of the goals and the mission by identifying strengths and weaknesses of the ARE-KPIs. Then developing plans to improve these weaknesses.

However, based on the table of ARE-KPIs for the first semester of the academic year 1437/38 H (Shown earlier), the strengths and weaknesses of the ARE-KPIs of each criterion can be determined and recommendations for improvement are drawn as follows:

The First Standard S01: Mission, Goals and Objectives:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The decision to adopt the Vision and Mission of the Department Council and the College Council is archived with the academic councils. The vision and mission have been published on the website of the program, posters and brochures, and television screens in the department. As well as explained to beneficiaries of the program.
- The average actual satisfaction rate on the vision and mission of the program was illustrated in table of ARE-KPIs. It was found for faculty members (93%), and undergraduate students (70%). With an average of (79%) for all stakeholders, which is close to 80%.
- The content of the program's vision and mission is consistent with the content of the vision and mission of college and university. The well-matched was with a percentage of 95%, which is higher than the target of 90%.
- Easy to communicate with students and graduates through social media, and then carry out a survey on their views through these electronic questionnaires.
- All faculty members have participated and involved in formulating and improving the vision and mission of the architecture program.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The average actual satisfaction rate of Degree students is (70%), this is lower than the target of 80%. However, it is largely in line with the percentage achieved in the internal benchmark program (Civil Engineering - University of Najran). This is due to the low number of students participating in electronic questionnaires.
- There is no recording to the number of decisions taken in the department's board based on the program's mission.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- Increase awareness of the vision and mission of the ARE-program through seminars and workshops that concerns on the students, and take their views in the formulation of their statements.
- It is recommended to increase the number of surveyed students for measuring their degree of awareness as much as possible in the future for obtaining accurate evaluation results.
- The actual percentage of satisfaction of faculty members meets the target ratio. It requires comparison with External Benchmark.

The Second Standard, S02: Program Management:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- All the department's records and documents specifying the policies and authorities (roles and responsibilities) and those related to the conduct of administrative and academic work are documented and preserved (electronic and paper copies) by the Department.
- Satisfaction of faculty members and administrators with regard to the organizational structure of the department and its policies for managing administrative and academic work was 89%, which considered much closer to the target percentage i.e. 90%.
- The average actual percentage of stockholder assessment of the adequacy of the policy guide is from faculty members (88%) and undergraduate students (78%). With a total average of 84%, which considered much closer to the target percentage i.e. 85%. In comparison to the internal reference program (Civil Engineering - Najran University), the satisfaction with this indicator is good.
- The questionnaire provided to faculty members of the Architectural Engineering Department was comprehensive and clear, especially the following:
 - The academic leadership of the program maintains all powers and authorities when making the decision.
 - The academic leadership of the program seeks to apply the instructions strictly.
 - The academic leadership of the program uses various channels of communication with faculty members.
 - The academic leadership of the program shows flexibility in dealing with it.
 - The academic leadership transmitters of the program are clearly articulated.

- The academic leadership of the program prefers to use the interview method when communicating information and obtaining information.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The satisfaction of final year students on the organizational structure of the department and its policies for the conduct of academic work was 78%. Which is below the target i.e. 85%.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- There are some procedures and mechanisms used as a system of work that need to be approved by the Council of the Department and the College Council.
- The satisfaction of the final year students on the organizational structure of the department and its policies for running the academic work was below the target. Therefore, the academic leadership of the program recommends that more efforts be made to achieve the target.
- The academic leadership of the program should make a necessary effort to improve the weaknesses received from the analysis and evaluation of electronic questionnaires provided by faculty members, which shows their satisfaction of the working environment of the program in terms of administrative and academic works.

The Third Standard, S03: Program Quality Assurance Department:

1. Strengths of KPI:

- Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the program was 76.4%, close to the target of 80%.
- Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the academic year 37/38 was 100%, whereas the Target benchmark was 80%. This accurse because of the students are required to conduct the survey to get access to the semester result.

2. Recommendations for improvement:

- Needs to be compared with external benchmarks

The Fourth Standard, S04: Learning and Teaching:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The ratio of students to full-time or equivalent teaching staff was 1:10.6, more than the target ratio of 12:1. In theoretical courses
- The overall student assessment of the quality of the courses (average student ratings on a five-point scale for overall assessment of courses) was 80% close to the target ratio 87%.
- The proportion of faculty members who hold a Ph.D. qualification approved by the faculty of the department is 64% close to the target ratio 70%.
- The proportion of graduates of bachelor's programs who were employed during the first six months of graduation was 45%, close to the target ratio 50%.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The ratio of students to full-time or equivalent teaching staff was 1:10.6, less than the target ratio of 1:6. In practical courses.
- The percentage of students entering the programs who successfully completed the first year WAS 60%, which is below the target ratio 80%.
- The proportion of students who completed the graduation requirements in the minimum period of time for graduation is 0%, which is very low.
- None of the graduates of the program were registered for those registering for higher studies or for those who seeking employment or studying during the first six months of graduation. While the target ratios are 10% each.
- It was found a 60% of the faculty members expressed their satisfaction with the professional and personal skills of the graduates of the program, which is below the target of 75%.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- Ratio of students to full-time or equivalent teaching staff, need to be compared with internal benchmarks and external benchmarks
- To increase the professional and personal skills of graduates of the program through more efficient and advanced teaching methods, in order to achieve 60% of the new target for the next academic year.
- To increase the proportion of students in completing the graduation requirements in the minimum period prescribed by the program, by encouraging academic professors and academic supervisors to the academic follow up closely to the students.
- Percentage of faculty members who hold a Ph.D. qualification approved by the total faculty of the department needs to be compared with internal benchmarks and external benchmarks.

- It is noted that the percentage of students who completed the graduation requirements in the minimum period of graduation for the program is much lower than the target, while 60% is the proportion of students in the program who successfully completed the first year, which is lower than the target 80%. Based on this observation and for the purpose of raising the proportion of students who complete the graduation requirements in the minimum duration of graduation, it is recommended to open the first year courses in the summer semester each year.
- The proportion of graduates of bachelor's programs who were employed during the first six months of graduation was higher than the target. They need to compare with internal indicators and external benchmarks.

The Fifth Standard, S05: Student Affairs and Support Services:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The ratio of students to administrative staff was 12:1, which is much higher than the target ratio of 45:1. (Assuming the current administrative staff of the college is serving the department)

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- Student assessment of vocational and academic guidance (average estimates of the extent of counselling and vocational counselling on an annual scale of five points for final year students) was 64%, which is much weaker compared to the targeted value of 80%.
- The percentage of students participating in none curricular activities is 20%, which is lower than the targeted percentage, which is 40%.

3. Improvement recommendations:

They are as follows:-

- To review the vocational guidance mechanism for students and improve the rules and regulations entrusted to them.
- To increase the efficiency of academic guidance for students by increasing the hours of academic guidance and the provision of advanced training courses for academic tutors, in order to reach 70% of the new target for the next academic year.
- To encourage students and encourage them to participate in various student activities such as sports, cultural ... etc.

The Sixth Standard, S06: Learning Resources:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The students assessed library services as appropriate were 60% (assessment is the average of the estimates on an annual scale of five points for final year students), close to the target of 70%.
- The students rated e-library services as appropriate were 75% (assessment is the average of the estimates on an annual scale of five points for final

year students), close to the target of 80%.

- The library contains several copies of the references and the latest periodicals that meet the needs of the department.
- Although the number of titles of books in the library to the number of students is less than the target, but has been the supply of recent books for some of the program's courses.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The ratio of the number of titles in the library to the number of students is 0.65 : 1, which represents half of the target ratio 10 : 1.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- The administration of the department in coordination with the administration of the college and the university may work hard to increase the library services from the provision of missing books and increase the number of titles of books for all curriculum programs, accompanying references, necessary periodicals, and increase printing services to run the program.
- Conducting training courses that increase the skills of using the electronic library.

The Seventh Standard, S07: Facilities and Equipment:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The number of computers available per student is 1: 5 which is excellent compared to the target rate 1:25.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The overall rate of efficiency of facilities and equipment through the survey of views of faculty members was 49%, which is much below the target of 80%.
- The students expressed their satisfaction with the preparation of classrooms and laboratories were 43%, while the target was 85%.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- Work on increasing the laboratory equipment in the department and create the appropriate environment for conducting the required tests, through the recruitment of qualified technicians, maintenance of damaged devices, provision of accessories and missing devices, and provision of consumables necessary for the conduct of experiments, in order to achieve 50% of the new target for the next academic year.

The Eighth Standard, S08: Financial Planning and Management:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The percentage of faculty members satisfaction with the financial management system and the adequacy of the budget available to the program was 58% out of the 60% target, which is very good.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- Not exist.

3. Optimization recommendations:

- Appropriate percentage of the college budget for the operation of the department.
- The head/ coordinator of the department should monitor and submit a proposal for the budget required for the operation of the department to the program board.
- Program management should prepare a detailed budget report required for the operation of the department to the quality unit at the college, in order to achieve 60%, the new target for the next academic year, from the satisfaction of faculty members on the financial management system.

The Ninth Standard, S09: Recruitment processes:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- Percentage of the staff – students is now 1:9., which nearly the recommended one which is 1:10. If the staff who are studying abroad come back and the student number does not increase, the ratio would be appropriate.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The ratio of the staff members who participate in professional development activities last year was 0.6:1, the targeted ratio was 1:1.

3. Improvement recommendations:

They are as follows:-

- To recruit more specialized staff members, teaching assistants technicians, and administrators.
- To encouraging staff members to participate in professional development activities.
- To announce the training workshops plan before the start of the academic year.
- To link and engage staff members in the labour market.
- To link staff members with the society activities.
- To encourage staff members to participate in local and international conferences, workshops and relevant events.

The Tenth Standard, S10: Scientific Research:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The number of scientific papers published in refereed scientific journals for full-time faculty members or equivalent in the previous school year is 9, which is greater than the target number 5.
- The presence of local, regional and international agency concerned with scientific research and the desire to be partners with the College.
- The department has a large number of faculty members and researchers who have research missions abroad, allowing them the opportunity to publish internationally and develop their scientific research capabilities.
- Awareness and encouragement of the administration of the university, college, department, scientific research agency, faculty members to conduct scientific research and publish it in refereed scientific journals and participate actively in scientific conferences global, regional and local.
- The Department of Scientific Research at the University is pursuing competitive policies regarding the terms of financial support for the participation of faculty members in this field.
- There is a mechanism for financial support (domestic and external) that will lead to the development of scientific research at the university.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- The number of citations and quotations of scientific papers published in refereed scientific journals for full-time faculty members or equivalent is 50 less than the target number 100.
- There is no research or scientific reports that have been approved at scientific conferences for any full-time faculty member or equivalent in the previous school year.
- The average number of copies of reference scientific journals (conferences and / or refereed journals) for each full-time faculty member or equivalent is less than the target value 1: 1.

3. Improvement recommendations:

- Encouraging faculty members and providing opportunities to develop their research capacities and active participation in this field, both inside and outside the Kingdom, by providing adequate moral and material support and facilitating the related procedures by the University administration.
- Increasing the number of faculty members to ease administrative burdens and provide more opportunities for research, scientific participation and conferences.
- Meeting the desire of agencies involved in scientific research (national, regional and global) to enter into a partnership with the College.
- Increasing public and institutional awareness of the importance of scientific research in development.
- Encourage and support the department's scholarship members to participate in international publishing and develop their scientific research capabilities.

The Eleventh Standard, S11: Relations with the Community:

1. Strengths of Performance of Quality Indicators:

The presence of faculty members in the department with various engineering abilities.

The department has laboratories equipped with advanced equipment with high efficiency and excellent work environment, enabling it to:

- Organizing training courses for community segments related to the nature of the program.
- Conduct and develop scientific research.
- Conduct engineering consultations in the labour market.

2. Weakness of Performance of Quality Indicators:

- There are no activities that support community service by full-time or equivalent faculty members in the past academic year, where the target number was 3.
- The number of community education programs, training courses, engineering consultations and community service activities provided by the program was only 1, below the target number which is 3.

3. Improvement recommendations:

- Strengthening the relationship and exchange of visits between the College, the Department and between government institutions and civil society organizations.
- Motivate employees of the faculty or department who participate in the service of the community, morally and financially.
- Allocation of a financial item by the University administration to develop the contribution and participation of the department in the service of the community.
- The administration of the university and the college should expedite coordination with the Department to accelerate the formation of houses of expertise in the department so that it can provide Architectural Engineering advisory services to the community.
- Employing an administrative writer to perform some basic functions such as typing, coordinating and documentation functions