

I Independent Evaluations

1. Describe the process used to obtain independent analysis on the quality of the program and the reliability and validity of analyses carried out in the report. Processes may include a review of documentation by an experienced and independent person familiar with similar programs at other institutions and who could comment on relative standards, consultancy advice or a report by a review panel, or even the results of an accreditation review by an independent agency. An independent evaluation may be conducted in relation to the total self-study, or involve a number of separate comments by different people on different issues.
 - In 2008, **the Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC)** was appointed as independent evaluator for the program. The Canadian expertise in the area of agriculture visited the college and the animal production department and went through all documents requested, visited all facilities including laboratories, farms and other facilities. They discussed many issues important for high quality educational outputs with the College Dean, Vice Dean of Development Quality, Head of Quality Unit, Head of Animal Production Department, Departmental Assessment and Academic Accreditation Committee and selected staff members. In 2010, the program was fully accredited (see Annex I. 1.). The main serious concern of AIC reviewers was the limited number of undergraduate student enrolled in the most important agriculture area (Animal Production) and the department will have to engage in an active recruitment program to attain viable numbers of students. Regarding the educational capabilities and quality, The department has about 31 teaching staff member with different ranks and most of them graduated from a respective universities in North America and Europe. They are active publishers and have a good knowledge of their discipline areas. On the other hand, the department has access to a number of well-equipped teaching laboratories supplemented by an even larger number of research laboratories. Field research facilities including animal experimental, poultry housing, mill and others are available in the educational farm in Al-Ammareiah district. Access to commercial livestock farms and animal feed manufacturing companies are established for students' training and teaching and research purposes.
 - Recently (in 2013), a consultant from Prince Sultan University was invited to conduct an independent review of the ANP program and to provide an independent opinion in the Self – Evaluation Scales Report (SSRP) for NCAAA accreditation (Annex I.2.). The consultant is the current director of the quality assurance center in the said university who is also responsible for obtaining their full institutional accreditation for PSU from 2010-2017. Through the Office of

the Vice Dean for Development and Quality of the College of Food and Agriculture Sciences, arrangements have been made to formalize the consulting activity. Logistical requirements were provided to the consultant as requested. The Director of Quality Assurance Unit of the college arranged for the individual and group interview session, site visits to facilities and offices, and review of accreditation documents. In order to obtain sufficient information about the program, around 35 hours of visit to the department have been conducted. Interview sessions with the program managers were held and separate group interviews were also conducted involving a representative number of teaching staff, personnel and students. In addition, the consultant also conducted the following activities:

1. Visit to the laboratories of the department
2. Visit to the University Library
3. Visit to other learning facilities of the department
4. Review of quality assurance documents
5. Visit to the we-site of the KSU and the CFAS, and
6. Review of existing manuals, brochures and handbook.

2. Summary of matters raised by independent evaluator(s). ***Provide a response report*** to each of the recommendations provided by the independent evaluators.

The issues that raised by the independent evaluator can be summarized as follow:

1. In general, there is limited information provided for each subsection indicated in Section G (Evaluation in Relation to Quality Standards), particularly for Standards 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 11. Reference should be made to KPIs where they are relevant to the concerned items. Specific data are needed to show trends, statistical data, figures derived from survey results. Conclusions need to be supported and benchmarked against other similar institutions where they are relevant.

Response: All the above comments were seriously considered by including the relevant KPIs for each standard supported with figures compared to the internal benchmark and targeted benchmarks. Still the department face difficulties to obtain external benchmark. Even though external benchmark is absent, the CFAS and the animal production department have already made efforts to establish collaboration with other universities with similar programs in the USA and other well-known universities in Europe and Australia. We expect to receive a response from these universities very soon.

2. The low enrolment rate of students in the Animal Production Program needs to be seriously addressed. A comprehensive plan of action has to be formulated and supported by the College. Consequently, apparent completion rate (graduation rate) is adversely affected.

Response: The department follows different strategies to increase number of student enrolment. The most effectively used and perceived beneficial strategies were contacts with secondary schools and community, individual contact by the staff members and student contact with other potential students, use of various publications (promotional brochures, videos, posters, bulletin boards, newsletters, newspaper, radio, television, and school announcements), and the use of special recruitment events. Special services can be provided by the department, which includes providing information, recruiting, orientating and supporting students through their first classes at the department. As a result of these new strategies, twenty three new students enrolled in the 2013-2014 academic year.

3. Although student learning outcomes are appropriately specified in the course specifications, there is a need to directly measure learning outcomes other than the tradition forms of assessment such as the use of rubrics.

Response: For the student learning outcomes, the department accreditation steering committee reviewed all the data regarding the assessment of student learning outcomes to assure the use of more direct forms of assessment including the rubrics. The direct form assessment will be started this semester (second semester- 2013/2014) in term of exchanging the correction of final examination papers within the staff members.

4. Generally, although program managers seem to demonstrate a strong commitment to quality assurance, there is a need to improve the physical resources of the quality assurance unit in the college. In addition, a more systematic and organized system of quality assurance database should be set-up at the program level. Moreover, additional seminar workshops may be required for program managers and faculty to obtain more knowledge about the quality.

Response: The QMS (Quality Management System) at KSU is responsible of the following:

1. Addresses all matters related to the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) and the External Quality Assurance (EQA) of the institution as per the established minimum requirements of the standards, criteria, items and key performance indicators at the institution, colleges and programs levels and the administrative units.
2. Ensures that the Quality Assurance (QA) in the institution, colleges and programs and the administrative units is properly maintained and managed.
3. Ensure that all policies and regulations pertaining to QA at the university, college and programs levels and the administrative units are properly documented, analyzed and disseminated and is properly maintained and managed as per the Strategic Performance Management System.

This system works efficiently to provide technical and scientific support on the departmental levels to ensure outstanding quality assurance. At the program level, the entire quality assurance indicators are well established and documented. The program specifications, annual reports, courses specifications, courses reports, field experience specification and all surveys and their analysis are available as a soft and hard copies. Moreover, an exhibit room has already been established where all records and documents pertaining to program accreditation are securely kept.

3. **Provide an analysis report** on matters raised by independent evaluator(s) (Agree, disagree, further consideration required, action proposed, etc.).

- The Department accreditation steering committee completely agreed with the independent evaluator for point 1 and 2 that mentioned above. The action plans were developed and a significant improvement achieved in term of number of student enrolled and standards KPIs and benchmarking.

- Regarding comments 3 and 4, the committee disagreed because of the department maintained a high Quality Assurance (QA) system with high efficiency. Moreover, the student learning outcomes are properly evaluated considering all different assessment methods including rubric when applicable.

- Attach or hyperlink the independent evaluation report and CVs

Annex I.1. Accreditation certificate from AIC.

Annex I. 2. Matters raised by the independent evaluator.