



**King Saud University**

**College of Food and Agricultural Sciences  
Department of Animal Production**

## **Department Responses to NCAAA Comments on the SSR**

January 2014

### Department of Animal Production Responses to NCAAA Comments on the SSR

NCAAA			Institution/Program Response			
Point	Page	Notation and Recommendation	Point	Page	Response	Notations
1	5	<p>It appears that Section A is incomplete.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP revise Section A with an overall KSU administrative flowchart that provides details regarding CFAS and ANP, a "Historical Summary," Preparatory Program Data, and Statistical Summary data.</p> <p>Note: the NCAAA template denotes this to be Section B. Perhaps ANP is using an older template?</p>	1	5	- More historical, preparatory or foundation program and statistical data regarding CFAS and ANP were added using the new 2013 NCAAA Template, pages 9 – 10 and 18 – 19, which completely differ from the previous NCAAA template.	
2	6	<p>Section A. Confirmed Enrollment (normally part of Section B). The SSR reports 11 students in the undergraduate program. No first or second year students are enrolled.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP provide an analysis of its enrollment and discuss its future enrollment plans.</p>	2	6	- New policies and plans to recruit more undergraduate students was stated and discussed on pages 44-45 using the new NCAAA template.	
3	8	<p>Section B. The SSR reports the number of faculty has grown from 20 in 2010 to 23 in 2012. During this time no undergraduate students have been enrolled.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP provide an explanation for reviewers.</p>	3	8	- Explanation regarding poor enrollment of undergraduate students and increase number of the faculty members were mentioned on page 48 of the new NCAAA template.	
4	8	<p>Section B. Self-Study Process (normally Section C). The SSR states that ANP was accredited by the AIC in 2012.</p>	4	8		

		<p>1. It is recommended that FSN revise this statement in order to align itself with AIC. According to the AIC website, all of the CFAS programs at KSU are not accredited by AIC; rather they are “<b>granted substantial equivalency.</b>” (See page 21 of the <u>AIC 2012 Accreditation Report</u>). The Report also clearly states that the term “accreditation” only applies to Canadian program, and not to international programs. <b>Accordingly, FSN is not accredited by AIC, and must not represent itself as being accredited by AIC.</b></p>			<p>- A copy of the AIC accreditation certificate is attached for NCAAA to further evaluate whether or not the academic programs of the CFAS have been accredited by AIC.</p>	
5	9	<p>Section C.2. The SSR skips C.2. Major Goals/Objectives of Development of the Program.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP complete all sections of the SSR. Note: It appears that ANP presents 4 program goals on pages 15-20.</p>	5	9	<p>- ANP completed all sections of the SSR in compliance with the requirements of the NCAAA. Information regarding the goals and objectives and were discussed in details on section E. pages 29-41 using the new NCAAA template.</p>	
6	9-10	<p>C.3. KPIs. The SSR lists 24 program KPIs. <b>NCAAA requires all programs to complete 50% of the NCAAA KPIs and to utilize additional KPIs as needed to demonstrate evidence that supports the quality of the program.</b></p> <p><b>1. It is recommended that ANP identify the NCAAA KPIs.</b></p> <p><b>2. It is recommended that ANP complete the KPI requirements by including benchmarks (none are given) and provide an analysis of each one.</b></p> <p>3. It is recommended that ANP will utilize the new NCAAS program SSR template, with the KPI tables, in order to clearly demonstrate that the KPI requirements are met.</p>	6	9-10	<p>- ANP identified more than 50% of the NCAAA program KPIs which distributed among the standards in the SSR documents and included in details on pages 159-172 of the SSR document that necessary to demonstrate evidence that supports quality of the program.</p> <p>- Complete analysis of KPIs with internal benchmarks were used with detailed analysis for each one and recommendations for improvements.</p> <p>- ANP utilized the new NCAAA program SSR template and clearly demonstrated with focusing on the strength and weakness of each KPIs and the requirements are met or not.</p>	

		<p>4. It is recommended that the ANP add at least one KPI that directly provides assessment of program learning outcomes in order to demonstrate that student learning is taking place in ANP classes.</p> <p><b>ANP does not meet NCAAA eligibility requirements in the area of KPIs.</b></p>			<p>- ANP included two KPI, pages 84-85, that directly provides assessment of PLO in order to demonstrate that student learning outcomes is taking place in ANP classes. Moreover, 5 KPIs were included within standard 4. To assess the quality of learning and teaching issue at the ANP.</p>	
7	11	<p>D.1. The SSR presents 5 elements in the external environment that affect the delivery of the program.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP write using complete sentences and to present this information in further detail in order to establish a clear relationship between ANP and the elements.</p>	7	11	<p>- A clear relationship between the ANP and the external elements that affect the program delivery were discussed in details on pages 41-42.</p>	
8	11	<p>D.2. The SSR presents a list of 3 changes in the institution affecting the program.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP establish a clear departmental link between the institutional changes and animal production.</p>	8	11	<p>-The information requested by the NCAAA regarding the link between institutional changes on the performance and output of the ANP program were discussed in detail on page 47 under G. Program Development.</p>	
9	11-12	<p>E.1. Summary of Changes. The SSR list provided for D.3. is exactly the same as E.1.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP revise these sections to accurately address what is requested by NCAAA. For example, a major change in the institution has been the establishment of the PYP program; however it is not included in these sections.</p>	9	11-12	<p>- ANP provides the requested information by NCAAA within the SSR documents. The Institutional changes which have some impact on the ANP department were discussed thoroughly in the revised SSR document.</p>	
10	12	<p>E.2. Apparent Program Completion Rate. The SSR data covers 3 years from 2009 to 2011/12.</p>	10	12		

		<p>1. It is recommended that ANP include 2012 data and that current data always be used in the SSR.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP provide analysis of the data; for example it may be beneficial to explain and analyze why the completion rate is in the range of 9 to 13% in comparison with expectations or the ANP completion rate goal.</p>			<p>- ANP included the 2012-2013 data about the apparent program completion rate as required, page 16.</p> <p>- ANP provided discussion and analysis regarding its program completion rate with proposed plans to achieve the ANP expectations on pages 44-48.</p>	
11	13	<p>E.3. Progression Rates. The SSR reports that the ANP progression rates are the result of the “obvious decrease in percentage [that] is mainly due to the student transfer to other colleges.”</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP support this claim with evidence, explain why this might be true, and develop a strategy to improve the progression rate.</p>	11	13	<p>- Explanations regarding the progression rate was included in the revised SSR, pages 44-48, and new strategies were suggested to improve the students’ progression rate.</p>	
12	13-14	<p>E.4. Comparison of Planned and Actual Enrollment. According to the SSR, ANP plans for 30 students to be enrolled each year. At the same time, the ANP enrollment has been 0,0, and 1 student over the past 3 years.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP develop a reasonable plan to determine realistic student enrollment estimates.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP significantly improve the analysis of its enrollment data. For example, the analytical comment states that student enrollment “is low and widely changeable from year to other,” however the data shows that only 1 student has been enrolled over the past 3</p>	12	13-14	<p>-ANP developed a reasonable plan to determine a realistic student enrollment estimate and improve the analysis of its enrollment data which mentioned on pages 47-48 in the revised SSR document. Moreover, analysis of the significant discrepancy between program capacity and actual number of students enrolled was discussed.</p>	

		years.  3. The SSR also states that the “real capacity is to contain at least 100 students.” It is recommended that ANP provide analysis of the significant discrepancy between the program capacity (100 students) and the actual number of students enrolled (11 students).				
13	15-16	F. First Goal. The ANP goal to “ prepare national staff scientifically qualified and practically trained in various branches of animal production...” aligns with the department mission. ANP assesses this goals with 3 desired benchmarks.  1. It is recommended that the desired benchmarks align with the goal in order to accurately measure the achievement of the goal. For example, the 3 benchmarks provided to assess the goal or make it clear that the goal is achieved do not align with the goal; i.e., an “optimal ratio of students to teaching staff” or an optimal proportion of ... qualified teaching staff” does not directly apply or assess the goal or the outcome.  2. It is recommended that the desired benchmarks are revised in order to align with the goal and to actually measure the performance required to demonstrate that the goal is successfully being evaluated.  Goal #4 is a good example of how the other goals should be written and aligned.	13	15-16	-ANP clearly specified the target benchmarks for each KPIs and clearly aligned them with the goals in order to accurately measure their achievement. These information provided on pages 29-41in the revised report. Performance indicators for each goal were also includes with a list of strength and recommendations for improvements.	
14	15-20	Goal 2-3.  1. It is recommended that ANP see point # 13 and	14	15-20	- ANP specified the desired benchmarks and performance indicators for the four departmental	

		<p>apply the same suggestions to these goals.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP include an analysis of the data or the actual benchmark findings provided for each goal; including strengths and recommendations for improvement.</p> <p>Note. The lack of benchmarking with analysis appears to be consistent weakness in the SSR. It is recommended that ANP include considerably more benchmarking with analysis throughout the SSR; including interpretation of the data and recommendations for improvement.</p>			<p>goals and in order to accurately measure their achievement as mentioned above, pages 29-41. Moreover, analysis and assessment of the ANP outcome goals and action plans for improvement were provided as required.</p>	
15	21	<p>Standard 1. Explanatory Note. The SSR provides a brief ( 1 out of 3 sentences) statement about the mission development.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP include additional information about the development since 1965 and describe <b>how</b> or the <b>process</b> of creating and establishing the current mission statement.</p>	15	21	<p>-ANP provided on pages 50-54 the additional information which describes the process of establishing the current mission statement.</p>	
16	23	<p>Standard 1. ANP uses the NCAA template; however at times (1.4 and 1.5) the responses given are sentence fragments and bullet points. This style presents incomplete thoughts and assumes the reader knows the detailed content or is willing and able to complete the thoughts. A NCAA self-study should be treated as a professional research project, including well written sentences, sound reasoning, compelling evidence, and analysis.</p>	16	23	<p>- ANP considered seriously this comment and treated the SSR documents as a professional research project considering all mentioned aspects.</p>	
17	23	<p>Standard 1. 1.2-1.5. The ANP information is word for word exactly the same as the PLPT SSR.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP and all other CFAS</p>	17	23	<p>- ANP provided appropriate research notations or citation in the report as necessary particularly on common data shared by departments in the CFAS.</p>	

		<p>departments write independently and when information is shared that appropriate research notations or citations be given.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP revise the entire SSR to ensure that all cut and pasting is eliminated or that proper sources are footnoted.</p>			<p>- ANP revised the SSR document using the new NCAAA template and eliminated the cut and paste information shown in the previous SSR wherever available.</p>	
18	24	<p>Standard 1. Area for Improvement #1. It is recommended that ANP immediately implement a system to benchmark and analyze the performance of its mission.</p>	18	24	<p>- ANP implemented a system to benchmark and analyzed the performance of its mission that shown on page 53.</p>	
19	25	<p>Standard 2. Description of Process, #1. The SSR refers to Annual Program Reports from 2007-2011.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP attach the Annual Program Reports for 2012 and 2013 (a NCAAA eligibility requirement).</p>	19	25	<p>- ANP will attach a copy of the Annual Program report for 2012 and 2013 as part of the eligibility requirements of the NCAAA.</p>	
20	25	<p>Standard 2. Description of Process, # 5. The SSR states that the AIC external review report recommendations were utilized.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP state explicitly in the SSR what AIC recommendations were used and how they fit into the action plan.</p>	20	25	<p>- ANP stated on pages 57-58 in the revised SSR document the action plan of the SSR committee and recommendations considering AIC comments.</p>	
21	26-27	<p>Standard 2. 2.2 -2-5. Strengths. Areas for Improvement, and Priorities for Action. The ANP SSR continues to incorporate information that is nearly identical to the PLPT SSR. See point 17 above.</p>	21	26-27	<p>-ANP considered the comments and changes made on pages 55-58.</p>	
22	28	<p>Standard 3. 3.1. The ANP response to 3.1 includes three sentence statements without really saying anything of significance. For example, the SSR says that "faculty members are involved" but does not</p>	22	28		



		<p>say <b>how</b> they are involved. It acknowledges “weakness’ but does not say <b>what</b> the weakness are, and it says the KSU – OMS will ensure quality but does not say how it will or <b>how</b> it does do this.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP substantially improve its responses to all NCAAA sub-standards with substantive content (3.3 – 3-5 are additional examples).</p>			<p>-ANP improved its responses by providing more comprehensive information for standard 3, pages 58-65, and all sub-standard throughout the SSR document.</p>	
23	28	<p>Standard 3. The SSR states that “KPIs were identified” and then says “learning outcomes for students are considered a priority in the evaluation process.”</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP include some examples of KPIs with benchmarking and analysis in Standard 3 and/or at other specific points where statistical data and KPIs demonstrate evidence to support that ANP meets a given standard.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP supports its claim that program and course LOs are a priority in the evaluation process by including KPIs and benchmarking with analysis that directly demonstrate that student learning performance is successful.</p> <p>3. It is recommended that the ANP QA team describe precisely how each of the program LOs are <b>directly</b> evaluated by using KPIs, rubrics, or some other scientific assessment.</p>	23	28	<p>- ANP specified concrete KPIs on pages 59-60 with benchmarking and analysis for Standard 3. Evidence was shown in the report to support that ANP meets a given standard.</p> <p>- ANP provided specific KPI and benchmarking with analysis on pages 64-65 that directly demonstrate that student learning performance is successful.</p> <p>-The ANP QA team describe on pages 64-65 how each of the program LOs is directly evaluated using appropriate assessment methods.</p>	
24	31	<p>Standard 4. APN presents 8 indirect indicators for standard 4.</p>	24	31		

		1. It is recommended that ANP include some evaluative criteria for each one.			- ANP included some evaluative criteria for each indicator as required by NCAAA throughout standard 4.	
25	31	Standard 4.1. The SSR states that “overall learning outcome[s are] is measured based on exams, quizzes, class participation, and feedback of students...”  1. It is recommended that ANP describe in detail exactly how program LOs are directly tracked and evaluated to ensure student learning.  Note. The quote above is nearly an exact working used by the AGECSR (p.30) and by the PPS SR (p.18); thus the NCAAA response is therefore exactly the same.	25	31	- ANP provided description on how program LOs are directly tracked and evaluated to ensure student learning outcomes, on pages 67-71..	
26	33	Standard 4.1. Areas Requiring Improvement.  1. It is recommended that ANP promptly implement improvement #1; including mapping of program LOs.  Note. #1 is written exactly the same as in the PPS SSR (p.18)	26	33	- ANP provided the mapping of the program LOs as recommended by NCAAA on page 67-71.	
27	31-33	Standard 4.1. Learning Outcome. The SSR does not state that the academic quality unit ensures programs or course LOs, teaching strategies, and assessment methods are in alignment or that they fit within the NQF.  <b>1. It is recommended that ANP demonstrate alignment of each program LO with specifically designed assessment methods and teaching strategies within the NQF.</b>	27	31-33	- ANP demonstrated the alignment of each program LO with appropriate teaching strategies and assessment methods on page 67 to 71.	

28	33-34	<p>4.2. Program Development. The SSR reports that the program was reviewed in 2006 and in 2009 the prep year was established. This modified the program.</p> <p>1. It is significant that the program was modified 3 years ago. Therefore, it is recommended that ANP, as part of its SSR, re-evaluate the modified program to determine improvements and what action plans are needed in 2013-2014.</p>	28	33-34	<p>- ANP re-evaluated the modified program to determine improvements and formulated an action plan as required, pages 72-77.</p>
29	36	<p>4.4. The SSR points to its assessments known as “tried and true methods.”</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP expand its discussion and evaluation of student assessment in order to include critical thinking, creativity, problem solving, and other higher end learning and assessment strategies; like those found in Bloom’s Taxonomy and the NQF. Differentiated instruction and assessment should be presented in detail to support the SSR’s statement, “student assessment processes are diverse, true and globally used.”</p>	29	36	<p>- ANP expanded its discussion and evaluation of student assessment as shown on pages 79-80. Differentiated instruction presented comprehensively to support a diverse assessment process.</p>
30	39-42	<p>4.6. Quality of Teaching. The SSR presents undated statistical student survey results using percentage scores as actual benchmarks and interpretations that it “showed satisfaction.”</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP include this kind of statistical information throughout the SSR, like is also included in standard 10.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP include target benchmarks and other available benchmarks in</p>	30	39-42	<p>-Updated statistical information about survey results were provided throughout the SSR document as required by NCAAA.</p> <p>-Target benchmarks and other available benchmarks were included in the report to compare and contrast data or to establish trends as recommended by NCAAA.</p>

		<p>order to compare and contrast the data or to establish trends.</p> <p>3. It is recommended that ANP analyze the benchmarking data and apply its recommendations to the SSR and its improvement plans.</p>			<p>- ANP provided analysis regarding benchmarking data, recommendations and improvement plans in compliance with the recommendations of the NCAAA.</p>	
31	41	<p>Strengths. The SSR states as a strength, "satisfaction indicated high quality of teaching."</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP include (in addition to point 31 above) some kind of <b>reasoning why</b> this is a strength or why a specific survey score, percentage, or benchmark demonstrates "high quality of teaching."</p>	31	41	<p>-ANP further elaborated and provided reason why this item is considered strength. More evidence presented in the revised version of the report on pages 83-90.</p>	
32	46-49	<p>Standard 5. See point 31 above.</p>	32	46-49	<p>-ANP addressed the same concern accordingly for standard 5 as shown on pages 99-103.</p>	
33	49-50	<p>Standard 6. Learning Resources. KSU is well respected as the leading university in KSA. The learning resources it provides students are among the best and most extensive in the Kingdom. Nevertheless, ANP provides but a half page of information. It appears that ANP does not recognize or utilize all that KSU has to offer its students.</p> <p>1. It is recommended that ANP substantially improve its responses to the explanation and description sections in all NCAAA sub-standards by adding substantive content and precise details, like have been done for standard 7.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that ANP include KPIs and benchmarking with analysis to support its evaluation and self-study of standard 6.</p>	33	49-50	<p>-ANP improved its responses to the explanations and descriptive sections in all NCAAA sub-standards on pages 103-109.</p> <p>-ANP included appropriate KPIs and benchmarking with analysis to support its evaluation and self-study of standard 6, pages 106-109.</p>	

34	64-66	Standard 9. Nearly the entire standard report is exactly identical to the PPS SSR (31-32).  1. It is recommended that ANP conduct its own independent SSR.	34	64-66	-ANP revised and updated this section of the report as shown on pages 125-128.
35	67-73	Standard 10. Except for substituting the statistical data the entire standard report, including the strengths, recommendations for improvement, and priorities of action, are exactly the same as the PPS SSR (p.32-34)/  1. It is recommended that ANP conduct its own independent SSR.	35	67-73	-ANP reviewed and rewrites the Standard 10 as required by NCAAA and shown on pages 128-143.
36	73-74	Standard 11. Most of this work is exactly the same as the PPS SSR.	36	73-74	-ANP revised and updated this section of the SSR as required as shown on pages 144-149.
37	76	Standard 11. Areas for Improvement, #2.  It is recommended that ANP immediately develop a sustain alumni community.	37	76	-ANP will develop an action plan to further address this area of concern. Presently, ANP has already started to develop an Alumni Community for its graduates. A web page was launched and included into the college/department web site.
38	76-77	H. Review of Course. The SSR does not provide a thorough response to this section.	38	76-77	- ANP responses provided regarding this section in the revised version of the SSR as shown on pages 149-150.
39	79	I.3. Independent Evaluator.  1. It is recommended that ANP provide a complete analysis of the recommendations given by the independent evaluator for its program.	39	79	-ANP provided a complete analysis of the recommendations provided by the independent evaluators for its program as shown on pages 150-154.
40	79	J. Conclusion. The SSR template says to "list and briefly describe..."	40	79	

		1. It is recommended that ANP complete this section by adding the appropriate description.				-ANP completed this section of the report with the appropriate description as shown on pages 154-155.	
		The ANP SSR does not meet the NCAAA eligibility requirements.					

### Self-Evaluation Scales Recommendations

NCAAA			Institution/Program Response			
Point	Page	Notation and Recommendation	Point	Page	Response	Notations
1		It appears that ANP Self Evaluation Scales Report is incomplete (see standard 8)	1		-ANP properly completed the Self-Evaluation Scales Report as required by NCAAA.	

### Program Specification Report Recommendations

NCAAA			Institution/Program Response			
Point	Page	Notation and Recommendation	Point	Page	Response	Notations
1		5. Development of Learning Outcomes.  1. It is recommended that ANP include its program <b>specific learning outcomes</b> in the appropriate NQF domains. For example, the knowledge and cognitive report descriptions do not communicate LOs that explicitly represent animal production knowledge and comprehension. They are too broad.	1		-ANP included its program LOs in the appropriate NQF domains in compliance with the requirements of the NCAAA, pages 70-72.	
2		Program Evaluation. The processes that will be used to evaluate and improve the strategies	2			

		planned for developing and evaluating learning outcomes are incomplete. For example, it is recommended that ANP include a process to directly evaluate program and course LOs.  It is recommended that ANP include mapping of its program LOs throughout its entire course offerings.				-ANP included mapping of its program LOs throughout its entire course offerings as shown in all courses specifications that provided with the SSR document.	
3		The ANP Program Specification Report appears complete. It is recommended that ANP utilize the new NCAA templates and to include additional substance or content to this report.		3		-ANP utilized the new NCAA templates and included all additional substances and contents to this report.	

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>Additional Notations</b>	
1	The ANP Course Specification Reports presented appear to include course learning outcomes that focus on content achievement. It is recommended that course LOs are written with measurable verbs, quantified limits, or utilize some kind of assessment rubric. It is recommended that the new NCAA templates be utilized and additional substance or content be included in these reports.
2	The ANP Annual Program Report for 2012-2013. C. Program Context. The report presents the PY program starting in 2007 as a significant change during the past 2 years. This need to be updated. Section I is incomplete.
3	Course Reports. The reports do not always include much of an action plan for improvement beyond "providing software packages."
4	Indicators and Benchmarks. The report presents 24 KPIs. Nowhere in the document presented KPI target benchmarks provided, although some actual finding benchmarks are given in some section of the SSR. It is recommended that ANP establish target benchmarks for each KPI, that actual benchmarks are collected from APN quality and direct improvement. The near absence of APN benchmarking and analysis is significant. Accordingly, it is recommended that ANP complete its KPI and benchmarking with analysis studies. Furthermore, the outcomes should be applied or inserted in the SSR or other templates as evidence to support its self-study.
<b>Summary Recommendations</b>	
1	It is recommended that ANP review and responds to the 40 points given for the improvement of the SSR. Careful and detailed emphasis should be given to the bold type comments.
2	It is recommended that ANP revise its SSR using the new NCAA template and support this work by using all of the new NCAA templates.
3	It is recommended that ANP complete its new Annual Program Report using the new NCAA template.
4	It is recommended that ANP revise the Course Specification documents and utilize the new NCAA template.
<b>Eligibility Recommendation</b>	

ANP is not immediately eligible for a NCAAA review. In order to be eligible, ANP must complete the summary recommendations. Accordingly, it is estimated that this work could be complete before the end of the 2013-2014 academic year and that a NCAAA review could take place in the first semester of 2014-2015 academic year.

**Date of Response**

**It is recommended that ANP provide a written response to this report by 10 October 2013 and that PPS implement an action plan to complete the recommendations by May 2014.**