

ATTACHMENT 2 (c)

Annual Program Report

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

The National Commission for Academic Accreditation & Assessment

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT
(APR)**

PLANT PRODUCTION SCIENCES PROGRAM

(2011/2012)



Program Eligibility: The program is to submit the two most recent APRs as part of the requirements for program eligibility using the NCAAA Template.

Post Accreditation: The program is required to annually complete an APR. The APR is to document a complete academic year.

APR's are prepared by the program coordinator in consultation with faculty teaching in the program. The reports are submitted to the head of department or college, and used as the basis for any modifications or changes in the program. The APR information is used to provide a record of improvements in the program and is used in the Self Study Report for Programs (SSRP) and by external reviews for accreditation.

Annual Program Report (2011/2012)

1. Institution: King Saud University	Date of Report: 2012
2. College/ Department Food and Agriculture Sciences/ Plant Production	
3. Dean Professor Dr. Fahad Nasser Al-Barakah	
4. List all branches/locations offering this program: N/A	
1. _____	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	



A. Program Identification and General Information

Program title and code Plant Production Sciences, (PPS)
Name and position of person completing the APR Professor Nasser A. Al-Suhaibani, Department Head
Academic year to which this report applies. 2011/2012

B Statistical Information

1. Number of students who started the program in the year concerned:	<input type="text" value="18"/>
2. (a) Number of students who completed the program in the year concerned:	<input type="text" value="11"/>
Completed the final year of the program:	
Completed major tracks within the program (if applicable)	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
Title.....No	<input type="text"/>
Title.....No	<input type="text"/>
Title.....No	<input type="text"/>
Title.....No	<input type="text"/>
2. (b) Completed an intermediate award specified as an early exit point (if any)	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
3. Apparent completion rate.	
(a) Percentage of students who completed the program,	<input type="text" value="61%"/>
(Number shown in 2 (a) as a percentage of the number that started the program in that student intake.)	
(b) Percentage of students who completed an intermediate award (if any)	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
(e.g. Associate degree within a bachelor degree program)	
(Number shown in 2 (b) as a percentage of the number that started the program leading to that award in that student intake).	
Comment on any special or unusual factors that might have affected the apparent completion rates (e.g. Transfers between intermediate and full program, transfers to or from other programs).	



4. Enrollment Management and Cohort Analysis (Table 1)

Cohort Analysis refers to tracking a specific group of students who begin a given year in a program and following them until they graduate (How many students actually start a program and stay in the program until completion).

A **cohort** here refers to the total number of students enrolled in the program at the beginning of each academic year, immediately after the preparatory year. No new students may be added or transfer into a given cohort. Any students that withdraw from a cohort may not return or be added again to the cohort.

Cohort Analysis (Illustration): **Table 1** provides complete tracking information for the most recent cohort to complete the program, beginning with their first year and tracking them until graduation (students that withdraw are subtracted and no new students are added). Update the years as needed.

Enrollment Management and Cohort Analysis (Table 1)

					Current Year
Student Category	2007-08	2008-09*	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Total cohort enrollment	8	8	7	7	7
Retained till year end	8	7	6	6	3
Withdrawn during the year and re-enrolled the following year	0	1	1	1	0
Withdrawn for good	0	0	1	0	0
Graduated successfully	0	0	0	0	4

- Provide an analysis for the cohort that started PYP on 2008 – 09
No new student enrolment took place in years 2008/2009. The number of enrolled students for that year is carry-over from previous academic years. One student took off and reenrolled again. No students withdrew from the department while no students graduated that year. The main reasons for the relatively low program enrollment will be presented at the end of this section.
- Provide an analysis for the cohort that started PYP on 2009 –10
In 2009/2010, three students were enrolled in the PPS program. In that year one student withdrew completely from the program while another took a year off. The cohort of this year is composed of transferring students from other programs within the college or the university.
- Provide an analysis for the cohort that started PYP on 2010 –11
No new student enrolment took place in year 2010/2011. The number of enrolled students for that year is carry-over from previous academic years. One student took off and reenrolled again. No students withdrew from the department and no students graduated that year.
- Provide an analysis for the cohort that started PYP on 2011 –12
No new student enrolment took place in years. The number of enrolled students for that year is carry-over from previous academic years as well as transferring students from other programs within the college or the university. In that year, four students



	<p>completed the program with no withdrawal. The main reasons for the relatively low program enrollment over the years 2008/2009 to 2011/2012 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Following restructuring of CFAS programs, the Deanship of Admissions and Registration (DAR) put the PPS program on hold as it was not officially approved. 2. Starting from the 2010/2011, the DAR has adopted a new enrollment policy, by which the minimum size for all new cohorts passing the PYP should be 15 students. As a result, students of small size cohort (< 15) are allocated to other programs of their choice. <p>Despite the above analysis, the PPS program maintained fair student enrolment rate. During the academic years 2007/2008 – 2011-2012, the average enrolment was 39 students. Thirty students graduated during the same period while only 13 students withdrew from the PPS program either due to low GPA dismissal, transfer to other programs or any other unspecified reason. It is needless to say that PPS program offers some courses specifically required and/or tailored for other CFAS programs. These include PPS 201, PPS 206, PPS 347, PPS 348, PPS 340 and PPS 403.</p> <p>*PYP – Preparatory Year Program</p>	
--	--	--

5. Destination of graduates as shown in survey of graduating students (Include this information in years in which a survey of employment outcomes for graduating students is conducted).

Date of Survey

2012/2013

Number Surveyed

11

Number Responded

9

Response Rate %

81.8

Destination	Not Available for Employment		Available for Employment		
	Further Study	Other Reasons	Employed in Subject Field	Other Employment	Unemployed
Number	3	0	5	1	0
Percent of Respondents	33.3	0	55.6	11.1	0

Analysis: List the strengths and recommendations

Despite the low rate of student enrolment in PPS program, satisfactory rate of completion (61%) was attained. Furthermore, within one year of graduation, PPS graduates were either employed or continued their postgraduate studies. The majority of employed graduates were working in their subject field reflecting efficient delivery of program learning outcomes.

C. Program Context

1. Significant changes within the institution affecting the program (if any) during the past year.	None
Implications for the program	None
2. Significant changes external to the institution affecting the program (if any) during the past year.	



Implications for the program	None
	None

D. Course Information Summary

<p>1. Course Results. Describe and analyze how the individual NCAAA “Course Reports” are utilized to assess the program and to ensure ongoing quality assurance (eg. Analysis of course completion rates, grade distributions, and trend studies.)</p> <p>(a.) Describe how the individual course reports are used to evaluate the program. Individual course reports are prepared by course instructors at the end of each semester. These reports are checked and reviewed by the department committee for Quality Assurance and Accreditation. Weaknesses that might affect program learning outcomes are given high priorities in program evaluation. Any necessary changes to improve program delivery are stated as priorities for action.</p> <p>(b.) Analyze the completion rates, grade distributions, and trends to determine strengths and recommendations for improvement.</p> <p>(1) Completion rate analysis: Course completion rate was high (89.61%). Twenty five percent of students who did not complete the courses withdrew from these courses before the end of the semester as the University roles give students the right to withdraw from individual courses six weeks before the end of the semester, as long as a student maintains at least 12 credits hours.</p> <p>(2) Grade distribution analysis: The below table shows the student grades distribution:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>A⁺</th> <th>A</th> <th>B⁺</th> <th>B</th> <th>C⁺</th> <th>C</th> <th>D⁺</th> <th>D</th> <th>F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Percentage</td> <td>22.70</td> <td>12</td> <td>17.40</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>8.00</td> <td>8.00</td> <td>8.00</td> <td>2.60</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Students’ grades were normally distributed. More than 66% of the students achieved high grades (over B grade). No apparent skewedness is detected in grade distribution. The failure percent seems to be normal. Results in general reflect high quality of program learning outcomes.</p> <p>(3) Trend analysis (a study of the differences, changes, or developments over time; normally several semesters or years): The general trend in course results indicates no change over the past two years.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- High course completion rate (89.61%) was achieved. 2- Students’ grades were normally distributed. 3- No apparent change in trend is noticed of student course completion rate or grading. <p>Recommendation for improvement:</p> <p>None</p>	Grade	A ⁺	A	B ⁺	B	C ⁺	C	D ⁺	D	F	Percentage	22.70	12	17.40	13.3	8.00	8.00	8.00	2.60	8.00
Grade	A ⁺	A	B ⁺	B	C ⁺	C	D ⁺	D	F											
Percentage	22.70	12	17.40	13.3	8.00	8.00	8.00	2.60	8.00											

<p>2. Analysis of Significant Results or Variations.</p> <p>List any courses where completion rates, grade distribution, or trends are significantly skewed, high or low results, or departed from policies on grades or assessments. For each course indicate what was done to</p>



investigate, the reason for the significant result, and what action has been taken. No significant changes in completion rates, grade distribution, or trends occurred in individual course results. However, few courses have low student attendance; therefore they cannot be judged for skewedness in results.	
a. Course	Significant result or variation
Investigation undertaken	
Reason for significant result or variation	
Action taken (if required)	
b. Course	Significant result or variation
Investigation undertaken	
Reason for significant result or variation	
Action taken (if required)	
c. Course	Significant result or variation
Investigation undertaken	
Reason for significant result or variation	
Action taken (if required)	

(Attach additional summaries if necessary)



4. Delivery of Planned Courses

(a) List any courses that were planned but not taught during this academic year and indicate the reason and what will need to be done if any compensating action is required.

Course title and code	Explanation	Compensating action if required
Production of Horticultural Crops / PPS 301	This course is tailored for non PPS program students. As an elective course, students did not register for it.	None
Cooperative Training / PPS 400	As an elective course, students did not register for it.	None
Protected Cultivation / PPS 403	Students did not either reach the level where it is taught or the course was equaled to PLPR 401 (previous curriculum).	None

(b) Compensating Action Required for Units of Work Not Taught in Courses that were Offered. (Complete only where units not taught were of sufficient importance to require some compensating action)

None

Course	Unit of work	Reason
Compensating action if required		

Course	Unit of work	Reason
Compensating action if required		
Course	Unit of work	Reason
Compensating action if required		
Course	Unit of work	Reason
Compensating action if required		

E Program Management and Administration

List difficulties (if any) encountered in management of the program	Impact of difficulties on the achievement of the program objectives	Proposed action to avoid future difficulties in Response
None	None	None



F. Summary Program Evaluation

1. Graduating Students Evaluation (To be reported on in years when surveys are undertaken)			
Date of Survey		2012/2013	
Attach survey report			
a. List most important recommendations for improvement, strengths and suggestions		Analysis (e.g. Assessment, action already taken, other considerations, strengths and recommendation for improvement.)	
None			
b. Changes proposed in the program (if any) in response to this analysis and feedback.			
None			
2. Other Evaluation (e.g. Evaluations by employers or other stakeholders, external review)			
Evaluation by stakeholders			
Describe evaluation process			
Evaluation by stakeholders takes two forms; through questionnaires and through formal meetings of college advisory council.			
Attach review/survey report			
a. List most important recommendations for improvement, strengths and suggestions for improvement.		(e.g. Analysis of recommendations for improvement: Are recommendations valid and what action will be taken, action already taken, or other considerations?)	
Improve English language competency of college graduates in general.		Competency of English language is important for PPS graduates as a mean of communication with foreign experts. At the program level, it is intended to use English and Latin scientific terminology wherever appropriate in all PPS courses to improve language skills of students.	
b. Changes proposed in the program (if any) in response to this feedback. None			
2. Ratings on Sub-Standards of Standard 4 by program faculty and teaching staff; 4.1 to 4.10.			
(a) List sub-standards. Are the "Best Practices" followed; Yes or No? Provide a revised rating for each sub-standard. Indicate action proposed to improve performance (if any).			
Sub-Standards	Best Practices Followed (Y/N)	5 Star Rating	List priorities for improvement.
4.1 Student Learning Outcomes	Y	3.40	None
4.2 Program Development Processes	Y	3.57	None
4.3 Program Evaluation and Review Processes	Y	3.50	None
4.4 Student Assessment	Y	3.80	None
4.5 Educational Assistance for Students	Y	3.64	None
4.6 Quality of Teaching	Y	3.50	None
4.7 Support for Improvements in Teaching	Y	3.86	None
4.8 Qualifications and Experience of Faculty	Y	4.00	None
4.9 Field Experience Activities	Y	3.45	None
4.10 Partnership Arrangements	NA	NA	None

Analysis of Sub-standards. List the strengths and recommendations for improvement of the program's self-evaluation of following best practices.

The PPS program goes through rigorous evaluation processes. Continuous evaluation takes place at several levels. For instance, course reports are done every semester and program is done annually. These reports are reviewed and analyzed. The followings are the major strengths, recommendation and priorities for action to improve PPS learning outcomes.

Strengths:

- 1- The integration between theoretical and practical aspects for some courses enhances learning outcomes.
- 2- The incorporation of human resources and facilities supports student learning outcomes.
- 3- Cooperative training course was included as main part of the new curriculum which was designed to acquire more knowledge and field experience.
- 4- Qualified teaching staff graduated from different international universities (e.g. USA, UK and Germany) enhanced the quality of the program development
- 5- Presence of internal program evaluation by the students and staff members.
- 6- Assessment strategies are clear to both students and instructors.
- 7- All faculty members are full time employee and available at sufficient scheduled times to enhance educational assistance for students.
- 8- The integration between human resources and facilities provide good quality of education.
- 9- Training programs offered by the Deanship for Skill Development (DSD) are reflected in the quality of teaching.
- 10- The cooperative training course (equals to 12 credit hours) encourages the student to acquire learning skills and perform well, and serves as a pre-job acquisition.

Recommendations for Improvement

- 1- International consultants should be involved in the curriculum design and development.
- 2- The standards of the achieved student learning outcomes should be compared to external benchmarks.
- 3- Encouraging the faculty members to spend a sabbatical leave and participate in cultural exchange with international universities.

Priorities for Action:

Questions Bank should be available to enable students to perform exams by computer and that will minimize errors and student get immediate score.



G. Program Course Evaluation

1. List courses taught during the year. Indicate for each course whether student evaluations were undertaken and/or other evaluations made of quality of teaching. For each course indicate if action is planned to improve teaching.*

Course Title/Course Code	Student Evaluations		Other Evaluation (specify)	Action Planned	
	Yes	No		Yes	No
Principles of Plant Production / PPS 201	Yes		None		No
Production of Horticultural Crops / PPS 301	Yes		None		No
Protected Cultivation / PPS 403	Yes		None		No
Vegetable Production / PPS 331	Yes		None		No

* The low number of courses taught during this year, is attributed to overlapping with the previous program curriculum (Plant Production, PLPR).

(Add items or attach list if necessary)

2. List All Campus Branch/Locations (approved by Ministry of Higher Education or Higher Council of Education).

Campus Branch/Location	Approval By	Date
Main Campus: KSU, Riyadh	MoHE	1965
1: None	None	None

List all courses taught by this program and for this program that are in other programs (if any).

Year	Course Code	Course Title	Required or Elective	Credit Hours	College or Department
Prep Year	ENGL 140	English Language Skills (1)	Required	8	Preparatory Year Deanship
	MATH 140	Introduction to Mathematics	Required	2	Preparatory Year Deanship
	CT 140	Computer Skills	Required	3	Preparatory Year Deanship
	MC 140	Communication Skills	Required	2	Preparatory Year Deanship
	ENGL 150	English Language Skills (2)	Required	8	Preparatory Year Deanship
	MATH 150	Mathematics (2) Calculus	Required	3	Preparatory Year Deanship
	CI 140	Learning, Thinking and Research Skills	Required	3	Preparatory Year Deanship
	ENT 101	Entrepreneurship	Required	1	Preparatory Year Deanship
	CHS 150	Health and Fitness	Required	1	Preparatory Year Deanship
	TOTAL			31	



1st Year Semester 1	BOT 102	General Botany	Required	3	Dept. of Botany and Microbiology
	CHEM 103	General Chemistry -1	Required	4	Dept. of Chemistry
	SOSC 201	Fundamental of Soil Science	Required	3	Dept. of Soil Sciences
	STAT 122	Applied Statistics -1	Required	3	Dept. of Statistics and Operation Research
		One course in Basic Islamic Culture	Required	2	
		Free Courses	Elective	2	
	TOTAL			17	
1st Year Semester 2	BCH 101	Biochemistry	Required	4	Dept. of Biochemistry
	PPS 201	Principles of Plant Production	Required	3	Dept. of Plant Production
	PLPT 201	Principles of Plant Protection	Required	3	Dept. of Plant Protection
	AGEN 230	Water and Irrigation Systems	Required	2	Dept. of Agricultural Engineering
	SOSC 331	Soil Fertility and Plant Nutrition	Required	3	Dept. of Soil Sciences
		One course in Basic Islamic Culture	Required	2	
		Free courses	Elective	2	
	TOTAL			19	
2nd Year Semester 1	AGEC 205	Principles of Agricultural Economics	Required	3	Dept. of Agricultural economics
	PPS 203	Crop Ecology	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 205	Nurseries and Methods of Plant Propagation	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 206	Applied Agriculture Genetics	Required	3	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 331	Vegetable Production	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 342	Field Crops	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
		One course in Basic Islamic Culture	Required	2	Department of Islamic Studies
		Free courses	Elective	2	Any KSU program
	TOTAL			18	
2nd Year Semester 2					
	PPS	Crop Physiology	Required	3	Dept. of Plant



	309				Production
	PPS 310	Principles of Plant Breeding	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 321	Production of Fruit Trees	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 347	Weed Control	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 372	Production of Ornamental Plants and flowers	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 380	Practical Training in Field Crops	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 381	Practical Training in Horticultural Crops	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
		One course in Basic Islamic Culture	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS	One of the PPS Program Elective Courses.	Elective	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	TOTAL			19	
3rd Year Semester 1	PPS 400	Cooperative course training	Elective	12	Dept. of Plant Production
	OR				
	PPS	PPS Program Elective Courses		12	Dept. of Plant Production
	TOTAL			12	
3rd Year Semester 2	PLPT 225	Field Crop and Horticulture Diseases	Required	3	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 308	Plant Tissue Culture	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 324	Production of Date Palm and Dates	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 403	Protected Cultivation	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 404	Principles of Field Experiments	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 405	Practical Plant Biotechnology	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS 498	Graduation Project	Required	2	Dept. of Plant Production
	PPS	PPS Program Elective Courses	Elective	4	Dept. of Plant Production
	TOTAL			19	
Include additional years if needed.					

3. Program Learning Outcome Assessment. Design a program learning outcome assessment plan using the NCAAA accreditation four year cycle. By the end of the four year cycle all program learning outcomes are to be assessed using KPIs with benchmarks and analysis, national or international standardized testing if available, rubrics, exams and grade analysis, or some alternative scientific measure of student performance

KPI #	NQF Learning Domains and Learning Outcomes	Method of Assessment	Date of Assessment
1.0	Knowledge		
1.1	Define the concepts of various aspects of plant production.	Written Test	2013
1.2	Describe theoretical and practical backgrounds related to plant production.	Written Test (quizzes, midterm and final exams)	2013
1.3	Recognize obstacles facing plant production in Saudi Arabia.	Written Test (quizzes, midterm and final exams)	2013
1.4	Outline feasible measures to maintain agricultural sustainability.	Written Test (quizzes, midterm and final exams)	2013
2.0	Cognitive Skills		
2.1	Recognize certain aspects pertaining to particular areas of plant production.	Written Essay Test	2013
2.2	Comparative theoretical approaches to the management of plant production field.	Written Essay Test	2013
2.3	Critical evaluation of factors involved in plant production.	Rubric Assessment	2013
2.4	Compose practical actions for the sustainability of agriculture.	Case Study	2013
3.0	Interpersonal Skills & Responsibility		
3.1	Demonstrate personal skills to identify factors hindering agricultural plant production.	Paper-pencil evaluation	Self-2013
3.2	Show personal ability to solve problems pertaining to plant production.	Oral Presentation	2013
4.0	Communication, Information Technology, Numerical		
4.1	Demonstrate good experiences related to plant production aspects.	Paper-pencil evaluation	Self-2013
4.2	Illustrate abilities to use technology tools and information in the plant production field.	Rubric Assessment	2013
5.0	Psychomotor		
5.1	NA	NA	NA
5.2	NA	NA	NA

Provide “direct assessments” for the current year’s program learning outcomes, according to the dates provided above (G.2). A *KPI Assessment Table* is provided below. Each learning outcome should utilize a separate KPI table. Over the four (five/six) year cycle, all program learning outcomes are to be assessed and reported in the *Annual Program Report(s)*. Normally a program has 6 to 8 program learning outcomes. Therefore 1 to 3 learning outcomes are directly assessed each year.

The KPI table is used to document directly assessed program learning outcomes. Assessments methods may include: national or international standardized test results, rubrics, exams and grade analysis, or learning achievement using an alternative scientific assessment system (copy the **KPI Assessment Table** and paste to make additional tables as needed).

KPI Assessment Table (Institutionally approved for the program)

KPI # 1.1 Program KPI: Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in specified time.	
Assessment Year 2013 Program Learning Outcome: Define the concepts of various aspects of plant production.	
NQF Learning Domain	Knowledge
Target Benchmark	100%
KPI Actual Benchmark	44.4%
Internal Benchmark	33.3%
External Benchmark	N/A
New Target Benchmark	50%
Analysis: (List strengths and recommendations)	
<p>In the PPS program, students should normally complete their studies in 4 years. During the past 4 years (2009-2012), 5.6% of students graduated within 3.5 years. Those students took advantage of taking core courses offered by other University programs during summer time. Acceptable proportion (44.4%) of PPS students graduated in the specified time (4 years). When combined with those who graduated in three and a half years, the achievement raised up to 50%. An average of 33% of students graduated within 5 years while the rest of students (17%) graduated within 6 years.</p> <p>The main cause behind the extended period of graduation of belatedly students is the failure to pass the basic courses such as general chemistry, math and physics from the first time. Furthermore, due to the individual variations among students, any student who fails to pass any course is not allowed to register for more than the designated credit hours in the curricula. Moreover, CFAS does not offer summer courses to help those students catch up with their cohort. Actual benchmark is relatively higher than the internal benchmark.</p>	

KPI # 2.4 Program KPI: Students' overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experience (Average rating of the overall quality of their program on a five point scale).	
Assessment Year 2013 Program Learning Outcome: Compose practical actions for the sustainability of agriculture.	
NQF Learning Domain	Cognitive Skills
Target Benchmark	5
KPI Actual Benchmark	4.25
Internal Benchmark	3.87
External Benchmark	N/A
New Target Benchmark	4.5
Analysis: (List strengths and recommendations)	
Students highly valued the quality of their courses (85%) compared to the internal benchmark	

(77.4%) of Agricultural Engineering Program, CFAS. Lack of any equivalent external benchmark did not permit complete comparison. PPS will continue to improve course quality through evaluation of course and program reports to achieve the new target of 90%.

KPI # 3.2 Program KPI: Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are enrolled in further study.

Assessment Year 2013 Program Learning Outcome: Show personal ability to solve problems pertaining to plant production.

NQF Learning Domain	Interpersonal Skills & Responsibility
----------------------------	---------------------------------------

Target Benchmark	35%
-------------------------	-----

KPI Actual Benchmark	25%
-----------------------------	-----

Internal Benchmark	N/A
---------------------------	-----

External Benchmark	N/A
---------------------------	-----

New Target Benchmark	30%
-----------------------------	-----

Analysis: (List strengths and recommendations)

Students highly valued the quality of their courses (85%) compared to the internal benchmark (77.4%) of Agricultural Engineering Program, CFAS. Lack of any equivalent external benchmark did not permit complete comparison. PPS will continue to improve course quality through evaluation of course and program reports to achieve the new target of 90%.

KPI # 4.2 Program KPI: Number of accessible computer terminals per student.

Assessment Year 2013 Program Learning Outcome: Illustrate abilities to use technology tools and information in the plant production field.

NQF Learning Domain	Communication, Information Technology, Numerical
----------------------------	--

Target Benchmark	1
-------------------------	---

KPI Actual Benchmark	1
-----------------------------	---

Internal Benchmark	N/A
---------------------------	-----

External Benchmark	N/A
---------------------------	-----

New Target Benchmark	1
-----------------------------	---

Analysis: (List strengths and recommendations)

The CFAS provides two computer labs with 20 computer terminals in each. These terminals are available to all students including the PPS program students. A computer technician expert supervises the two labs and provides technical assistance to students. Also, most of the department laboratories are equipped with computer terminals normally used by post graduate students.



3. Orientation programs for new teaching staff

Orientation programs provided? Yes No If offered how many participated?

a. Brief Description
Orientation programs are provided by KSU to new teaching staff annually through DSD deanship.

b. List recommendations for improvement by teaching staff.
None

c. If orientation programs were not provided, give reasons.
Orientation programs were not provided because new staff joined the program in 2012.

4. Professional Development Activities for Faculty, Teaching and Other Staff	How many Participated	
	Teaching Staff	Other Staff
a. Activities Provided		
Teaching Through Active Learning	4	2
Student Learning Enhancement and Improvement	5	1
The Seven Keys of Excellence in Teaching	3	4
Website Design and Management	9	3
Planning for Effective Teaching	5	2
Use of Photoshop Software in Teaching and Research	3	2
Use BlackBoard in Teaching	8	1
b. Summary analysis on usefulness of activities based on participant's evaluations or other evaluation methods. The active participation of the teaching staff has reflected positively on the quality of teaching process and the communication with students, in addition to the ability to upload course materials and any other related information easily accessible by the students.		



H. Independent Opinion on Quality of the Program after Considering Draft Report (e.g. head of another similar department/ program offering comment on evidence received and conclusions reached) (Attach notes).

Following the latest PPS program modifications by Plant Production Department, the program went through rigorous evaluation by hierarchical levels of committees. Moreover, the program curriculum sent to the department of Botany and Microbiology, College of Science at KSU.

1. Matters Raised by Evaluator Giving Opinion	Comment by Program Coordinator
None	No comments were raised by the independent reviewer.
2. Implications for Planning for the Program	
None	



I. Action Plan Progress Report

1. Progress on Implementation of Previous Year's Action Plans:				
No action plans were suggested.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
a.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
b.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
c.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
d.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
e.				
Actions Planned	Planned Completion Date	Person Responsible	Completed	If Not Complete, Give Reasons
f.				



2. Proposals for Program Development
a. Proposals for Changes to Program Structure (units/credit-hours, compulsory or optional courses, other) <p style="text-align: center;">None</p>
b. Proposals for Changes to Courses, (deletions and additions of units or topics, changes in teaching or assessment procedures etc.) <p style="text-align: center;">None</p>
c. Development Activities for Faculty and Teaching Staff <p style="text-align: center;">None</p>

3. New Action Plan for Academic Year 2012		
Actions Required	Completion Date	Person Responsible
a. Strengthening students' enrollment	2017	Department's committees for Administration, Learning and Teaching and Committee for Public Relations and Community Services.
b. Seek external benchmarks.	2015	The department Committee for Quality Assurance and Accreditation and the department head will be in charge of following this issue.
c. Encourage staff members to express PPS mission in their academic activities.	2015	The department Committee for Quality Assurance and Accreditation will be in charge of implementing this issue.
d. Build question bank.	2015	The department Committee for Learning and Teaching will be in charge of implementing this issue.
e. Use SMS and direct mobile calls to follow up the slow and belatedly students.	2016	The department Committee of Student Affairs and department secretary will be in charge of implementing this issue. The department secretary task will be limited to handling the messages.
f. Establish a departmental central laboratory equipped with state-of-the-arts facilities and equipment.	2016	The department Committee for Facilities and Equipment will be in charge of implementing this action under the supervision of the department head.



Program Chair/ Coordinator Name: Professor Nasser A. Al-Suhaibani

Signature: _____ **Date Report Completed:** _____

Received by: _____ **Dean/Department Head**

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____