هيئة تقويم التعليم والتدريب
Education & Training Evaluation Commission

T-103
2022

Program Specification

Program Name: Cybersecurity
Program Code (as per Saudi university ranking): 06120302
Qualification Level: Bachelor
Department: Computer Science
College: College of Engineering and Information Technology
Institution: Onaizah Private Colleges
Program Specification: New ☐ updated* ☒
Last Review Date: 2023-08-13

Content:

Content	Page
A. Program Identification and General Information	3
B. Mission, Objectives, and Program Learning Outcomes	5
C. Curriculum	7
D. Student Admission and Support	22
E. Faculty and Administrative Staff	27
F. Learning Resources, Facilities, and Equipment	28
G. Program Quality Assurance	33
H. Specification Approval Data	58

A. Program Identification and General Information

1. Program's Main Location:
Main Campus; Onaizah Private Colleges
2. Branches Offering the Program (if any):
N/A
3. Partnerships with other parties (if any) and the nature of each:
None
4. Professions/jobs for which students are qualified:
1. Cyber security specialist. 2. Gap assessment specialist. 3. Cyber Security developer. 4. Cyber Security Risk Specialist. 5. Commitment specialist in Cyber Security. 6. Resident cyber security controls. 7. Cyber security auditor. 8. Cyber Security researcher.
5. Relevant occupational/ Professional sectors:
1. Sipchem Company. 2. General Administration of Education in Qassim. 3. Saudi Federation for Cyber Security, Programming and Drones. 4. Municipality of Qassim Region - Department of Information Technology. 5. Municipality of Qassim Region - Department of Cybersecurity. 6. Saudi Aramco company. 7. Saudi telecommunications company. 8. Saudi technical control company. 9. RSM Company. 10. Mint Company. 11. King Abdulaziz City for science and technology. 12. Tuwaiq Academy. 13. The NEOM project. 14. Red Sea projects. 15. City visions project. 16. Main branches of banks.
6. Major Tracks/Pathways (if any):

Major track/pathway	Credit hours (For each track)	Professions/jobs (For each track)
1. None	None	None

7. Exit Points/Awarded Degree (if any):	
exit points/awarded degree	**Credit hours**
1. None	None

8. Total credit hours: 133 Credit Hours

B. Mission, Objectives, and Program Learning Outcomes

1. Program Mission:

To offer competitive higher education in Cyber Security within a supportive academic environment to prepare qualified Cyber Security specialists with vital employability skills, make research contributions, promote community engagement, and participate in realizing the Kingdom's Vision 2030.

2. Program Objectives:

1. Improve the quality of teaching and learning experiences, the quality of learning resources, and the quality of basic facilities, equipment, and supporting infrastructure.
2. Provide support to students through the improvement of academic, social, psychological, and professional advising, counseling, and supportive services.
3. Enhance of the performance of faculty members both professionally and academically.
4. Improve the program's administrative efficiency and processes and procedures.
5. Preparate of competent and qualified graduates with vital employability skills demanded in the labor market.
   A. Enable graduates to demonstrate core knowledge in Cyber Security using essential technologies, and basic research skills.
   B. Enhance students' critical thinking, problem-solving, communication and teamwork skills.
   C. Improve students' awareness of ethical values, principles of professional conduct, independence, and autonomy.
6. Contribute to the field of Cyber Security through the production of quality research in alignment with OC and the program's research priorities.
7. Contribute to the local community through services, programs, and consultations.

3. Program Learning Outcomes:

Knowledge and understanding	
K1	Identify fundamental Cyber Security concepts, principles, and theories in relation to the underlying computer-physical and mathematical sciences.
K2	Explain analytical and research methodologies used in Cyber Security systems.
K3	Recognize ethical values, cyber laws, safety provisions and precautions, and principles of professional conduct in the field of Cyber Security.
K4	Reiterate common security issues in networks and computer systems of IT infrastructures.
K5	Define security controls sufficient to provide a required level of confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA) in a given IT infrastructure.

Skills	
S1	Diagnose Cyber Security events and incidents related to computer systems and digital evidence, using appropriate research methods.
S2	Design creative solutions to common cybersecurity issues and threats in order to reduce or mitigate risks, and according to a set of security requirements.
S3	Critically analyze the behavior of cybersecurity threats and vulnerabilities using mathematical, quantitative, and computational tools.
S4	Critically evaluate security levels of IT systems and infrastructures.
S5	Effectively communicate inquiries, research results, and solutions to complex issues in cybersecurity with a range of audiences, using appropriate numerical data, graphical representations, and media technologies.
Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility	
V1	Effectively participate in Cyber Security teams and think-tank groups in solving Cyber Security problems and in decision-making processes, in order to advance the discipline and society.
V2	Demonstrate ethical values, safety provisions and precautions, and principles of professional conduct in the cybersecurity workplace.
V3	Act responsibly, independently, and autonomously in both work and learning situations of Cyber Security.

C. Curriculum

1. Curriculum Structure

Program Structure	Required/ Elective	No. of courses	Credit Hours	Percentage
Institution Requirements	Required	6	12	9.02%
College Requirements	Required	10	34	25.56%
Program Requirements	Required	26	75	56.39%
	Elective	2	6	4.51%
Capstone Course/Project	Required	2	5	3.75%
Field Training/ Internship/ Capstone Course	Required	1	1	0.75%
Residency year	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-
Total		**47**	**133**	**100**

2. Program Courses

Level	Course Code	Course Title	Required or Elective	Pre-Requisite Courses	Credit Hours	Type of requirements (Institution, College, or Program)
Level 1	ENG0011	English (1)	Required		8	College
	PSYCH101	Thinking Skills and Learning Styles	Required		2	College
	STAT100	Statistics	Required		2	College
	PHYS110	General Physics (1)	Required		2	College
	CSC105	Computer Skills	Required		4	College
Level 2	ENG0012	English (2)	Required	ENG0011	5	College
	MATH105	Calculus	Required		3	College
	PHYS115	General Physics (2)	Required	PHYS110	3	College
	CSC111	Computer Programming (1)	Required	CSC105	3	College
	ESP102	English for Engineering and Computer Science	Required	ENG0011	2	College
Level 3	CSC181	Computer Programming (2)	Required	CSC111	3	Program
	CYS111	Introduction to Cyber Security and Digital Crimes	Required		3	Program
	MATH106	Integral Calculus	Required	MATH105	3	Program
	ARAB101	Linguistic Skills	Required		2	Institution
	CYS131	Database & Information Management (1)	Required		3	Program
	IC101	Introduction to Islamic Culture	Required		2	Institution
Level	MATH107	Linear Algebra and Analytic geometry	Required	MATH106	3	Program

Level	Course Code	Course Title	Required or Elective	Pre-Requisite Courses	Credit Hours	Type of requirements (Institution, College, or Program)
4	CYS211	Introduction to security	Required		3	Program
	CSC214	Data Structures	Required	CSC111	3	Program
	STAT325	Introduction to Probability & Statistics	Required	MATH106	3	Program
	CYS122	Object oriented programming	Required	CSC181	3	Program
	IC102	Islam and Community Building	Required		2	Institution
Level 5	MATH212	Discrete Mathematics	Required	MATH106	3	Program
	CYS132	Cryptography Fundamentals	Required	CYS131	3	Program
	CSC383	Software Engineering	Required	CSC214	3	Program
	COE351	Computer networks	Required	CSC111 COE352	3	Program
	COE352	Computer Networks Lab	Required	COE351	1	Program
	CYS332	Cyber Law and Regulation of the Information Society	Required	CYS211	3	Program
	ARAB103	Arabic Writing	Required	ARAB101	2	Institution
Level 6	CYS342	Database Security	Required		3	Program
	CYS445	Internet Protocols and Algorithms	Required	COE351	3	Program
	CSC222	Operating Systems	Required	CYS122	3	Program
	CYS351	Security Architecture and System Administration	Required	CYS211	3	Program
	CYS127	Web Programming	Required	CYS122	3	Program
	IC103	Economic System in Islam	Required	IC102	2	Institution
Level 7	CYSXXX	Track course (1)	Elective		3	Program
	CYS472	Intrusion Detection System	Required	COE351	3	Program
	CYS333	Digital Forensic Investigation	Required	CYS342	3	Program
	CYS421	Network Security	Required	COE351	3	Program
	CYS498	Graduation Project (1)	Required	Pass 85 Hrs.	2	Program
	IC104	Political System in Islam	Required	IC103	2	Institution
	CYS497	Summer Training	Required	Pass 85 Hrs.	1	Program
Level 8	CYSXXX	Track course (2)	Elective		3	Program
	CYS341	Cloud Computing Security	Required	COE421	3	Program
	CYS452	Wireless Security	Required	CYS431	3	Program
	CSC433	Artificial Intelligence	Required	CYS445	3	Program
	CYS499	Graduation Project (2)	Required	CYS498	3	Program

3. Course Specifications

Insert hyperlink for all course specifications using NCAAA template (T-104)

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1CHAtP8mS8jGAlxGbrlBrs6sjkk6qwNdy

4. Program Learning Outcomes Mapping Matrix

Align the program learning outcomes with program courses, according to the following desired levels of performance *(I = Introduced P = Practiced M = Mastered).*

Course code & No.	Program Learning Outcomes												
	Knowledge and understanding					Skills					Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility		
	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	V1	V2	V3
ENG0011										I			
STAT100		I						I					
PSYCH101									I				I
CSC105	I					I		I					
PHYS110	I												
ENG0012										P			
ESP102										M			
MATH105		I						I					
CSC111	P					I		P					
PHYS115	P												
IC101												I	
ARAB 101										I			
MATH106		I						P					
CYS111	P		I									P	
CYS131	P									P	I		
CSC181	P					P		P					
IC102												I	
MATH107		P						P					
CYS122	P					P		P					
CYS211					I	P							P
CSC214	P		I					P					
STAT325		P						I					
ARAB103										I			
CYS132					P		I	P					
MATH212	P							P		P			
CYS332			P			P						P	
COE351				I					P		I		
COE352				I					M		P		

Course code & No.	Program Learning Outcomes												
	Knowledge and understanding					Skills					Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility		
	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	V1	V2	V3
CSC383	M						I			M			
IC103												P	
CYS127	M					M		M					
CSC222				P	M				M				
CYS342				P			P			M			
CYS351				P			P		M				
CYS445				P			M						P
IC104												P	
CYS333						M		M		M			
CYS421				P		M			M				
CYS472						M		M	M				
CYS497			M					M	M		M		M
CYS498	P	P								P	M		
CYS341				M		M					M		
CYS433		M					M	M					
CYS452				M			M			M			
CYS499		M					M	M	M		M	M	M
CYS431			M						P			P	
CYS453				M		M			P				
CYS454				M		M			P				
CYS482			M	M					M				
CYS252	M					M		M					
CYS435			M			M						M	
CYS456		M					M	M					
CYS479											M		

5. Teaching and learning strategies applied to achieve program learning outcomes

Describe teaching and learning strategies, including curricular and extra-curricular activities, to achieve the program learning outcomes in all areas.

OC-QMS guiding principle #5 (and its relevant policies and processes) mandates that an OC academic program should:

1. Align all its courses with its PLOs (process P-P-04 and its guidelines & procedures).
2. Define individual CLOs for each course (process P-P-05 and its guidelines & procedures).
3. Map all individual CLOs with PLOs based on step #1.
4. Map all individual CLOs with appropriate teaching strategies and learning activities through CTAs matrices (process P-P-06 and its guidelines & procedures). This process is semi-automated through OC-E-QMS.
5. Map all PLOs to appropriate teaching strategies and learning activities, based on the established alignments of individual CLOs as defined in steps 1 to 4 and include this mapping in the PLOs Assessment Plan (process P-P-07 and its guidelines & procedures). This process is fully automated through OC-E-QMS.

Accordingly, the program adhered strictly to the previous steps and their associated processes and procedures, systematically aligning all courses with the defined PLOs. The content of each course was meticulously deconstructed into individual CLOs, which were subsequently associated with appropriate teaching strategies and learning activities in accordance with the OC-QMS guidelines. These mappings were then embedded in our PLO assessment Plan, facilitating a unified and effective approach to pedagogy across the program. The following table summarizes the mapping of our PLOs to teaching strategies and learning activities based on the relevant NQF domain:

NQF-PLO Domain	Mapped Teaching Strategies/Learning Activities
Knowledge & Understanding PLOs	1. Lectures. 2. Tutorials. 3. (Online) Video. 4. Discussions (and similar active learning activities). 5. Online Discussions (e.g., Discussion Forums). 6. Independent Study or Research. 7. Group Work and Cooperative Learning Activities (including online group activities). 8. Group Research.
Skills PLOs	1. Interactive Lecture Demonstration. 2. Demonstration Video. 3. Discussions (and similar active learning activities). 4. Group Work and Cooperative Learning Activities (including online group activities). 5. Extracurricular Activities. 6. Lab Work and Experiential Learning Activities. 7. Fieldwork. 8. Seminar. 9. Peer group presentations. 10. Project or research work. 11. Case Study.
Values, Autonomy and Responsibility PLOs	1. Discussions (debates and similar active learning activities). 2. Independent Study. 3. Group Work and Cooperative Learning Activities (including online group activities). 4. Lab Work. 5. Fieldwork. 6. Group Project or Research. 7. Extracurricular Activities.

As further explained in the OC-QMS handbook, the sequence of teaching strategies and learning activities in the table above is structured in line with Bloom's taxonomy, which represents a continuum of increasing complexity in learning. For each domain—Knowledge & Understanding, Skills, and Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility—the strategies progress from simpler to more complex strategies and activities. For instance, in the Knowledge and understanding domain, the strategies transition from basic information transmission (lectures, tutorials) to more complex activities (discussions, group work, independent research). A similar pattern is observed in the Skills domain, starting with direct instruction (interactive demonstrations, videos) and moving toward more practical tasks (lab work, fieldwork, projects). Lastly, in the Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility domain, the strategies shift from fostering reflection and critical thinking (discussions, debates) to encouraging autonomy and responsibility (independent studies, group projects). Thus, the sequence of strategies in each domain aligns with Bloom's taxonomy, guiding students from simpler to more complex learning tasks.

As detailed in the OC-QMS handbook, this progression of teaching strategies and learning activities also corresponds to the course level and the level of the link established between the course and a PLO (i.e., introduced, practiced, or mastered). When preparing CTAs, course instructors are made aware through OC-E-QMS of the course level and its links to PLOs. Therefore, in introductory or lower-level courses, simpler teaching strategies (e.g., lectures and tutorials) are recommended to be used to convey foundational knowledge and understanding. As students' progress to intermediate and advanced level courses, the complexity of teaching strategies and learning activities is expected to increase. This aligns with the need for students to develop more sophisticated skills, demonstrate greater autonomy, and take on more responsibility in their learning. Hence, more complex activities are introduced in these courses such as discussions, debates, sophisticated group work, and independent research in the Knowledge and understanding domain; lab work, fieldwork, and projects in the Skills domain; and independent studies and group projects in the Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility domain.

Furthermore, the mapping between PLOs of each domain and teaching strategies/learning activities in this table aligns well with widely recognized theories on pedagogy and learning as summarized below:

Knowledge and Understanding: Since this domain primarily involve PLOs related to the acquisition and comprehension of information, traditional teaching methods like lectures and tutorials are useful for delivering information, while discussions and group work foster understanding and help students to actively engage with the material.

Independent study or independent research promotes in-depth exploration of the topic and reflects the "**student-centered**" aspect of OC Learning and Teaching Philosophy (outlined in OC-QMS handbook). Online tools like videos and discussion forums can enhance accessibility and provide diverse modes of engagement.

Skills: PLOs in this domain are concerned with the application of knowledge or the performance of certain actions. Interactive lecture demonstrations, group work, and seminars provide opportunities for students to practice skills in a controlled environment. Lab work and fieldwork allow students to apply what they've learned in a practical, real-world context, and they reflect the "**practical-oriented**" aspect of OC Learning and Teaching Philosophy. Peer group presentations and project work can help develop communication and project management skills, which are crucial in many professions. The table indicates that the Skills domain is associated with a relatively wider array of teaching strategies and learning activities. This variety is crucial to cater to the two diverse subcategories of skills: **cognitive** (interactive lectures, discussions, etc.) and **practical** (lab work, fieldwork, extracurricular activities, etc.).

Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility: PLOs in this domain are centered on personal and ethical development, as well as the capacity to work independently and take responsibility for one's own actions. Discussions, particularly debates, can help students to explore different perspectives and develop their own values. Independent study encourages autonomy and self-direction. Group work can foster a sense of responsibility, as students must collaborate effectively and contribute to a collective outcome. Lab work, fieldwork, and project work can help students understand the practical implications and real-world impacts of their actions. All these strategies and activities resonate well with the "**value-driven**" aspect of OC Learning and Teaching Philosophy.

(For more details on these teaching strategies and learning activities, along with their practical implementation cases, forms, and templates, please refer to the "Practical Guide to OC-Approved Teaching and Assessment Strategies.")

OC-QMS also mandates that these mappings between PLOs, teaching strategies, and learning activities must be reviewed periodically by the program based on analysis and evaluation reported in regular PLOs assessment reports as well as CLOs assessment results in course reports (more on these periodic reviews, their established procedures, and timeframes is given in the OC-QMS handbook). Furthermore, our program places great emphasis on professional development for our faculty, recognizing their pivotal role in the successful implementation of the teaching strategies and learning activities outlined above. Working in collaboration with the Development Administration, we

create an Annual Faculty Training Plan that outlines a comprehensive suite of development programs. These programs equip our faculty with the latest knowledge and skills in pedagogical methods, technology integration, assessment design, student engagement techniques, and accommodating diverse learning styles. The participation of our faculty in these programs is monitored and assessed through two KPIs: OC-16 and OC-17. Moreover, appropriate, and effective implementation of these teaching strategies and learning activities inside classrooms is monitored and evaluated through regular peer review and chairperson evaluation (templates OC-QMS-D-01, OC-QMS-D-02 and OC-QMS-D-03, respectively). Based on the outcomes of these periodic reviews and evaluations, we can identify areas where additional faculty training is needed or suggest revisions in the mapping of our teaching strategies and learning activities to the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

As far as extra-curricular activities are concerned, their actual planning is of two levels: course-level, and program-level. At the course level, they are considered a separate teaching strategy/learning activity particularly aligned with CLOs in the skills and values domains and documented in the relevant courses' specifications. At the program level, the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) follows an established mechanism through which extracurricular activities are selected, mapped to PLOs, and evaluated for their effectiveness. This mechanism was initially prepared with close involvement of faculty and students, and it mainly consists of the following components:

1. **Input from Stakeholders** (mainly Faculty, Students, and our Professional Advisory Board).
2. **Selection Criteria** (more importantly relevant to PLOs)
3. **Mapping to PLOs**.
4. **Evaluation Process** (mainly collection of feedback from stakeholders and achievement results of mapped PLOs; conducted at the conclusion of each academic year).
5. **Review & Update** (based on evaluation results).

6. Assessment Methods for Program Learning Outcomes

Describe assessment methods (Direct and Indirect) that can be used to measure the achievement of program learning outcomes in all areas.

In addition to the alignment and mapping of teaching strategies and learning activities to PLOs (steps summarized above), OC-QMS also mandates that an OC academic program should:

1. Map all individual CLOs with appropriate assessment methods through CTAs matrices (part of process P-P-06 and its guidelines & procedures). This process is semi-automated through OC-E-QMS.
2. Map all PLOs to appropriate assessment methods, based on the established alignments with individual CLOs as defined in steps 1 to 4, and include this mapping in the PLOs Assessment Plan (part of process P-P-07 and its guidelines & procedures). This process is fully automated through OC-E-QMS.

Accordingly, the program adhered strictly to the previous steps and their associated processes and procedures, systematically aligning all courses with the defined PLOs. The content of each course was meticulously deconstructed into individual CLOs, which were subsequently associated with appropriate assessment methods in accordance with the OC-QMS guidelines. These mappings were then embedded in our PLOs assessment Plan, facilitating a unified and effective approach to pedagogy across the program. The following table summarizes the mapping of our PLOs to assessment methods based on the relevant NQF domain:

NQF-PLO Domain	Mapped Assessment Methods
Knowledge & Understanding PLOs	1. Quiz (including online). 2. Homework. 3. Written Exam (both MCQ and Essay Questions). 4. Essay (both Individual and Group). 5. Research Summary. 6. Student Portfolio (knowledge tasks).
Skills PLOs	1. Written Exam. 2. Oral Exam or Interview. 3. Practical Assessment (according to a specific rubric, in both labs and classrooms). 4. Fieldwork Assessment (e.g., by field experience supervisors) 5. Presentation (both individual and group, according to a specific rubric). 6. Project/research assessment. 7. Short Reports (both individual and group, according to a specific rubric). 8. Case Study (both individual and group). 9. Course Evaluation Survey (item 14). 10. Observation (according to a specific rubric). 11. Student Portfolio (skills tasks).
Values, Autonomy and Responsibility PLOs	1. Observation (according to a specific rubric by faculty, peer students and/or committee). 2. Oral Exam or Interview. 3. Case Study (both individual and group). 4. Fieldwork Observation. 5. Student Portfolio (independent or team tasks).

Like the sequence and order of teaching strategies and learning activities discussed in the previous section, and as further explained in the OC-QMS handbook, the order of assessment methods in the table above also corresponds to Bloom's Taxonomy, which represents a continuum of increasing complexity in learning, and hence, in the assessment process. Each domain—Knowledge and understanding, Skills, and Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility—involves a progression in the assessment methods from relatively straightforward to more complex tasks. Within the Knowledge and understanding domain, assessments transition from basic tasks such as quizzes and homework, which test basic recall and comprehension, to more complex activities like essays and research summaries that require deeper understanding and synthesis of information. The Skills domain follows a similar progression, beginning with standard written and oral exams, and then advancing to hands-on, practical assessments, fieldwork, presentations, and projects. These methods not only test the application of knowledge but also the analysis and synthesis of data, concepts, and situations. Lastly, the Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility domain employs strategies that require the highest levels of cognitive complexity. Starting from observations and peer assessments, which foster reflection, it moves on to oral interviews, case studies, and fieldwork observations, all requiring critical thinking, decision-making, and responsibility. Again, this progression of assessment methods corresponds to the course level and the level of the link established between the course and a PLO as discussed in the previous section.

The mapping between PLOs of each domain and assessment methods in this table aligns well with widely recognized theories on pedagogy and assessment as summarized below:

Knowledge & Understanding: The methods listed under this domain are designed to assess PLOs related to the student's theoretical knowledge and their understanding of the concepts. Quizzes and homework assignments can be used to gauge the student's understanding of the course material. Written exams (both multiple-choice and essay questions) can assess the ability of students to recall information and mentally apply the knowledge they have acquired. Essays allow students to demonstrate their understanding of a topic in depth, including the ability to synthesize information and present arguments. Research summaries help in understanding how well students can comprehend, analyze, and summarize knowledge as research. Student portfolios (knowledge tasks) provide a comprehensive view of the student's learning progression and knowledge absorption over time. Each method embodies the "**student-centered**" approach that is a cornerstone of the OC Learning and Teaching Philosophy (outlined in the OC-QMS handbook), as they all foster independent thinking and individual effort.

Skills: Assessment methods under this domain are mainly concerned with assessing students' practical skills, their ability to apply knowledge and their proficiency in certain techniques or methods. Written exams can test theoretical knowledge along with the application of essential cognitive skills. Oral exams or interviews can assess the communication skills required by the field. Practical assessments are linked to evaluating hands-on skills in a lab or classroom setting. Fieldwork assessments help assess skills that are applicable in real-world or field situations. Presentations, projects, short reports, and case studies assess a variety of skills including research, organization, critical thinking, communication, and teamwork. The course evaluation survey can be a tool to understand how effectively the skills are being imparted and received from the students' perspective. Observation allows the teacher to assess skills in real time in a natural setting. Student portfolios (skills tasks) offer an ongoing record of skill development and competency. The above table indicates that the Skills domain is associated with a relatively wider choice of assessment methods. This variety is important for two reasons: 1) to cater to the two diverse subcategories of skills: **cognitive** (written exams, short reports, portfolios, etc.) and **practical** (student presentations, projects, practical assessment, etc.), and 2) to reflect two tenets in OC philosophy of learning and teaching, namely "**diversity**" and "**authentic assessment**".

Values, Autonomy, and Responsibility: The methods associated with this domain are aimed at assessing PLOs related to students' attitudes, values, autonomy, and responsibility in their learning process. Observation is a great tool to assess students' behavior, attitude, and values in a natural setting. Observation by peer students encourages students to critically evaluate others' work, which can foster a sense of responsibility and improve their understanding of the subject. Oral exams or interviews can provide insights into students' thought processes, values, and ability to articulate their understanding independently. Case studies can show how students apply their knowledge and skills in a complex, real-world scenario, reflecting their values and sense of responsibility. Fieldwork observation allows for the assessment of students in real-world scenarios, which can reveal their values, autonomy, and sense of responsibility. Student portfolios (independent or team tasks) can demonstrate students' ability to manage their learning process independently or as part of a team. These assessment methods resonate well with the "value-driven" and "value-based "components of OC Learning and Teaching Philosophy.

(For more details on these assessment methods, along with their potential implementation cases, suggested forms, and templates, please refer to the "Practical Guide to OC-Approved Teaching and Assessment Strategies.")

OC-QMS also mandates that these mappings between PLOs and assessment methods must be reviewed periodically by the program based on analysis and evaluation reported in regular PLOs assessment reports as well as CLOs assessment results in course reports, and recommendations of relevant committees such as the Advisory Board (more on these periodic reviews, their established procedures, and timeframes is given in the OC-QMS handbook). Furthermore, our program places great emphasis on professional development for our faculty, recognizing their pivotal role in the successful implementation of the assessment methods outlined above. Again, working in collaboration with the Development Administration, the program's Annual Faculty Training Plan outlines a comprehensive suite of development programs. These programs equip our faculty with the latest knowledge and skills in pedagogical and assessment methods, technology integration, assessment design, student engagement techniques, and accommodating diverse assessment styles. As mentioned in the previous section, the participation of our faculty in these programs is monitored annually through two KPIs: OC-16 and OC-17. Moreover, appropriate, and effective implementation of these assessment methods inside classrooms is monitored and evaluated through regular peer review and chairperson evaluation (templates OC-QMS-D-01, OC-QMS-D-02, and OC-QMS-D-03, respectively). Based on the outcomes of these periodic reviews and evaluations, we can identify areas where additional faculty training is needed or suggest revisions in the mapping of our assessment methods to the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

It should be noted here that all assessment methods outlined above are course-based, and hence, they are mainly direct methods (exams, observation, practical assessment according to specific rubrics, etc.), except for the Course Evaluation Survey under the Skills domain. The reasoning is discussed in detail in the OC-QMS handbook. At the program level, however, we use both **direct** and **indirect** assessment methods for the PLOs. Our main program-level direct method is the **exit exam**. It serves as a comprehensive evaluation of our students' knowledge, skills, and values, just prior to graduation. According to OC-QMS, exit exams should have two parts: **theoretical** and **practical**. Questions in the theoretical part are mainly aligned with PLOs in the Knowledge domain, and some PLOs in the Skills domain. Practical tasks of the exit exam are aligned with PLOs in the Skills and Values domain. To ensure appropriate alignment between the exit exam's theoretical questions, practical tasks, and PLOs, the program uses the OC Exit Exam Specification template (OC-QMS-P-05) in which we explicitly link each PLO to a question/task bundle in the exit exam, with details regarding each bundle.

The main indirect assessment method at the program level is based on two annual **surveys**: PO_EMPO (employers survey) and PO_GRAD (alumni/alumnae survey). The mapping between elements/questions in these two surveys and the PLOs is explicitly outlined in the PLOs Assessment Plan (under the Program-Level Additional Assessment Methods section). Furthermore, results of the direct course-based assessment methods as well as of the program-level assessment are reported in the PLOs Assessment Report. This report includes individual results of each assessment method, aggregated and normalized results, and various comparisons of results between courses, sections, teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessment methods.

In addition to mapping PLOs to assessment methods, our program also ensures a comprehensive mapping of PLOs to our **Graduate Attributes (GAs)**. This is an integral part of our holistic approach to teaching and learning, ensuring that our graduates are well-equipped with the necessary skills and attributes to thrive in their chosen fields. The mapping of GAs to PLOs is explicitly outlined in our PLOs Assessment Plan, where each GA is linked to relevant PLOs, which in turn are assessed through the various assessment methods detailed earlier. This connection ensures that not only are we assessing the attainment of specific learning outcomes, but we are also evaluating how well our program is instilling the desired graduate attributes in our students. As mandated by OC-QMS, the assessment of GAs is done by aggregating the individual results of the mapped PLOs. This method allows us to evaluate the achievement of GAs based on the comprehensive performance of students across all relevant learning outcomes. By mapping and assessing our GAs, we can monitor and evaluate how effectively our program is preparing our graduates for their future endeavors. This aligns with our commitment to continuous improvement, as the feedback from these assessments is used to make necessary adjustments and enhancements to our teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessment methods.

D. Student Admission and Support

1. Student Admission Requirements

1. The student must be a Saudi national or a non-Saudi who holds a regular residence permit
2. Obtaining a general Secondary School Certificate or equivalent from inside or outside the kingdom
3. He must not have completed a high school diploma or equivalent for more than five years.
4. Pass the required admission tests (abilities + achievement), which are organized by the National Center for Measurement and Evaluation.
5. Pass any test or personal interview required by colleges.
6. The student must be medically fit.
7. The student should not have been dismissed from any other university or college for academic or disciplinary reasons.

2. Guidance and Orientation Programs for New Students

(Include only the exceptional needs offered to the students of the program that differ from those provided at the institutional level).

Two days of Guidance and Orientation to the Program, include:

1. Meeting with program staff members,
2. Lectures to introduce the program's goals
3. Introductory tour for new students of the program library, labs and classrooms
4. The tasks involved include distributing a student guidebook, which includes listing new students and updating their information, facilitating connections between students and academic mentors, providing information about mentors, and encouraging students to meet with them. Additionally, the aim is to introduce students to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and enhance their understanding of their rights, the Code of Conduct, and ethical guidelines.

3. Student Counseling Services

(Academic, professional, psychological, and social)

(Include only the exceptional needs offered to the students of the program that differ from those provided at the institutional level).

- **Academic counseling:**
  One of the most important roles of a program is to take care of its students from all scientific, psychological, and intellectual aspects. Academic counseling is an organized process aimed at guiding students to obtain the best results, adapt to the university environment and take advantage of the opportunities available by providing them with academic skills that raise the level of their academic achievement.

- **Student Advisory Council:**
  It is a council that serves students and seeks to solve their problems. It also accepts their feedback and opinions, and among its members is a group of students from different majors. It holds meetings at least twice per semester.

- **Objectives of the council:**
  1. Facilitating communication between college staff and students to improve the academic, educational, and service processes at the college.
  2. Understanding students' perspectives on the academic and extracurricular activities provided within the college.
  3. Collaborating to make the college an optimal place for acquiring knowledge and a fertile environment for learning values, and ethics, socializing, and building relationships among all members.
  4. Committing to honesty and accuracy in addressing issues that serve students and the college.
  5. Valuing responsibility and not disclosing confidential information or discussing what is being discussed in private.
  6. Fostering leadership skills among students and providing them with opportunities to express their opinions.
  7. Raising awareness among students about their rights and responsibilities according to college regulations.
  8. Prioritizing student issues, monitoring them, and working towards resolving them.
  9. Respect the opinions and other's opinions.

- **Academic guidance mechanism:**
  1. The student is responsible for meeting with the academic advisor during the add/drop period to help the student prepare their schedule and select appropriate courses according to the academic plan.
  2. Refer to the university handbook and familiarize yourself with academic regulations and all program requirements.
  3. Follow the curriculum prepared by the program to ensure completion of all requirements within the specified time frame.
  4. Consult with the academic advisor and develop an alternative study plan if circumstances such as withdrawal, failure, or change of major arise, in order to ensure completion of all graduation requirements.
  5. Maintain regular communication with the academic advisor, especially during registration periods.
  6. Review with the academic advisor and familiarize oneself with systems and regulations regarding all matters related to academic progress, especially in cases of course registration and withdrawal from college, as well as making academic decisions. The academic advisor will direct the student to the relevant office.
  7. The student should have a high level of academic awareness that enables them to take responsibility and respect college customs.

- **Professional Advising:**
  1. Assign dedicated academic advisors to Cybersecurity students who specialize in the field and have in-depth knowledge of the curriculum, requirements, and career opportunities.
  2. Provide assistance with course selection, academic planning, and degree progress tracking.
  3. Offer guidance and resources for internships, co-op programs, and job placement.
  4. Organize workshops, seminars, and guest lectures by industry professionals to enhance career readiness and networking opportunities.
  5. Maintain a database of alumni who can serve as mentors and provide industry insights.

- **Psychological and Social Advising:**
  1. Establish a counseling center or collaborate with existing counseling services to provide mental health support to Cybersecurity students.
  2. Offer individual and group counseling sessions to address stress, anxiety, and other psychological challenges.
  3. Conduct workshops or programs on stress management, time management, and work-life balance.
  4. Foster a supportive and inclusive environment through student organizations, clubs, and events focused on Cybersecurity.
  5. Promote community engagement and provide opportunities for students to connect with their peers through social activities and networking events.

- **Support Services:**
  1. Provide resources and workshops on study skills, research methodologies, and project management specific to civil engineering.
  2. Offer tutoring services and study groups to help students excel in their coursework.
  3. Establish a peer mentoring program where upper-class Cybersecurity students guide and support incoming students.
  4. Collaborate with the university's disability services office to ensure accommodations are provided to students with disabilities.
  5. Maintain a centralized online platform or portal where students can access important information, resources, and support services.

4. Special Support

(Low achievers, disabled, gifted, and talented students).

1. **Low achievers and disabled**
    1. Developmental courses (study skills, test anxiety, etc.).
    2. Remedial courses.
    3. Guidance messages by all available means.
    4. Guidance publications.
    5. Group counseling.

2. **The mechanism and procedure for support Low achievers and the disabled include**
    1. Assigning each academic advisor, a care program for struggling students.
    2. Determining default criteria (low average, repeated absences, study duration, repeated omissions, student behavior in the classroom, etc.).
    3. Counting the failing students.
    4. Call the students to meet them individually.
    5. Diagnosis of the failing student.
    6. Sorting failure cases (academic, psychological, social, economic, etc.).
    7. Addressing the academic problems of each student.
    8. Refer other default cases to a solutions center (psychological, social, economic, etc.).
    9. Following up on the case after it has been transferred to the Academic Advising Unit.
    10. Close the case after its completion.
    11. Submitting a total final report on the results of academic failure in the college.

3. **Gifted, and talented students**
    1. Advanced courses.
    2. Student visits to: (officials, government sectors, private sectors).
    3. Scientific trips.
    4. Scientific meetings.

4. **The mechanism and procedure for supporting Gifted, and talented students include**
    1. Counting the academically outstanding students in the college.
    2. Preparing a rehabilitation and enrichment program for outstanding students.
    3. Preparing lists of supportive agencies for outstanding students inside and outside the college.
    4. Definition and nomination of outstanding students for the Dean's Award.
    5. Definition and nomination of the ideal student in the college.

E. Faculty and Administrative Staff

1. Needed Teaching and Administrative Staff

Academic Rank	Specialty		Special Requirements / Skills (if any)	Required Numbers		
	General	Specific		M	F	T
Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associate Professor	Computer Science	AI	-	2	-	2
Assistant Professor	Computer Science, Computer System, Mathematics	Software engineering, Computer graphics, System engineering, Mathematics	-	3	1	4
Lecturer	Computer Science	Computer network	-	2	6	8
Teaching Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-
Technicians & Laboratory Assistant	Computer Science	-	-	3	2	5
Administrative & Supportive Staff	Computer Science	-	-	2	2	4
Others (specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-

F. Learning Resources, Facilities, and Equipment

1. Learning Resources

Learning resources required by the Program (textbooks, references, and e-learning resources and web-based resources, etc.)

The Department of Cyber Security formed the "Learning Resources, Facilities, and Equipment Committee" as per operational objective number (20) in the 2022 operational plan of the "Cyber Security Program". The committee formation letter includes a number of key tasks assigned to the committee, most importantly "Preparing, implementing, and following up mechanisms to provide all essential, supportive and electronic learning resources and references".

The mechanism and its procedures can be summarized in the following points:

1. The committee identifies all learning resources required for the academic program including essential, supportive, and electronic books and references by automatic extraction of resources listed in the latest version of the program's course specifications through OC-E-QMS. Then it prepares a dated list including these resources.
2. The list is presented to the department council for discussion and approval.
3. After the council approves the list, the committee through the department chairperson presents the list to the dean of the college.
4. The dean contacts the "Library and Learning Resources Administration" with the list of resources specific to the academic program.
5. The Library and Learning Resources Administration identifies the currently unavailable print and electronic resources in the library, determines their cost, and contacts the Assistant Chief Supervisor for Planning and Quality regarding the provision of those resources, who in turn contacts the General Supervisor to approve the purchase and procurement.
6. After written approval from the Chief Supervisor, the Library Administration secures the resources through available channels.
7. The Library Administration notifies the dean once all the learning resources listed are available in or through the library.
8. If the library is unable to secure some of the listed resources and references, it should notify the dean and suggest alternatives such as providing electronic copies of the required print resources or vice versa, or suggest alternative titles.
9. If the library suggests any alternative titles for the listed resources, these alternatives must be presented to the department council through the department head and course coordinator for discussion, approval, or disapproval. Then the

course specification is updated based on the department council's approval and the course coordinator's recommendation.

The "OC Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) - Chapter Five" Handbook includes a description of other details related to this mechanism, its procedures, and templates.

The committee also periodically (at the end of each academic year) evaluates the quality of learning resources (including essential, supportive, and electronic books and references) by:

1. Reviewing course evaluation results related to developing or updating learning resources, references, and textbooks in the relevant course reports.
2. Reviewing learning resources quality evaluation results in the program's annual survey reports, specifically:
   - Results of item analysis (33) in the PO_PRO_01 survey.

2. Facilities and Equipment

(Library, laboratories, classrooms, etc.)

The Department of Cybersecurity formed the " Learning Resources, Facilities and Equipment Committee " as per operational objective number (20) in the 2022 operational plan of the "Cybersecurity Program". The main tasks assigned to the committee include preparing, implementing, and following up on mechanisms to provide all the basic and supporting needs of equipment and software for the laboratories.

Statistics on the Number of Computer Labs and the Distribution of Computers

Section	Number of Labs	Number of Computers	General Specifications
Male	7	157	Intel Core i7, Intel Core i5, Intel Core i3
Female	5	110	Intel Core i7, Intel Core i5, Intel Core i3
The total number of computers in lab			267

Statistics on the Number of Rooms and the Distribution of Capacities

Section	Number	Number According to Capacity	Absorptive Capacity
Male	35	5	50
		20	35
		10	25
Female	25	5	50
		10	35
		10	25
Sum		60	

3. Procedures to ensure a healthy and safe learning environment

(According to the nature of the program)

Onaizah Private Colleges (OC) takes a proactive and thorough approach to ensuring a safe, healthy, and secure learning environment for students and staff.

Regular inspections and maintenance of all facilities and equipment are conducted in close coordination with external specialists and agencies to proactively identify and mitigate any potential risks. Fire safety is a major area of focus, with fire extinguishers readily available in all corridors. Smoke detectors and fire alarms are placed strategically throughout campus facilities and residences.

The Risk Management Administration team conducts fire drills and periodic checks of all fire safety equipment in conjunction with the Civil Defense Department to ensure proper functioning. First aid kits equipped to treat minor injuries are kept in main corridors and locations for easy access. Fire hoses are located in all major hallways and buildings.

In addition to regular fire safety inspections and drills, all campus buildings have clearly marked emergency exits on each floor leading to outside evacuation points. Detailed floor maps showing emergency exits and assembly points are posted in every hallway and classroom. Students and staff are informed about proper emergency evacuation procedures including orderly exit through marked emergency doors. Practice evacuation drills are conducted periodically to ensure everyone is familiar with routes. Designated assembly points are assigned for each building and marked with visible signs. Sufficient open spaces have been allocated around campus buildings to accommodate people during emergency evacuations.

OC operates two well-equipped health clinics staffed by qualified medical practitioners to care for students and personnel in both male and female sections. During the COVID-19 pandemic, OC implemented additional safety measures such as providing masks, hand sanitizers, and enforcing the use of the Tawakkalna app to screen for infections before allowing entry to campus. Those measures also include procedures for transitioning to secure online learning when in-person classes are suspended due to public health risks. Students access virtual classrooms safely through the college's licensed Blackboard platform which provides robust security features including password-protected access, encrypted data transmission, and role-based permissions. Strict cybersecurity policies are enforced to maintain information security. The IT department closely monitors the system and network for any potential threats or anomalies.

Comprehensive safety protocols are enforced in all laboratories, with clear instructions provided nearby. Regular training is conducted on proper lab procedures, safe equipment operation, and aggression response strategies. Rigorous information security standards are maintained through the use of secured networks, firewalls, anti-virus software, and access controls. A CCTV camera system provides monitoring of facilities, and offices are secured with proper locks to restrict access. Critical information is backed up both locally and on secure cloud servers. Additional measures are in place such as backup power generators and redundant internet connections to ensure continuity of service in case of outages. OC's maintenance team performs scheduled upkeep of all safety and security systems.

To ensure continuous review and enhancement of safety protocols at the program, the Learning Resources, Facilities, and Equipment Committee in our department oversees evaluations of all emergency preparedness and safety procedures directly through scheduled inspections and indirectly through surveys distributed to students and staff. Those surveys cover important aspects related to awareness and effectiveness of safety protocols and risk management at the college. Key areas included in the surveys are familiarity with risk management guidelines outlined in OC policies, training received on emergency response procedures and evacuation drills, adherence to information security standards, knowledge of safety guidelines for laboratory experiments and equipment usage, accessibility and condition of fire safety apparatus, overall campus security measures, and any other safety concerns. Feedback received through the surveys provides valuable insights into the strengths and potential gaps in existing risk mitigation practices at OC. The input helps the Learning Resources, Facilities, and Equipment Committee determine where additional risk awareness and management training or upgrades to safety infrastructure may be needed across the college's academic and residential facilities.

G. Program Quality Assurance

1. Program Quality Assurance System

Provide a link to quality assurance manual.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1mnlEGGu9AorlUK5ijbfv1pc20hYKX61y

2. Procedures to Monitor Quality of Courses Taught by other Departments

Procedures to Monitor Quality of Courses Taught by other Departments:

The updated OC-QMS includes established mechanisms through which academic programs should monitor the quality of courses taught by other academic departments/programs as well as cross-listed courses. The key elements of these mechanisms include:

1. **Involvement of all programs in which the course is delivered (or listed) in reviewing course learning outcomes (CLOs):**
   OC-QMS includes procedures for developing/updating course learning outcomes in the OC-E-QMS electronic system. These entail a series of reviews, most importantly reviews by the program director (as well as assistant director and quality assurance committee members; QAC for short) of CLOs in OC-E-QMS, particularly those linked to one of the programs learning outcomes (PLOs). The system allows the director of each program in which the course is delivered to comment on the CLOs linked to its PLOs, accept or reject them, and explain the rationale, for all courses including those offered across departments or colleges.

   The course specification includes a QR code and hyperlink showing the detailed report of the review process as well as its timeframes associated with each program director, along with the outcomes and course coordinator's responses. Refer to the OC-E-QMS Manual for details on electronic reviews of CLOs, and the OC-QMS Handbook (process P-P-05).

2. **Involvement of all programs in which the course is delivered in reviewing and approving the course specification matrix:**
   Similarly, the OC-QMS process P-P-06 requires the engagement of all program directors (and QACs) in reviewing course matrices (CTAs) for joint, externally offered, or cross-listed courses via OC-E-QMS. The course specification includes a QR code and link showing the detailed report of the review process, as well as its timeframes associated with each program director, along with the outcomes and course coordinator's responses to relevant program directors' comments.

3. **Involvement of all programs in which the course is delivered in reviewing and approving the course specification:**
   Furthermore, all program directors (and QACs) participate in reviewing the specifications for courses offered in their programs by other departments or programs (per process P-P-010 in OC-QMS). The electronic system gives each program director the authority to accept or reject with justification the specification for any course linked to their academic program be it delivered by the program itself or another program/department within OC. Course specs can only be approved by both program directors and the college quality unit (QU). Upon approval by these two parties, the course coordinator/instructor cannot modify them without going through the program directors of the program in which the course is delivered and their relevant department councils. Each course specification includes a QR code and link showing the review details and reports for each program director.

4. **Involvement of all programs in which the course is delivered in reviewing and approving CLOs assessment results:**
   Additionally, all directors (and QACs for that matter) of programs sharing the course must participate in reviewing and approving CLOs assessment results and their relevant evidence, especially results and targets for the CLOs linked with the program in its curriculum mapping matrix (process P-E-02 in OC-QMS). The electronic system gives each program director the authority to accept or reject with justification the assessment results and/or its evidence for a particular course. Final approval of assessment results and their evidence cannot be granted until all directors of the programs linked to the course provide their individual approval and feedback. All course reports include a QR code and link showing the detailed report of the review process, timing, and outcomes associated with each program director.

5. **Involvement of all programs in which the course is delivered in reviewing and approving the course report:**
   Similarly, to the (semester) course report, OC-QMS through process P-E-03 requires the engagement of all program directors (and QACs) in reviewing and accepting course reports for externally offered courses through the electronic system. Directors of the program in which the course is offered can also view all related reports including student evaluation survey report, peer review report, chairperson evaluation of course instructor(s), and course recommendations within the course report. They are also expected to provide feedback within OC-E-QMS. All course reports include a QR code and link showing the detailed documented processes, timeframes, and reviews of related reports by each program director, and documentation of their acceptance or rejection of the course reports.

6. **Inclusion of course learning outcomes (CLOs) assessment results in PLOs assessment reports of all programs in which the course is delivered:**
   Additionally, CLOs assessment results and targets of all courses taught either by the program itself or another program/department are automatically included by OC-E-QMS in PLOs Assessment Reports (or PLOARs for short, according to template OC-QMS-C-07 and process P-E-01 in OC-QMS). Analysis of PLOs assessment results in the report relies on CLOs assessments of all courses based on their links to program outcomes (in the mapping matrix resulting from process P-P-04). Recommendations in the program outcomes report are binding for all courses offered by the program or externally delivered and must be adopted based on the relevant college council decision (related to discussing and approving PLOARs).

7. **Review and approval by the college quality unit (QU) and quality assurance administration (QAA):**
   For all the above processes, reviews by QU and QAA represent the final stage of endorsement, approval, or rejection of those processes' outcomes. OC-QMS does not allow acceptance of any process outcome such CLOs, CTAs, specifications, or reports without the approval of all relevant program directors through OC-E-QMS. All ad-hoc or periodic taskforces and review teams formed by QAA to review of outcomes of the above processes cannot approve any specifications or reports or provide the final rubric evaluation for some processes like P-P-06 without full approval of those specifications or reports by all program directors in which the course is delivered. QUs must coordinate (or liaise where needed) between those programs in case of differing perspectives on the outcomes of any of the above processes.

8. **Involvement in forming the course team:**
   As outlined in process P-P-12 of OC-QMS, the course team is formed during the program planning stages. The team is usually headed by the course coordinator, who is typically affiliated with the program responsible for the course delivery. However, OC-QMS provides adequate flexibility for the team to include instructors across all sections, where some of those instructors may be from other programs where the course is offered, thereby representing those programs on course teams to varying extents. In any case, the course team cannot make final decisions on any changes to the course (CLOs, CTAs matrices, specifications, reports) without approval from the director of each program in which the course is delivered, as explained for each process above.

9. **Participation of all programs in the periodic review of CLOs, CTAs matrices, and course specifications:**
   Additionally, all programs participate in the periodic review process for course learning outcomes, CTAs matrices, and specifications (process P-P-08 in OC-E-QMS). The director of each program can recommend through quality committees and department councils any changes, whether major or minor, relating to courses offered by other programs or departments, and according to the procedure outlined in the OC-QMS handbook. Again, QUs must coordinate as needed between programs in case of differing perspectives on enacting such changes.

3. Procedures Used to Ensure the Consistency between the Main Campus and Branches (including male and female sections).

OC-QMS includes guiding principles and quality policies (principles and policies #2, #4, and #6) and specific procedures (detailed in the OC Quality Policies and System Handbook) to ensure the consistency, parity, and equality between male and female sections. These procedures encompass a wide range of measures, such as ensuring equal implementation of the mission statement and goals, maintaining an inclusive department council and committees, and following consistent study plans, curriculum, and course specifications across both sections. In addition, gender balance is assessed and evaluated in annual KPIs and survey reports, as well as in PLOs Assessment Reports and Annual Program Reports. Consistency is also maintained in course learning outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessment methods. Further, consistency and equity between the two sections are ensured by providing equal training opportunities, services, and support to all faculty, staff, and students of both genders. Furthermore, OC-QMS emphasizes quality parity in services, facilities, and equipment across both sections and any discrepancies are considered a priority for improvement in our reports and operational plans. These measures are further elucidated as follows:

1. **Equal implementation of the mission statement and goals**
   OC-QMS established certain mechanisms through which the academic program ensures that the mission statement and goals are implemented equally in both male and female sections. An equal implementation is ensured through several measures mainly including an annual operational plan inclusive of both sections where assignment of responsibilities is equally distributed among male and female faculty and committees, and ii) its progress reports identifying any potential gaps in performance between the two sections.

2. **Inclusive department council and gender-balanced committee membership**
   In compliance with the national bylaws and regulations, the department council is comprised of all female and male faculty members. Furthermore, internal regulations of OC stipulate that all committees should have a proportional representation of both female and male sections. In addition to department chairpersons, the Administration of Councils and Committees is responsible for monitoring the proper and consistent implementation of this practice.

3. **Study Plans, Curriculum, and Course Specifications**
   The program implements the same study plans, curriculum, course specifications, learning outcomes, teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessment methods in both male and female sections. This ensures that regardless of gender, all students have access to the same educational content, receive the same learning experience, are evaluated using the same criteria, and follow the same academic trajectory, eliminates any potential bias in curricular content and provides equal learning opportunities for all female and male students.

4. **Assessment and evaluation reports reflecting both sections**
   In compliance with OC-QMS, all assessment and evaluation reports must be based on an in-depth analysis of the program's performance across both sections by incorporating comparative data from both female and male stakeholders. These reports mainly include KPIs reports, annual surveys reports, operational plan progress reports, annual program reports (APRs), and PLOs assessment reports (PLOARs). Results outlined and documented in these reports should help the program to identify and address any gender-specific trends or disparities in performance.

5. **Equal opportunities and support, gender-neutral procedures and mechanisms**
   In compliance with OC regulations, the program provides equitable services, support, and opportunities for both male and female stakeholders. Both male and female faculty have the same training and professional development opportunities, and both have access to all available facilities, labs, equipment, services, etc. Furthermore, the program implements impartial, unbiased, and gender-neutral mechanisms and procedures for faculty appraisal and evaluation, recruitment, research, community service activities, grievances, complaints, and disciplinary, for activation of values of proper conduct, scientific integrity, intellectual property rights, and so on. All procedures implemented in the program to assess, guide, and support the program's students are unbiased and gender-neutral, including procedures for academic, psychological, social, and professional advising, for grievance, complaints, and disciplinary, for extra-curricular activities, for field training, for voluntary participation and community service, for ethical conduct and academic integrity, for admission, registration, transfer of credits, graduation requirements and so forth.

6. **Gaps and Improvements**
   OC-QMS explicitly stipulates (especially in the action planning and closing the quality loop chapters) that any gaps between the two sections must be considered a priority for improvement in all reports (e.g. KPIs, surveys, PLOARs, ARPs) and should be addressed immediately in its annual operational plans. This should ensure that any disparities in performance, resources, services, or outcomes between the two sections are promptly identified and addressed, fostering continuous improvement with equity at the center.

4. Assessment Plan for Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs),

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PYAELNuMIvvQHEoHYU2i4lWrGXqoT0N1/view

5. Program Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Areas/Aspects	Evaluation Sources/References	Evaluation Methods	Evaluation Time
Effectiveness and Quality of Teaching and Assessment	Faculty (Peer Review)	classroom/virtual visit + peer review template OC-QMS-D-01 through OC-E-QMS	end of semester
	Students	surveys (PO_SU_01 & PO_SU_02) + course evaluation surveys (CESs)	end of the academic year
	Alumni/Alumnae	survey (PO_GRAD)	end of the academic year
	Professional Advisory Board/Committee	meeting (discussion and recommendations of PLOs Assessment Report and Annual Program Report APR)	end of the academic year
	Chairperson	visit + meeting with a sample of students + evaluation template OC-QMS-D-03	end of semester
	Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)	review of the main points in the course reports + final analysis and evaluation of PLOs Assessment Report (OC-QMS-C-07)	end of semester comprehensive: end of the academic year
Effectiveness and Quality of Field Experience/ Training	Field Experience/Training Students	survey (PO_FTR_STU)	end of the academic year
	Field Experience/Training Supervisors	survey (PO_FTR_SUP)	end of the academic year
	Professional Advisory Board/Committee	meeting (discussion and recommendations of Field Experience Report)	end of semester
	Chairperson	visit + meeting with a sample of students + evaluation template OC-QMS-D-03	end of semester
Quality of Learning Resources	Students	surveys (PO_SU_01 & PO_SU_02)	end of the academic year

Evaluation Areas/Aspects	Evaluation Sources/References	Evaluation Methods	Evaluation Time
	Faculty	surveys (PO_PRO_01, PO_PRO_02)	end of the academic year
	Learning Resources, Facilities and Equipment Committee	analysis and evaluation of relevant surveys' items and KPIs	end of the academic year
Quality of Facilities and Equipment	Students	surveys (PO_SU_01 & PO_SU_02)	end of the academic year
	Faculty	surveys (PO_PRO_01, PO_PRO_02)	end of the academic year
	Administrative Staff at the College	survey (PO_STAFF)	end of the academic year
	Learning Resources, Facilities and Equipment Committee	analysis and evaluation of relevant surveys' items and KPIs	end of the academic year
Leadership and Academic Environment	Students	surveys (PO_SU_01 & PO_SU_02)	end of the academic year
	Faculty	surveys (PO_PRO_01, PO_PRO_02)	end of the academic year
	Administrative Staff at the College	survey (PO_STAFF)	end of the academic year
Graduates' Competence and Skills and PLOs Achievement	Professional Advisory Board/Committee	meeting (discussion and recommendations of PLOs Assessment Reports)	end of the academic year
	Employers	survey (PO_EMPO)	end of the academic year
	Alumni/Alumnae	survey (PO_GRAD)	end of the academic year
	QAC	final analysis and evaluation of PLOs Assessment Report (OC-QMS-C-07)	
Quality of Services and Procedures (including various kinds of guidance and counseling)	Students	surveys (PO_SU_01 & PO_SU_02)	end of the academic year
	Faculty	surveys (PO_PRO_01, PO_PRO_02)	end of the academic year
	Counseling and Guidance Committee	analysis and evaluation of relevant surveys' items and KPIs	end of the academic year

Evaluation Areas/Aspects	Evaluation Sources/References	Evaluation Methods	Evaluation Time
Overall Quality of the Program	QAC	review and evaluation of period quality reports (including mainly surveys and KPIs reports, Program Peer Review [OC-QMS-D-02], Course Reports, ARP, and PLOs Assessment Reports)	end of the academic year
	Quality Unit (College)	review and evaluation of period quality report (including mainly surveys and KPIs reports, Program Peer Review [OC-QMS-D-02], Course Reports, ARP, and PLOs Assessment Reports) through OC-E-QMS	end of each semester and academic year
	Other essential program committees (including Scientific Research and Ethics Committee and Community and Volunteer Service Committee)	periodic review and evaluation of the KPIs related to each committee in addition to evaluation of the related activities reported in the APRs.	end of the academic year
	Professional Advisory Board/Committee	meeting (periodic discussion of major quality reports e.g., PLOs Assessment Report, APR, etc.)	end of the academic year
	Students Advisory Council (at the College)	meeting (discussion of developmental suggestions and initiatives)	once per semester
	Internal Reviewer (Quality Assurance Administration)	comprehensive review of quality reports and SSR according to NCAAA standards and preparation of comprehensive review report that includes the main strengths,	biennial

Evaluation Areas/Aspects	Evaluation Sources/References	Evaluation Methods	Evaluation Time
		opportunities, and recommendations for improvement.	
	External Reviewer	comprehensive review of quality reports and SSR according to NCAAA standards and preparation of comprehensive review report that includes the main strengths, opportunities, and recommendations for improvement.	triennial/ quadrennial according to OC-QMS

Evaluation Areas/Aspects (e.g., leadership, effectiveness of teaching & assessment, learning resources, services, partnerships, etc.)
Evaluation Sources (students, graduates, alumni, faculty, program leaders, administrative staff, employers, independent reviewers, and others.
Evaluation Methods (e.g., Surveys, interviews, visits, etc.)
Evaluation Time (e.g., beginning of semesters, end of the academic year, etc.)

6. Program KPIs*

The period to achieve the target (1) year(s).

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
1	OC-01	The average clarity of the message for all segments of the stakeholders (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.68	Item (1) in the questionnaire PO_SU_01 Item (1) in the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire Item (1) in the PO_EMPO. questionnaire Item (1) in the PO_GRAD questionnaire Item (1) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
2	OC-02	The average level of awareness of all segments of the stakeholders of the program's message (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.83	Items (2, 3) in PO_SU_01 questionnaire. Items (2, 3) in PO_PRO_01. questionnaire Items (2, 3) in the PO_EMPO. questionnaire. Items (2, 3) in the PO_GRAD. questionnaire Items (2,3) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire.	
3	OC-61	Average degree of clarity and realism of program objectives for all segments of stakeholders (on an estimated scale from 1 to 5)	3.84	Item (4) in the questionnaire PO_SU_01 Item (4) in PO_PRO_01 questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				Item (5) in the PO_EMPO. questionnaire Item (4) in the PO_GRAD questionnaire Item (5) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
4	OC-03	Average evaluation of program employees to program committees and councils in terms of tasks clarity and powers and the effectiveness of these committees and their decisions (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.85	The two items (10+11) in the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire The two items (8+9) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
5	OC-04	Average evaluation of the program's employees to the leaders and management of the program in terms of the appropriateness of their experiences, and qualifications and ability to achieve the program's mission and objectives (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	4.0	PO_PRO_02 Item (12) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	
6	OC-06	Average evaluation of the program's employees on the atmosphere, the organizational and academic environment within the program (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.43	Item (3) in the questionnaire PO_SU_02 Items (1-4) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Item (10) in the PO_GRAD. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				Items (10-13) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
7	OC-07	Average evaluation of program employees for the appropriateness and effectiveness of representation, integration, coordination, and participation between the two parts of the program (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.5	The two items (13+14) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	
8	OC-08	The average evaluation of the program's employees for the integrity, fairness, and equality of the program's management among all its employees (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.66	Item (4) in the questionnaire PO_SU_02 Item (5) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Item (11) in the PO_GRAD. questionnaire Item (14) in the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
9	OC-11	Average satisfaction of stakeholders with the comprehensiveness and adequacy of the description and information announced by the program (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.79	The two items (5, 6) in the questionnaire PO_SU_01 The two items (6, 7) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire The two items (6, 7) of the PO_EMPO. questionnaire The two items (6, 7) of the PO_GRAD. questionnaire The two items s (6, 7) of the	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
10	OC-12	Average satisfaction of program employees with the encouragement of the program management administrators for developmental initiatives a suggestion and the extent of the clarity of the related mechanisms (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	2.5	Item (5) in the PO_SU_02. questionnaire The two items (6, 7) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Item (12) in the PO_GRAD questionnaire The two item (15, 16) in the PO_STAFF questionnaire	
11	OC-13	The extent of the stakeholders' awareness of the controls, values, and rules of scientific honesty, intellectual property rights, and ethics practices (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.54	Item (6) in the questionnaire PO_SU_02 The two items (8, 9) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Item (13) in the PO_GRAD. questionnaire	
12	OC-14	The extent of awareness of the program's staff about the mechanisms of complaints, grievances, and discipline on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.0	Item (7) in the questionnaire PO_SU_02 The two items (10, 11) in the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Item (14) in the PO_GRAD questionnaire	
13	OC-15	The extent of the stakeholders' awareness of the characteristics of program graduates and learning outcomes (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.4	The two items (1, 2) in the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				The two items (8, 9) in the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire Item (8) in the PO_EMPO. questionnaire The two items (8, 9) in the PO_GRAD questionnaire	
14	KPI-P-09	Employers' evaluation of the program graduates' efficiency	4.0	Items (10-21) of the PO_EMPO. questionnaire	
15	KPI-P-03	Students' evaluation of the course quality	2.0	Item (35) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
16	OC-18	Average student evaluation of the elements of the questions related to the beginning of the course, which includes the extent to which students are provided with comprehensive information about the course at the beginning of the semester and familiarize them with the requirements for success and methods of assessment (on an estimated Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.5	The two items (31, 32) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
17	OC-19	Average student evaluation of the item "Providing homework and test scores in a timely and fair manner" as a total for all courses (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.0	The two items (33, 34) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
18	KPI-P-10	Student satisfaction of the provided services	2.35	Items (7, 8) and items (15-19) from	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				PO_SU_01 questionnaire Items (9, 10, 14, 15) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
19	OC-68	Average evaluation of students and supervisors of the field training program according to the field experience course (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.12	Items (1-12 excluding 11) and items (19 and 20) of the PO_FTR-STU questionnaire Items (1-12 excluding 11) of the PO_FTR-SUP. questionnaire	
20	OC-69	Average evaluation of students and supervisors of field training institutions (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.37	Items (13-18) of the PO_FTR-STU. questionnaire Items (13-21) of the PO_FTR-SUP. questionnaire	
21	OC-70	Average student evaluation of field supervisors (on an estimated Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.5	Items (21-27) of the PO_FTR-STU. questionnaire	
22	OC-20	Average student evaluation of the fairness of the program in applying the criteria and conditions for admission and registration (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.0	Item (9) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
23	OC-22	Average student evaluation for easy obtaining information about the program before registering for it (On a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.5	Item (11) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
24	OC-23	Average student evaluation of the induction programs for	3	Item (12) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
		new students (on an estimated Likert scale from 1 to 5)			
25	OC-24	Average student evaluation of the program fairness in the application of grievance, complaints, and disciplinary mechanisms (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3	Item (8) of the questionnaire PO_SU_02	
26	OC-25	Student satisfaction of the academic advising services (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.25	Items (7, 8) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire	
27	OC-26	Student satisfaction of the career counseling services (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.43	Items (9, 10) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
28	OC-27	Student satisfaction of psychological and social counseling services (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.23	Items (14, 15) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
29	OC-28	Student satisfaction of the identification mechanisms and procedures for supporting gifted, creative, and talented students (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.28	Items (16, 17) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
30	OC-29	Student satisfaction with the identification mechanisms and procedures of supporting defaulting students (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	2.51	Items (18, 19) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
31	OC-30	Student and graduates' satisfaction with the professional development activities	2.58	Items (11, 12) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
		provided to them (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)		Items (15, 16) of the PO_GRAD. questionnaire	
32	OC-34	Special needs and disability students Satisfaction with the adequacy and relevance of the services, facilities, and equipment provided to them (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3	Items (1-14 excluding 6) of the PO_SPN_STU questionnaire	
33	OC-35	Average satisfaction of the faculty in the program of the program policy and procedures in selection, recruitment, and contracting (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3	Item (12) of the PO_PRO_01. Questionnaire	
34	OC-66	Average student evaluation of course professors (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.5	Item (36) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	
35	OC-40	Average faculty satisfaction in the program with the orientation programs offered by the colleges/college/program	3.5	Items (13, 14) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
36	OC-47	Average satisfaction of faculty and students with the adequacy and quality of services provided to them by the program/college/faculties (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3	Items (13-16) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (20-25) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (15-32 excluding 25) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
37	OC-48	Average faculty satisfaction with the mechanisms and	4	Items (15-17) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
		procedures for periodic evaluation of their performance (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)			
38	OC-49	Average faculty awareness of mechanisms, procedures, and models of periodic evaluation of their performance (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	4	Items (18, 19) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	
39	OC-50	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the availability of sufficient numbers of learning resources of all kinds in the libraries of the program, college, or central library (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.3	Items (26, 27) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (33-37) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
40	OC-51	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the availability and adequacy of electronic resources and digital databases and their accessibility (on a Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.4	Items (29, 30) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (39, 40) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
41	KPI-P-17	Stakeholders' satisfaction of learning resources	3.35	Items (26-30) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (33-40) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
42	OC-52	Average satisfaction of the stakeholders with the technical services provided to them in terms of their suitability, safety, confidentiality, maintenance, and periodic updating (on an	3.05	Items (20-23) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (15-20) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
		estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)			
43	OC-53	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the adequacy and quality of providing technical support from the various authorities in the colleges (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	2.85	Items (24, 25) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire Items (21-24) from the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
44	OC-54	The extent to which the stakeholders of the faculty and students are satisfied with e-learning systems such as the Blackboard system in terms of its adequacy, ease of use, and access (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	4	Items (13, 14) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (26-28) of the PO_PRO_01. questionnaire	
45	OC-55	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the adequacy, quality, modernization, maintenance, and accessibility of laboratories and the availability of their guides and instructions (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	2.9	Items (20-24) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (27-30) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	
46	OC-56	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the adequacy of the numbers and qualification of technicians and laboratory operators (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.0	Item (21) of the PO_SU_01. Questionnaire Items (31, 32) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
47	OC-57	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the adequacy of the classrooms, their capacity, and their technical and equipment (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.5	Items (25-27) from the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (33-35) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire	
48	OC-58	The extent of the beneficiaries' satisfaction with the quality and adequacy of the facilities and equipment (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.58	Items (17-30) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (20-39 excluding 22) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Items (17-27 excluding 23) of PO_STAFF	
49	OC-59	The extent of the stakeholders' satisfaction with the availability of security and safety means and equipment in all program facilities (on an estimated Likert scale from 1 to 5)	3.64	Item (28) of PO_SU_01. Questionnaire Items (36, 37) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Items (22, 24) of the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
50	OC-60	The extent of the stakeholders' awareness of the risks evidence and how to deal with them and evacuation plans (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)	3.57	Items (29, 30) of the PO_SU_01. questionnaire Items (38, 39) of the PO_PRO_02. questionnaire Items (25, 26) of the PO_STAFF. questionnaire	
51	OC-71	Average satisfaction of the stakeholders of the faculty and students with the availability of different	3	Item (28) of the PO_SU_02. questionnaire	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
		libraries for students and faculty in sufficient and appropriate times (on an estimated scale of Likert from 1 to 5)		Item (38) of PO_PRO_01. Questionnaire	
52	KPI-P-02	Students' evaluation for the learning experiences quality in the program	2.96	Items (26, 27) and items (31-35) from PO_SU_02 questionnaire	
53	KPI-P-01	Percentage of the achieved from the indicators of the objectives of program operational plan	95.35	Number of program strategic objectives whose indicators have achieved the targets ÷ total number of program strategic objectives × 100	
54	KPI-P-04	Virtual completion rate	48.7	Number of students (in a certain batch) who completed the program and obtained the certificate in the shortest possible period for the program ÷ total number of students in the same batch x 100	
55	KPI-P-05	First-year student retention rate	71.35	Number of students (in a new batch) who continued in the program until the following year ÷ total number of students in the same batch x 100	
56	KPI-P-06	Students' performance in professional and/or national examinations	50	Average scores of students in professional	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				and/or national examinations	
57	KPI-P-07	Employing graduates and enrolling them in postgraduate programs during the first year of their graduation	63.9	Academic program records/graduate records in the program or college	
58	KPI-P-08	Average number of students in the class	9.4	Academic Program Records	
59	KPI-P-11	Student to Faculty members Ratio	11.76	Academic Program Records	
60	KPI-P-12	Percentage of faculty members' distribution	lecturer 64.2% Assistant Professor 21.4% Associate Professor 14.2% Professor 0%	Academic Program Records	
61	KPI-P-13	Percentage of faculty dropping out of the program (for reasons other than reaching the retirement age or the expiry of the maximum contractual limit)	10.3	Academic Program Records	
62	KPI-P-14	Percentage of scientific publication of faculty members	72.85	Academic program records/program faculty research production database	
63	KPI-P-15	The rate of published research per faculty member	0.98	Academic program records/program faculty research production database	
64	KPI-P-16	Average citations in refereed journals per faculty member	0.98	Academic program records/faculty research production	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				database in the program/research databases such as Google Scholar and the like	
65	OC-05	Ratio of students to technicians (including lab operators)	66.0	Academic Program Records	
66	OC-16	Percentage of faculty participation in training programs on teaching strategies and methods of evaluating outcomes	74.15	Training plan completion Report of the academic program (Form C-D-10), section (3)	
67	OC-17	The percentage of faculty participation in training programs on the use of modern technologies in teaching and student assessment	75.85	Training plan completion Report of the academic program (Form C-D-10), section (3)	
68	OC-31	Percentage of graduates of the year with records in the graduates' database out of the total number of graduates per year	100.0	Academic program records/graduate records in the program or college	
69	OC-65	Average volunteer hours for each student (during the year)	is half an hour for each student.	Academic Program Records	
70	OC-41	Rates of faculty participation in conferences, discussions, research projects, arbitration of scientific theses, arbitration of scientific research	68.5	Academic Program Records	
71	OC-44	The percentage of faculty participation in community activities	84.45	Academic Program Records	
72	OC-45	The percentage of the training plan completion of the teaching staff	60.0	training plan completion Report e of the academic	

No.	KPIs Code	KPIs	Targeted Level	Measurement Methods	Measurement Time
				program (Form C-D-10), section (3)	
73	OC-46	The percentage of faculty participation and enrollment in the planned training programs	62.0	training plan completion Report of the academic program (Form C-D-10), section (3)	
74	OC-63	Percentage of achieving learning outcomes targets	60.0	Report of the results of measuring graduate characteristics and learning outcomes in the academic program (Form C-D-6), Section 4.	

*Including KPIs required by NCAAA

H. Specification Approval Data

COUNCIL / COMMITTEE	COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT COUNCIL
REFERENCE NO.	2
DATE	2023-09-14