


# تقرير الاستبانات البرامجية

## (نسخة مختصرة)

# Program Surveys Report
# (Abridged Version)

النسخة الكاملة من هذا التقرير متاحة على نظام الجودة الإلكتروني
The detailed version of this report is available on OC-E-QMS

(Academic Year: 2024/2025)

# Content

**Basic Info** ....3
**Analysis of Programmatic Surveys: Key Findings** ....3
**(1)Faculty and Teaching Staff Evaluation of Program's Quality** ....3
**Analysis of Key Survey Elements** ....3
**(2)Faculty and Teaching Staff Evaluation of Program's Quality** ....4
Analysis of Key Survey Elements ....4
**Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_PRO_02** ....5
**Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_PRO_02** ....5
(3) Freshmen and Sophomores Students Evaluation of Program's Quality#1 ....5
Analysis of Key Survey Elements ....5
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SU_01 ....6
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SU_01 ....7
(4) Juniors and Seniors Students Evaluation of Program's Quality#2 ....7
**Analysis of Key Survey Elements** ....7
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SU_02 ....8
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SU_02 ....8
(5)Field Experience/Training Evaluation by Students ....8
Analysis of Key Survey Elements ....8
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_FTR_STU ....9
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_FTR_STU ....9
(6 ) Field Experience/Training Evaluation by Supervisors ....9
تحليل العناصر الرئيسةAnalysis of Key Survey Elements ....9
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_FTR_SUP ....10
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_FTR_SUP ....10
(7)Alumni and Alumnae Evaluation of Program's Quality ....10
تحليل العناصر الرئيسةAnalysis of Key Survey Elements ....10
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_GRAD ....11
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_GRAD ....11
(8)Employers' Evaluation of Program's Quality and its Graduates ....12
تحليل العناصر الرئيسةAnalysis of Key Survey Elements ....12
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_EMPO ....13
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_EMPO ....13
(9)Students with Disability Evaluation of Program's Quality ....13
Analysis of Key Survey Elements ....13
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU ....13
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU ....14
(9)College Administrative Staff's Evaluation of Program's Quality ....14
Analysis of Key Survey Elements ....14
Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_STAFF ....15
Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU ....15
Top Strengths and Recommendations Based on Analysis of All Surveys Above ....15
**Approval Data** ....16

## Basic Info

| College | College of Engineering Information Technology |
|---|---|
| Program | Architecture Program |
| Date | June 23,2025 - Time: 08:02 |

## Analysis of Programmatic Surveys: Key Findings

### (1) Faculty and Teaching Staff Evaluation of Program's Quality

#### Survey code (PO_PRO_01)

**Analysis of Key Survey Elements**

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Survey Item #13: Various programs for preparing new faculty members (training, workshops, facility tours, orientation to equipment/services, introduction to curriculum and learning outcomes)<br>- Survey Item #03: I am fully aware of the program's mission<br>- Survey Item #26: Blackboard helps teaching/learning with high efficiency<br>- Survey Item #27: Blackboard is easy to use by students and faculty<br>- Survey Item #01: The program's mission is clear |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

**Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_PRO_01:**
None
**Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_PRO_01:**
None

### (2)Faculty and Teaching Staff Evaluation of Program's Quality

**Survey code (PO_PRO_02)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Item 12: The program's leadership has adequate qualification, expertise and skills necessary to achieve the program's mission and goals<br>- Item 08: The program publicizes research ethics and intellectual property rights among its staff<br>- Item 36: Safety equipment is available in all facilities<br>- Item 02: Program management provides sufficient communication with faculty, students, staff, and local community<br>- Item 20: Facilities satisfy health and safety requirements with high quality |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | - Item 13: There is appropriate and effective representation and participation of both male and female sections in the program's activities. |
| Comment on the comparatively lower | The evaluation shows a notable decline in the perception of cooperation between male and female sections. The score dropped from 4.59 last year to -1.0 in the male section, while the female section maintained a positive |

| | |
|---|---|
| evaluation scores of the above items | score of 4.43. This highlights a significant communication and collaboration gap.<br>Recommendations:<br>1. Investigate causes of the disparity<br>2. Enhance collaboration strategies<br>3. Form cross-sectional committees<br>4. Schedule regular joint meetings<br>5. Address systemic or cultural barriers |

**Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_PRO_02**

Strength 1: Program Leadership Demonstrates Strong Qualifications and Competence
The survey reveals that the program's leadership possesses high-level qualifications and capabilities necessary to achieve the program's mission and goals, with an impressive total evaluation score of 4.82. This strength directly aligns with the program's goal of enhancing faculty performance and administrative efficiency, supporting the mission of offering competitive higher education in architecture engineering.

Strength 2: Robust Commitment to Research Ethics and Intellectual Property
The program demonstrates a strong commitment to publicizing and circulating research and teaching ethics, codes of conduct, and intellectual property rights among its staff, achieving a high evaluation score of 4.77. This aligns with the program's goal of contributing to the field of architecture through quality research and promoting ethical values and professional conduct.

Strength 3: Comprehensive Safety and Risk Management Infrastructure
The program has established a comprehensive safety infrastructure, with high evaluation scores across multiple safety-related aspects. Safety requirements and equipment are available in all facilities (4.73), risks are appropriately publicized (4.64), and safety guidelines are in place in labs and facilities (4.59). This strength supports the program's goal of improving learning resources, facilities, and supporting infrastructure while ensuring a safe academic environment.

**Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_PRO_02**

Given the survey analysis, there is no need for immediate action. All evaluated items show scores of 3.0 or above, indicating satisfactory performance levels that do not require urgent intervention at this time.

### (3) Freshmen and Sophomores Students Evaluation of Program's Quality#1

**Survey Code (PO_SU_01)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| and female of 1 point or more | |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Item 04: The program has clear and realistic goals.<br>- Item 01: The mission of the program is clear.<br>- Item 09: Admission and registration are conducted with fairness, integrity, and transparency.<br>- Item 02: The means of disseminating the program's mission are sufficient and varied.<br>- Item 03: I am fully aware of the program's mission. |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | - Item 19: Adequate and suitable parking for students' cars is available. |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | Student satisfaction with parking facilities significantly improved, rising from 3.0 to 3.91 (+0.91). Female students scored higher (4.14) than males (3.73), indicating a need to address the gender-based perception gap. Improvements may include expanded parking spaces, better management, and enhanced design. The response reflects program responsiveness to student feedback and a commitment to enhancing campus services. |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SU_01

Based on the survey data for the Architecture Program, here are three key strengths:

Strength 1: Clear and Realistic Program Goals

The program demonstrates exceptional clarity in its goals, with a high total evaluation score of 4.49. This aligns directly with the program's mission to offer competitive higher education and prepare qualified architects. The high score indicates that students have a strong understanding of the program's objectives, which supports the goal of preparing competent graduates with vital employability skills.

Strength 2: Comprehensive Course Information and Assessment Transparency

Students receive detailed course information and clear assessment criteria, with high scores for course information provision (4.36) and success requirements explanation (4.38). This strength supports the program's goals of improving teaching and learning experiences and enhancing students' understanding of academic expectations, particularly for first and second-year students.

Strength 3: Effective E-Learning System and Academic Support

The Blackboard e-learning system received high ratings (4.4 for both efficiency and ease of use), and academic advisors provide strong support with scores of 4.34 for advisory services. This demonstrates the program's

commitment to providing supportive academic infrastructure and student support services, which is crucial for helping freshman and sophomore students navigate their academic journey effectively.

### Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SU_01

Given the survey analysis, there is no need for immediate action as all survey items are evaluated at 3.0 or above out of 5, indicating satisfactory performance across all measured areas for the برنامج العمارة Architecture program among students at lower levels.

### (4) Juniors and Seniors Students Evaluation of Program's Quality#2

**Survey code (PO_SU_02)**

**Analysis of Key Survey Elements**

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | Item 32: *The teaching staff in the program are fair in their treatment of students.*<br>Male rating: 4.36<br>Female rating: 3.09<br>Difference: 1.27 |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | There is a significant gender-based perception gap in faculty fairness. While male students rated fairness at 4.36, female students rated it at 3.09 — a 1.27-point difference.<br>Recommendations:<br>1. Conduct listening sessions with female students<br>2. Review faculty-student interaction policies<br>3. Set up anonymous feedback systems<br>4. Introduce gender-sensitivity training for faculty |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Item 10: Educational brochures and continuous courses align with employer requirements<br>- Item 11: Diverse professional development activities support students<br>- Item 05: Student initiatives are encouraged and supported<br>- Item 06: Awareness of academic integrity and IP rights is strong<br>- Item 22: Educational software is readily available |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SU_02

Strength 1: Professional Development and Employability Support

The program demonstrates strong commitment to preparing students for the job market by providing comprehensive professional development activities. With a high rating of 4.58 for educational brochures and 4.45 for professional development programs, the Architecture program effectively supports students' transition to professional careers, aligning with the goal of preparing competent graduates with vital employability skills.

Strength 2: Student Initiative and Academic Integrity

The program actively encourages student initiatives and development proposals, scoring 4.39, while maintaining a strong emphasis on academic integrity. Students show high awareness of scientific honesty and intellectual property rights (4.39), which directly supports the program's goal of enhancing students' ethical values and professional conduct.

Strength 3: Technical Support and Learning Resources

The Architecture program provides robust technical support and learning resources, with high ratings for technical support in classrooms and labs (4.36) and necessary educational software (4.39). This strength directly contributes to the program's objective of improving the quality of teaching, learning experiences, and supporting infrastructure, ensuring students have access to the tools needed for effective architectural education.

Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SU_02

Given the survey analysis, there is no need for immediate action.

The only survey item provided shows that male students rated faculty fairness at 4.36/5 and female students rated it at 3.09/5. While there is a notable gender difference in perception, the female students' rating of 3.09 is above the 3.0 threshold, indicating acceptable performance levels. Therefore, no immediate recommendations are required based on the current survey data.

(5)Field Experience/Training Evaluation by Students

**Survey code (PO_FTR_STU)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Item 01: The field training plan is linked to theoretical studies and enhances practical application.<br>- Item 02: Field training effectively contributes to achieving the learning outcomes and objectives of the program.<br>- Item 04: Field training develops collaborative work and teamwork skills.<br>- Item 06: Field training is a good opportunity to refine character and acquire life skills.<br>- Item 15: The location of the training institution is convenient and easy to access. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_FTR_STU

None

Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_FTR_STU

None

## (6 ) Field Experience/Training Evaluation by Supervisors

### Survey code (PO_FTR_SUP)

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Findings |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - Item 05: Field training develops the ability to analyze professional situations.<br>- Item 08: The field training attitudes are characterized by seriousness and a sense of responsibility.<br>- Item 10: There are clear and specific mechanisms for evaluating student performance in field training programs.<br>- Item 12: Reports and activities related to field training are evaluated fairly and objectively.<br>- Item 17: The place of training provides the opportunity to gain diverse and useful experiences. |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_FTR_SUP

None

Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_FTR_SUP

None

## (7)Alumni and Alumnae Evaluation of Program's Quality

**Survey code (PO_GRAD)**

**Analysis of Key Survey Elements**

| Category | Items |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | Survey Item #11: The program management applies clear mechanisms to ensure integrity and justice among students. |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | Survey Item #11: The program management applies clear mechanisms to ensure integrity and justice among students.<br>Survey Item #25: During my study, I acquired the team work skills efficiently and effectively.<br>Survey Item #14: The grievance, complaints and disciplinary mechanisms are announced in a variety of, sufficient and appropriate ways. |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | The survey analysis reveals significant disparities in perceptions between male and female graduates across key areas:<br><br>1. Program Management and Fairness (Q11): Males 4.0 vs. Females 2.62 (diff: 1.38). Suggests issues in fairness perceived by female students.<br>2. Team Work Skills Development (Q25): Males 4.14 vs. Females 3.08 (diff: 1.07). Indicates differences in collaborative experience.<br>3. Communication of Disciplinary Procedures (Q14): Males 4.14 vs. Females 3.15 (diff: ~1.0).<br><br>Recommendations:<br>- Conduct qualitative research to understand disparities<br>- Review policies on fairness and inclusion<br>- Improve transparency and communication<br>- Develop inclusive teamwork strategies |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | Survey Item #3: I am fully aware of the program mission.<br>Survey Item #1: The program mission is clear.<br>Survey Item #5: The program's mission is in line with the needs of society, the labor market, and the national trends.<br>Survey Item #7: The program provides a comprehensive and sufficient description of the program nature and its performance through appropriate and varied means.<br>Survey Item #13: I am fully aware of the controls, values and rules of scientific honesty, intellectual property rights and ethical practices. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff >= 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff >= 0.7 pts) | Survey Item #11: The program management applies clear mechanisms to ensure integrity and justice among students.<br>Survey Item #25: During my study, I acquired the team work skills efficiently and effectively.<br>Survey Item #14: The grievance, complaints and disciplinary mechanisms are announced in a variety of, sufficient and appropriate ways.<br>Survey Item #12: The program encourages initiatives and development suggestions and encourages their providers.<br>Survey Item #16: I am satisfied with the professional development activities that the program offers to its students and graduates. |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | The data show significant declines across several dimensions with strong gender disparities. Female ratings were consistently lower:<br><br>- Integrity mechanisms (Q11): Females 2.62 vs. Males 4.0<br>- Team work skills (Q25): Females 3.08 vs. Males 4.14<br>- Professional development (Q16): Females 3.31 vs. Males 4.14<br><br>Recommendations:<br>- Review program structure and inclusivity<br>- Support mechanisms for female students<br>- Improve grievance and communication processes<br>- Enhance professional development offerings |

## Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_GRAD

Strength 1: High Awareness of Program Mission
The program demonstrates strong alignment with its mission, with alumni showing a high level of awareness (4.25/5) about the program's mission. This directly supports the program's goal of preparing competent graduates with a clear understanding of their professional trajectory and the program's objectives.

Strength 2: Alignment with Societal and Labor Market Needs
The program's mission is highly rated (4.15/5) for its alignment with societal needs, labor market requirements, and national trends. This reflects the program's commitment to Goal 5 of preparing graduates with vital employability skills that are relevant to the Kingdom's Vision 2030.

Strength 3: Ethical and Professional Development
Alumni demonstrate a strong sense of professional ethics and self-learning skills, with high ratings (4.05/5) for developing self-learning capabilities, taking responsibility, and feeling satisfied with professional standards. This directly supports the program's goals of enhancing students' ethical awareness and professional conduct, particularly Goal 5.3, which aims to improve students' awareness of ethical values and professional principles.

## Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_GRAD

**Recommendation 1.**
Establish a comprehensive gender equity framework to address the significant disparity in perceived integrity and justice mechanisms between male and female alumni, particularly focusing on the female section where the score is critically low at 2.62.

**Recommendation Justification.**

The survey data reveals a critical gender gap in question 11, where female alumni rated the program's integrity and justice mechanisms at only 2.62 out of 5, compared to 4.0 for male alumni. This represents a substantial 1.38-point difference and indicates that female graduates perceive significant deficiencies in fair treatment and equitable processes during their academic experience. This low score among female alumni suggests systemic issues that require immediate attention to ensure equal educational opportunities and treatment across both program sections.

**Recommendation Responsibility.**
Program Management in collaboration with the Guidance and Advising Committee should lead this initiative, with support from relevant Department heads to ensure implementation across both male and female sections.

**Recommendation Relation to Program's Mission and Goals.**
This recommendation directly supports the program's mission to provide "competitive higher education in architecture engineering within a supportive academic environment" and aligns with Goal 2 (providing comprehensive student support services) and Goal 4 (improving administrative efficiency and processes). Ensuring integrity and justice for all students, regardless of gender, is fundamental to creating the supportive academic environment outlined in the mission statement and essential for preparing qualified architects with vital employability skills in alignment with the Kingdom's Vision 2030.

### (8)Employers' Evaluation of Program's Quality and its Graduates

**Survey code (PO_EMPO)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Items |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | Survey Item #8: The Graduate Attributes of the program and the program learning outcomes are disseminated in a variety of appropriate means.<br>Survey Item #17: The graduate is obligated to work in accordance with professional ethics and professional standards.<br>Survey Item #18: The graduate has the ability to self-learn and take responsibility.<br>Survey Item #20: The graduate has the skills to properly use technology in his field of work.<br>Survey Item #1: The program mission is clear. |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff >= 0.7 pts) | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff >= 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_EMPO

None

Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_EMPO

None

(9)Students with Disability Evaluation of Program's Quality

**Survey code (PO_SPN_STU)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Category | Items |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | Survey Item #2: Suitable sanitary facilities are available for the use of students with special needs.<br>Survey Item #5: There is an appropriate environment for students with special needs to enroll in educational and social programs.<br>Survey Item #6: Tick OK.<br>Survey Item #8: The program explores the opinions of special needs students about the services and care programs provided to them for the purpose of improving them.<br>Survey Item #13: Disabled parking is available near the colleges. |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU

Strength 1: High-Quality Sanitary Facilities

The Architecture program demonstrates exceptional commitment to supporting students with special needs by providing suitable sanitary facilities, achieving a high satisfaction rating of 4.57. This aligns directly with the

program's goal of improving basic facilities and supporting infrastructure, ensuring an inclusive and accessible learning environment.

Strength 2: Comprehensive Enrollment and Engagement Support

The program has successfully created an appropriate environment for students with special needs to enroll in educational and social programs, with a strong satisfaction rating of 4.43. This reflects the program's dedication to providing support services and enhancing students' academic and social integration, which directly supports the goal of improving academic and social counseling.

Strength 3: Proactive Feedback and Academic Monitoring

The Architecture program demonstrates a strong commitment to continuous improvement by actively exploring the opinions of students with special needs about services and care programs, while also closely monitoring their academic progress. With satisfaction ratings of 4.43 and 4.0 respectively, these practices showcase the program's focus on student-centered support and professional development, aligning with the goals of enhancing student support and preparing competent graduates.

### Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU

Given the survey analysis, there is no need for immediate action as all survey items are evaluated at 3.0 or above out of 5, indicating satisfactory performance across all measured areas for students with disabilities in the Architecture program.

### (9)College Administrative Staff's Evaluation of Program's Quality

**Survey code (PO_STAFF)**

Analysis of Key Survey Elements

| Evaluation Category | Top Survey Items / Comments |
|---|---|
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by all respondents | None |
| Comment on respondents' evaluation of the above survey items | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by male respondents | None |
| Top survey items scored less than 3 by female respondents | None |
| Top survey items with large deviation between male and female of 1 point or more | None |
| Comment on the noticeable deviations between male and female evaluations of those items | None |
| Top strengths according to items scored 4 and higher | - *Survey Item #1*: The programs' missions in the college are clear.<br>- *Survey Item #5*: The programs in the college have clear, specific and realistic goals.<br>- *Survey Item #3*: I am aware of the programs' missions in the college.<br>- *Survey Item #4*: Program missions in the college are in line with the needs of society, the labor market, and national trends.<br>- *Survey Item #7*: The college programs provide a comprehensive and adequate description of their nature and performance through appropriate and varied means. |
| Top items that got higher evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively higher evaluation scores of the above items | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| Top items that got lower evaluation scores this year (diff ≥ 0.7 pts) compared to last year | None |
| Comment on the comparatively lower evaluation scores of the above items | None |

Top strengths according to above analysis of PO_STAFF

1. **Clarity of Mission**
   - The programs' missions in the college are clear and well-defined.
   - Staff members are aware of and understand these missions.
2. **Realistic and Specific Goals**
   - The programs have clear, specific, and achievable goals, reflecting strong planning and direction.
3. **Alignment with Societal and National Needs**
   - Program missions are consistent with the needs of society, the labor market, and national trends, which strengthens their relevance.
4. **Comprehensive Program Description**
   - The programs provide an adequate and comprehensive description of their nature and performance through appropriate and varied means.

Top recommendations for improvement according to above analysis of PO_SPN_STU

Given the survey analysis, there is no need for immediate action as all survey items are evaluated at 3.0 or above out of 5, indicating satisfactory performance across all measured areas for administrative staff evaluation of the Architecture program quality and services.

Top Strengths and Recommendations Based on Analysis of All Surveys Above

**Top Strengths – Architecture Program**

| Strength | Description |
|---|---|
| Strength 1: Comprehensive Faculty Development and Preparation Programs | The program demonstrates exceptional commitment to faculty development with the highest-rated item being *"Various programs for preparing new faculty members"* (4.71/5.0). This includes training, workshops, facility visits, equipment orientation, and curriculum familiarization. It supports Program Goal 3 by enhancing faculty performance both professionally and academically, enabling the program to uphold high teaching standards and prepare qualified architects. |
| Strength 2: Strong Mission Clarity and Stakeholder Awareness | Faculty show excellent awareness of the program's mission (4.67/5.0), reflecting strong communication and alignment with the program's aim of delivering competitive higher education in architecture. This clarity aligns with Goals 1 and 5, ensuring stakeholders contribute effectively to Vision 2030. |
| Strength 3: Highly Effective E-Learning Infrastructure | The Blackboard system receives outstanding ratings for efficiency and ease of use (4.67/5.0), with accessibility rated at 4.62/5.0. This supports Goal 1 by enhancing learning resources and ensuring flexibility for all students, thus promoting a supportive academic environment. |
| Strength 4: Excellent Graduate Professional Competencies | Employers rate graduates exceptionally high on ethics, self-learning, and technology skills (4.81/5.0). These scores validate the achievement of Goals 5.1–5.3, confirming that graduates are equipped with architectural knowledge, critical thinking, and ethical standards needed in the labor market. |
| Strength 5: Outstanding Field Training Program Excellence | The field training component scores a perfect 5.0/5.0 across key areas such as theory-practice integration, objective achievement, teamwork development, and safety. This directly supports Goals 5.1 and 5.2 by enhancing real-world skills and community engagement. |

**Top Recommendations – Architecture Program**

| Recommendation | Description | Responsible Body |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Enhance Gender Equity and Fair Treatment Mechanisms** | Strengthen mechanisms to ensure integrity and justice among students, addressing the gender disparity in fairness perceptions (Females: 2.62 vs. Males: 4.0). Implement gender-sensitive training and establish fairness protocols. | Program Management and Guidance and Advising Committee |
| **2. Strengthen Teamwork and Collaborative Skills Development** | Improve curriculum and teaching methods to foster teamwork, addressing the disparity in ratings (Females: 3.08 vs. Males: 4.14). Use more collaborative projects, group tasks, and peer learning. | Course Teams and Program Management |
| **3. Improve Communication and Transparency of Program Procedures** | Enhance communication about grievance, complaint, and disciplinary mechanisms (Females: 3.15 vs. Males: 4.14). Use multiple channels to inform students and increase procedural awareness. | Program Management and Relevant Department |
| **4. Expand Professional Development and Career Preparation Activities** | Broaden professional development programs with equal access and engagement, addressing satisfaction differences (Females: 3.31 vs. Males: 4.14). Diversify offerings to meet gender-specific needs. | Program Management and Community Service and Voluntary Work Committee |
| **5. Enhance Technology Integration and Digital Skills Development** | Strengthen digital skills training in architectural software and tools (Females: 3.31 vs. Males: 4.14). Ensure adequate exposure and support to bridge technological skill gaps. | Course Teams and Learning Resources Facilities and Equipment Committee |

## Approval Data

| | |
|---|---|
| Department Council Ref. & Date | Session 01<br>**27/08/2024** |
| College Council Ref. & Date | Session 04<br>**7/10/2025** |



Onaizah Colleges

كليات عنيزة