

QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL

FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
IN PAKISTAN

Zia Batool
Riaz Hussain Qureshi



Higher Education Commission,
Islamabad, Pakistan

QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN

Zia Batool
Riaz Hussain Qureshi



HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
ISLAMABAD - PAKISTAN

CONTENTS

Acknowledgement.....	vii
Foreword.....	ix

SECTION-I: INTRODUCTION AND MILIEU

1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Background	3
1.3	Rationale for the Manual.....	4
1.4	Defining the Quality Assurance Processes.....	4
1.5	Outlining the Principles of Quality Assurance Processes.....	5

SECTION-II: QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN AN OVERVIEW

2.1	Quality Assurance Programme of Higher Education in Pakistan an overview.....	9
2.2	Role of the HEC in Quality Assurance.....	10
2.3	Role of the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC).....	11
2.4	Introducing the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).....	12
2.5	The Role of QAA, its Mission and Strategic Goals.....	12
	2.5.1 Mission.....	12
	2.5.2 Vision Statement.....	13
	2.5.3 Strategic Goals.....	13
2.6	Role of the QAA.....	13
2.7	Guidelines for the QECs.....	13
2.8	Selected Universities for Establishment of the QEC during First Phase.....	15
2.9	Financial Viability of the QAA and the QECs.....	15
2.10	Functional Relationship between QAA and QEC.....	15
	2.10.1 Functional Relationship of QAA with QA Department of the HEC.....	16
2.11	Future Vision and Scope of the QAA.....	16
2.12	Salient Features of QA System to be introduced by the QAA.....	17

SECTION-III: TOPICAL NOTIONS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

3.1	Concepts and Theories of Quality Assurance.....	21
3.2	Academic Standards.....	21
3.3	Quality of Learning Opportunities.....	22
3.4	Research and Other Scholarly Activities.....	22
3.5	Community Participation.....	22
3.6	Quality Management and Enhancement.....	23

SECTION-IV: QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

4.1	Three Stages of Quality Assurance.....	27
-----	--	----

4.2	Stage I	27
	4.2.1 Outcomes.....	27
4.3	Stage II.....	27
	4.3.1 Outcomes.....	27
4.4	Stage III.....	27
	4.4.1 Outcomes.....	27
4.5	Two Levels of Quality Assurance.....	28
	4.5.1 QA at Program Level.....	28
	4.5.2 Out comes.....	28
4.6	Institutional Level.....	28
4.7	Future Developments.....	28
4.8	Illustration of QA Framework.....	29

SECTION-V: EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

5.1	Evaluation and Assessment System for Quality Assurance.....	33
5.2	Internal Quality Assurance System (Self Assessment).....	34
5.3	External Quality Assurance System.....	35
	5.1.1 Accreditation.....	35
	5.1.2 Peer-Review.....	36
5.4	Meta Evaluation by the HEC.....	37
5.5	Arrangements for Transitional Period.....	37
5.6	Role of HEC in Development Engagement.....	38

SECTION-VI: FUTURE VISION FOR QA AT THE HEC

6.1	Future Dimensions of QA.....	41
6.2	Quality Culture.....	41
	6.2.1 Expected Outcomes of Developing a Quality Culture.....	42
	6.2.2 Variances in Quality Culture.....	42
6.3	World Quality Label (WQL).....	43
	ABOUT APPENDICES OF THESE GUIDELINE.....	47

APPENDIX - A

GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATES FOR COURSE SPECIFICATIONS AND ANNUAL COURSE REPORTS.....	51
--	----

Annex-I of Appendix-A

GUIDELINES FOR COMPILING A COURSE SPECIFICATION.....	53
A. Basic Information.....	53
B. Professional Information.....	54

Annex – II of Appendix-A

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING COURSE REPORTS.....	56
A. Basic Information.....	56
B. Statistical Information.....	56

C. Professional Information.....	57
----------------------------------	----

Annex III of Appendix-A

TEMPLATES FOR COURSE SPECIFICATIONS.....	59
--	----

Annex IV of Appendix –A

TEMPLATE FOR ANNUAL COURSE REPORTS	62
Appendix B	67
Appendix C	81
Appendix D	87
Appendix E	91
Appendix F	95
Proforma-1.....	97
Proforma-2.....	100
.....	
Proforma-3.....	102
.....	
Proforma-4.....	105
.....	
Proforma-5.....	107
.....	
Proforma -6.....	110
.....	
Proforma-7.....	112
.....	
Proforma- 8.....	114
.....	
Proforma -9.....	116
.....	
Proforma- 10.....	118
.....	
GLOSSARY.....	123

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the Higher Education Commission, Islamabad, the authors hereby acknowledge the intellectual guidance provided by Dr. Abdul Raouf to help in extending the boundaries of knowledge in this specific field of quality assurance. We acknowledge the added flavours of pragmatism came through consulting “The quality assurance and accreditation handbook for higher education in Egypt published by NQAAC in year 2004. We acknowledge the legendary leadership role of Prof. Dr. Sohail Naqvi that gives added value to this effort.

Foreword

Higher education is very essential for active participation in the knowledge societies which in turn accelerates economic growth. Quality education is a prerequisite to gain access to knowledge which guarantees economic development. This makes the condition of higher education in Pakistan a very critical issue. Recognizing this, the Higher Education Commission is committed to quality assurance and enhancement of higher education institutions. To achieve world class standards, quality assessment and continuous improvement are the necessary ingredients. This includes the accreditation of academic programmes and quality assessment of the university / institution. The university quality assessment is primarily concerned with the institutional issues rather than programme issues.

HEC has developed procedures and guidelines for quality assurance and its enhancement. This Manual is an effort made to put all the guidelines and procedures in one volume so that university administration, quality enhancement cells and faculty might find it easier to implement.

This Manual comprises of six sections. Section 1 provides introductions which include rationale for the manual, quality assurance definitions and an outline of principals of quality assurance.

Section 2 contains an overview of the Quality Assurance of Higher Education in Pakistan. In section 3 Topical Notions of Quality Assurance are provided which contains quality assurance concepts, standards and quality management and enhancement. Whereas section 4 illustrates Quality Assurance Framework outlined by the HEC. Evaluation and assessment of academic programmes and university quality assessment is covered in Section 5

Section 6 describes the future vision of quality assurance at the HEC. The procedures developed for affiliating colleges with universities and a process describing progression of PhD programmes are included as appendixes.

This Manual will be revised as per feedback obtained from the readership in due course of time.

Prof. Dr. Abdul Raouf *Sitara-e-Imtiaz* P. Engr(Ont.)
Distinguished National Professor,
Higher Education Commission - Pakistan
University Professor and Adviser

SECTION - I

INTRODUCTION AND MILIEU

Introduction

Quality Assurance is the planned and systematic review process of an institution or programme to determine whether or not acceptable standards of education, scholarship and infrastructure are being met, maintained and enhanced.¹ It is an instrument designed to add value to higher education by encouraging high quality. An efficient and effective high quality higher education system which is internationally recognized and a well established national Quality Culture are vital for economic growth in developing countries like Pakistan. A sustainable quality assurance programme enhances employment opportunities, improves the education and training of future employees, harnesses future leaders, facilitates an enabling learning environment, and enriches the academic and intellectual landscape. Thus it fuels the engine of economic and social development at the national, regional and international levels.

A quality higher education system is essential to the successful development and functioning of an open and democratic civil society. Higher education is expected to provide the social norms of communication and interaction such as philosophical thinking and reasoning to promote the sovereignty of its individuals, and to eliminate all kinds of social-class ethnic conflicts and gender or religious biases. A quality providing institution of higher education is a model for creating a modern civil society. This ideal state of academic quality is not commonly realized but it is, nevertheless, a yardstick by which to measure the effectiveness of higher education systems operating in the country.

The development of Quality Assurance is a continuous process and therefore, continuity of strategies, actions and efforts is a prerequisite for quality in higher education. Quality Assurance including its processes, procedures and outcomes of assessment is a challenge and its management is even a greater challenge to practitioners seeking workable guidelines, evidences of good practices and tools that will facilitate the process.

1.2 Background

The standards of quality of higher education in Pakistan need to be improved significantly to achieve the goals of competitiveness with international standards and to create the foundations of a Knowledge Economy and Compatibility. The Higher Education Commission is making concerted efforts to improve the quality of higher education and to move university education to meet international standards in the provision of high-quality teaching, learning, research and service. A focused and precise approach is being developed for the best results and for consistency in the process of the Quality Assurance & Enhancement in higher education in the country. It reflects an effort to sensitize higher education institutions to the changes taking place internationally and bring higher education in Pakistan into complete harmony with the shifting paradigms at leading institutions around the world. Thus, various long and short run initiatives of the HEC are aimed particularly at improvement of the quality of knowledge being imparted at the universities and other higher education institutions.

A Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was established in 2004 under umbrella of the HEC as a specialized body to introduce and encourage the development of a quality culture in higher

¹ Fred M. Hayward, *Glossary: Quality Assurance and Accreditation*, prepared by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in February 2001. See: http://www.chea.org/international/inter_glossary01.html.

education. As a special feature of QA programme of the Pakistan higher education system, the HEC is also establishing Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) in all public sector universities in a phased manner. Ten QECs were set up during first phase of the project in AJK and all four provinces of the country and subsequently 20 more QECs have been established during second phase of the project. These QECs serve as focal points for quality assurance in the institutions in order to improve and uphold the quality of higher education. Capacity building of academia in quality assurance is one of the key functions of QAA and subsequently of QEC. Thus QAA and QECs of the Universities will work hand in hand to move in this direction of capacity building arrangements that include awareness campaigns, development of quality assurance policy instruments, training to learn the processes and procedures of quality assurance in higher education institutions and development of Manual to equip the practitioners of quality assurance.

1.3 Rationale for the Manual

This Manual defines a comprehensive set of policy instruments to conduct the processes to develop the procedures of Quality Assurance for the Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) established in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) of Pakistan. The document is complete with guidelines, evidences and various Quality Assurance tools for the practitioners and key players in academic quality assurance across the board.

The Manual underlines precise and efficient processes and procedures of quality assurance that can play an important role in building capacity of all those who are directly or indirectly involved in quality assurance in higher education. These partners and stakeholders include universities/ higher education institutions, the faculty, the management, the researchers, the students (current and perspective), the graduates and alumni, funding organizations, the employers of graduates; and the society. The goals set out here refer to internationally practiced academic standards and frameworks for assessment and evaluation of academic quality assurance & its enhancement.

It offers a set of guidelines and the processes primarily to facilitate the functioning of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) of the HEC, and Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) as operational units of the Universities and HEIs. The guidelines and processes defined in the Manual aim to improve quality of teaching, learning and research. It also aims to promote a “*Quality Culture*” in higher education in the country. The Manual is developed to further strengthen the efficiency and effectiveness of professionals engaged in QA either through QECs or directly.

1.4 Defining the Quality Assurance Processes

Implicitly, it is the responsibility of the universities and higher education institutions to maintain and improve the standards of quality of its academic activities as degree awarding institutions. This Manual deals with the role of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) in the guidance, facilitation, and conduct of the quality assurance activities and processes by the higher education institutions. It is designed to encourage them in developing plans for improvement in academic quality.

The Quality Assurance Agency is committed to improve academic quality across country. In that regard Quality Assurance is defined by NQAAC as follows:

“The means of ensuring that informed by its mission, academic standards are defined and achieved in line with equivalent standards nationally and internationally, and that the quality of learning opportunities, research and community involvement are appropriate and fulfill the expectations of the range of stakeholders”²

Another definition of QA more specifically used for the universities and higher education institutions for clear understanding on the subject is given below:

“The means by which an institution can guarantee with confidence and certainty, that the standards and quality of its educational provision are being maintained and enhanced”³

1.5 Outlining the Principles of Quality Assurance Processes

The process of quality assurance is embedded on certain principles tacitly agreed upon by practicing the systems across the countries. The principles of quality assurance process refer to good practices currently carried out around the world to assure and improve quality standards in higher education. These principles are applicable to the Quality Assurance Systems at the institutional level and to the successful functioning of the Quality Assurance Agency at HEC.

The nine principles⁴ of Quality Assurance are given below:

- i. Focus on the customer (addressing the prime needs of the students, society and the labor market)
- ii. Leadership (bonding vision, aims and strategies in the educational community)
- iii. People’s participation (confirming the effective and equitable participation of all who are engaged in higher education without discrimination and allowing the full use of their abilities for the benefit of higher education and the society)
- iv. Focus on tools (quality assurance processes and means as well as learning outcomes)
- v. Adopting decisions on the basis of fact (encouraging requiring judgments to be evidence based and logical)
- vi. Continuous improvement (recognizing the commitment to respond to changing global needs of quality assurance systems in higher education)
- vii. Autonomy (respecting the responsibility of an institution for its academic activities)
- viii. Shared benefit (taking an approach to the range of participants – reviewers, institutions, students and the society – that promises the development and transfer of knowledge and skills)
- ix. Continuity with next steps (ensuring that the institutions and Quality Assurance Agency , being in a dynamic and open ended process of continuing improvement, are committed to identify actions and issues to be addressed in future).

² The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook for Higher Education in Egypt, NQAAC,2004

³ Higher Education Funding Council, UK.

⁴ The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook for Higher Education in Egypt, NQAAC,2004

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) at higher education institutions will undertake their responsibilities and functions based on the best principles of quality assurance namely openness, transparency, fairness, equity and accountability as practiced in the rest of the world.

In general, quality comes out of internal processes of the universities and institutions. Thus, experience in most of world is that the *Bottom-up* approach represented by internal QA Systems is inevitably important to success while, at the same time, the *Top-to-Bottom* approach, represented by external QA Systems, operates at the national level. A basic coherence between the universities and the Quality Assurance Agency needs to be reached at earlier stages so that the institutional quality assurance efforts and those of the system do not challenge the autonomy of an institution but rather reinforce it with improved standards of quality which are comparable with high national and international standards of quality assurance and accreditation at any level.

SECTION – II

QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN

(AN OVERVIEW)

Quality Assurance programme of Higher Education in Pakistan – an overview

Emphasis on Quality Assurance in higher education in Pakistan is creating serious impression across the world that Pakistan is facing the existing challenges head on and paving the way to success in the future. Like many other developing countries, Pakistan is passing through a crucial phase of developing and integrating quality into higher education. The graduates in developing countries face great difficulties while competing within international employment markets where quality makes the difference. The only way to meet these challenges is to focus on quality assurance and emphasize quality improvement.

Even in terms of access to higher education in Pakistan, the statistics are not encouraging for many decades. However in the current decade, an exceptional growth in number of HEIs has been observed. The number of universities in the public sector increased from 2 in 1948 to 49 in 2006 and growth in the private sector higher education is also of high magnitude in terms of numbers. There were rapid increases in the number of new Universities /Degree Awarding Institutes (DAIs) after mid 1990s, and particularly after the year 2000. A graphic presentation of the data about the number of universities and DAIs in the country is given below:




Fig 2.1.1 Growth of Universities/DAIs in Public and Private Sector (1947-48 to 2004-05).

Table 2.1.2 Number of Public and Private Sector Universities & Degree Awarding Institutions (DAIs) in Pakistan.

Year	Universities				Degree Awarding Institutions			
	Public		Private		Public		Private	
	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female
1947-48	2	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
1950-51	4	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
1959-60	5	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
1960-61	5	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
1961-62	6	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
1963-64	6	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
1964-65	7	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
1965-66	7	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1970-71	8	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1971-72	8	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1972-73	8	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1973-74	9	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1974-75	12	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1975-76	12	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1976-77	15	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1977-78	15	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1978-79	15	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1979-80	15	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1980-81	19	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1981-82	19	-	0	-	2	-	0	-
1982-83	19	-	1	-	2	-	0	-
1983-84	19	-	1	-	2	-	0	-
1984-85	19	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1985-86	19	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1986-87	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1987-88	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1988-89	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1989-90	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1990-91	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1991-92	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-
1992-93	21	-	3	-	3	-	0	-
1993-94	22	-	3	-	3	-	0	-
1994-95	25	-	4	-	3	-	2	-
1995-96	25	-	7	-	3	-	3	-
1996-97	27	-	7	-	3	-	4	-
1997-98	27	-	10	1	3	-	5	-
1998-99	28	1	10	1	3	-	5	-
1999-00	31	2	13	1	4	-	6	-
2000-01	32	2	14	1	5	-	8	-
2001-02	36	2	20	1	5	-	13	-
2002-03	45	2	31	1	7	1	13	-
2003-04	47	3	34	1	8	1	17	-
2004-05*	47	3	32	1	8	1	17	-
2004-05	47	3	34	1	8	1	19	-
2005-06**	49	4	36	1	8	1	18	-

* DHA Suffa University Karachi, Nazeer Hussain University withdrawn from HEC list, due to lack of physical, financial & academic infrastructure.

** Institute of South Asia Upgraded to University in July 2005. Kinnard College for Women shifted from Public to Private sector.

2.2 Role of the HEC in Quality Assurance

The present status of quality assurance in higher learning institutions of Pakistan is not sufficiently strong and thus it poses a major challenge for the reform agenda of the HEC in terms of quality of knowledge being imparted in these institutions. The Pakistani Universities need to develop and improve their internal processes for quality assurance in line with international academic standards and practices. The gap between the present status and desired level of quality is critical and identifies the need for a directed approach for enhancement of practices of quality assurance in Pakistan.

Quality in higher education is dynamic entity and therefore various factors that determine quality of higher education must set in equilibrium at a level that matches with international expectations and standards. These factors include, inter alia, leadership, quality of faculty, quality of students, curriculum, infrastructure facilities, research and learning environment, governance, strategic planning, assessment procedures, and relevance to market forces. In the Pakistani context, additional factors like poor quality of education at the primary and secondary levels, poor grasp of communication skills of the students, and the low level of the socio-political environment of the universities, complicated by rival student (and faculty) groups, leaves a heavy impact on quality and pushes the quality level further down⁵.

The Higher Education Commission, being cognizant of the situation, was keen to develop a strategic vision to address the relevant issues with strong support of the Government to push the equilibrium up and to make it match the international standards of quality in Higher Learning. The HEC has adopted a multidimensional approach focused on the issue of quality, with particular emphasis on: a) the improvement of quality of faculty, b) infrastructural improvement, c) improvement of research and learning environment, d) improvement of curricula, e) addressing governance issues, f) assessment issues, and g) accreditation of new academic program as well as Universities and Degree Awarding Institutions (DAIs).

The goals of international compatibility and competitiveness can not be achieved without enhancing quality in higher learning throughout the system. Thus, a Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has been established under the umbrella of HEC with the intention to make it autonomous when it is fully functional and becomes sustainable as an independent body.

2.3 Role of the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

In order to look after the key issue of Quality Assurance in the knowledge being imparted by all higher education institutions of Pakistan the Higher Education Commission constituted a Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) in the first quarter of the year 2003 with the objective of developing Manual for quality assurance in higher education institutions. The QAC is playing its role as an advisory body to HEC for developing an effective and workable system of quality assurance and enhancement in the country to address the issues of quality in crosscutting areas of academics. Membership of the Committee is comprised of the Vice Chancellors of various public and private sector universities and representatives of HEC.

Members of QAC are enlisted below:

- Prof. Dr. Abdul Raouf, Chairman, University of Management and Technology, Lahore.
- Prof. Dr. Iqrar Ahmad Khan, Vice Chancellor, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.
- Brig. (Retd.) Agha Ahmad Gul, Vice Chancellor, University of Balochistan, Quetta.

⁵ Quality Assurance in HEC, Prof. Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi, daily The Dawn, Islamabad, 2005

- Dr. Syed Zahoor Hassan, Vice Chancellor, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore.
- Dr.A.Q.K Rajput, Vice Chancellor, Mehran University of Engineering and Technology, Jamshoro.
- Prof. Dr. Saeeda Assadulla , Vice Chancellor, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi
- Dr. S. Sohail H. Naqvi, Executive Director, Higher Education Commission, Islamabad.
- Prof. Dr. Muhammad Javed Khan , Vice Chancellor, University of Peshawar, Peshawar
- Prof. Dr. Pirzada Qasim Raza Siddiqui, Vice Chancellor ,University of Karachi, Karachi
- Prof. Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi, Advisor, Quality Assurance & Learning Innovation, HEC, Islamabad.
- Prof. Dr. Azam Ali Khwaja, MD- QAA, HEC, Islamabad.
- Ms. Zia Batool, Director General -QA, HEC, Islamabad.

The Quality Assurance Committee operates on the basis of a process of consultation. Its decisions grow out of interacting activities such as holding regular meetings at various higher education institutions; development and follow up on policy issues, discussions, consultations and holding seminars on relevant topics to get feed back from all stakeholders. The *Participatory Approach* followed by the HEC and QAC aim at developing ownership of Quality Assurance policies by the executing parties.

2.4 Introducing the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)

Based on the consultative process and its findings, the QAC strongly recommended establishment of Quality Enhancement Cells at all universities with a special focus on quality of higher education to fill the gap between the prevailing and the desired status of quality education. The whole programme of Quality Assurance in higher education will be executed by various Quality Enhancement Cells established at all universities. These Quality Enhancement Cells will be facilitated by the Quality Assurance Agency which has been established on January 18, 2005 at the HEC with approval of PC-1 through DDWP according to rules provision under the 0⁶“Ordinance of HEC 2002, Section 10, and Para ‘e’ that states⁶

“Set up national or regional evaluation councils or authorize any existing council or similar body to carry out accreditation of institutions including their departments, faculties and disciplines by giving them appropriate ratings. The Commission shall help build capacity of existing councils or bodies in order to enhance the reliability of the evaluation carried out by them.”

The setting up of QAA at HEC followed by 10 QECs during first phase of the QAA project was a critical step towards sensitizing the academia for quality enhancement and to draw their attention on present state of quality in higher education in the country. Currently, 30 QECs have been established at various universities in the country.

2.5 The Role of QAA, its Mission and Strategic Goals

⁶ ORDINANCE NO.LIII OF 2002, Government of Pakistan, September 11, 2002

2.5.1 Mission

“To integrate the concept of quality assurance in higher learning with enhanced levels of international compatibility through capacity building”⁷.

2.5.2 Vision Statement

“Developing a viable and sustainable mechanism of quality assurance in higher learning sector to meet the rising challenges of transforming the country into a knowledge economy”.

2.5.3 Strategic Goals

The Quality Assurance Agency is established at HEC as a policy making and monitoring body and it will be source of capacity building for quality assurance and enhancement in higher education sector of the country. The policies designed to achieve the following goals will be implemented through Quality Enhancement Cells which will be established at all public sector higher education institutions in a phased programme. The strategic goals of Quality Assurance Agency are given below:

- Policy making and developing practical guidelines of quality assurance in cross cutting areas of higher learning
- Developing guidelines for establishing Quality Enhancement Cells and Monitoring & Evaluation of these QECs
- Capacity building to enhance the standards of quality assurance in higher education at national level.

2.6 Role of the QAA

The specific objectives of establishing QAA and Quality Enhancement Cells at higher education institutions under the umbrella of QAA working at the HEC as stated in the project PC-1 are given below to inform the practitioners:

- to establish a Quality Assurance Agency at HEC for designing and monitoring of a phased programme of quality learning with uniformity of higher learning standards across the country with ultimate objective of autonomy in quality assurance
- to establish Quality Enhancement Cells at all universities in phased manner to implement the quality assurance programme
- to build the capacity of higher education institutions to meet the rising global challenges and improved levels of international compatibility and competitiveness of our graduates through a systematic capacity building training programme
- to develop a cadre of Master Trainers for Quality Assurance in higher education through foreign training of professionals of Quality Assurance Agency during first phase of the programme.

⁷ Project PC-1 for establishment of QAA, HEC, Islamabad, 2004

2.7 Guidelines for the QECs

The Quality Enhancement Cells were established at different universities in the light of Guidelines given below: ⁸

- i. The Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) will be established in each university/degree awarding institute to be headed by a Professional whose services will be hired against the relevant criteria for quality assurance of higher education. The status of QEC head will be equivalent to a Dean and the reporting authority for this position will be Vice Chancellor/Rector. He/she will be the correspondent with the outside bodies and responsible for internal Academic Audit as well. All these Quality Enhancement Cells will be facilitated by Quality Assurance Agency that will be established at Higher Education Commission.
- ii. QEC will be responsible for promoting public confidence that the quality and standards for the award of degrees, management and over all quality of knowledge being imparted by the institutions are enhanced and safeguarded.
- iii. QEC will be responsible for the review of quality standards by auditing academic standards and the quality of teaching, learning and management in each subject area.
- iv. QEC will be responsible for the review of academic affiliations with other institutions in terms of effective management of standards and quality of programs.
- v. QEC will be responsible for defining clear and explicit standards as points of reference to the reviews to be carried out. It should also help the employees to know as to what they could expect from the candidates.
- vi. QEC will be responsible to develop qualifications framework by setting out the attributes and abilities that can be expected from the holder of a qualification, i.e. Bachelors, Bachelor with Honors, Master, MPhil, PhD
- vii. QEC will be responsible to develop program specifications. These are standard set of information clarifying what knowledge, understanding, skills and other attributes a student will have developed on successfully completing a specific programme.
- viii. QEC will be responsible to develop quality assurance processes and methods of evaluation to affirm that the quality of provision and the standard of awards are being maintained and to foster curriculum, subject and staff development, together with research and other scholarly activities.
- ix. QEC will be responsible to ensure that the university's quality assurance procedures are designed to fit in with the arrangements in place nationally for maintaining and improving the quality of Higher Education.
- x. QEC staff will get the capacity building training from HEC on the subject of quality in higher learning and will be responsible to implement and disseminate that acquired knowledge into learning environment of the institution.

⁸ Professor Dr. Abdul Raouf, Chairman, Quality Assurance Committee, HEC, Islamabad, 2004.

- xi. QEC will be Responsible to Develop Procedures for the following:
 - a. Improvement of existing programs and approval of new programs in consultation with already existing body responsible for the task at universities.
 - b. Annual monitoring and evaluation including program monitoring, faculty assessment, and students' perception.
 - c. Developing a data source for accurate information regarding quality assurance which will be deliverable to all stakeholders.
 - d. Departmental review.
 - e. Student feedback.
 - f. Employer feedback.
 - g. Quality assurance of Master, M Phil. and PhD degree programmes.
 - h. Subject review.
 - i. Institutional audit.
 - j. Programme specifications.
 - k. Qualification framework.
 - l. Over all quality improvements in institutional management/leadership.

2.8 Selected Universities for Establishment of the QEC during First Phase

With implementation of the first phase of QAA Project at HEC, total ten universities were selected to establish the QECs as initial step towards developing a sustained mechanism of quality enhancement in academia. These universities were selected on the basis of geographical representation of all four provinces of the country and Azad Jammu and Kashmir. The selected universities for the establishment of QECs are enlisted below:

- i. University of Karachi, Karachi
- ii. Liaquat University of Medial & Health Sciences, Jamshoro, Sindh
- iii. The University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Mirpur
- iv. University of Agriculture, Faisalabad
- v. University of the Punjab, Lahore
- vi. University of Engineering & Technology, Lahore
- vii. University of Peshawar, Peshawar
- viii. University of Baluchistan, Quetta
- ix. Quaid-i -Azam University, Islamabad
- x. National University of Sciences & Technology, Rawalpindi

Ten QECs are functional since year 2005 while twenty more are established in 2006 with the initial funding provided by the HEC and all public sector universities of the country will be covered during next phases of the QAA project.

2.9 Financial Viability of the QAA and the QECs

Financial support to establish the Quality Enhancement Cells is provided primarily by the Higher Education Commission. In order to catalyze the activity and subsequently, the amount needed for operations of these QECs, after the establishment year funding is shifted to the recurring budget of the universities and will become permanent feature of the university set up.

2.10 Functional Relationship between QAA and QEC

The Quality Assurance Agency will develop a process of quality assurance to be implemented at the universities and DAIs through the Quality Enhancement Cells to be set up in each university as a focal point.⁹ These QECs will serve as the king pin to achieve the objective of quality learning in the universities. The guidelines for QECs developed by Chairman of Quality Assurance Committee have already been discussed in section 2.6. Primarily, these QECs will be quality assurance units developed at all public sector universities to work independently as an integral part of these institutions and will put a focused attention on quality assurance in higher education. These cells are required to develop and implement the processes of quality assurance with promises of quality enhancement to meet the international standards of higher education. These QECs will be operated by all public sector universities for execution of the Quality Assurance policies while QAA will provide policy guidelines and facilitation for capacity building of the QECs working at universities.

The Quality Assurance Agency will perform major functions under sections of capacity building, international linkages, and liaison with other partners on quality assurance with the objective of improved standards of quality in higher education across the board. This agency will also account for the critical issue of quality versus quantity raised by all intellectual forums of the country. The agency will analyze the present state of Quality Assurance in higher education and will develop a sustainable mechanism of technical assistance, capacity building and facilitation on critical areas of quality assurance and continued improvement to meet the challenges of developing a knowledge economy. The QAA will design and develop processes and procedures for capacity building in the focused area of Quality in higher education institutions.

2.10.1 Functional Relationship of QAA with QA Department of the HEC

The QA department of the HEC is responsible for overall development and coordination of Quality Assurance System in the higher education sector of the country and also for the execution of this system with the help of QAA. The specific functions of academic quality assurance coming under mandate of the HEC will be performed by the QA department which is also responsible for development of QAA at the initial stage till its complete autonomy. Technical assistance, expertise, international support and all required financial support to QAA will be provided by the QA department. Before reaching at the stage of autonomy the QAA will work with of the QA department of HEC.

The major quality assurance functions of QA department of the HEC such as institutional accreditation, setting up of institutional accreditation standards, policy guidelines to address the emerging global challenges in quality assurance may also be assigned to QAA for practical purposes. Moreover, QAA may also represent HEC whenever required in the process of Programme Accreditation to be conducted through respective Accreditation Councils.

⁹ PC-1, Quality Assurance Agency, Higher Education Commission, Islamabad, 2004

2.11 Future Vision and Scope of the QAA

With the quantum increases in the budget grants for the higher education sector of the country it is now possible and logical to lay stress on the quality component outputs of higher learning therefore, to bring about the revolutionary changes and to improve the quality of output and efficiency of the higher education learning systems, a viable and sustainable Quality Assurance System is essentially required. The QAA will directly assess, develop and improve the standards of quality of higher education in a systematic way with uniformity across country. It will help to introduce an enabling learning environment which is fostering element to build a knowledge economy. QAA will contribute substantially in success of other programmes of higher learning such as faculty, curriculum and infrastructure development. QAA will also be responsible to assure the integration of important component of Quality in all developing fields and up coming policies of higher education.

The QAA is currently working under the umbrella of HEC due to specific academic culture prevailing in the country. However, its scope and future vision turns it into an autonomous academic quality assurance body at appropriate stage of development. The HEC is contributing to strengthen the QAA at its initial stage of development with financial and technical resources but the broader goal is to establish this QAA as an independent body with specific mission and vision to work independently.

2.12 Salient Features of QA System to be introduced by the QAA

The QAA is responsible to introduce the processes and procedures developed in the context of Pakistan not only to assure the standards of quality in higher education but also in order to achieve global compatibility in quality provision.

A few of the salient features of the Quality Assurance System to be introduced by the QAA are given below:

- ❑ The institution providing higher education programmes and holding degree awarding status is responsible for the academic standards and the quality of its programmes that comply with the standards developed by the HEC.
- ❑ Internal system for Quality Assurance when developed should be in conformity with the policy guidelines provided in the Manual for Self Assessment¹⁰ to enable it for any external evaluation.
- ❑ The QAA will continue to develop a framework for quality assurance and enhancement in consultation with the higher education community and other stakeholders to provide evidence based qualitative information.
- ❑ The QAA will facilitate and strengthen capacity of higher education institutions and practitioners of QA to develop their internal quality assurance systems and to enhance the quality of their programmes during transitional period and developmental engagements.

¹⁰ Self Assessment Manual, Abdul Raouf, Chairman QAC, HEC, Islamabad, 2006

SECTION - III

TOPICAL NOTIONS OF QUALITY
ASSURANCE

Concepts and Theories of Quality Assurance

While, the crosscutting areas of academic quality assurance are under discussion there should be an agreement on the basic concepts with the objective to achieve a common understanding amongst practitioners in the country. The Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) working in the universities as focal point for all quality assurance policies and practices will play their role not only in introducing, defining and developing these concepts but also to practice through tools of quality assurance.

The concepts frequently used in developing the process and procedures of quality assurance are discussed to facilitate the perceptions on a common path of understanding.

3.2 Academic Standards

The academic standards largely discussed in this Manual for practitioners of Quality Assurance in higher education, professionals of QECs and QAA, are given below¹¹:

- ❑ **Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO):** The Intended Learning Outcomes (OLIs) are the knowledge, understanding and skills which the institution intends for its programmes that are integrated into mission statement and developed to reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate level. The ILOs need to be satisfied while reporting through self assessment for external assessment of Quality Assurance.
- ❑ **Curricula:** The curricula for the programme facilitate realization of the known intended learning outcomes. The quality of curricula plays important role in defining the quality of teaching and learning outcomes. Thus, QECs are responsible to integrate the quality procedures in developing and improving the quality of curricula with consistency to respond to new developments in research and teaching.
- ❑ **Student Assessment:** Student Assessment is comprised of a set of processes, including examinations and other activities conducted by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course/ programme. Student Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievements. It needs to be confirmed that students are well informed on the criteria by which they are assessed and given appropriate structured feedback that supports their continuing learning. Student feedback is helpful in revising/improving the current standards to certain level of improvement.
- ❑ **Student Achievement:** The quality assurance system of universities and higher education institutions should be in place effectively to assure that levels of students' achievements are maintained with due consideration to the use of external reference points, moderation and evaluation of achievement.

¹¹ The quality assurance and accreditation handbook for higher education in Egypt, NQAAC, 2004

3.3 Quality of Learning Opportunities

The clarity of concepts on Academic Standards needs to be followed by developing a common understanding on quality of learning outcomes which is one of the key objectives of whole process of integrating quality assurance. The quality of learning opportunities at an institution or university may be evaluated against following reflective indicators that need to be satisfied to meet the global standards:

- ❑ **Teaching and Learning:** There are effective teaching and learning systems, informed by a shared, strategic view of learning and the selection of appropriate teaching methods; and due attention is paid to the facilitation of independent learning.
- ❑ **Student Support:** Academic and general support to facilitate students in dealing with possible academic problems ensures that they can make progress satisfactorily through their programme and are informed about their progress.
- ❑ **Learning Resources:**

It is to be ensured that:

- i. the facilities at institution for learning are appropriate, adequate and used effectively.
- ii. the institution staff of all kinds namely; academic, support, technical and administrative is adequate and meets the requirements of academic standards and strategies for learning and teaching.
- iii. the staff of the institution is competent to effectively teach, facilitate learning, and maintain a scholarly approach to teaching and to discipline.

3.4 Research and Other Scholarly Activities

As per mandate, the Quality Enhancement Cells will be responsible to assure that the system to organize research and other scholarly activities related to the teaching and supervision of doctoral students is relevant to the mission of respective institution. A few of the research and other scholarly activities of the universities and other higher education institutions are enlisted below as potential areas that need to be focused by Quality Enhancement Cells:

- ❑ Effectiveness of plans and the scale of activity
- ❑ Distinguishing features
- ❑ How the activities relate to the other academic activities in the institution.

3.5 Community Participation

The concept of integrated community participation in the whole process of learning and teaching is relatively a new concept but important to achieve the desired level of quality assurance. Therefore, more efforts are needed by the QECs to introduce the concept where it does not exist

previously and to make it more effective where it exists in underlying way and is difficult to be practiced.

The system of quality assurance ensures that a higher education institution, informed by its mission, makes a significant contribution to the community it belongs, to the society it serves and to the wider environment. The level of success in community participation can be assessed through QA system in place in the following areas:

- The contribution it makes
- The range of activities, relevance to the institution's mission and plan
- Examples of effective practice

3.6 Quality Management and Enhancement

The effectiveness of quality management and enhancement systems in practice at universities and other higher education institutions must focus on the following areas:

- **Governance and Leadership:** Governance, management and quality assurance systems should be sufficient to manage existing academic activities and respond to development and change.
- **Academic Leadership:** The academic leadership in the institution provides strong and sustainable basis for academic activities to grow in an environment conducive to learning.
- **Self-Evaluation:** Self-Evaluation, internal reporting and improvement plans should be open, transparent, focused and supportive of continuing improvement. The procedural details are provided in Self Assessment Manual already published by the HEC.
- **Management of Stakeholders' Feedback:** The institutions have mechanism for receiving, processing and responding to the reviews and feed back coming from a range of stakeholders. The feedback management system of universities and higher education institutions should ensure that effective and timely action is taken to promote strengths, address any weaknesses identified and demonstrate responsibility and accountability.

SECTION – IV

**QUALITY ASSURANCE
FRAMEWORK**

Quality Assurance Framework

Three Stages of Quality Assurance

The stages of quality assurance identified in the QA framework are for the purpose of guiding management, faculty, students and all other practitioners of QA in higher education institutions of the country. The stages enlisted below are in line with the international QA practices:

4.2 Stage I

Setting up of Quality Assurance standards and criteria through national level consultation to assure the desired level of engagement and ownership of all stakeholders.

4.2.1 Outcome

- ◆ Criteria/Standards for Quality Assurance
- ◆ Criteria/ Standards for Accreditation
- ◆ Doctrines/ Manuals/ Guidelines

4.3 Stage II

Developing Internal Quality Assurance System (**IQA**) at the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

The HEIs stand responsible for setting up of IQA at their own realizing the significance of integrating quality into all tiers of academic activity. Whereas all kind of facilitation required for capacity building of the HEIs to accomplish the task is provided by HEC.

4.3.1 Outcomes

- ◆ Self Assessment Manuals
- ◆ IQA Doctrines/ Guidelines

4.4 Stage III

Developing External Quality Assurance System (**EQA**) in the higher education sector of the country.

The respective Accrediting / Auditing Bodies stand responsible for EQA in the form of Academic Audit, Accreditation or Performance Reviews. These bodies are Accreditation Councils for Program Accreditation in case of Pakistan and the HEC for Institutional level Accreditation, Academic Audit or Performance Review.

4.4.1 Outcomes

- ◆ Program Accreditation standards
- ◆ Intuitional Accreditation Standards
- ◆ Doctrines/ Guidelines/ Manuals

4.5 Two Levels of Quality Assurance

4.5.1 QA at Program Level

Programme Level Quality Assurance System identified as essential and not to be replaced with Institutional Level QA Processes as standards vary amongst various academic programs even within the same institution. Thus for accuracy of information to standards, the specific program level quality assurance processes are given significant importance. Accreditation Councils / Professional Bodies are responsible to assure that Programme level QA processes are in place. Establishment of new Accreditation Councils is a milestone on this roadmap where these do not exist whereas active linkages are developed with already existing ones. The information regarding Program level quality assurance is published for Public Information and transparency. Self-Assessment reports generated by the HEIs correspond to Accreditation Bodies for Program Assessment Reports.

4.5.2 Outcomes

- ◆ Establishment of Programme Accrediting/ Auditing Bodies (Councils) on the need identification basis
- ◆ Self-Assessment Reports
- ◆ Program Accreditation Reports
- ◆ Program Ranking lists

4.6 Institutional Level

The institutional level quality assurance processes are required to develop an ultimate Quality Culture with the goal that quality is central focus of the institution at all levels and is integral part of all academic practices. It involves all aspects and tiers of academic research and scholarship including students, faculty, staff, governance, management, infrastructure, facilities, funding etc.

Institutional level Quality Assurance System defines that Quality assurance is primarily a responsibility of the HEIs. Creating enabling learning environment for the students is the core of mission and goals achievable through all academic activities planed and conducted by the HEIs.

4.7 Future Developments

- ◆ Autonomous Status of single operative QAA
- ◆ Establishment of more independent EQA Bodies like QAA
- ◆ Internationally recognized Quality Label

4.8 Illustration of QA Framework




Fig I: Quality Assurance Framework

SECTION – V

EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Evaluation & Assessment System for Quality Assurance

The Evaluation System is meant for the practitioners and partners of quality assurance to understand the processes involved in assessment for the success of quality assurance program.

The Evaluation and Assessment System for Quality Assurance I which is three folds in case of Pakistan is given below:

1. Internal QA System involving Self Assessment etc.
2. External QA System that involves Accreditation by respective accrediting bodies, Peer-Review etc.
3. Meta QA System by the government mainly through the HEC for Higher Education Institutions.

All three QA Systems of evaluation and assessment are provided with developmental arrangements for the transitional period. The universities are responsible for provision of quality education to the students through self assessing system of quality assurance and to work with a satisfactory system of external quality assurance. The autonomy of universities is recognized in terms of academics and governance however, the autonomy is accountable to public, to the government, to present and prospective students and to the society.

The internal QA and external QA are strongly linked being complementary and integrated with each other. The internal QA is essential for external QA while external QA motivates internal QA for future developments and improvements.

5.2 Internal Quality Assurance System (Self Assessment)

The internal QA process largely takes place within the academic programme/ department itself. Generally, this process collects continued information in a systematic way about the quality being achieved. The Self Assessment reports are the corner stone of the whole QA system and need to be prepared by the institutions under the guidance provided by QECs and Manual of Self Assessment published by HEC as first documented effort to implement the quality assurance processes in the higher education institutions.

The Self Assessment report to be validated by peers is the backbone of the whole exercise of Quality Assurance and Enhancement in academics¹². Thus a standard Self Assessment report should motivate the internal QA by identifying its weaknesses and strengths, in practicing to be prepared for external assessment and informing the external evaluators about internal QA System. A self assessment report should provide comprehensive information regarding objectives, structure and content of the academic programmes, learning and teaching environment and curriculum organization etc.

The processes of conducting Self Assessment (SA) of academic programmes are outlined in the published Manual of Self Assessment which provides guidance for practicing self assessment of academic programmes of higher education institutions to maintain and improve the quality

¹² Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions: Indian Experience, Dr.V.S. Parsad & Dr. Antony Stella, NAAC, Bangalore, India.

standards simultaneously. Self Assessment is an effective tool for academic Quality Assurance and provides feed back to administration to initiate action plans for improvement¹³.

5.3 External Quality Assurance System

Accreditation and Peer-Review are two significant tiers of external QA System to work on the base line information provided through process of internal QA. It is recommended for the higher education institutions to compare their academic standards with equivalent national and international standards through external evaluation with the objective of improvements in quality.

In the national context, responsibility of developing and validation of Academic Standards for the Institutional Accreditations in future comes under the scope of HEC through QAA while the Programme Academic Standards should be developed by the respective Accreditation Councils in consultation with the HEC. For capacity building at institutional level to conduct this critical process, QAA will work with national and international partners, line agencies, higher education institutions, professional organizations and other stakeholders to develop National Academic Standards to be used as reference standards for practical purposes and to evaluate the current state of quality as compared to global standards. The process of Institutional Accreditation will be led by these National Academic Standards while the Programme Accreditation will largely be based on academic standards developed by the respective Accreditation Councils.


The effectiveness and relevance of these two types of academic standards will be assured by the transparency and quality of the process involved in development of these standards. The baseline information conveyed by the annual self evaluation and five year peer-review reports of the universities and other higher education institutions will be communicated by the Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) and filtered by the Quality Assurance Agency at HEC.

The proposed tiers and the actors of the External Quality Assurance System all-encompassing evaluation, review, transitional arrangements and accreditation with overlapping functions and roles to be performed are the HEIs, the HEC, Accreditation Councils and the QECs. Whereas, QAA of the HEC and independent Accreditation Councils perform the functions of external Reviewers and Accreditors, the role of the HEC is like **“Accreditor of Accreditors”**.

The QECs facilitate and strengthen the process of internal review and self assessment to provide baseline information for external quality assessment and for continuity of the processes of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement. The whole processes conducted by all the actors escort the higher education system towards developing a “Culture of Quality” in Academics.

The practices of quality assurance while leading towards international compatibility, sketches out a process of sharing information, providing feedback, building capacity, strengthening partners and developing commonly agreed sets of academic standards to be followed. The areas linked with each other provide strength to achieve the broader goals of quality assurance.

¹³ Prof. Dr. Abdul Raouf, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan



Quality Management at University Level (fig. 5.2)

5.3.1 Accreditation

The Accreditation should be defined for the purpose of general understanding amongst the professionals working under the umbrella of the QAA of the HEC, QECs and rest of the practitioners of the Quality Assurance and Accreditation in the higher education sector of the country. The Accreditation is known as “The process of external review used in higher education to scrutinize colleges, universities, and higher education programmes for quality assurance and quality improvement”. The success of the process results in accreditation of an institution and/ or programme, while some of the countries like South Africa, United Kingdom, Western Europe, and United States characterize it as the institutional authority to offer specific academic programme.

The specific context of Accreditation process at the HEC in Pakistan is a two tier process of accreditation divided into Institutional and Programme Accreditation. As discussed earlier, the Institutional Accreditation is responsibility of the HEC and Programme Accreditation is to be carried out by the respective Accreditation Councils. Since, Accreditation Councils are functional only in few of the disciplines in the country and establishment of new Accreditation Councils by the HEC in rest of the disciplines will take time; therefore, transitional arrangements will serve the purpose till completion of the task. The transitional arrangements are linked to IQA corresponding to accreditation process through tools given at **(APPENDIX-A)**¹⁴ as a reference point.

It is anticipated that the mission and strategic aims of the Higher Education Institutions are clearly defined to develop a five yearly strategic review report **(APPENDIX-B)**¹⁵. The universities are expected to develop their internal quality assurance systems at par with external quality assurance systems developed by QAA at HEC assuming the responsibility of Quality Assurance at national level.

5.3.2 Peer-Review

The HEC through QAA or Programme Accreditation Councils will conduct the process of Peer-Review for assessment and quality assurance at all levels. The peer- reviewers will need to be appointed for this purpose. The process of selection of Peer-Reviewers should be systematic and will need a certain standard and quality in all procedures to be followed in terms of international compatibility. The specification and criteria presented in Appendix-A may be used as tool to achieve the excellence in selection of Peer-Reviewers on which the authenticity and quality of the process of peer-review will largely depend. The process of selection of Peer-Reviewers has to be transparent and should involve open advertisement to invite applications for the candidates for this purpose.

The guidelines to conduct the whole process of Peer-Review in line with international practices, the specifications for peer-reviewers, the criteria for their appointment and deployment, and criteria for team composition are given at **APPENDICES-C & D**.

This Manual is largely to inform and equip the peer-reviewers, the chair of review panel, and the facilitators nominated by the institution and the site visits. It is mandatory to QAA and subsequently to QECs to arrange the training for academic and support staff involved in the process of quality assurance at different stages on the method, the role and task assigned, including the Peer-

¹⁴ Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in the UK and the accrediting agency for mid and west USA universities

¹⁵ The quality assurance and accreditation handbook for higher education in Egypt, NQAAC, 2004

Review writing skills. The process of continued capacity building on the subject will assure the success of applying the quality assurance procedures and processes across board.

The reviewers will not be assigned to their own institutions and universities to assure transparency and they should not have any conflict of interests. The peer-reviewers undertake the prime evaluating role, bringing latest pertinent experience in higher education and pertinent experience in the teaching and professional practices and relevance to national goals. Therefore, their recognition, respect by the academic staff of universities, and credibility as peers is important for the success and continuity of the whole process. The internal self—assessment of HEIs as part of the institutional quality assurance system is therefore, not defined as peer-review however, it is advisable to illustrate peer-review skills and insights while implementing its institutional quality assurance systems. The protocols which may help in assuring the best conduct of peer-review are given as **(APPENDIX-E)** to the Guidelines.

5.4 Meta Evaluation by the HEC

The higher education sector is more accountable to public funding now and generally, parents, stakeholders and society is keen to know about the appropriate utilization of public funding in the sector. In Pakistan the segmentation between public and private sector for higher education is significant. Fifty eight out of total 108 HEIs are public sector and others are private sector HEIs. The Government is the major funding agency for all public sector universities and these funds are allocated to meet the recurring and developmental costs of universities through the HEC. Therefore, HEC is not only responsible but accountable to public for provision of quality education across the country.

Consequently, the HEC has to perform the role of Meta evaluator for assessing quality in higher education to check that whether the internal and also external quality assurance systems are in place and working effectively and to respond the public concerns in quality of higher education.

5.5 Arrangements for Transitional Period

There will be a transitional period between a complete shift towards adoption of developed mechanism of quality assurance and accreditation by the universities through QECs & the Accreditation Councils and commencement of the policy protocol. The transitional arrangements will be followed during that transitional period. The transitional arrangements intend to provide an opportunity to the universities to scrutinize and assess their systems of quality assurance with the help of processes conducted by the QECs of the HEC and the autonomous Accreditation Councils in the respective disciplines. The arrangements made for transitional period will assist in defining the level of effectiveness of their Quality Assurance Systems practiced internally, strength of the reporting procedures along with evidences for quality assurance.

The specification of transitional arrangements is featured with the differentiation that developmental arrangements will not lead to accreditation decisions. The outcomes of transitional arrangements will include a judgement of reviewers as to what extent the university or institution would have met the criteria and what are the weaknesses identified for further improvements but this outcome can not be used as direct measure to determine accreditation status of the university or department. However, the report (Annex-Q) will identify the recommendations for further improvements and subsequent assistance to get prepared for accreditation. The weaknesses identified during the process will lead the future planning of higher education institution to make a

reasonable preparation to meet the criteria of accreditation which is ultimate objective of the transitional arrangements.

The practical example for the transitional arrangements quoted here is the “PhD Review Committee of the HEC”; which is evaluating and reviewing the performance of all the PhD programmes conducted by the HEIs. The outcomes of these reviews in the form of review reports are being shared with the respective institutions to inform them about their standing in the quality of PhD programme and to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the teaching learning systems in function. This process of review for the transitional period in the absence of an effective and efficient system of accreditation is to facilitate the universities in identifying the gaps in quality and improving the academic standards similar to international standards in the respective fields of study.

5.6 Role of HEC in Developmental Arrangements

The QAA through QECs will evaluate and develop its systems and processes in line with international trends in the area, to meet the national needs in quality. The process of Self-Assessment, External Assessment, Reviews and transitional arrangements will be evaluated with consistency of using the criteria for successful reviews (**APPENDIX-E**) as the basic tool for developing questionnaires sent to all those who are directly participating in the review process (the peer-reviews, the review chairs, the institutional representatives, facilitators and the institutions). A detailed role of institutional representatives / facilitators in internal reporting, developmental arrangements and accreditation is given in **APPENDIX-E**.

The developmental arrangements during transitional period need an active facilitative role of QAA to assist and support the institutions in developing systems and procedures of Quality Assurance leading towards practices of Self Assessment and for preparation of subsequent external assessment. The crosscutting areas of developmental arrangements that need to be focused by HEC during transitional period are given below:

- ❑ The quality assurance frame-work
- ❑ Evidence based self evaluation is central to the internal and external review process
- ❑ External peer-review is employed to reach evidence based judgements and decisions
- ❑ National academic standards will be developed by the QAA to inform institutions, reviewers and other stakeholders
- ❑ Implementation of already published “Good Practices for Quality Assurance for Accreditation Councils in Pakistan¹⁶” by the HEC will be amplified by sets of relevant guidelines.

¹⁶ Good Practices for Quality Assurance for Accreditation Councils in Pakistan, Zia Batool, HEC, Islamabad, Sep. 2006.

SECTION – VI

FUTURE VISION FOR QA

Future Dimensions of QA

The development of Quality Assurance system is a continuous process, thus a continued focus on reviewing the development needs is required and HEC has to be more responsive to these needs.

In line with the world practices, landmarks of quality assurance such as Bologna Process and Berlin Conference of late 2003, the emerging areas need to be highlighted. The major areas carving the future dimensions of QA in global context are

- Quality Culture
- Global Quality Label
- Internationalization of QA

The practitioners need to develop a clear understanding of these three main areas defining future dimensions of QA. Once the concepts regarding these areas will be crystalline, the processes and procedures will come forward to practice these.

6.2 Quality Culture

The quality culture in higher education may be defined as follows:

“It is an organic internal rather legislated external approach by institutions and departments towards dealing with the delivery of quality courses. Quality Culture is based around an internal system of continuous quality which seeks to establish quality higher education through a holistic approach on a day to day basis”

Ultimate objective of the establishment of QECs by the HEC is to develop and promote a Quality Culture in the academia in Pakistan leading towards sustainability in quality assurance and enhancement efforts at institutional level. This culture can not be developed over night; it involves certain time period, directed efforts and substantial evidence of good governance to lead the move. Complete execution of the Self Assessment policy and process will facilitate to achieve the goal in broader terms. QECs need to be more aware of the need for this quality culture to become change agents at the institutional and programme level.

Once the Quality Culture is developed within the universities or higher education institutions, it becomes easy to practice the processes and procedures bringing high standards of quality. Practicing the internal quality evaluations, enhancement, developmental arrangements and quality management to the excellence minimizes the external factors influence and strengthens the autonomy to universities from external evaluation and assessment.

Development of a Quality Culture in universities is an art of holistic approach to account for all aspects of quality in terms of faculty, research, students, curricula management, governance, accreditation, recognition of qualifications in specific and harmony with national needs and societal impact in general.

6.2.1 Expected Outcomes of Developing a Quality Culture

A number of significant outcomes provide motivation for development of a quality culture in higher education. Some of the expected outcomes of quality culture are enlisted below.

1. Increased academic autonomy of the universities from external evaluators
2. Satisfaction of increasing demand of accountability to justify the massive public spending in higher education.
3. Increased scope to diversify income sources other than public funding on grounds of quality provision.
4. Increased magnitude and level of contribution to national and regional economic and social development building up a knowledge economy.
5. Increased internationalization level in higher education with greater frequency of student and faculty mobility across border, provision of cross-border education opportunities and partnership etc.
6. Enhances status in globalization arena of higher education to achieve the benefits of competitiveness in international market with highly skilled professionals, research and technologies.

6.2.2 Variances in Quality Culture

The variances in quality culture are critical factors which invite attention of practitioners of quality assurance especially in the local context. The above mentioned expected outcomes of developing a quality culture at universities do not cover the grey areas of processes. There is a thin line between academic autonomy of the universities and the absence of any accountability mechanism in the national set up. The governments are accountable for public spending; therefore, all those sectors too for receiving public finances to operate and function even with certain levels of autonomy. These variances need to be emphasized for the practical purpose to avoid any dilemma at later stage of development in higher education at national level. A few of the precautions in this regard are enlisted below:

1. The higher education sector can not be left on disposal of complete autonomy or commercial factors in Pakistan. Thus, a partial control of government bodies with the objective of facilitation of the development of higher education in line with international standards and matching with national needs is required for greater efficiency of the system.
2. Students' participation in the process of quality assurance and enhancement is important regardless of the level of autonomy of the institution. It is integral part of the Quality Culture that quality assurance process is assuring active involvement of students at certain levels of assessment, evaluation and decision making.
3. Increase in access to quality assurance is supportive to develop a quality culture in universities and higher education institutions therefore; strong measures should be taken to increase the access of students to higher education without compromising

quality. The criteria of quality should not be stringent to the extent that access to higher education may be affected adversely.

4. Trust between students, faculty, University staff and management is basic element of quality culture which comes through rigorously practicing the quality assurance processes across board. The quality culture should not be used to maintain a status-quo in those universities which are suffering from poor quality issues. Thus, quality culture prevalence must be assessed by external evaluators and by the public perception to be more realistic.
5. The successful occurrence of quality culture in Universities; not only assures the excellence in management, governance, faculty, curricula and general repute earned by the universities but it must consider significance of the over all teaching learning environment and facilities available to the students on campus including infrastructure and living etc. The grassroots level consultation in defining the QA standards and developing the quality culture is effective in pre determination of the expected issues to be faced by the universities and HEIs at later stage during implementation.

6.3 World Quality Label (WQL)

Many of the Quality Assurance Agencies have standard functioning across the world in the recent decades. A few of the strong networks for quality assurance such as APQN (Asia Pacific Quality Network) and INQAAHE (International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education) are also active in establishing a harmony and uniformity across borders. The HEC acquired earned membership for these QA networks for knowledge and resource sharing on the subject and to promote quality culture in the country compatible to international practices in the field of higher education.

There are three major categories of these Quality Assurance Agencies working at international level:

1. State Driven QAA
2. Private
3. Intermediate Form.

QAA is functional in Pakistan is under umbrella of the HEC and is trying to build its own capacity first to work as an autonomous body of quality assurance and to complete the preliminary task of introducing the concepts, theories and practices of internationally acceptable quality assurance systems. Autonomy of this agency is within the future vision of the HEC which would involve strengthening its legislative status, building its capacity and acceptance by academia and the wider community in Pakistan.

Quality Assurance Agencies perform a number of functions to assure and enhance the quality of higher education across the globe. Some of the Quality Assurance Agencies are practically involved in accreditation process at intuitional and programme level, some are doing only institutional accreditation whereas others are merely dealing with quality assurance procedures development without directly dealing with setting of academic standards, benchmarks or final assessment decisions. Consequently, clear variations are evident in procedural details, assessment techniques and protocols followed by different agencies. WQL is one of the future goal of HEC

The World Quality Label (WQL) may be defined as follows:

“A Quality Label that is given to internationally trustworthy quality assurance and accreditation agencies (QAAs), under the legitimacy of a consortium formed by international groups (LAUP (International Association of Universities Presidents), the INQAAHE (International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education) and UNESCO. The WQL awarded to an agency guarantees that this agency meets the internationally defined standards for trustworthy quality assurance. These include clear commitment to develop standards of academic quality among the institutions and programmes evaluated by it, fair and appropriate quality assessment procedures, well developed and publicly available protocols, published reports, etc. As a consequence, the quality mark of QAA signifies that institutions and programmes evaluated by this agency meet trustworthy standards of academic quality. Students, academic staff, programmes and institutions wishing to cooperate with these programmes and institutions in the context of various forms of internationalization of higher education, can have a reasonable confidence in their quality.”

APPENDICES

ABOUT APPENDICES OF THIS MANUAL

The appendixes of this Manual illustrate a few of the Quality Assurance Tools practiced in the world. These templates and Proformae are quite flexible as per specific academic requirements and variations amongst the HEIs.

Appendix A to E are based on international practices in the field to facilitate practitioners of QA whereas **Appendix- F** is the set of Proformae developed in thorough consultation with all the stakeholders with dominance of the national context. Therefore these Proformae are being more efficiently used by the practitioners of QA within the country.

The objective of introducing these templates and QA tools by the HEC is just to highlight and promote the recent trends in processes and procedures of quality assurance therefore, use of these tools is obligatory and not mandatory. However, the HEC encourages adherence to these guidelines for the use of these tools and appreciates the efforts of Universities and respective departments to develop their need based templates and tools for QA in consultation with QAA of the HEC.

APPENDIX-A

(GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATES FOR
COURSE
SPECIFICATIONS AND ANNUAL COURSE
REPORTS)

GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATES FOR COURSE SPECIFICATIONS AND ANNUAL COURSE REPORTS

Preface

1. The objective of these guidelines is to assist higher education institutions in compiling course specification and the associated annual course reports in accordance with international standards for assuring their quality. It is one of the sets of guidelines produced to facilitate the practitioners of Quality Assurance and Accreditation.
2. The forms for course specifications and reports have been prepared with the cooperation of consultants from the United Kingdom. The guidelines and templates were developed in association with representation of institutions in January and June 2004.
3. Each section of the guidelines has been divided into two parts. The first part contains the general rules presenting the basic requirements which educational institution will have to meet and the practices, which they will have to follow in order to assure the quality of their provision. The second part is a collection of basic elements, which are suggested for each section. The general rules as well as the titles of the basic elements are shadowed in grey to distinguish them.
4. In order to prevent any misunderstanding, each item of these guidelines is accompanied by an explanation of the meaning of the item and its connection with the basic requirements and practice which have to be put into place to assure the quality of their provision.
5. The course specification template contains eight main items. These are; basic information; the overall aims of the course; its intended learning outcomes (ILOs); the course content; teaching and learning methods; student assessment methods; a list of books and references and facilities required for teaching and learning.
6. The course report template contains eleven main items. These basic information; statistical information; topics taught; methods of teaching and learning; student assessment methods; constitution of examination committees, including the role of the external evaluator; administration constraints; student evaluation; comments of external evaluators; enhancement proposals; and finally; a formal action plan.
7. The course specification has to be provided when the faculty academic by – laws document is authorized. The course report should be provided within two weeks after the publication of student' results.
8. The course specification template is given in annex (1).
9. The course report template is given in annex (2).
10. The published documents of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in the UK and the accrediting agency for mid and west USA universities were used for guidance when these guidelines were prepared.

Introduction

11. Recent developments in science and in other fields have resulted in the enhancement of education standards and quality becoming one of the most important challenges facing all nations. Such enhancement enables nations to cope with the consequences of globalization

policies. Thus, education has become a matter of national strategic concern for both developing and developed nations. The need is to fulfill the main aim of education, which is to provide society with graduates capable of meeting its professional and research needs and of effectively participating in drawing-up and implementing the intended policies and plans of investment.

12. The higher education quality reform policies have been developed by the HEC to assure the production of graduates conforming to internationally recognized standards. Implementation of these policies will increase the skills of graduates and enhance their competitive capacity in the national and regional labour market. For these reasons, the QAA was established with subsequent establishment of QECs. The academic programmes are considered to be the core of the educational system. It is therefore essential that all programmes are specified according to international standards and on the basis of intended learning outcomes (ILOs). It is also essential to demonstrate, by means of annual report, that the operation of the programmes has resulted in the specified quality and standards being achieved. This must be done with reference to the standards and benchmarks that are carefully chosen by the HE institution in accordance with its mission. These guidelines have been prepared through the (QAA) aiming at satisfying certain performance standards. They also aim at standardizing the concepts among faculty members when compiling the course specifications and reports covered by these guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR COMPILING A COURSE SPECIFICATION

General precepts

1. The institution should have a file for each course “Course File” containing the course specification, samples of previous examination sheets, and results of student evaluation of the course as well as the percentages of students dropping out, passing, and failing the course. The file should include any other relevant information.
2. The institution should ensure the existence of two copies of the course file, one for the course lecturer and the other for the head of the department or program coordinator. This will help in performance follow-up.
3. The institution should provide a system for course evaluation.
4. The Department / Programme Committee/ Council should approve the course specification when preparing/reforming/developing an educational programme and before authorization of the programme by higher authority or, in case of reviewing a course to cope with novel topics or to add/ delete some of programme academic standards.

A-BASIC INFORMATION

1. Programme Title

Write the title of the programme(s) which contain the course, and identify If major/ minor elements, where relevant.

2. Department offering the programme(s):

Write the name of the department responsible for programme(s)

3. Department responsible for the course:

Write the name of the department responsible for teaching the course.

4. Course code:

Write the code (the letter(s) and the number that identify the course in the faculty by – laws). If there is no code, leave the space blank.

5. Year / Level:

Write the year of the programme for the students in the case of a daily scheduling system or the level in a credit- hour system.

6. No. of hours/units:

Referring to the faculty by – laws, write the number of weekly contact hours of the course for the daily scheduling system and credit hour units for credit hour system divided into lectures, exercise and lab.

7. Authorization date of course specification:

Write the year in which the course specification has been authorized.

B- PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

1. Course aims:

Overall course aims should be expressed as the outcomes to be achieved by students completing the course as significant and assessable qualities.

2. Intended Learning Outcomes from the course:

Express the ILOs of the course in terms of:

a. Knowledge and understanding

The main information to be gained and the concepts that should be understood from the course.

b. Intellectual skills

Explain the intellectual skills, which the course will assist in developing in the students such as; analysis, capability for creative thinking, problem identification, and solving...etc.

c. Professional skills

These skills demonstrated by the ability of the student, after completing the course, to apply and adopt the topics into professional applications.

d. General and transferable skills

Skills of a general nature, which can be applied in any subject area, including: written and oral communication, the use of new technological tools, ICT, group working, problem solving, management...etc.

3. Course content:

Write in the main course topics, the number of semester hours allocated for teaching each topic for lectures as well as for seminars, tutorials, exercises, laboratory work, etc. The topics should comply with the content written in the faculty by – laws.

4. Teaching and learning methods:

Identify the methods used in delivering the course such as lectures, discussion sessions, information collection from different sources, practical, research assignment, field visits, and case studies etc.

5. Student assessment:

- a. Write down the assessment methods used, such as written examinations (mid term, regular, at the end of term) class activities (reports, discussion, practical... etc.). Match the methods used with the course ILOs (item No. 3).
- b. Time Schedule: identify the percentage of marks allocated to teach assessment tool mentioned above
- c. Formative only assessment are those, which do not contribute to the overall grading system, but are important in the learning process.

6. List of text books and references:

- a. Lectures notes: When notes are available, specify whether they are prepared in the form of a book authorized by the department or are handed out to the students part by part.
- b. Essential books (text books): When the lecturer uses one book that covers most of course contents, specify the book.

When the lecturer uses more than one book, which contains parts of the course specify the books and the topics covered by each.

- c. General references, journals, periodicals, newspapers, web sites, which enrich the learning process should also be listed.

The references that should be identified in the above items should be written in a standard way (publisher, edition, year, author(s)...etc. Refer also to locations for reading or buying the specified references.

7. Facilities required for teaching and learning:

The facilities include: appropriate teaching accommodation, including teaching aids, laboratories, laboratory equipment, computers etc, facilities for field work, site visits etc, which are necessary for teaching the course.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING COURSE REPORTS

General precepts

1. The academic institution should have a file for each authorized programme containing the specification of its courses. Two copies should be available, one with the academic coordinator and the other with the vice dean for education and student affairs.
2. The institution should provide the necessary mechanisms to ensure continuous reviewing and updating of the programmes including readjustment of the structure, adding/deleting specific skills from the courses, ILOs...etc.
3. The institution should have clear academic standards and benchmarks for each education programme.
4. At the end of the semester/year, the lecturer/ coordinator of a course should submit a course report to the head of the department.

A - BASIC INFORMATION

1. Course title and code:

Write the title and the code (the letter(s) and the number that identifies the course in the faculty by - law). If there is no code, leave the space blank.

2. Programme:

Write the title of the programme(s) to which the course contributes.

3. Year / Level:

Write the programme year(s) of the students attending the course in the case of a daily scheduling system or the level in credit –hour systems.

4. No. of hours/ units:

Referring to the faculty by-laws, write the number of weekly contact hours of the course for the daily scheduling system and credit hour units for credit hour system divided to lectures, exercises and lab.

5. Teaching staff:

Write the name(s) of lecturer(s) teaching the course.

B- STATISTICAL INFORMATION

1. No. of students starting the course:

Write the number of students starting the course at the beginning of the semester.

2. Results of students' assessment:

Write the number and percentage of pass students as well as fail students.

3. Distribution of passed students according to:

Fill in the allocated space, the number, as well as the percentage of students for each grade.

C- PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

1. Course topics taught:

In the first column of the table, write the topics actually covered in the semester/year. In the second column of the table, write the actual hours spent in covering each topic. In the third column, write the name of the lecturer covering each topic.

Write in the space provided the percentage of the specified topics actually covered. State the reasons for the failure to cover any of the specified topics. If topics, not included in the course specification, were taught, justify this action.

2. Teaching and learning methods:

Tick in the appropriate rectangle, the method used. Write any comments.

Lectures.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical training / lab.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion sessions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class activities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Case studies	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other assignments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Student assessment:

a. Methods of assessment

Tick in the appropriate place the method(s) used.

b. State the rules applied for the selection of the examination committee.

State the names of the members of the examination committee.

c. State the involvement of the external evaluator in :

- The match between the examination and the topics taught.
- The existence of grading criteria in examination sheets.
- The allocation and distribution of marks and weighting.
- Effectiveness of the overall assessments in measuring the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (ILOs).

4. Facilities and teaching materials:

Tick the boxes provided to indicate whether or not the facilities for learning and teaching materials are adequate. If there are any inadequacies, identify them, together with any problems in the delivery of the course or achieving the ILOs, which resulted.

5. Administration constraints:

State any administrative constraints related to teaching and learning (lack of: some facilities or funds, teaching aids, site visits, qualified personnel for laboratory and administration). Also mention any management problems or regulations, which impeded the delivery of the course and the achievement of the ILOs.

6. Results of course evaluation by students:

State the main points resulting from the analysis of students' evaluation of the course, and the response to any criticisms by the faculty members delivering the course, together with their proposals for dealing with those issues.

7. External evaluator' comments:

State the issues raised by the external evaluator and the responses from the faculty members delivering the course, together with their proposals for dealing with those issues.

8. Course enhancement:

- a. List the issues identified in the action plan from the previous year and whether or not they have been dealt with effectively. When issues have not been effectively dealt with, give reasons, and include in the current year's action plan. Write the issues not handled from those raised in the previous report and the reasons for overlooking such issues.
- b. Action plan for programme enhancement over the next academic year: List:
 - a. Issues and actions required
 - b. Time schedule
 - c. Persons(s) responsible for the successful achievement of the specified action.

The action plan is fundamental to the success of the quality system. It appears at the end of the report, because it is the result of all of prior analysis. Enhancement can only take place if issues are identified and then acted upon and resolved. The action plan identifies the issues, prioritizes them, and dictates the necessary action to be taken. It is also clearly places the responsibility for the implementation of the action and the resolution of the associated issues, in a given time scale on named individuals.

TEMPLATE FOR COURSE SPECIFICATIONS

University

Faculty

Course specifications

Programme(s) on which the course is given

Major or minor element of programmes

Department offering the programme

Department offering the course

Academic year/Level

Date of specification approval

A- Basic Information

Title:

Code:

Credit hours:

Lectures:

Tutorial:

Practical:

Total:

B- Professional Information

1. Overall aims of course

.....
.....
.....

2. Intended learning outcomes of course (ILOs)

- a. Knowledge and understanding:
 - i.
 - ii.
 - iii.

- b. Intellectual skills
 - i.
 - ii.

- iii.
- c. Professional and practical skills
 - i.
 - ii.
 - iii.
- d. General and transferable skills
 - i.
 - ii.
 - iii.

3. Contents :

Topic	No. of hours	Lecture	Tutorial/Practical

4. Teaching and learning methods

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

5. Student assessment methods

- a. to access.....
- b. to access.....
- c. to access.....
- d. to access.....

Assessment schedule

- Assessment 1 Week
- Assessment 2 Week
- Assessment 3 Week
- Assessment 4 Week

Weighting of assessments

Mid-term examination	%
Final-term examination	%
Oral examination	%
Practical examination	%
Semester work	%
Other types of assessment	%
Total	100%
Any formative only assessments	

6. List of references

- a. Course notes
- b. Essential books(text books).....
.....
- c. Recommended books.....
.....
- d. Periodicals, Websites,....etc.....
.....
.....

7. Facilities required for teaching and learning.....
.....

Course coordinator:

Head of Department

Date: / /

Date: / /

**TEMPLATE FOR ANNUAL COURSE
REPORTS**

UniversityFacultyDepartment.....

Course Report

A – Basic Information

1. Title and code:
2. Programme(s) on which this course is given:
3. Year /Level of programmes:
4. Units/ Credit hours:

Lectures Tutorial / Practical Total

5. Names of lecturers contributing to the delivery of the course

- a.
- b.
- c.

Course coordinator

External evaluator

B – Statistical Information

No. of students attending the course: No. %

No. of students completing the course: No. %

Results:

Passed: No. % Failed: No. %

Grading of successful students:

Excellent: No. % Very Good: No. %

Good: No. %

C- Professional Information

1. Course teaching

Topics actually taught	No. of hours	Lecturer

Topics taught as a percentage of the content specified:

>90% 70-90% <70%

Reasons in detail for not teaching any topic

.....
.....
.....

If any topics were taught which are not specified, give reasons in detail

.....
.....
.....

2. Teaching and learning methods:

Lectures:

Practical training/laboratory:

Seminar /Workshop:

Class activity:

Case Study:

Other assignment/homework:

If teaching and learning methods were used other than those specified, list, and give reasons:

.....
.....

3. Student assessment:

Method of assessment	Percentage of Total
Written examination	<input type="text"/>
Oral examination	<input type="text"/>
Practical /laboratory work	<input type="text"/>
Other assignments/class work	<input type="text"/>
Total	100%

Members of examination committee

.....
.....
.....

Role of external evaluator

.....
.....
.....

4. Facilities and teaching materials:

Totally adequate

Adequate to some extent

Inadequate

List any inadequacies

.....
.....

5. Administrative constraints

List any difficulties encountered

.....
.....
.....

6. Student evaluation of the course:

Response of course team

List any criticisms

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7. Comments from external evaluator(s): Response of course team

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

8. Course enhancement :

Progress on actions identified in the previous year's action plan:

Action	State whether or not Completed and give reasons For any non-completion
---------------	---

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

9. Action plan for academic year 200X - 200Y

Actions required	Completion date	Person responsible
.....
.....
.....

Course coordinator:
Signature: Date: / /

APPENDIX- B

GUIDELINES FOR THE PERIODIC
STRATEGY
REVIEW AND FOR COMPILING
THE PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT

Guidelines for the periodic strategic review

1. These guidelines address the process of periodic strategic review and are organized in sequence to cover preparation, the sources of evidence, the processes available and outputs (leading to the compilation of the strategic review report, for which there is also guidance in the next section).

Guiding principles

2. The following principles are offered as guidance on the good conduct of strategic reviews in institutions. They are drawn from good practice in a range of contexts, including auditing, ISO standards and the AA1000 series of the Institute for Social and Ethical Accounting.

The process should:

1. Be “inclusive” – involve at all stages of the review and reporting process over time the aspirations and needs of all stakeholder groups. It requires the consideration of “voiceless” stakeholders including future generations (e.g. intending students and sponsors) and the environment.
2. Be complete – the review process should include without bias, over time, all appropriate areas of activity relating to the organization’s performance.
3. Contain or cite all material information – the inclusion of significant information that is likely to affect one or more stakeholder groups and their assessment of the organization’s performance. Determining the significance of information requires an inclusive process of needs and engagement with the stakeholders.
4. Be regular (periodic) and timely – the need for regular, systematic and timely action of the process to support the decision making of the organization and its stakeholders and to provide information for accreditation.
5. Be Quality assured – concerns the audit of an organization’s process by an verifier, auditor or other independent party, building credibility in the process with all stakeholder groups, considering the accuracy / validity of the organization’s reporting. (This function is performed in part by the Agency as part of its accreditation process.)
6. Be Accessible – concerns appropriate and effective communication to the organization’s stakeholder (including the University and the Agency) of its process and performance.
7. Offer Comparability - the extent to which it is possible to compare an organization’s performance with that of previous periods, performance targets or external benchmarks drawn from the experience of other organizations, statutory regulations or non-statutory norms.

8. Promote reliability – the characteristic that allows the organization and its stakeholders to depend on the information provided to be free from significant omission, error or bias.
9. Be relevant – the usefulness of information as a means of building knowledge and forming opinions, and as assistance to decision making. Engagement with stakeholders is an essential part of identifying the relevance of information.
10. Be understandable – the comprehensibility of information to the organization and its stakeholders, including issues of language

In addition, there are two principles relating to the management of the process:

11. Embeddedness – the appropriate incorporation of quality assurance and accounting processes, consultation and review findings within the strategic, managerial practice and policy, and operational levels of the organization. Embeddedness may be considered as an indicator of the capacity of the institution to manage self-knowledge and learn as well as look forward.
12. Continuous improvement – the institution takes recognized and verified steps to improve performance in response to the results of earlier reviews, together with the means of securing continuous improvement in the strategic review process and annual review processes within the institution.

Preparation

3. Designation of the responsible person: the institution will need to nominate a senior member of staff to take responsibility for the review and the eventual production of the review report. The Dean or equivalent head of institution will normally take this position. They should take an active part in leading and coordinating the review process and not merely hold a titular position. They may, however, wish to appoint a small core team of colleagues to steer the process. They should report directly to the Dean or the equivalent head of the institution with regular skills and knowledge, including a working knowledge of the principles and practices of quality assurance, recent experience of leading equivalent reviews and the authority to coordinate the evidence base and the activities of colleague staff.
4. Timetable: Although defined as periodic review once every five years, the review is in practice a process and requires a timetable. This is likely to begin a year ahead of the due date for the completion of the strategic review report, although the timing will depend on the range, scale and complexity of the institution's activities and the extent to which new evidence (such as survey questionnaire responses) is to be generated to supplement annual recurring data. The timetable should contain clear indications of the components required, milestones and appropriate measures of progress.
5. Defining the scope: Effective strategic review must be comprehensive yet also realistic about the volume and level of information that can reasonably be managed. The guidance offered later in this annex on the structure of the strategic review provides the agenda in broad terms. However, decisions need to be taken early in the process to determine the adequacy of the existing evidence base (starting with the accumulated annual reports), the range of enquiries, the level of detail and the focus. For example, all educational activities should be included, but there may be early indications (perhaps from a recent faculty review report) that a long-established educational programme needs substantial reform of its educational aims and the curriculum with implication for the level of resources; in this case, the strategic review may wish to devote more attention to that programme, either to support the reforms or to identify

more precisely the strategies required to implement the changes successfully. In another instance, the institution may wish to undertake a systematic analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) identified as factors in strategic decision – making.

6. Self-Study: the strategic review is essentially a self-study conducted with the faculty. However, the institution may wish to consider engaging the services of a facilitator or external evaluator to support the process. This may be of particular value on the first occasion or when in preparation for the review it is clear that far – reaching reforms are required and the capacity for undertaking them needs to be enlarged.
7. Creating the capacity: A strategic review undertaken on top of existing responsibilities is a major undertaking that requires managing. When the review is accompanied by far – reaching changes or the detailed planning of such changes, the institution may need to create capacity to address the review. Examples of capacity building that can be used include the use of improvement funding, sponsorship of training for staff, the development of a new data base, new initiatives to improve communications between staff, between staff and students, and between the faculty and other organizations such as the employing community. Some of these, if introduced for the first time for the first strategic review, may be regarded as valuable elements of a robust quality assurance process that can be placed on a systematic basis. Other elements may be used for the review process and then phased down until the next periodic strategic review is due.
8. Carrying people along: An effective strategic review process involves all those with a legitimate interest and engages them in the process. All those individuals and groups should feel included and feel confident that their views are sought and listened to. The institution embarking on its first strategic review may wish to consider undertaking a preliminary scoping study to clarify the range of stakeholder interests and the most efficient and effective ways of including them in the process. These groups will also have a reasonable expectation that they will receive feed back and have an opportunity to comment on interim findings and this process needs to be built into the timetable.
9. Recording key steps and outcomes: without inviting an over-bureaucratic approach, the strategic review will require a methodical record of the preparation, the key steps in the process, the decisions made and the outcomes. The peer-reviewers attending the institution as part of the institution’s accreditation application may wish to see this record to clarify and substantiate the value to the institution of the strategic review and the derived strategic review report. However, care should be taken to quote only the conclusions from cited references, rather than any detail.

Sources of Evidence

10. Effective strategic reviews are evidence – based. The due application of the institution’s internal systems of quality assurance will routinely generate valuable qualitative and quantitative information on the programmes and the supporting infrastructure in the faculty. The strategic review should not attempt to duplicate this information, but harness it to take a strategic view of the performance, the effectiveness of the systems and processes in place and the direction the institution needs to take in the foreseeable future. The institution may wish to gather and collate additional information of strategic significance.
11. The evidence base for a strategic review should be obtained from: existing evidence accumulated incrementally from internal sources such as annual review reports and regular student satisfaction surveys; as well as periodic or occasional evidence such as trends

analyses and additional information gathered for the strategic review or for other purposes, that are not always captured in annual reports. This should be complemented by evidence from relevant external sources. The following guidance (see paragraph 25 -28) on sources of evidence is not exhaustive, but gives an indication of the range of evidence that is likely to be relevant and may assist institutions to consider the organization of the evidence base that supports the strategic review and the derived strategic review report. Some expels are drawn from the pilot self-studies in 2003 and the outcomes of the workshops held in 2004 with representatives of higher education institutions.

12. A full critical account of the activities of an institution during each academic year should be encapsulated in the Faculty Annual Report. These will therefore provide the main sources of internal evidence for the strategic review. They should represent the situation of the institution each year, and consequently record its incremental development. In compiling the strategic review, much of the information required can be obtained from these reports see template, Annex C1). These reports should be analysed, interpreted and quoted as references but not duplicated. In their annexes they should contain all of the detail relative to the various sections. Other factors affecting the strategic position of an institution will be external pressures, resulting from changes in government policy, economic social and political changes as well as international pressures and events.
13. One of the most successful features of the pilot self-studies in 2003 was the use of well – constructed questionnaires and other forms of surveys including meetings with representative groups. These addressed key strategic issues and filled gaps in information that confirmed levels of satisfaction and suggested next steps for development.
14. Another valuable source of evidence for an institution is benchmarks from comparable institutions, professional organizations, national and international organizations that publish standards and procedures which represent good practice. A strategic review should scan worldwide for relevant benchmarks and cite instances of innovation and improvement that are relevant to the institution. Such evidence may then form the basis for discussion in the course of the strategic review of the desired improvements to the institution’s aims, the range of programme specifications in place and the range of research and other scholarly activity. A strategic review report that can demonstrate currency and relevance in these ways strengthens the strategic position of the institution in its portfolio of programmes, research and community involvement.
15. Arrangements with key stakeholder groups may take place at any time. The strategic review may provide a good opportunity to increase the rate of exchange of information and view with some stakeholder groups. Annual reports may not always capture the full range of these arrangements and draw out strategic implications. The strategic review provides such an opportunity.

Guidelines for writing the periodic strategic report

16. The template in Annex C I provides a structure for organising the strategic report. This intentionally avoids detailed prompts and check lists at the level of detail addressed in the annual course and programme review reports and in the annual faculty report.
17. The function of the strategic review should be clear to the writers and to the intended audiences from the outset: it is a report of the main findings of the process of strategic review and an instrument to guide medium and longer term plans.
18. The strategic review report should draw upon evidence in its discussion of key features and issues, but avoid the technical detail contained in the annual reviews other than citing

examples as part of its evidence – based analysis. Some of the pilot self studies contained detailed blocks of information including lists of faculty staff, library stocks, lists of physical resources raw data from surveys etc. All of this information is valuable, but its use in the body of a self-study tends to make the document unwieldy. This type of information needs to be continually up-dated and used where required as evidence, which can be referenced in the report.

19. The strategic report needs to be analytical, concise and transparent. It should go beyond analysis by demonstrating vision and leadership with a focus on key issues and preferred strategic developments.
20. Institutions with experience of writing strategic reviews, and equally those colleagues who are embarking on the process for the first time, will recognize that it is a complex and demanding task. Four of the most common difficulties that should be avoided with good planning and economical writing are:
 - Getting confused with too much information at a level of detail that is redundant: therefore use annexes, cite references, focus on conclusions reached
 - Dealing with each part of the portfolio in turn and missing the overview: therefore produce a generalized statement, qualified and differentiated only when necessary
 - Over-emphasising either the strengths or the weaknesses: therefore endeavor to strike the right balance with a realistic assessment that is evidence- based, and perhaps moderated by an external evaluator or facilitator
 - Doing a sound job of analysis but not taking a future view of emerging needs and new priorities: there fore rehearse” what if “scenarios as part of the process of review in team discussions and early draft position papers, that can be polished into chosen action plans in the strategic review report.
21. Most institutions in the pilot scheme adopted a team approach to writing the self- study report. However, many are involved in the writing, it is important that one person takes responsibility for the final editing, for version control and for the production and circulation of the report. Institutions may wish to consider from the outset appointing a “critical friend” as a final reader of the draft report to assist the institution in producing a sound report free of errors and contradictions.
22. The range of matters to be addressed, implied by the headings presented and questions posed in the template, will normally apply to all institutions but in exceptional circumstances, the structure of the report may need to be adapted. The questions should be addressed and the answers analysed to produce prioritized action plans under each heading, culminating in an overall prioritized action plan to establish the strategy of the institution for the future period.

TEMPLATE FOR THE PERIODIC STRATEGIC REVIEW REPORT

The report should normally be addressed to the President of the University or the equivalent most senior academic member of the organization. The report should be presented electronically as a MS word document and available in hard copy. The document should be paginated and paragraphs numbered in the main text. The institution may wish to consider accessibility on either its website and / or internet facility.

Title page

Name of University (if applicable)

Title of institution (faculty)

“Strategic Review Report”

“Date”

“Senior person or team responsible”

Contents

Executive summary

Not exceeding one page, setting out the purpose of the report, the nature of the process of strategic review that it represents and the key findings

List of contents including annexes

.....
.....

Introduction

- Brief outline of portfolio, indicating range of activities of the institution, scale and how long established
- Purpose of this strategic review
- Context of the review (any key factors such as timing)
- Any brief comments or explanation concerning the review process such as who has been included
- Any brief explanation for the structure used or special features in the report

Main text

The following should report on the outcomes of all internal processes as well as an analysis of the wider environment for higher education. (For example, presenting position papers derived from SWOT analysis of any of the aspects identified below) in respect of:

- Institution mission
- Undergraduate programmes
- Postgraduate programmes
- Research
- Community involvement

- The impact of quality assurance processes and systems
- Governance and leadership

Institution Mission

Consider the appropriateness of the existing institution mission statement in respect of:

- Government policy for higher education and any recent initiatives, such as admission policy
- Trends and developments in the industrial and professional sectors relevant to graduates and collaborative activities such as joint research projects
- Trends and innovations detected nationally, regionally and internationally in higher education that are significant, such as developments in teaching and learning strategies (e.g. e-learning) or significant subject-specific developments
- Cross-reference the above with key messages from recent annual review reports

Key questions:

- How well has the mission served detectable trends nationally, regionally, interracially, in industrial and professional sectors and the context of government policy?
- Was the mission modified to take account of any short coming in this respect?
- If so, what was the modification?
- If not, why not?
- How should the mission now be modified to relate fully to government policy and other trends in respect of the four main educational activities?
- Are there any activities other than those presently in place which should or could be undertaken?
- If so, what are they and what is the justification?
- How well does the existing strategic aims serve?
- How effective have any previous action plan (s) been at faculty level and what is their impact?
- Are any revisions to strategic aims or objectives desirable to serve the medium or longer term?
- If so, what is recommended?

*Review any previous action plans
and their impact at the strategic levels, as reported in recent faculty
annual review report*

Action plan

.....
.....

Priorities (in order)

.....
.....

Undergraduate and postgraduate academic programmes

- i. Do the educational programmes establish, clearly articulate, and deliver, appropriate academic standards and acceptable quality of learning opportunities?**

Are all programme specifications appropriate to the selected benchmarks, and current to comparable programmes; are they responsive to detectable trends and developments in the institution and in the external environment (region, industrial sector etc)?

- Are they fully understood and applied by colleagues, students and other partners such as organizations involved in internship?
- Is the balance of vocational skills and transferable skills and higher education skills correct?
- Do the programmes deliver appropriate subject specific and transferable skills?
- Are the overall levels of student's achievement appropriate?
- Are the programmes producing graduates with the subject specific and general skills and knowledge required by the government / nation / community in sufficient numbers?
- Do graduates and postgraduates experience any difficulties in finding appropriate employment or other career opportunities?
- Is the institution sufficiently pro- active in identifying / seeking new programmes (and courses, topics, learning and teaching strategies within programmes) and able to respond to detected trends, feedback and suggestion from colleagues?

- ii. Are the programmes fully supported by appropriate resources, staff and support services for staff and students (including libraries, IT facilities, academic and support / administrative staff, student tutorial and counseling services)?**

- iii. Is there an effective strategic approach to ensure that changes to programmes and other activities are matched by appropriate development in the resources and other components of the infrastructure?**

*Review of any previous action plans
and their impact at programme level, as reported in
recent programme review reports*

Action plan

.....
.....

Priorities (in order)

.....
.....

Research Activities

Do the academic research activities make a full contribution to the achievement of the mission?

- What is the quantity and quality of the research activities?

- Summary of papers published in period of review in journals and conferences international / national / regional and any significant themes of patterns
- Conference attended (international / national / regional)
- Research commissioned and the strategic significance of partnerships, collaborative arrangements and networking for the institution and for the other educational activities (educational programmes and community involvement)
- Finance attracted, government / private
- Five – year trends in the registration and completion of PhDs
- Number of staff involved, absolute and as a percentage
- Is this record satisfactory?
- How does it compare with the remainder of the university, all Egyptian universities, other centres of research, internationally?
- Is the institution pro- active in identifying /seeking research topics / activity / finding?

Action plan

.....

Priorities (in order)

.....

Community Involvement

Do community involvement activities make a full contribution to the achievement of the mission?

- What is the extent of community involvement and are there opportunities for additional activity?
- Is the extent of community involvement satisfactory the light of government policy and competitors’ performance?
- Is the institution pro-active in seeking / identifying community involvement?
- Is the institution optimizing mutual exchange and knowledge transfer with the other educational activities?
- What are the relationships with stakeholders / employers locally / nationally / internationally?

*Review of any previous action plan and its impact,
 as reported in recent faculty review reports*

Action plan

.....

Priorities (in order)

.....

.....

The Impact of Quality Assurance Processes and Systems

This section addresses at strategic level the impact of the current arrangements and identifies examples of emerging good practices as well as any perceived obstacles. It is primarily derived from an analysis of the internal review reports but could also be informed by questionnaires and discussion groups commissioned for the strategic review. Please refer to the relevant criteria in the evaluative frameworks, with particular reference:

“.....management and quality assurance systems are sufficient to manage existing academic activities and respond to development and change”

“Self- evaluation, internal reporting and improvement plans are open, transparent, focused and supportive of continuing improvement.”

“The institution has mechanisms of receiving and processing the views of those with a legitimate interest in the activities (the range of stakeholder groups”).

“Effective and prompt action is taken to promote strengths, address any weaknesses and demonstrate responsibility and accountability.”

i. Are effective systems and processes in place to ensure quality and to support continuing improvement?

- Is there a structured process, supported by clear procedures, for quality and to support continuing improvement?
- Is there a structured process, supported by clear procedures, for quality assurance and enhancement?
- If no, why not?
- If yes, is it adhered to?
- To what extent is it adhered to?
- Are there any significant gaps on effectiveness of the educational activities?
- If so, what additional information is needed and how?
- Are there formal course and programme specifications and reports?
- If so, are they fulfilling their purpose/function?
- If not, why not?
- Are there action plans at course and programme level?
- To what extent are they fulfilled?
- If fulfillment is not complete, why not?
- If they are fulfilled are there examples of good practice that can be disseminated more widely?

ii. Do the current arrangements promote confidence in the quality and standards of the range of activities and in the capacity to develop?

- Are there obstacles to the enhancement of quality?
- Are elements of government policy and University regulations such obstacles or are they particularly supportive in any way?
- Are administrative requirements and the current structure and organization of the institution such obstacles or are they particularly supportive in any way?
- How could all of these obstacles be overcome?

*How can examples of effective processes at work be exploited / capitalized on?
Review of any previous action plans and its impact*

Action plan

.....
.....

Priorities (in order)

.....
.....

Governance and Leadership

This section is concerned with the overall impact on the institution’s performance and plans for: the structures the culture of scholarship, learning and placing the students and other clients first; and the quest for continuing improvement. It is not an occasion to critically appraise the individual qualities of the person in senior posts.

Please refer to the criteria in the evaluation framework with particular reference to:

“Governance, management and quality assurance system are sufficient to manage existing academic activities and respond to development and change”

“The academic leadership in the institution provides a sound and sustainable basis for academic activities to flourish in an atmosphere conducive to promoting learning.”

For example, address:

- The integrity of the institution and its performance.
- The relationship of the institution with the university
- Comparable performance by other faculties in the university and comparable faculty in other Universities, national and international and other competitors.
- The balance between the main areas of activity: undergraduate and postgraduate programmes; research; and community involvement.
- Is the culture of institution fully supportive of the fulfillment of the mission?

- Is the culture appropriate for the commitment to quality and for the development of effective processes for quality assurance?
- Is there a clear vision of both the institution's legacy and its future role and how it can develop?
- In operational terms, do the structure, systems and academic leadership encourage proactive approaches together with the engagement of the range of stakeholders?
- In operation terms, are the structures, systems and academic leadership conducive to the full achievement of the mission?
- Are there any aspects that can be improved to optimize the strategic position of the institution, such as the processes by which the institution, is accountable, is able to identify priorities based on sound interpretation of facts, make plans happen and have reliable information of success?

Review any previous action plan and its impact

Action plan

.....

Priorities (in order)

.....

Conclusions

- Summary of key strengths
- Issues that need to be addressed
- External factors that need to be taken into account

Overall Action Plan

Incorporating priorities at each level expressed in realistic terms of timing, resources required, management to ensure progress and successful completion.

Annexes

These should include: summaries of annual reports, results of surveys, an index of citation/reference, other significant internal or external sources of evidence etc.

APPENDIX-C

**SPECIFICATION FOR PEER-REVIEWERS
& CRITERIA FOR THEIR APPOINTMENT
& DEPLOYMENT, & CRITERIA FOR
TEAM COMPOSITION**

Specification for peer-reviewers and Criteria for their Appointment and Deployment, and Criteria for Team Composition

- 1) Peer-review is an essential part of the quality assurance and accreditation process as practiced in the world. This appendix sets out the criteria for the appointment of reviewers, the person specification for reviewers and review chairs and criteria for the composition of review teams.

Introduction

- 2) Review by peers means that the institution has a reasonable expectation that the visiting reviewers should hold, or have recently held, equivalent professional positions to those with whom they conduct their enquiries in the institution. They should have the confidence of the institution and, when offering professional opinion on their area of expertise, they are credible in the eyes of the institution. Peer-review also offers safety in numbers for the process, in that the team as a whole provides a degree of protection for the institution and the Agency from one person, eccentric views.
- 3) The effective contribution of peer-reviewers is underpinned by the application of criteria for their appointment, equal opportunities for all reviewers, experience of the same training and support in the quality assurance and accreditation process. In addition, the specification for the composition of review teams offers transparency to the process of arranging reviews.

Recruitment, training and visit allocation

- 4) Reviewers are recruited and trained in line with standard operating procedures and published criteria to ensure that they make an effective contribution to the process. The criteria for appointment are:
 - a. All reviews actively engaged in the schedule of arrangements should meet the specification (see below)
 - b. All reviewers allocated to a review have successfully completed the training
 - c. Reviewers are provided with the Quality Assurance Guidelines and Self Assessment Manual together with supporting materials and guidelines
 - d. Reviewers will be allocated to reviews that are within their competence
 - e. Reviewers will make themselves available with the agreement of their organization for not less than three reviews during an academic year
 - f. Reviewers will make themselves available for the whole of the scheduled review
 - g. Reviewers will not be assigned to a review where either they, or the institution believe there to be a potential conflict of interest (see below, Composition of team)
 - h. Reviewers take a professional interest in the process and the advancement of academic affairs.

Personal Specification

- 5) Reviewers need to have sufficient status and reputation for their views to be respected in the academic community. They also need to bring to the process a high order of skills in communication and evaluation. All candidates for the role of reviewer will be invited to submit a CV and write a letter in English that sets out how they meet the specification and the

contribution they feel they can make to the process as a reviewer. The Agency will acknowledge all submission notify candidates of the outcome.

6) The following points represent a core specification:

i. Essential

- a. Academic expertise in one or more discipline that appears in the schedule for review within the Agency's medium-term plans.
- b. Current or recent academic experience including successful teaching practice and at least five years teaching and /or research and /or community projects within the last 10 years.
- c. Those in professional practice in a relevant discipline; who have recent, direct experience of academic activity may also be considered.
- d. Proven abilities in communication in Urdu and English including: listening; joining group discussion; rapid reading with understanding; and concise clear writing to tight deadlines.
- e. Competence in the use of and interpretation of number including: the accurate analysis of data sets; verification and reconciliation techniques; presentation of valid data in support of a judgment.
- f. Proven in evaluation including: appraisal of the context; identifying logical and irrational argument; making sound judgments based on facts; adjusting judgments in the light of additional information or well-argued alternative views in a professional context; and a willingness to justify judgments.
- g. A favourable disposition to the national initiatives to improve the quality and academic standards of higher education.

ii. Desirable

- a. IT Skills, including the use of laptops or notebooks, internet and preferably in MS word.
- b. Current or recent experience in moderation or marking, external examining and /or formal validation of graduate attainment.
- c. Effective practice in curricula developments, including the writing of outcome-related curricula documents, action plans for programme/course improvements or strategies for learning, teaching and assessment.
- d. Acknowledged track record in research and other scholarly activities.
- e. Recognized contributions to society or the community within the normal range of academic activities (e.g. projects, consultancy, teaching, coaching or mentoring).
- f. Advisory or interventionist functions as internal or external consultant or change agent in higher education or related professional fields.

iii. Review Chairs

7) Review chairs will meet all the above requirements, except relevant academic activity in the discipline under review, and in addition will need to demonstrate:

- a. Recent experience in internal and / or external review methods.
- b. Proven qualities of leadership and the management of people and information in task groups or projects.

- c. Abilities to implement procedures and protocols consistently yet fairly to accommodate local circumstances.
- d. Effective chairing of reviews and meetings including thorough planning, collaboration with other key participants and time management.
- e. Ability to assess the evidence available and the validity of emerging judgments.
- f. Ability to write cogently to deadlines and edit the writing of reviewers to meet the specification for the review report.
- g. Ability to evaluate the review and make constructive suggestions for the continuing improvement of the method.
- h. On request, additional contributions to the process through, for example, conference, editing the review reports generated by others, trawling reports in order to draft overview or summary reports, and the preparation of materials for briefing reviewers and institutions.

Composition of a Review team

- 8) The HEC (Agency) will create review teams for each review in line with its standard operating procedures. The Agency will work with the institution to ensure the composition of an appropriate team and inform the institution of the proposed team prior to its confirmation. However the final allocation of reviewers is made by the Agency to ensure the independence of the review process.
- 9) The key criteria for the composition of the team are as follows:
 - i) Teams are composed of reviewers who meet the above requirements.
 - ii) The minimum number of reviewers will be three plus a review chair. The size of the team will vary according to the scale and complexity of the institution's academic activity
 - iii) The team will be led by a review chair who may or may not have relevant expertise in the discipline
 - iv) The profile of the team reflects the profile of the main academic activities of the institution
 - v) The team cannot cover every specialist teaching and research interest in the institution , but the Agency guided by the institution , will seek to provide a balance of interests in the principal academic activities
 - vi) Where appropriate , a team may include a reviewer from professional practice
 - vii) Where appropriate, a team may include a reviewer who offers relevant regional and international perspectives
 - viii) Potential conflicts of interest in the team will be avoided, and the Agency will seek the cooperation of reviewers and the institution to this end.

APPENDIX-D

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PEER-
REVIEWERS

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PEER-REVIEWERS

Introduction

1. The HEC through its QA Agency wishes to ensure that the peer-review process makes a full contribution to its quality assurance and accreditation process. The role of the peer-reviewer is complex and demanding. The contribution to its quality assurance and accreditation process. The role of the peer-reviewer is complex and demanding. The contribution the reviewer can make in assisting institutions to continue to develop their quality assurance systems and improve their standards is considerable.
2. This note offers guidance to the reviewers and other participants in the peer-review process on the standards of conduct expected.
3. The Agency will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the review process. It will train and support the reviewers it appoints to the role, and the code of conduct will feature in this training.

Code of Conduct

4. The reviewer is expected to:
 - Take all reasonable steps to know and understand the published quality assurance and accreditation process and in particular the methods of developmental engagements and accreditation.
 - Ensure that they remain up to date with any developments in the published method, including attending conferences and workshops arranged for peer-reviewers by the Agency.
 - Conduct their roles and activities in reviews in a way that fully respects the published method and protocols, including reaching justifiable evidence-based judgments.
 - Undertake their part in review in a way that respects the mission of the institution they are visiting and avoids bringing to the process any prejudices.
 - Show courtesy to all colleagues with whom they work in the review team and in the institution, including respect for their views and opinion.
 - Complete the assignment on time and to a high professional standard, drawing upon the hand book and the guidance provided in the review.
 - Respect the confidences shared in the course of the review, so that they do not divulge any information on the self-evaluation, the findings of the review team or the conduct of the review to any other institution, any member of the public or the media.
 - Contribute as requested by the QA Agency, to the evaluation of the process by offering constructive comment of their experiences as a reviewer.

APPENDIX-E

ROLES OF INSTITUTIONAL
REPRESENTATIVES/ FACILITATORS IN
INTERNAL REPORTING,
DEVELOPMENTAL ENGAGEMENTS AND
ACCREDITATION

ROLES OF INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES/FACILITATORS IN INTERNAL REPORTING, DEVELOPMENTAL ENGAGEMENTS AND ACCREDITATION

Introduction

- 1) The HEC through its QA Agency wishes to invite the institutions to nominate a suitable senior member of academic staff to represent the institution and facilitate the peer-review process when developmental engagement and accreditation visits take place. The facilitator must be briefed on the role by the Agency. The Agency will make suitable arrangements for this briefing to take place before the site-visit. This annex provides information on the roles, activities and the person specification for the facilitator who is most likely to be the head of AEC in the university.

Roles and activities

- 2) The facilitators will work both with the team in the institution responsible for preparing for the peer-review process, and with the review chair and reviewers. They take no part in the decision – making processes of the review team in reaching judgments. They will take a professional approach in facilitating the process. They should not be directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution's academic activities and, if the institution is part of a university, they may be from another faculty or institution within the university. Their “loyalty” is to the integrity and effectiveness of the peer-review process.
- 3) The role is demanding of time and the facilitator should ensure that they are available without distractions for the preliminary visit and throughout the site-visit. The facilitator is expected:
 - a. To ensure factual accuracy in the documentation produced internally for the developmental engagement and accreditation visit.
 - b. To ensure that appropriate supporting evidence is available to the visiting review team and is accessed by the review team.
 - c. To support the preparations for the site-visit in partnership with both the visiting review chair and the person assigned by the institution to lead the institution's part in the review and to verify for the institution and the review chair that the proposed timetable for the site-visit is suitable.
 - d. To attend the preliminary meeting arranged by the reviewer chair.
 - e. To attend the daily meeting arranged the daily meetings of the review team and any of the meetings arranged during the site-visit between reviewers and academic staff. By attending these meetings, they will gain understanding of the lines of enquiries and the development of the review team's approach to making judgments. Such insights may be shared with colleagues in the review process. However, the facilitator should avoid speculating on the possible outcomes of review. They should remain passive on the range of evaluations that the peer-reviewers compile in the course of the visit and should not divulge them to members of the institution during or after the review.
 - f. To clarify, during the site-visit, any matters concerning the context in which the institution conducts its academic activities and to assist the review team in determining

- how they can seek further clarification in the institution report or the periodic strategic review report.
- g. To attend the final oral feedback meeting.
 - h. Following each review visit, to provide a brief for the institution, to ensure that the benefits of the review process are captured in the institution's arrangements for further development and continuing improvement. To be responsible for the preparation of the institution's evaluation of the peer-review, following the site-visit.
- 4) It should be noted that the facilitator will not attend the meeting(s) between peer-reviewers and students or other stakeholder. He will not attend the final meeting of the review team on the last day when it makes the judgments and agrees to the conclusions.

Person Specification

- 5) The institution may nominate one person per engagement or accreditation and will inform the Agency. The facilitator should be a senior, experienced member of academic staff, and should not be currently engaged in the teaching, assessment or management of the academic activities in scope.
- 6) In nominating the facilitator, the institution should be satisfied that the person:
- a. Has knowledge and experience of quality assurance initiatives within an institution
 - b. Has sufficient knowledge of the mission ,any recent engagement in developments and the methods of working in the institution
 - c. Has the skill to intervene constructively in sensitive situations.

Briefing and support

- 7) The Agency will produce further guidance and arrange for the facilitator to be briefed on the published method and the role.
- 8) After briefing, the facilitator should also:
- a. Have knowledge and comprehension of the published method and the part to be played by the quality assurance and accreditation process in education reform
 - b. Understand the role and contribution of the facilitator.
- 9) The Agency believes that institution will wish to ensure that the facilitators engaged in the conduct of the peer-review process are also able to make positive contribution to the development of quality assurance system in the institution.

APPENDIX-F

10 PROFORMAE FOR QA PROCESSES

Proforma - 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
 (To be filled by each Student at the time of Course Completion)

University
Logo

Department _____ Course No: _____

Course Title _____ Teacher Name: _____

Year of Study _____ Semester/Term: _____

*Please give us your views so that Course quality can be improved.
 You are encouraged to be frank and constructive in your comments*

CORE QUESTIONS

Course Content and Organization	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un-certain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
1. The course objectives were clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The Course workload was manageable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The Course was well organised (e.g. timely access to materials, notification of changes, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Comments					

Student Contribution	<input type="checkbox"/> <20%	<input type="checkbox"/> 21-40%	<input type="checkbox"/> 41-60%	<input type="checkbox"/> 61-80%	<input type="checkbox"/> >81%
5. Approximate level of your own attendance during the whole Course					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. I participated actively in the Course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. I think I have made progress in this Course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Comments					

Learning Environment and Teaching Methods	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Dis-agree
9. I think the Course was well structured to achieve the learning outcomes (there was a good balance of lectures, tutorials, practical etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The learning and teaching methods encouraged participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Classrooms were satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Comments					

Learning Resources	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Dis-agree
14. Learning materials (Lesson Plans, Course Notes etc.) were relevant and useful.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Recommended reading Books etc. were relevant and appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The provision of learning resources in the library was adequate and appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The provision of learning resources on the Web was adequate and appropriate (if relevant)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Comments					

Quality of Delivery	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un-certain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
19. The Course stimulated my interest and thought on the subject area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The pace of the Course was appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Ideas and concepts were presented clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Comments					

Assessment	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
23. The method of assessment were reasonable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Feedback on assessment was timely	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Feedback on assessment was helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Comments					

Additional Core Questions

Instructor / Teaching Assistant Evaluation	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
27. I understood the lectures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. The material was well organized and presented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. The instructor was responsive to student needs and problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Had the instructor been regular throughout the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Tutorial	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
31. The material in the tutorials was useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. I was happy with the amount of work needed for tutorials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. The tutor dealt effectively with my problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Practical	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
34. The material in the practicals was useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. The demonstrators dealt effectively with my problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Evaluation

36. The best features of the Course were:

37. The Course could have been improved by:

Equal Opportunities Monitoring (Optional)

38. The University does not tolerate discrimination on any irrelevant distinction (e.g. race, age, gender) and is committed to work with diversity in a wholly positive way. Please indicate below anything in relation to this Course which may run counter to this objective:

Demographic Information: (Optional)

39. Full/part time study: Full Time Part Time

40. Do you consider yourself to be disabled: Yes No

41. Domicile:

42. Gender: Male Female

43. Age Group: less than 22 22-29 over 29

44. Campus: Distance Learning/Collaborative

Proforma 2

Faculty Course Review Report
(To be filled by each teacher at the time of Course Completion)

**University
Logo**

For completion by the course instructor and transmission to Head of Department of his/her nominee (Dept. Quality Officer) together with copies of the Course Syllabus outline

Department:		Faculty:			
Course Code:		Title:			
Session:		Semester:	Autumn <input type="checkbox"/>	Spring <input type="checkbox"/>	Summer <input type="checkbox"/>
Credit Value:		Level:		Prerequisites:	
Name of Course Instructor:		No. of Students Contact Hours	Lectures	Other (Please State)	
			Seminars		
Assessment Methods: give precise details (no & length of assignments, exams, weightings etc)					

Distribution of Grade/Marks and other Outcomes:
(Adopt the grading system as required)


Under-graduate	Originally Registered	% Grade A	% Grade B	%Grade C	D	E	F	No Grade	Withdrawal	Total
No. of Students										
Post-Graduate	Originally Registered	% Grade A	% Grade B	% Grade C	D	E	No Grade		Withdrawal	Total
No. of Students										

Overview/Evaluation (Course Coordinator's Comments)

Feedback: first summarize, and then comment on feedback received from:

(These boxes will expand as you type in your answer.)

1) Student (Course Evaluation) Questionnaires
2) External Examiners or Moderators (if any)
3) Student /Staff Consultative Committee (SSCC) or equivalent, (if any)
4) Curriculum: Comment on the continuing appropriateness of the Course curriculum in relation to the intended learning outcomes course objectives) and its compliance with the HEC Approved / Revised National Curriculum Guidelines
5) Assessment: Comment on the continuing effectiveness of method(s) of assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes (Course objectives)
6) Enhancement: Comment on the implementation of changes proposed in earlier Faculty Course Review Reports
7) Outline any changes in the future delivery or structure of the Course that this semester/term's experience may prompt
Name: _____ Date: _____ <i>(Course Instructor)</i>
Name: _____ Date: _____ <i>(Head of Department)</i>



Proforma: 3

Survey of Graduating Students
(To be filled out by graduating students in last semester/year
before the award of degree)

The survey seeks graduating students' input on the quality of education they received in their program and the level of preparation they had at university. The purpose of this survey is to assess the quality of the academic programs. We seek your help in completing this survey.

A: Very satisfied B: Satisfied C: Uncertain D: Dissatisfied E: Very dissatisfied

1. The work in the programme is too heavy and induces a lot of pressure

A B C D E

2. The program is effective in enhancing team-working abilities.

A B C D E

3. The programme administration is effective in supporting learning.

A B C D E

4. The programme is effective in developing analytical and problem solving skills.

A B C D E

5. The programme is effective in developing independent thinking.

A B C D E

6. The programme is effective in developing written communication skills.

A B C D E

7. The programme is effective in developing planning abilities.

A B C D E

8. The objectives of the program have been fully achieved.

A B C D E

9. Whether the contents of curriculum are advanced and meet programme objectives.

A B C D E

10. Faculty was able to meet the programme objectives.

A B C D E

11. Environment was conducive for learning.

A B C D E

12. Whether the Infrastructure of the department was good.

A B C D E

13. Whether the programme was comprised of Co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

A B C D E

14. Whether scholarships/ grants were available to students in case of hardship.

A B C D E

Answer question 15 if applicable.

15. The internship experience is effective in enhancing.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| a. | Ability to work in teams | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| b. | Independent thinking | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| c. | Appreciation of ethical Values | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| d. | Professional development | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| e. | Time management skills | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| f. | Judgment | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| g. | Discipline | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| h. | The link between theory and Practice | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |

16. What are the best aspects of your programme?

17. What aspects of your programme could be improved?

You may use additional sheets for questions 10 & 11 if needed.

Proforma: 4

**RESEARCH STUDENT PROGRESS REVIEW FORM
(To be filled out by Master/ MPhil/PhD Research
Students on six monthly basis)**

**University
Logo**

To be submitted by the HoD / Dept. Quality Officer to the QEC

For Research Student to Complete:

1. Date of admission to the department
2. Date of initiation of research
3. Date of completion of Course work
4. Number of credit hours completed
5. Date of Synopsis Defence
6. Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) secured
7. Please outline details of progress in your research since your last review (including any research publications):
8. Do you have any Comments on the level of supervision received?
9. What do you plan to achieve over the next 6 months?
10. Do you have any Comments on generic or subject-specialist training you may have received or would like to receive internally and / or externally?
11. Do you have easy access to sophisticated scientific equipment?
12. Do you have sufficient research material / commodities available?

Student _____

Date: _____

Supervisory Committee Comments

(Please comment on and benchmark the student's progress against your University's internal and external HEC Quality Criteria for Master/PhD/MPhil Studies)

Principal Supervisor: _____

Date: _____

Co-Supervisor: _____

Date: _____

Co-Supervisor: _____

Date: _____

Head of Department Comments:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Director, Board of Research Studies (or equivalent) Comments:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Dean/Director, QEC Action: (including monitoring of Follow-up action) Date: _____

Proforma: 5

Faculty Survey
(To be submitted on annual basis by each faculty member)

The Purpose of this survey is to assess faculty members' satisfaction level and the effectiveness of programmes in place to help them progress and excel in their profession. We seek your help in completing this survey and the information provided will be kept in confidence.

Indicate how satisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your situation at your department?

A: Very satisfied B: Satisfied C: Uncertain D: Dissatisfied E: Very dissatisfied.

1. Your mix of research, teaching and community service.
A B C D E
2. The intellectual stimulation of your work.
A B C D E
3. Type of teaching / research you currently do.
A B C D E
4. Your interaction with students.
A B C D E
5. Cooperation you receive from colleagues.
A B C D E
6. The mentoring available to you.
A B C D E
7. Administrative support from the department.
A B C D E
8. Providing clarity about the faculty promotion process.
A B C D E
9. Your prospects for advancement and progress through ranks.
A B C D E
10. Salary and compensation package.

- | | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | Job security and stability at the department. | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. | Amount of time you have for yourself and family. | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 13. | The overall climate at the department. | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. | Whether the department is utilizing your experience and knowledge | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 15. | What are the best programmes / factors currently available in your department that enhance your motivation and job satisfaction: | | | | |

16. Suggest programmes / factors that could improve your motivation and job satisfaction?

Information about faculty member

- i. Academic rank:

A: Professor B: Associate Professor C: Assistant Professor D: Lecturer E: Other

ii. Years of service:

A: 1-5 B: 6-10 C: 11-15 D: 16-20 E: >20

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Proforma : 6

SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT OFFERING PhD PROGRAMMES

The following information is required for EACH Department in which a PhD programme is offered.

1.	General Information:	
1.1	Name of Department	
1.2	Name of Faculty	
1.3	Date of initiation of PhD program	
1.4	Total number of academic journals subscribed in area relevant to PhD program.	
1.5	Number of Computers available per PhD student	
1.6	Total Internet Bandwidth available to all the students in the Department.	
2.	Faculty Resources:	
2.1	Number of faculty members holding PhD degree in the department.	
2.2	Number of HEC approved PhD Advisors in the department.	
3.	Research Output:	
3.1	Total number of articles published last year in International Academic Journals that are authored by faculty members and students in the department.	
3.2	Total number of articles published last year in Asian Academic Journals that are authored by faculty members and students in the department.	
3.3	Total number of ongoing research projects in the department funded by different organizations	
3.4	Number of post-graduate students in the department holding scholarships/fellowships.	
3.5	Total Research Funds available to the Department from all sources.	
3.6	Number of active international linkages involving exchange of researchers/students/faculty etc. (Attach Details)	

4.	Student Information:	
4.1	Number of PhD degrees conferred to date to students from the Department during the past three academic years.	
4.2	Number of PhD students currently enrolled in the department.	
4.3	Ratio of number of students accepted to total number of applicants for PhD Program.	
5.	Program Information	
5.1	Entrance requirements into PhD Program (M.Sc. / MPhil) Indicate subjects or M.Sc. / MPhil	
5.2	Is your PhD program based on research only? (Y/N)	
5.3	Maximum number of years in which a PhD degree has to be completed after initial date of enrollment in PhD program.	
5.4	Total number of post M.Sc. (16 year equivalent) courses required for PhD	
5.5	Total number of MPhil level courses taught on average in a Term / Semester.	
5.6	Total number of PhD level courses taught on average in a Term / Semester.	
5.7	Do your students have to take/write:	
	a. PhD Qualifying examination (Y/N)	
	b. Comprehensive examination (Y/N)	
	c. Research paper in HEC approved Journal	
	d. Any other examination (Y/N)	
5.8	Total number of International examiners to which the PhD dissertation is sent.	
5.9	How is the selection of an examiner from technologically advanced countries carried out?	
5.10	Is there a minimum residency requirement (on campus) for award of PhD degree?	
6.	Additional Information	
6.1	Any other information that you would like to provide.	

Proforma: 7

Alumni Survey

(To be filled by Alumni - after the completion of each academic year)

The purpose of this survey is to obtain alumni input on the quality of education they received and the level of preparation they had at University. The purpose of this survey is to assess the quality of the academic program. We seek your help in completing this survey.

A: Excellent B: Very good C: Good D: Fair E: Poor

I. Knowledge

1. Math, Science, Humanities and professional discipline, (if applicable)

(A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

2. Problem formulation and solving skills (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
3. Collecting and analyzing appropriate data (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
4. Ability to link theory to practice. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
5. Ability to design a system component or process (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
6. IT knowledge (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

II. Communications Skills

1. Oral communication (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
2. Report writing (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
3. Presentation skills (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

III. Interpersonal Skills

1. Ability to work in teams. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
2. Ability to work in arduous /Challenging situation
3. Independent thinking (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
4. Appreciation of ethical Values (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

IV. Management /leadership Skills

1. Resource and Time management skills (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
2. Judgment (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
3. Discipline (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

V. General Comments

Please make any additional comments or suggestions, which you think would help strengthen our programs. (New courses that you would recommend and courses that you did not gain much from)

VI. Career Opportunities**VII. Department Status**

- | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Infrastructure | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| 2. Faculty | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| 3. Repute at National level | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| 4. Repute at international level | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |

VIII. Alumni Information

1. Name (Optional) _____
2. Name of organization _____
3. Position in organization _____
4. Year of graduation _____

- | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2. Judgment | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
| 3. Discipline | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |

V. General Comments

Please make any additional comments or suggestions, which you think would help strengthen our programs for the preparation of graduates who will enter your field. Did you know as to what to expect from graduates?

VI. Information About Organization

1. Organization Name_____
2. Type of Business_____
3. Number of Graduates (specify the program) in your Organization:

Proforma: 9

Faculty Resume

Name							
Personal	<i>May include address(s) and phone number(s) and other personal information that the candidate feels is pertinent.</i>						
Experience	List current appointment first, each entry as follows: <i>Date, Title, Institution.</i>						
Honor and Awards	List honors or awards for scholarship or professional activity.						
Memberships	<i>List memberships in professional and learned Societies, indicating offices held, committees, or other specific assignments.</i>						
Graduate Students Postdocs Undergraduate Students Honour Students	<p><i>List supervision of graduate students, post docs and undergraduate honors theses showing:</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Years</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Degree</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Show other information as appropriate and list membership on graduate degree committees.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Years	Degree	Name	Show other information as appropriate and list membership on graduate degree committees.		
Years	Degree	Name					
Show other information as appropriate and list membership on graduate degree committees.							
Service Activity	<i>List University and public service activities.</i>						
Brief Statement of Research Interest	<i>May be as brief as a sentence or contain additional details up to one page in length.</i>						
Publications	<p><i>List publications in standard bibliographic format with earliest date first.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manuscripts accepted for publication should be included under appropriate category as “in press;” ○ Segment the list under the following standard headings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Articles published by refereed journals. ● Books. ● Scholarly and /or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue. ● Contribution to edited volumes. 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papers published in refereed conference proceedings. • Paper or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings. (refereed on the basis of abstract) • Articles published in popular press. • Articles appearing in in-house organs. • Research reports submitted to sponsors. • Articles published in non-refereed journals. • Manuscripts submitted for publication. (include where and when submitted). 						
<p>Research Grants and Contracts.</p>	<p><i>Entries should include:</i></p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Date</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Title</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Agency / Organization</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Total Award Amount</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Segment the list under following headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed • Funded and in progress • In review 	Date	Title	Agency / Organization	Total Award Amount		
Date	Title	Agency / Organization					
Total Award Amount							
<p>Other Research or Creative Accomplishments</p>	<p><i>List patents, software, new products developed, etc.</i></p>						
<p>Selected Professional Presentations</p>							

Proforma: 10

**Teacher Evaluation Form
(To be filled by the student)**

Course Title and Number: _____

Name of Instructor: _____ Semester _____

Department: _____ Degree _____

Use the scale to answer the following questions below and make Comments

A: Strongly Agree B: Agree C: Uncertain D: Disagree E: Strongly Disagree

Instructor:					
1. The Instructor is prepared for each class	A	B	C	D	E
2. The Instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject	A	B	C	D	E
3. The Instructor has completed the whole course	A	B	C	D	E
4. The Instructor provides additional material apart from the textbook	A	B	C	D	E
5. The Instructor gives citations regarding current situations with reference to Pakistani context.	A	B	C	D	E
6. The Instructor communicates the subject matter effectively	A	B	C	D	E
7. The Instructor shows respect towards students and encourages class participation	A	B	C	D	E
8. The Instructor maintains an environment that is conducive to learning	A	B	C	D	E
9. The Instructor arrives on time	A	B	C	D	E
10. The Instructor leaves on time	A	B	C	D	E
11. The Instructor is fair in examination	A	B	C	D	E
12. The Instructor returns the graded scripts etc. in a reasonable amount of time	A	B	C	D	E
13. The Instructor was available during the specified office hours and for after class consultations	A	B	C	D	E
14. Course:					
15. The Subject matter presented in the course has increased your knowledge of the subject	A	B	C	D	E
16. The syllabus clearly states course objectives requirements, procedures and grading criteria	A	B	C	D	E
17. The course integrates theoretical course concepts with real-world applications	A	B	C	D	E
18. The assignments and exams covered the materials presented in the course	A	B	C	D	E
19. The course material is modern and updated	A	B	C	D	E

Comments:

Instructor:

Course:

GLOSSARY

Some of the terms appearing in these guidelines and/ or used in writing course specification and course report in the higher education institutions may have more than one meaning according to its context. This might cause confusion in understanding, and consequently affect the compilation of specifications and reports. It is very important for the reader of these guidelines to be aware of the meaning, in this context of the terms used. Therefore, this section defines the terms used in the compilation of course specifications and reports.

Academic Standards:

Specific standards decided by the institution, and informed by external references and including the minimum knowledge and skills to be gained by the graduates from the programme and fulfilling the stated mission of the institution.

Accreditation:

The recognition accorded by the Agency to an institution which can demonstrate that its programmes meet acceptable standards and that it has in place effective systems to ensure the quality and continuing improvement of its academic activities, according to the criteria published by respective councils.

The impact of accreditation at course and programme level will be to require an assurance of the existence of a specific quality level in accordance with the institution's mission, the objectives of the programme(s) and the expectations of similar academic institutions, the students, and the labour market.

Benchmarks:

Reference points with which to compare the standards and quality of a programme. Therefore, benchmark statements represent general expectations about the standards of achievement and general attributes to be expected of a graduate in a given in the subject area.

Course aims:

A collection of the course-specific goals that are derived from the overall objectives of the education programme. They are written in a general manner concentrating on the knowledge, skills and attitudes that the course intends to develop in the students.

External Evaluator:

An external experienced person in the field of specialization who is invited to review the structure and content of a programme, its relevance to the ILOs, the standards and appropriateness of student assessments and attainment against the specification, and also evaluating the existing learning resources and whether or not they satisfy the programme requirements. The institution is responsible for specifying the evaluators, role and appointing them.

Institution:

A faculty or higher institute providing HE programmes leading to a first university degree (under graduate) or a higher degree.

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

The ILOs are the knowledge, understanding, and skills which the institution intends for its programmes that are mission – related; reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate level.

Internal System for Quality Management:

The self assessment system adopted by the institution as introduced by the HEC to improve the level of the educational programmes and other elements affecting them. Such an outcomes – related system involves precise specifications for quality, the identification of good practice as well as of learning deficiencies and obstacles, performance follow-up, suggestion for development and enhancement, and the systematic review and development of processes for establishing effective policies, strategies and priorities to support continuing improvement.

Peer-Reviewer:

A person who is professionally equal in caliber and subject specialization to those delivering the provision but not from the same institution, without any conflict of interest, who can contribute to the review of an educational programme wither for internal quality assurance (QA) or for accreditation purposes.

Programme Evaluation:

The methods used to obtain the opinions of the stakeholders of the programme, including students, faculty members, and the graduates, and the governing council, etc with the aim of improving and developing the programme to cope with the advances in subject matter and the needs of society and the environment.

Strategic Objectives:

A collection of institution – specific objectives that are derived form its mission. They are written in a general manner concentrating on the knowledge and skills that the institution intends to develop in its students.

Student Assessment:

A set of processes, including examinations and other activities concluded by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course/programme. Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievements. The students are well informed on the criteria by which they are assessed and given appropriate structured feed back that supports their continuing learning.

Teaching and Learning Methods:

The methods which are used by teachers to help students to achieve the ILOs for the course.

Examples would be: a case study to teach students how to analyze information and reach a decision; writing a review paper for the students to gain the skills of self- learning and presentation; practical session for the students to gain practical skills and executing experiments to train the students to analyze the results and reach specific conclusions.