

**REPORT ON**  
**TWO DAYS ORIENTATION WORKSHOP ON ENHANCING THE QUALITY**  
**OF HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH SELF ASSESSMENT**

**SUMMARY**

The Higher Education Commission of Pakistan has established a Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) at HEC Islamabad with the objective of significant enhancement of quality in higher leanings and international compatibility.

After the satisfactory progress and significant impact of ten QECs establishment during Phase-1of QAA, twenty more QECs have been established in public sector universities. In order to build up the capacity of existing and newly established QECs in quality enhancement and self assessment procedures at the program level, a two day awareness workshop regarding “***Enhancing the quality of Higher Education through Self Assessment***” has been conducted on 22<sup>nd</sup>- 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007 at HEC Islamabad where the Master Trainers from phase-1 QECs and QAA discussed the procedures and share experience with the representatives from all the twenty QECs for practical purposes. Moreover, the sixth meeting of the QECs has also been scheduled on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007 at the same venue

**2. INTRODUCTION**

The Higher Education Commission has been set up to facilitate the development of the universities of Pakistan to be world class centers of education Research and development. The Commission plays a central role in the development of both human beings and the modern societies as to enhance social, cultural and economic development, active citizenship and ethical values. By promoting learning and the advancement of knowledge, the HEC aims to assist in the building of a modern, progressive and tolerant society that values the dignity of labour, craftsmanship, spirit of enquiry, critical and independent thought, and public duty. Its goal is to mobilize financial, technical, human and social resources for enhancing the quality of educational institutions and for facilitating the reform process initiated within these institutions.

The HEC intends to play its part in spearheading the building of a knowledge based economy in Pakistan. Key issues are the quality of education imparted to the graduates and its relevance to the economy.

NEED FOR WORKSHOP  
Earlier WORKSHOPS  
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOP  
SESSION 1

**Quality Assurance Agency**

A Quality Assurance Agency has been established to develop a mechanism of quality assurance through Quality Enhancement Cells set up in thirty Public sector universities (as a focal point) in a phased manner. QEC's have been established in the following thirty universities:-

1. University of Karachi, Karachi
2. University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore
3. University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir , Muzaffarabad
4. Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences, Jamshoro Sindh
5. University of Peshawar, Peshawar
6. National University of Science and Technology, Rawalpindi
7. University of Baluchistan, Quetta
8. Agriculture University, Faisalabad
9. The University of Punjab, Lahore
10. Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad
11. Allama Iqbal Open University
12. NWFP Agriculture University
13. University of Sargodha
14. Bahauddin Zikriya University Multan
15. University of Veterinary and animal Sciences Lahore, Pakistan
16. COMSATS Institute of Information Technology
17. Dow University of Health Sciences Karachi
18. Government College university Faisalabad
19. NWFP University of Engineering and Technology , Peshawar
20. Balochistan University of Information Technology and Management Sciences,  
Quetta
21. Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi
22. FRONTIER Women University Peshawar
23. Government College University, Lahore
24. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
25. Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat
26. Mehran University of Eng. & Technology, Jamshoro
27. University of Sindh, Jamshoro
28. University of Arid Agriculture, Murree Road, Rawalpindi
29. Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam
30. Quaid-e-Azam University of Engineering, Science & Technology, Nawabshah

### **3. TRAINING WORKSHOP: The Quality Enhancement Framework in Higher Education**

The subject of Quality in higher education has been a new phenomenon in Pakistan. Realizing this fact the QAA organized a two-day orientation Training Workshop for the staff of Quality Enhancement Cells & Quality Assurance Agency on July 25<sup>th</sup>- 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005 at HEC Islamabad to orient the officers of ten Quality Enhancement Cells regarding Quality assurance process and procedures designed by HEC. The training was designed in such a way that the new incumbents from QEC and QAA were better facilitated in understanding different aspects and strategies of Academic Quality. The main objectives of the course were as under

#### **3.1 Objectives**

- Orientation of QEC's staff on Quality Assurance in higher education
- Identification of expected issues for the implementation of Quality Assurance Agency
- Development of Action Plan for the implementation of Quality Assurance programme in universities.

#### **3.2 Methodology**

The methodology of the training was designed to be highly interactive and participatory. Keeping in view the capacities and capabilities of the participants the following techniques were used:

- Lectures and individual presentations
- Group discussions & Brain storming
- Group work
- Oral presentations

#### **3.3 Resource Persons**

The training was mainly carried out by:

1. Dr. Muhammad Ashraf
2. Air Commodore (Retd) Muhammad Ismail

#### **3.5 Participants**

Following is the list of workshop participants:

1. Prof. Mohammed Sajidin, University of Karachi, Karachi
2. Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad
3. Prof. Dr. Niyaz Ahmed, The University of Punjab, Lahore
4. Prof. Dr. Muhammed Ashraf, Agriculture University, Faisalabad
5. Dr. Abdul Nabi and Data Analyst, University of Baluchistan, Quetta
6. Air Commander Muhammad Ismail, National University of Science and Technology, Rawalpindi

7. Dr. Muhammed Taimur, University of Peshawar, Peshawar
8. Dr. Naeem Ul Haq Qureshi, Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences, Jamshoro Sindh
9. Prof. Dr. Sarwar Ahmed, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad
10. Prof. Dr. Gulam Abbas Anjum, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore
11. Dr. Zafar Iqbal, Allama Iqbal Open University
12. Dr. Muhammed Afzal, NWFP Agriculture University
13. Dr. Muhammed Bashir, University of Sargodha
14. Miss Maryam Ahmad Majoka, Bahauddin Zikriya University Multan
15. Mr. Shahan Azeem, University of Veterinary and animal Sciences Lahore, Pakistan
16. Dr. A.Q. Mughal, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology
17. Dr. Abdul Wahid Usmani, Dow University of Health Sciences Karachi
18. Mr. Azher Majeed, Government College university Faisalabad
19. Dr. Irfan Ullah, NWFP University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar
20. Prof. Dr. Niyaz Ahmed Akhtar, Balochistan University of Information Technology and Management Sciences, Quetta
21. Dr. Uzaira Rafique, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi
22. FRONTIER Women University Peshawar, Ms. Irum Sohail
23. Government College University, Lahore, Mr. khurram Shehzad Azam
24. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Mr. Iqbal Mohammad
25. Nadar Sarfraz, Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat
26. Prof.. Abdul Sami Qureshi, Mehran University of Eng. & Technology, Jamshoro
27. Prof. Dr. Muhammed Sulman Sheikh, University of Sindh, Jamshoro
28. Dr. Rauf-i-Azam, University of Arid Agriculture, Murree Road, Rawalpindi
29. Dr. Allah Baksh Khachiwan, Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam
30. Prof. Dr. Mahammed Memon, Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science & Technology, Nawabshah

However University of Karachi, University of Engineering and Technology Lahore and University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir did not participate

#### **4. TRAINING CONTENTS AND SCHEDULE**

The two-day training workshop was conducted in Seminar Room of CNT building HEC. The training schedule is enclosed as annex: 1

#### **5. PROCEEDINGS**

## Day 1

### SESSION # 1: WELCOME ADDRESS

The session was facilitated by Ms. Fakiha Zafar, Training Coordinator QAA and was inaugurated with recitation of Holy Quran, by Mr Hakim Ali Talpur, Assistant Director, Quality Assurance Department of HEC, followed by a welcome address and briefing about the objectives and schedule of the workshop. later the Training Coordinator introduced the QAA staff and resource persons where as the QECs participants were asked to introduced themselves and were enrolled as well.

### SESSION # 2: INAUGRAL SPEECH

Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi, Adviser (QA&LI) builds up the concepts of the participants about the training workshop by introducing the purpose and objectives of the workshop. Also a short introduction of the quality assurance program of HEC was highlighted

### SESSION # 3: SELF ASSESSMENT MANUAL ( part 1).

Dr. Muhammad Ashraf is HEC Distinguished National Professor, Dean, Faculty of Sciences at University of Agriculture, Faisalabad . he earned his Ph.D degree from Liverpool UK in 1986 and availed post doctorate training as a Fulbright scholar from the University of Arizona Tucson, USA in 1994. He is a Fellow of Pakistan Academy of Sciences as well as of Third World Academy of Sciences, Italy. His more than 200 research papers have been published in foreign journals having impact factor. His **citation index** is over 350 and **impact factor** 140.

Recognizing his outstanding performance/achievements the President of Pakistan awarded him with the awards of:

**Izaz-e-Fazilat,**

**Pride of Performance and**

**Sitar-e-Imtiaz**

In recent years it has become an obligation that institutions of higher education demonstrate the effectiveness of their academic programs in providing high quality education that positively impacts students. Furthermore, most accrediting bodies and others concerned with quality assurance are requesting that institutions assess students' learning outcomes as a means of improving academic programs. This has led The Higher Education Commission (HEC) to develop methods for assessing the quality of academic program.

Assessment is a systematic process of gathering, reviewing and using important quantitative and qualitative data and information from multiple and diverse sources about educational programs, for the purpose of improving student learning, and evaluating whether academic and learning standards are being met. The process culminates when assessment results are used to improve student learning. A successful assessment program includes the following:

1. Purpose identification
2. Outcomes identification
3. Measurements and evaluation design
4. Data collection
5. Analysis and evaluation
6. Decision-making regarding actions to be taken.

The purpose of this document is to outline the process of conducting self-assessment (SA) of academic programs. It is HEC that requires universities to conduct periodic self- assessment for its academic programs in order to improve them and ensure high academic standards. Self-assessment is an important tool for academic quality assurance and provides feedback for faculty and administration to initiate action plans for improvement.

This document is organized as follows: Section 2 states the objectives of self-assessment, followed by the procedure for self assessment in Section 3 and Section 4 presents the criteria for self assessment.

### **Objectives**

The objectives of self-assessment are to:

- 2.1. Maintain and continuously enhance academic standards +
- 2.2. Enhance students' learning
- 2.3. Verify that the existing programs meet their objectives and institutional goals
- 2.4. Provide feedback for quality assurance of academic programs
- 2.5. Prepare the academic program for review by discipline councils

---

### **3. SELF- ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE**

---

In this section the procedure for conducting a self-assessment is described. Each academic program shall undergo a self-assessment (SA) every two years (assessment cycle). The Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) is responsible for planning, coordinating and following up on the self-assessment (SA) activities. The steps of the procedure for SA are as follows:

- 3.1 The QEC initiates the SA one semester prior to the end of the assessment cycle through the Vice Chancellor / Rector Office in which the program is offered. However,

- if the program is undergoing the SA for the first time, the department will be given one academic year for preparation.
- 3.2 Upon receiving the initiation letter the department shall form a program team (PT). The PT will be responsible for preparing a self-assessment report (SAR) about the program under consideration *over a period of one semester*. They will be the contact group during the assessment period.
  - 3.3 The department shall submit the SAR to the QEC through the concerned Dean. The QEC reviews the SAR *within one month* to ensure that it is prepared according to the required format.
  - 3.4 The Vice Chancellor / Rector forms a program assessment team (AT) in consultation with the QEC recommendations *within one month*. The AT comprises of 2-3 faculty members from within or outside the university. The AT must have at least one expert in the area of the assessed program.
  - 3.5 The QEC plans and schedules the AT visit period in coordination with the department that is offering the program.
  - 3.6 The AT conducts the assessment, submits a report and presents its findings in an exit meeting that shall be attended by the QEC, Dean and PT and faculty members.
  - 3.7 The QEC shall submit an executive summary on the AT findings to the Vice Chancellor / Rector.
  - 3.8 The Department shall prepare and submit an implementation plan to QEC based on the AT findings. The plan must include AT findings and the corrective actions to be taken, assignment of responsibility and a time frame for such actions. Table A.2 in Appendix A provides a format for preparing a summary of the implementation plan.
  - 3.9 The QEC shall follow up on the implementation plan to ensure departments are adhering to the implementation plan. The academic department shall inform the QEC each time a corrective action is implemented. QEC shall review the implementation plan once a semester to assess the progress of implementation. Table A.2 will provide the QEC with guidelines for monitoring the implementation.

## **Criteria**

Program Mission Objectives and Outcomes .....	6
4.2 Curriculum Design and Organization .....	9
4.3 Laboratories and Computing Facilities .....	12
4.4 Student Support and Guidance .....	13
4.5 Faculty .....	14

4.6	Process Control .....	15
4.7	Institutional Facilities .....	17
4.8	Institutional Support	

The self-assessment is based on several criteria. To meet each criterion a number of standards must be satisfied. This section describes each criterion and its associated standards

### **SESSION # 3: OVERVIEW OF THE QAA PROJECT**

Mr. Tahseen Ullah, Programme Coordinator, QAA gave an overview of the project in light of the PC1 approved. The Programme Coordinator gave a short briefing to the participants about the History and Justification of the project, its mission, vision, goals and objectives in qualitative and quantitative terms, Capital cost of the Project, Time of completion of the project, Organizational Set up and its activities planned for future smooth running of the Project. A copy of PC1 was also disseminated among the participants.

### **SESSION # 4: QUALITY ENHANCEMENT FRAMEWORK**

Dr. Amir Hussain, a Consultant for QA Programme, presented a guideline for the establishment of Quality Enhancement Framework during the workshop. The consultant briefed that the Quality Assurance Agency plans to work with all key stakeholders in order to develop a new approach to quality i.e. the Quality Enhancement Framework. The QEF is the proposed all-inclusive term that will be used to cover the various aspects of the new model. A brief discussion was held among participants about the five proposed elements to this new approach, namely:

1. External Institutional-level review termed as '**Enhancement-led institutional review**' (Discussed in session 1 of workshop)
2. Two-yearly internal Subject/Departmental/Program level review (termed '**Internal Department/Subject Review**'), to be run by the Institutions themselves (via their Quality Enhancement Cells, QECs) with the help of External QAA approved/trained Reviewers. (The guidelines for the annual Departmental Self-Evaluations were discussed in sessions 5 and 6 of the Workshop.)
3. Improved forms of **Public information on quality of Higher Education**, based on addressing the different needs of a range of stakeholders including students and employers via the QECs & the QAA. (Discussed in session 11 of the Workshop)

4. A national programme of developing and sharing good practice in learning and teaching in higher education (HE) termed as '**quality enhancement themes**') supported by the QECs and managed by the QAA (Session 1).

5. Clear and explicit standards for Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) (termed '**academic infrastructure**') which currently include:

- The HEC Approved/Revised National Curriculum guidelines
- QAA draft guidelines for assuring Quality & Standards
- Reports and publications from the HEC LI and NAHE on teaching & learning criteria and standards

And in the future, may include:

- HEC National Subject Benchmark Standards, HEC National Qualifications Framework & Programme Specifications
- HEC QAA & LI Approved 'University Teaching Standards'
- And the HEC QAA Code of Practice.

The proposed elements of the new framework were discussed in different session of the training and were developed by the HEC QAA in consultation with various stakeholders. (Document attached as Annex :1)

## **1. Enhancement-led institutional review**

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) is peer review process which, will begin in the second operational phase of the QAA and will cover all the Pakistan Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) over a four year cycle. It will focus on the strategic management of enhancement; the effectiveness of student learning; the use of a range of reference points including the future QAA *Code of practice* and HEC Approved National Curriculum guidelines; appropriate reference to employer and international perspectives; and, published report. Dr Amir explained the themes which have under pinned the development of the proposed approach. The proposed ELIR process will consist of four integrated elements: an annual discussion with each institution; once in the cycle, the submission of a Reflective Analysis (RA) document; a review visit following the submission of the RA; and, each year, sector-wide feedback on the learning points from ELIR activity across the sector.

## **2. Quality enhancement themes**

The facilitator briefed that these themes are hoped to be launched in 2005/6 and the aims of the HEC QAA Enhancement Theme engagements will be to identify, share and disseminate good practice in teaching and learning, and to focus on areas where development is required to promote the continuous enhancement of the student experience in Pakistan Higher Education. Each year, one or two particular themes will be identified on which the sector wishes to

focus enhancement activities for the next academic year.

### **3. Institutional responsibility for subject review**

Dr. Amir stated that as part of the HEC Quality Enhancement Framework, a robust system of subject/program with the help of external QAA trained Reviewers/ Advisers is required to be operated. The Subject Review will usually be incorporated as part of a University's internal Departmental Review process. The QAA will have an annual dialogue with each University on the arrangements and outcomes of internal reviews at the subject/Dept. level. Each University will also provide the QAA with an annual summary report on its internal quality assurance arrangements.

### **4. Public information set**

In the proposed program HEI's have to be responsible to provide appropriate information for stakeholders, and the public, on relevant matters about the nature, quality and standards. Initial guidance on the approach which institutions should take on the provision of information about the quality of learning and teaching was discussed. It was decided that all the information (review report, drafts, brief information) will be provided on wed.

### **5. Academic Infrastructure**

Dr Amir briefed that the 'academic infrastructure' will comprise the various elements that will be developed by the HEC QAA and other bodies to define clear and explicit standards for HEIs, as follows:

(i) National Subject Benchmark Standards: to set out general expectations about standards of degrees in a range of subject areas.

(ii) National Qualifications Framework: to provide a national vocabulary for describing learning opportunities and thereby make the relationships between qualifications clearer

(iii) Programme Specifications: provide a concise description of a programme of study, to make the outcomes of learning more explicit, and promote discussion within the HE teaching community about outcome standards in different educational contexts

(iv). Code of Practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in Higher Education were also discussed among the participants

## **SESSION # 5& 6: DEPARTMENTAL SELF EVALUATION (Part I& II)**

Dr. Amir Hussain presented guideline on Institutional Mechanisms for Assuring Academic Quality & Standards with a focus on Departmental Self-Evaluation & Internal departmental Review". During his presentation the Resource person discussed the following issues:

The Self-Evaluation is of fundamental importance to the University's Internal Dept. Review process, in setting the context and identifying issues for discussion. It should provide a holistic review of all aspects of a Department's operations. Including:

- a. Strategy & Organization
- b. Learning & Teaching for both undergraduate & post-graduate
- c. Research
- d. Resourcing factors

It was proposed that each University's Internal Review processes should comprise:

- I. Module review, including use of a core set of questions for student module evaluations;
- II. Annual academic programme monitoring which will include a student (programme) completion survey, providing feedback at programme level and on the overall student experience (at the University);
- III. Annual Departmental Self-Evaluation (incorporating academic programme review, (i) & (ii) above)
- IV. Periodic University conducted internal Departmental review/audit (based on the Dept. Self- Evaluation)

Also the roles & Responsibilities of the various parties that can contribute to the university's quality assurance and enhancement were presented by Dr.

Amir in this session. (Annex: 2)

## **SESSION # 7: SUMMING UP OF THE DAY 1 PROCEEDINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS FO THE NEXT DAY GROUP WORK**

At the end of the day participants were provided with the training evolution forms by the Training Coordinator. Ms. Zia Batool assisted in making groups of the participants by giving the names Pen, Paper and Book to every alternate member. The participants were assigned tasks at the end sessions and were asked to make preparations for the presentation on the next day.

1. Individual presentations on:
  - a. Success factors involved in the process of QA and
  - b. Risks involved
  - c. How to strengthen it  
(Random selection of two participants for presentation)

2. Group presentation
  - a. Academic/ Professional bodies involved in QA process of universities/DAIs
  - b. Hierarchy of the above mentioned bodies
  - c. Quality Assurance processes/Roles and Responsibilities

List of the group members is attached

<b>Pen I</b>	<b>Paper II</b>	<b>Book III</b>
Mr. Shakeel Ahmed	Dr. Abdul Nabi	Mr. Irfan
Mr. Raheel Khan	Dr Naeem	Dr. Aslam Baig
Mr. Jamshaid Ikram	Mr.Tahseen Ullah	Dr. Abdur Rehman Tahir
Mr.Faqeer Hussain	Mr. Ejaz Ahmed	Mr. Nadeem Ahmed Bhatti
Brig. Mohammed Saleem		

## Day 2

### SESSION # 8: INDIVIDAL & GROUP WORK PESENTATIONS

The second day Proceeded with the preparation by the individuals and groups.

#### Group presentations

All three groups presented the assigned tasks in the form of oral presentation and the session was ended up with brain storming and discussions.

#### 1. GROUP I

Dr. Mohammed Arfan, Director QEC Peshawar, on behalf of the group, presented a model by using the existing bodies in universities (such as Board of studies, Academic Council, Alumni Office etc).According to their model, the responsibilities under Board of studies will be:

1. Departmental strategic plan , curriculum revision and updating
2. Teaching and learning strategic plan, Assessment plan, Academic program approval, Monitoring and Review Mechanism
3. Research strategic plan
4. Community Engagement plan
5. Internationalization action plan

The report for these activities will be submitted to the respective committee of the university and to the Faculty Board. These bodies will report to Dean QA. The Deans Council will finalize the report with comments and will forward it to the Academic Council (advisory body) and HEC. The group leader shared his experience in Peshawar University with participants to discuss that majority of the procedures are already in line in the university. (Model attached as Annex: 3)

## **2. GROUP II**

Mr. Shakeel Ahmed presented a model on Quality Enhancement Framework procedures. According to this model the information on academic related activities i.e. curriculum, conduct and execution, Self assessment, the faculty and student alumni feedback goes to BOS which will prepare a report and pass it on to the Faculty Board and then to QEC. The QEC will update the statutory bodies (Senate, Syndicate, and Academic Council). The information passes to VC and then finally to QAA. (Model attached as annex: 4)

### **Roles and responsibilities**

- To support ,assist , guide and enable BOS to prepared plans for development and growth for quality Higher education
- To evaluate, monitor and follow up the process of conduct and development
- To prepare reports on the basis of BOS information regarding development and growth/ improvement link between HEC/QAA and university.

## **3. GROUP III**

Dr. Naeem Qurashi from Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences shared the group views about Hierarchy of Academic/ Professional bodies involved in QA process of universities/DAI along with their roles and responsibilities.

### **Hierarchy of Academic/ Professional bodies involved in QA process of universities/DAI**

The group suggested that the QEC:

- Should be a separate cell with functional linkages with all quality concern bodies within and outside university.
- Should have an immediate Deputy In charge capable to run all ongoing activities in absence of the Dean.
- Should be directly responsible to the V.C but need to consult Deans/ Heads of department, key persons of academic units for all sort of decision making.
- Should occupy the secretary's chair in Teaching Learning Committee of the university V.C should chair the committee.
- Should be established under the legislative process to continuity and to delegate it necessary authority for implementation

### **Role and Responsibility**

1. QEC should play advisory role on quality issue
2. QEC should be responsible for:

- Need assessment of the departments, programs and university as a whole regarding quality enhancement
- Developing, suggesting and facilitating appropriate quality enhancement processes and procedures
- Periodical impact evaluation of QA/E program activities
- The development of strategic plans regarding quality enhancement of target areas.
- To develop, define quality standards for university, to make them appropriate according to local norms and fine tune them according to lessons learnt during practical application of these standards.
- For orientation/ training and capacity building of university staff regarding quality enhancement issues

### **General Comments during presentations**

During the workshop the participants suggested that:

- The Dean, students and faculty members should be involved in the process of academic quality assurance.
- These systems are already established and the present setup will not cause clash
- The long chain processes should be avoided. The decision making channel should be shortened
- Dr. Amir suggested that each university should prepare such model and then share with HEC.
- A staff person next to Dean may be appointed to look after the QEC activities during the absence of the Dean in activities other than QEC.
- Legal status of the QECs should be strengthened.

### **Individual presentations**

Following assumptions and risks were identified through individual presentations

#### **Assumptions about process of Quality Assurance**

- The proposed QA program will bring better quality of education and research in universities
- It will promote the trust and confidence of the students, families, masses, institutions, organizations, government and of local and international markets in the higher education system of Pakistan.
- It will enhance the knowledge and skill standards and thus will improve the services and productivity qualities with tangible economical property

- It will positively impact on primary and secondary education system.
- It will facilitate transfer of high technology and advance knowledge from advanced countries
- Meeting its criteria and standards, the steps of QA will no doubt improve the learning environment in higher education institutions.
- The internal evaluation of curriculum, students and faculty would involve various activities (academic) that would enhance the quality of education.
- QEC will have positive impact on university management to come out of pressure mounted by different quarters for favoritism.
- QEC as monitoring body will streamline rules and help other statutory bodies about the proper management of affiliated Institutions

#### **Risks involved in the process of Quality Assurance**

- The beneficiary institutions may not realize the importance of the program
- Some quality concerned bodies like Board of Advanced studies, Board of Studies, Academic Councils, Academic committee ,Registration and licensing authorities etc may find it challenging / rival to their authority
- May rise the expectations of the students, university management, faculties, masses etc beyond the purview of QA Program
- May rise conflict between faculty and university or between universities and HEC
- May be left half way due to shortage of funds, shifting of priorities, change of management etc.
- Non availability of data e.g.; Employers survey, Alumni survey, Poor feedback statement by the students who accomplish the program
- Poor response of the faculty on self assessment for implementation
- Elected representation in the statutory bodies
- Us model on self assessment is simple and do not contradict with the existing statutory bodies.

#### **Suggestions for improvement**

- A uniform examination system needs to be followed for implementing self assessment procedures.
- A uniform curriculum for Bachelors and Masters program is required
- HEC/QAA needs to stress for good governance through Chancellors/Vice Chancellors
- External assessment of Higher Education Institutions by HEC/QAA on self assessment program
- Protection of QECs through Act or Ordinance
- Recruitment of full time professionals to lead the QECs in the universities through transparent interview and presentations based selection process.

### **SESSION # 9: RANKING OF UNIVERSITIES**

Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi, Adviser (QA &LI) briefed the participants about the Ranking Criteria for Universities. The parameters of the Ranking criteria i.e. Faculty, Research output, Student, Facilities Available, Finance were discussed in detail. Participants were briefed about the methods of measurements of each parameter and about data base used for ranking. The impact factors, Pros and cons of the process were also discussed.

(See Annex: 5)

### **SESSION #10: INTERNAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW**

Dr. Amir presented the guidelines for University's Internal Departmental Review process. Dr. Amir stated that given the primary responsibility to Departments for quality of provision and the maintenance of academic standards, the rolling program of internal Departmental Reviews should be a major element of the HEI/University's quality strategy (in accordance with the HEC QAA's Quality Enhancement Framework). Internal Departmental Reviews should be conducted on a 2 year cycle. The Departmental Review should provide a mechanism for a review of all aspects of a Department's operations: Organization and Strategy, Learning and Teaching, Research and Resources. The Review process should be revised regularly to take account of future guidance from the HEC QAA for Internal Subject/Dept. Review. The resource person also briefed about:

1. Aims & Purpose of the Internal Departmental Review
2. The Internal Department Review Process
3. The Department self Evaluation Document
4. Supporting Documentation
5. The Internal Department Review

(Annex: 2)

## **SESSION #11: ISO 9000**

Dr Husnain Seyad is a visiting professor from Comsats Institute Islamabad. Based on the vast experience he was invited to brief the participants about the concepts and approaches for ISO 9000. Following are the contents the resource person briefed about

- What is quality?; Quality in an organization and its appropriate definitions ;Quality dimensions namely (Quality of design: Quality of conformance: Quality of use )
- TQM; Principles of TQM; Quality assurance
- ISO 9001: Definitions; Scope and field of application; Quality system requirements; Management responsibilities; Quality system
- ISO 9000 ;functions of ISO 9000; commitments in a company; functions of ISO 9000 after implementation ; pre requisites of ISO 9000 registration ; misconceptions of ISO 9000

(Details attached in Annex: 6)

## **SESSION #12: PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON QUALITY**

The HEC QAA has proposed (for public consultation) a new approach to quality assurance and enhancement, termed the Quality Enhancement Framework. A central feature of which is the role given to public information about the quality of provision. Institutions should also take account of the wider context of public information, especially the implications of any related legislation. Dr. Amir advised guidelines to institutions' QECs on the publication of information about quality under the following headings

1. Key Principles of Public Information
2. Specification of Information
3. Who are the users of public information about quality?
4. What needs do different users have for information about quality?
  - A: Prospective students
  - B: Current Students
  - C: Employers and Employer Organizations
  - D: Professional & Accreditation Bodies
  - E. The HEC and QAA

(Annex: 7 attached)

## **6. PARTICIPANTS FEED BACK/ EVALUATION**

### **Evaluation**

The participants evaluated the overall session performance of the external resource person as below:

PARAMETERS	SCALE							
	Fully	5	4	3	2	1	Not	Didn't

	met						met	respond
Overall objectives			60%	40%				
Learning experience		20%	30%	50%				
Relevance to your training needs	10%	20%	30%	30%				10%
Expertise of the Resource Person		60%	30%		10%			
Command on the subject		50%	30%	10%				10%
Consistency		20%	30%	40%	10%			
Overall learning		20%	40%	30%	10%			
Answer to the questions		30%	40%	20%				10%

\* The column on the right shows the parameters, the first row explains the scale of satisfaction and the percentages represent the participants grading .Two participants did not give feedback .

### Suggestions

- Dr. Naeem Qurashi, Director (P&D), Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences and Dr. Faqir Hussain ,Associate Professor, (Agriculture University Faisalabad, suggested that it was a big agenda for a two days workshop however the workshop duration should have been prolonged up to at least one week.
- Brig. M. Saleem, Director (Exam & Aced.) and Mr. Nadeem Ahmed Bhatti, Chairman, MBE, University of Punjab, praised the HEC's effort and comprehensive practical presentation by Dr. Amir Hussain. They suggested that there is a need to adopt the proposed Model (UK) of Quality Enhancement based on learning experience of the resource person (Dr. Amir) to the learning environment of our country and society, our needs in public, private, industry and cultural/social aspect. The proposed model/concept is needed to be re-developed suiting our requirements.
- Dr. Abdur Rehman Tahir, Chairman, Agriculture University Faisalabad, said that the vision and mission of QAA seems to be clear however the workshop was rather a group discussion meeting to exchange views. No modern theories were presented as reflected in the title. Therefore, in future workshop should be arranged with clear and systematic work plan keeping in view universities statutory bodies.

- Dr. M. Baig Professor of Physics, Quaid Azam University, suggested that more universities should be involved in this program
- Dr. Mohammed Hafeez, Professor, Deptt. of Sociology, University of Punjab, appreciated the idea of establishment of QEC . The workshop is a good effort but it could have been better prepared. Dr. Hafeez suggested the following sequence for the workshop like: What is quality education; Relevance and efficiency of education; Local/regional needs of education; How minimum standards of education are developed; What are the mechanisms through which minimum standards are assured; What are the possible bodies which could assure minimum standards of education; data generation ways and techniques/ formats; use of data to improve quality of education; Feedback to the concerned authorities within the universities and to HEC.

## 6. FUTURE ACTION PLAN

HEC QAA Proposed the following stages of QA system development and implementation to the QECs for their Action points/targets until the Sep Workshop

1. Establishment of a Quality Enhancement Cell with appropriate full-time Staff
2. Development of effective (HEC QAA approved) internal QA mechanisms/ procedures (via QECs) for generating, considering and acting upon feedback from students at Course ,Academic Program & University level, critical review by faculty at both Course & Academic Program level. As part of the workshop follow up action plan, the first stage Quality Assurance and Enhancement mechanism in all departments should be introduced through following proformas:
  - a. Student Course Evaluation/Feedback Questionnaire
  - b. Faculty Course Review Report
  - c. Student Program Completion/Graduation Survey.
  - d. Program Monitoring Report.
  - e. PhD/MPhil Research Student Progress Review Form
3. The QECs can modify or adapt these Proforma (or integrate them with any of your existing Proforma that may currently be in use) to meet their Institution's and Departments' individual requirements
4. Development of a central University Learning & Teaching Committee (or equivalent) with Institutional responsibility for quality assurance, quality enhancement and maintenance of academic standards
5. Development (via the QEC & the University Learning Teaching Committee) of an (HEC QAA approved ) draft “ Academic Quality Guide” (or equivalent) for Faculty members(comprising an organizational Chart and Committee structure, an outline of Institutional Roles and Responsibilities and authority of different bodies

- within university and a summary of the institutional Mechanisms for assuring academic quality and standards)
6. Appointment and capacity building (with HEC assistance) of a Departmental Quality Officer
  7. The QECs should organize at regular internal (HEC QAA accredited) Orientation and Training Workshops in QA processes and procedures (focusing on effective Teaching, Learning & Assessment) for all Department Faculty members (involved in teaching).
  8. Development (via the University Learning & Teaching Committee) of an (HEC QAA approved) “Academic Quality Handbook/Guide” (or equivalent) for all Faculty members (comprising an Organization Chart and Committee structure, an outline of Institutional Roles and Responsibilities and a Summary of the Institution’s internal Mechanisms for assuring academic Quality & Standards).
  9. Each Department conducting an annual Self-Evaluation (approved by the HEC QAA) and submitting satisfactory Annual Self-Evaluation Reports to the HEC QAA (via their QEC)
  10. Each Department should be internally audited/ reviewed by the University every two years with the help of QAA approved and trained External Advisors/Reviewers.
  11. University’s (voluntary) inclusion in QAA’s rolling 4-year schedule for external Institutional quality audits.
  12. Timely and accurate publication of qualitative and quantitative information on the quality of educational provision
  13. Submission of quarterly progress report and a detailed annual report to the HEC QAA outlining the progress
  14. Optional use of other external institutional Quality Audits/Reviews (for example, ISO9000 etc)