



**NASIR SHAH**

Director General (QAA/QAD)

# HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

H-9, Islamabad (Pakistan), Phone: (051) 90402700 Fax: (051) 90402702

Ref No. 96-3/HITECH/QAA(IPE)/HEC/2022/2663  
February 08, 2023

**Subject: Report of Institutional Performance Evaluation (IPE) of HITECH University, Taxila**

**Respected Dr. Kamran S. Afaq,** السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

Reference is made to the IPE review visit of your university on 21<sup>st</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2022. The performance of an HEI is evaluated through a peer review process from all aspects i.e., quality of Teaching & Learning, research, effectiveness of leadership and governance. The objective is to promote good governance and improve the quality of education and research in higher education institutions (HEIs). These IPE standards have been developed in line with the best practices adopted by international quality assurance bodies and universities across the world.

02. The primary goal of Institutional Review is to enable institutions to collaboratively reflect on the university's roles and activities considering the eleven IPE standards, with the goal of making potential improvements to the present system.

03. Forgoing in view, I am pleased to share the IPE report of your university along with Compliance Implementation Plan Template (CIPT-Sample) and Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOI) for compliance in terms that:

- i. The University/DAI should constitute a Compliance Implementation Plan Committee (CIPC), preferably comprising of Deans/equivalent members, including Director QEC. The Committee shall be chaired by the VC/Rector.
- ii. A list of Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOI) is given under each standard which may be used as ToR for the committee to guide through compliance and improvement.
- iii. The Committee should prepare CIP in coordination with the respective offices, with timelines against the recommendations/observations of the report. The CIP shall be placed before the highest competent forum of the University/Institute viz. Senate/Syndicate/BOG (as applicable) for endorsement.
- iv. The approved CIP and notification of the above-mentioned committee should also be placed on the official website of the University and its web link should be shared with QAA HEC at the earliest possible convenience.

04. We anticipate that, under your leadership, the University will execute these recommendations in a manner that ensures the internalization of a quality culture and, as a result, allows the institution to produce graduates with the necessary skills to contribute meaningfully to society's elevation.

(Nasir Shah)

**The Vice Chancellor**

HITECH University, Taxila

**Copy for information to:**

- Executive Secretary to Chairman, HEC, Islamabad
- Executive Secretary to Executive Director, HEC, Islamabad
- Director QEC, HITECH University, Taxila
- Registrar, HITECH University, Taxila
- Office copy

## Compliance Implementation Plan Template (CIPT) for IPE

Name of Institution:

Composition of CIP Committee:

S#	Recommendations of IPE Report	Actions/tasks Proposed by the CIP Committee	Timeline to accomplish actions/tasks	Focal Person

\*Pls add pages as per given format

Submitted by the Convener/Secretary of CIP Committee

Date of submission

Approved by the Vice Chancellor





## Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOI)

### Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOIs) against IPE Standards:

QAA extends maximum effort to make the entire IPE activities follow the true spirit of the Peer Review process. Accordingly, a robust Review Panel is constituted consisting of senior academicians and professionals to make the site visit of the university. The Review Panel after the 3 days visit – which included Documentation Review, Interaction session with all the stakeholders i.e. faculty, students, administration, and Site/infrastructure visit- prepares the final Draft of the IPE Report. The Draft Report contains best practices (if any), Findings, and comprehensive recommendations, against the 11 standards, to bring improvement in the HEI.

Thus the entire IPE process culminates into the IPE Report and the implementation of this Report, in the true spirit, is expected to take the HEI forward towards creating the following impact as the **Ultimate Outcome** of the entire process.

- ✓ Sensitize HEIs to take initiatives to meet the needs of society, engender public confidence, and sustain the trust of the public at large.
- ✓ Sensitize HEIs to take initiatives with an institutional mechanism to design the research activities and teaching principles in such a way that students and teachers can contribute in addressing the pressing local and global issues & challenges.

Although the IPE Review processes are performed, by the Peer Reviewers, with due diligence and professional care against the 11 IPE standards. These standards usually require obtaining reasonable assurance about the documentary evidence, provided by the HEI, being free of any misstatement. Nonetheless, despite putting in utmost efforts by the Review Panel, to verify documents/information provided, it is somehow near to impossible to review the entire activities of the HEI mainly due to inherent limitations of the peer-review process and the limited availability of time for an exhaustive review.

Therefore, to achieve the **aforsaid Ultimate Outcome**, the university **Statutory Forums/Authorities** - including Syndicate/Academic Council, **Vice-Chancellor, Registrar**, Deans, HODs, etc.- having primary responsibility of **improving quality**, must go beyond external review and utilize the IPE Report as a context and pretext to meet following expectation/KPIs against each Standard. For this purpose the University may treat the following elements as TOR for the **Compliance Implementation Plan Committee (CIPC)** so that these Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOI) together with the recommendations of the IPE report could bring the desired level of Quality for making a meaningful contribution towards the **Ultimate Outcome**:

### 1. Mission Statement and Goals:

- a. **Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOIs):**
  - i. The institutions' mission and goals should be consistent with its charter
  - ii. It should serve as the foundation for all the activities
  - iii. It should provide directions for future plans of the HEI so that a relevant, effective and coherent ecosystem for excellence could be developed.





## 2. Planning & Evaluation:

### a. Expectation & Outcome Indicators (EOIs):

- i. The institution should have a strong mechanism to plan, develop and review the available **A). Infrastructure, B). Financial and C). Academic or D). Resources for Extracurricular activities** to ensure the availability of adequate means and arrangements to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

## 3. Organization and Governance:

- i. The system of Organization & Governance in the university should be responsive to the present and future needs of the organization.
- ii. The system should be consistent with the power and functions and other requirements given in the Charter.
- iii. The system should exercise prudence in policy development and decision-making processes in the best interests of all the stakeholders in general and that of students in particular.
- iv. The system should have elements of good governance such as rule of law, accountability, effectiveness & efficiency, transparency, equity, and inclusion.

## 4. Integrity:

- i. The institution must have a mechanism in place that promotes essential elements of **Integrity** in each actor within the organization and in their interaction as well as that of the dominating norms, activities, decision-making procedures. The essential elements of Integrity are Honesty, respect, generating trust, pride, responsibility, keeping promises, creating an environment of support within the organization and beyond.

## 5. Faculty (Faculty Quality, Capacity Building & Support Services):

- i. The institution should ensure to recruit, retain and develop a body of faculty that could serve the institutional purpose of providing:
  - a. A quality learning opportunity for the students and
  - b. To promote research that serves the community and the country.
- ii. The institution should provide necessary support and facilitation to the faculty that include mechanisms to continuously provide training and capacity building of the faculty.
- iii. The university should have an institutional mechanism to provide necessary facilities and support to the faculty for career development and retention of quality faculty.

## 6. Students:

- i. The Institution pursues to admit students whose academic interests, educational goals, potentials, and abilities are compatible with its mission.
- ii. The university should have an institutional mechanism to enroll, retain and develop a body of students against a set procedure and provide them with a quality learning opportunity that could produce highly skilled and responsible global citizens.







**7. Institutional Resources:**

- i. The institution should have a strong mechanism to plan, develop and review the available infrastructure, financial and other academic or non-academic resources to ensure the availability of adequate means and arrangements to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.
- ii. The University should collaborate with other partner research and teaching organizations for effective utilization of its resources.

**8. Academic Programs and Curricula:**

- i. The academic programs and curricula should have elements that support students to learn and excel in the subject skills that could make the qualification at par with that of similar international qualifications.
- ii. It should also inculcate universal academic skills such as Critical thinking, Creativity, Collaboration, Communication, and Commitment.
- iii. The university should have a mechanism to regularly evaluate the quality of the curricula and system of evaluations vis à vis learning outcomes of the program and generate a program-wise report for continuous improvement.
- iv. The university should automate the mechanism of collecting, reviewing, and analyzing periodic data to track the achievements of the graduates and maintain reliability and validity of the result, the system of the exam, and the testimony about the students' skills and competence.

**9. Public Disclosures & Transparency:**

- i. The Institution should ensure the availability of a transparent mechanism where all the stakeholders, particularly students and faculty have access to not only decisions made but also to the processes & procedures of decision making.
- ii. It should have necessary policies in place to instill the element of integrity and fairness in its institutional system of teaching, learning, assessment, research, and publications.
- iii. Should also ensure availability of fair and transparent procedures for handling issues, complaints, and appeals which are accessible to all; students, faculty, and administration.

**10. Assessment & Quality Assurance (Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment & Evaluation):**

- i. The institution should have mechanisms in place to ensure continuous institutional improvement through its rules & regulations and activities related to faculty teaching, student learning, educational programs, and administrative and educational support services, with an Ultimate Outcome of providing students, a high-quality learning experience and attaining nationally/internationally comparable qualifications and awards.
- ii. The university should have a well-defined quality policy that could have a mechanism of continuous quality improvement such as elements of the plan, do, check, and act in all the decision-making processes.





**11. Student Support Services (Students Learning Opportunities & Support Services):**

- i. The university should have an institutional mechanism to include the voice of the students in the decision-making processes.
- ii. The university should have a mechanism for developmental and remedial learning opportunities particularly in the areas that are critically relevant to their future success.
- iii. The university should have an institutional mechanism and defined forums to resolve students' grievances.
- iv. There has to be a well-defined institutional mechanism in place to ensure the availability of equal opportunity and resources for extracurricular activities for all the students.
- v. The university must provide necessary basic quality services such as availability of spacious, neat, and clean cafeteria with appropriate seating arrangement, library facilities with ample book collections, and seating places.





YEAR 2022-23

# IPE REPORT

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY (QAA)



Higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan

<https://www.hec.gov.pk>





## QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY (QAA), PAKISTAN

### IPE Review Report of HITEC University, Taxila

Panel # P-158



---

HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION (HEC), ISLAMABAD







## INTRODUCTION

The IPE Review visit of **HITEC University, Taxila** was conducted on **21-22-23 December, 2022** on the basis of eleven IPE Standards Mission Statement and Goals, Planning and Evaluation, Organization and Governance, Integrity, Faculty, Student, Institutional Resources, Academic Programs and Curricula, Public Disclosure & Transparency, Assessment and Quality Assurance and Student Support Services. Prior to the team visit, **HITEC University, Taxila** prepared University Portfolio Report (UPR) on the guidelines provided by QAA-HEC. This also included a series of responses to the queries related to each of the eleven standards. During the visit of the university, the Panel physically examined the infrastructural facilities, acquainted itself with the institutional resources and held discussions with the faculty members, administrative officials and students. The UPR prepared by the university facilitated the job of the Panel to a great extent.

The efforts exerted in preparation of the UPR and cooperation extended by all the administrative and academic officials are gratefully acknowledged. The **Vice Chancellor and the team** have facilitated the review panel and held elaborate discussion on matters related to the functioning of the university and enhancing the quality of teaching and research.

All the Review Panel Members have exercised their utmost capacity to find out most relevant information and evidence and thus provided their judgement based on their enormous experience and insight of the sector. The Reviewers encouraged all the stakeholders to speak up for improvement of the institution through their candid feedbacks to ensure institutional transparency in the decision-making processes. We expect that the university will not only appreciate the students, faculty, and staff for their candid approach during interactive sessions but also will ensure institutional mechanism to internalize element of transparency at all levels.

During the three days documentation review, interactive sessions and onsite visit, the Reviewers not only identified areas of concerns but also proposed actionable recommendations.

We hope the University will implement these recommendations in their true spirit that will contribute into improving institutional quality that eventually enable institution to produce graduates with relevant skill to make meaningful contribution in uplifting society.

IPE Panel was comprised of following members:

- **Prof. Dr. Moazzam Ali Khan**, Professor, Quaid e Azam University, Islamabad
- **Prof. Dr. Saeed Buzdar**, Dean, Islamia University, Bahawalpur
- **Prof. Dr. Ilahi Bakhsh Margazani**, Professor, LUAWMS, Lasbela, Balochistan
- **Dr. Huma Ayub**, Director QEC, Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi,
- **Mr. Wisal Khalil**, Director QEC, GIKI, Swabi





## 1 STANDARD: MISSION STATEMENT AND GOALS

### 1.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 1.1.1 The university's vision and mission statement were framed during the early days of the university.

### 1.2 FINDINGS:

- 1.2.1 The vision and mission statements were outlined almost 12 years back and never revised till date. The university has not taken any initiative to review/update the mission and vision statements.
- 1.2.2 Most of the administrative & academic staff and students are not aware of the understanding of the philosophy behind the mission and vision statements. Therefore, it does not guide them to develop programs and learning objectives accordingly.
- 1.2.3 The goals of the university are not documented.

### 1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1.3.1 The university should constitute a committee to review the mission and vision statements and update it accordingly. The recommendations of the committee should be shared with all stakeholders for clarity before approval from the statutory bodies.
- 1.3.2 The goals of the university may be framed according to the vision and mission statements of the university and may be approved from the statutory bodies, each Department should update their vision mission for each program and display it on the website and appropriate places.
- 1.3.3 University may devise institutional mechanisms to ensure all the academic programs and institutional activities are aligned with the revised vision & mission statements of the university after pre-defined period.







## 2 STANDARD: PLANNING AND EVALUATION

### 2.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 2.1.1 University has special focus on planning and launching of academic programs keeping in view the job market and scope of the programs. The Finance and Planning Committee is functioning, and the meetings are held in good frequency.
- 2.1.2 University has an incremental growth plan for upcoming years

### 2.2 FINDINGS:

- 2.2.1 There is no formal system of planning and incorporating it into the budget. Development plans evaluation processes were not found. A life cycle management plan for infrastructure was not available. There is no committee which can monitor and evaluate the inputs received from the various stakeholders and recommend incorporating that in future planning and budget allocation.
- 2.2.2 There is no Directorate of Planning and Development in the university.
- 2.2.3 The faculty members and other stakeholders of the university are not engaged in the planning and development process. Timeline of the Planning process is also not available.
- 2.2.4 University has an incremental growth plan for upcoming years. However, no detailed strategic plan exists.

### 2.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.3.1 The Directorate of Planning and Development should be established. To assist this directorate, there should be a committee of senior faculty members, officers, and other stakeholders to prepare, monitor and evaluate plans before sending them to statutory bodies for approval through the Directorate of P & D.
- 2.3.2 Both the short and long-term strategic plans should be designed, containing the academic and administrative progression with time. This may include hiring of new administrative & academic staff, Development programs for existing faculty, Research grants and facilitating faculty to participate in national and international conferences, purchase of equipment and lab materials, infrastructure development etc.
- 2.3.3 Quality Enhancement Cell and its reports (SARs), should have a link with planning and development of the university.
- 2.3.4 The substantial portion of students belong to the CS and SE programs therefore it is recommended to have a separate faculty of Computing at the University.





### 3 STANDARD: ORGANIZATION & GOVERNANCE

#### 3.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 3.1.1 Statutory bodies of the university are formed as per University's act.
- 3.1.2 Frequency of the meetings of the bodies is commendable (except that of BOG).

#### 3.2 FINDINGS:

- 3.2.1 The statutory bodies of the university are in place but the frequency of the meeting of the top body, "Board of Governors" is very low. Only three meetings took place in the last 03 years.
- 3.2.2 The documentation process is not up to the mark. The notifications are not in uniform format, and additionally they do not contain the important information which are supposed to be the part of the notification text. i.e., relevant section of act, agenda item of statutory bodies, etc.
- 3.2.3 Conflict of interest policy does not exist.
- 3.2.4 The organizational chart of the university is placed in files, however no approval of the same is found in any document.
- 3.2.5 Most of the administrative positions are being run on acting charges.

#### 3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.3.1 Frequency of the meetings of BOG should be increased for more effective governance.
- 3.3.2 Various offices must be trained about documentation, including preparing agendas, minutes of meetings, implementation, and notifications of the approvals
- 3.3.3 Approval of various policies must be taken from the concerned body before implementing it.
- 3.3.4 The University should define a uniform format for all official documents and notifications for each department with proper dates, reference number and signature of the competent authority.
- 3.3.5 The permanent administrative positions may be advertised and filled.







4 STANDARD: INTEGRITY

4.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 4.1.1 The University has a mechanism in place that promote the integrity within the organization that dominates the decision-making procedures.
- 4.1.2 QA&C department is providing a Similarity Index Report to the students on same day.

4.2 FINDINGS:

- 4.2.1 Plagiarism Standing Committee is not approved by any statutory body.
- 4.2.2 The Intellectual property rights policy of the university does not exist.
- 4.2.3 There is no grievance committee for the students.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 4.3.1 The Students Complaint Committee is suggested to be renamed as Students Grievance Committee.
- 4.3.2 The composition of Plagiarism Standing Committee must be in line with the HEC guidelines.
- 4.3.3 Intellectual property rights policy of the university is required to be framed as per Government Intellectual Property Rights guidelines.
- 4.3.4 Conflict of Interest policy is required to be framed in consultation with the Legal team of the university.
- 4.3.5 All the above policies must be approved by the statutory bodies of the university.





5 STANDARD: FACULTY

5.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 5.1.1 Most of the faculty members are qualified and motivated to contribute in the University progress.
- 5.1.2 Despite shortage of space & resources, faculty members are managing academically activities in an appropriate manner.

5.2 FINDINGS:

- 5.2.1 Some of the junior faculty members are not trained in the areas of teaching methodology, assessment and learning outcomes.
- 5.2.2 Research based initiatives are affected by limited research fund allocation in the university budget.
- 5.2.3 There are inadequate senior faculty members.
- 5.2.4 Growth opportunities and faculty development programs don't exist for early career faculty.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 5.3.1 Young faculty members should be financially supported and encouraged to participate in various national and international workshops, seminars, to promote effective research and teaching/learning environment.
- 5.3.2 Faculty should be trained by relevant experts of the education department in the area of curriculum development, assessment, teaching methodology and learning outcomes.
- 5.3.3 University needs to devise effective faculty development plans in line with the mission and vision of the university.
- 5.3.4 The minimum criteria for appointment of faculty at various levels should be followed as per HEC guidelines.
- 5.3.5 The university should hire senior faculty to address the leadership gaps.
- 5.3.6 The university should devise a clear policy for faculty retention and timely promotion after fulfilling the required criteria. The faculty having PhD Degree should be promoted to AP
- 5.3.7 The University should hire specialized faculty for Bio Medical Engineering and Management Sciences as per council requirements.
- 5.3.8 Faculty offices needs serious attention of the competent authority.







6 STANDARD: STUDENTS

6.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 6.1.1 University has well defined approved admission policy from the academic council which is revised on yearly basis and published in the prospectus of the university and is available on the website of the university
- 6.1.2 The Student Handbook is readily available on the University website, and it is being shared with every fresh intake in soft form and explained at the orientation sessions.
- 6.1.3 There is a comprehensive policy of the university for credit transfer/migration duly approved by the Board of Governance.

6.2 FINDINGS:

- 6.2.1 No Students Grievance Committee exists.
- 6.2.2 There is no mapping of counseling services (Academic, personal, mental and wellbeing services).
- 6.2.3 During the student's interaction it was highlighted that few programs have not followed the pre-defined curriculum in its true spirit.
- 6.2.4 Students are facing problems in assignments and project submission due to slow internet connectivity.
- 6.2.5 There is no separate ORIC, and placement office to facilitate students.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 6.3.1 Although the Student Handbook is readily available on the university website, it needs to be revised and approved by the Academic Council.
- 6.3.2 A Student facilitation desk should be established to facilitate students.
- 6.3.3 Student handbook may include rules for the issuance of interim transcripts with time line.
- 6.3.4 Each department should ensure mapping of counseling services (Academic, personal, mental and wellbeing services).
- 6.3.5 The departments need to call well known national/international speakers to motivate students and upgrade their knowledge, confidence and improve their soft skills.
- 6.3.6 The chairpersons should ensure to follow the approved curriculum for each program and also offer specialization courses as per market requirements.





7 STANDARD: INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

7.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 7.1.1 The university dedicates resources with proper budget allocations for student bodies for different societies. University has well documented "12 years plan" keeping in view the future needs of programs and faculty hiring.
- 7.1.2 Overall campus cleanliness is commendable.

7.2 FINDINGS:

- 7.2.1 The budgetary provisions for student assistantship are limited.
- 7.2.2 Faculty wise budget allocation does not exist in the annual budget.
- 7.2.3 Departmental budget meetings with the Vice chancellor are not documented.
- 7.2.4 Adequate number of Journals are missing to support research endeavors.
- 7.2.5 Students are unaware about the usage of HEC digital library.
- 7.2.6 Computer labs are inadequate and need proper maintenance for social science students.

7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 7.3.1 The F&PC should prioritize the University resources for effective and productive utilization. The HR budgetary allocations of key offices need to be made as per strengths and strategic plans of administrative offices.
- 7.3.2 The procurement policy is required to be approved by the BoG.
- 7.3.3 Internal Research Grants to be allocated faculty wise for productive and supervising research and developments.
- 7.3.4 The ORIC set ups require strengthening to cater needs of research and development.
- 7.3.5 There is a need of collaborative programs for research projects at national and international level with strong collaboration with industry and academia.
- 7.3.6 The hiring, evaluation and termination criteria need to be revised keeping in view the latest trends of the market.
- 7.3.7 Hostel messing and medical services need to be improved.
- 7.3.8 The budgetary provisions for student's assistantship need to be enhanced.







## 8 STANDARD: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CURRICULA

### 8.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 8.1.1 Meetings of the statutory bodies are regularly held which ensure the efficient review, approval, and upgrade of the curricula of academic programs.
- 8.1.2 Laboratories are adequate as per the need of undergraduate programs.

### 8.2 FINDINGS:

- 8.2.1 There is no evidence of utilization of HEC digital library.
- 8.2.2 Teaching methodology and assessment strategies are also missing in the social sciences curricula.
- 8.2.3 Ph. D level research-based books are inadequate in the library.
- 8.2.4 There is no presence of Industrial experts and alumni representatives in the BoS.

### 8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 8.3.1 There should be a mechanism to generate the utilization report of HEC digital library after each semester.
- 8.3.2 Curricula should be revised on a regular basis with involvement of experts from relevant academia, industry, and alumni (Specifically in BoS and Computing BOF).
- 8.3.3 There should be training for the faculty to develop curricula and improve teaching and assessment methodologies.
- 8.3.4 University may collaborate with other universities having expertise in curriculum development.





9 STANDARD: PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AND TRANSPARENCY

9.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 9.1.1 University has well maintained Online Admission Portal and online Career Portal to get feedback from stakeholders. The university regularly publishes its approved audited annual report. Information related to programs, admission policy, faculty, fee structure and accreditation status with the council is readily available on website of the university.

9.2 FINDINGS:

- 9.2.1 There is no mechanism to ensure implementation of Right for Information Act as per available record.
- 9.2.2 Faculty handbooks is not available.
- 9.2.3 There is no written policy/SOP regarding communication strategy for dissemination of regulations, rules, and policies.
- 9.2.4 There is no mechanism to issue PEOs based transcript to the students by exam.

9.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.3.1 Right for Information may be adopted officially through the relevant statutory body followed with the notification from the Registrar.
- 9.3.2 Faculty and Students handbooks may be updated to include all the revised policies and uploaded on the University website on priority basis.
- 9.3.3 It is strongly recommended that there should be a comprehensive written policy/SOP regarding communication strategy for dissemination of regulations, rules and policies.







## 10 STANDARD: ASSESSMENT & QUALITY ASSURANCE

### 10.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 10.1.1 Major surveys conducted online as per university requirement.
- 10.1.2 All programs are accredited by the respective councils.

### 10.2 FINDINGS:

- 10.2.1 Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) exist with limited functions.
- 10.2.2 There is no SOP/TOR of QEC as per the HEC guidelines.
- 10.2.3 Self-Institutional Performance Evaluation (IPE) process and postgraduate program review have not been initiated
- 10.2.4 Self-Assessment Process as per the HEC guidelines is not followed.
- 10.2.5 QEC Activity Calendar, List of seminars/events not found.
- 10.2.6 Surveys/Evaluations conducted as per the report, with little or no information of the Compliance Implementation Plan (CIP) of the different feedbacks available.

### 10.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 10.3.1 The university should establish a formal QEC office as per the HEC requirement for meaningful Quality Assurance.
- 10.3.2 The university should immediately strengthen the office of the QEC with provision of relevant staff and office.
- 10.3.3 QEC should coordinate preparation of self-assessment reports of all the programs.





## 11 STANDARD: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

### 11.1 BEST PRACTICE(S):

- 11.1.1 Student support services are amicably provided by different offices as per the discussion and interaction with students.

### 11.2 FINDINGS:

- 11.2.1 Proper Student placement & career counseling offices are not present; however, the services are provided by the student's affairs department.
- 11.2.2 There were no direct complaints regarding student support during the visit and interaction with the students. However, certain indirect grievances were registered, which included classroom furniture, some transport issues, student services (Photocopier) and budget of the societies.

### 11.3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 11.3.1 More interaction of students with Deans may help address academic and administrative concerns of the students to build a conducive academic environment for the benefit of all.
- 11.3.2 A committee of students along with management may be constituted to have a regular check on quality and price of foods being offered at the student cafeteria.

**Note:** The IPE review is performed by Peer Reviewers with due diligence and professional care against the 11 IPE standards for institutional review. These standards usually require to obtain reasonable assurance about the documentary evidences being free of any misstatement. The Review Panel exert utmost efforts to verify the documents. However, there may be chances of error /omission due to inherent limitations of the peer review process.

