



Role Of Quality Enhancement Cell in Developing Quality Culture At University Level

Muhammad Tahir Nadeem

Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Afshan Rahat

Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Karachi
afshan_rahata@yahoo.com

Riffat Tahira

Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
riffat.tahira@iub.edu.pk

Irshad Hussain

Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
irshad.hussain@iub.edu.pk

Abstract

The current study was designed to investigate the current practices and the effectiveness of quality enhancement cell in developing quality culture at university level in Pakistan. This study was descriptive in nature. All public sector general universities in Punjab were the population of the study. Heads of the departments of public sector universities in Punjab, Pakistan were the population of the study. A total of 300 departmental and institutional heads from 7 selected universities were chosen as a sample of the study. A questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale, consisting of 47 statements was prepared for obtaining data. To arrive at findings, frequencies, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations were calculated. The results of the study indicate that the quality assurance practices i.e. Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) of universities don't provide training to non-teaching staff. Faculty members are not selected for the next grade in time by teacher training departments of the universities. Major problems with quality assurance have been found as scarcity of financial resources, shortage of permanent faculty members, and lack of infrastructure. Facilitating factors towards quality assurance were good teacher-student relations, cooperative attitude of administration with teachers, and well-educated teachers in universities, were good.

Keywords: *Quality, Quality Assurance, Higher Education, Quality Enhancement Cell, Teacher Training*



Introduction

Education is the main source to make a nation prosperous and better. A teacher is an important factor in the education system to shape and model the nation (Ugwoke et al., 2012). Teachers are considered the backbone of attaining educational objectives and increasing the quality of education. Implementation of reforms is highly expected from the teachers (Khan, 2015). To enhance the quality of education teacher is considered an important factor. In the Pakistani context, public sector universities contribute a lot to enhancing the quality of education. Competent teaching staff, pitiable quality of learning material, and textbooks supports the quality of education. The quality of teaching staff, learning material, and textbooks are assessed regularly both internally and externally (World Bank, 2006). The poor performances of teacher training institutions from the public sector and the quality of teacher training programs are also challenges for teacher training institutions. Furthermore, a dearth of research and origination, deficiency of professionalism, and low entry-level requirements are noticeable issues of teacher education in Pakistan (Malik & Urooj 2012). Moreover, lack of coordination among institutions offering teacher education, outdated curriculum, interference from political persons, shortage of physical infrastructure, problems relating to teaching practice, a dearth of incentives for teachers, and promotion structure of teachers are major causes that badly affect the quality of teacher education.

For the progress of any country, quality education is required and this happens only by improving the standard of teacher education (Aly, 2007). As said by Ron Lewis Quality Assurance is a vital component of higher education to save the future of the generation. In 1947, there were only two universities in Pakistan. However, currently, approximately 300 institutions offer programs for teacher education. These are oscillating from certificate courses to PhD. in all universities (USAID & UNESCO, 2009; Government of Pakistan, 2009). This is a pretty inspiring progressive development. The qualitative aspect of the education system has worsened and suffered from sluggishness. Different researches suggest that teacher education is mainly suffered due to a lack of quality and relevancy. Several nationwide surveys, reports, and studies quoted a variety of problems that affect the quality of teachers and their performance (Butt & Shams, 2007; Mahmood, 2016).

Quality assurance (QA) has the purpose to achieve its mission provided by the institution and makes sure that academic standards are achieved according to national and international standards (Batoool & Qureshi, 2010). The QA mechanism of any institution must be according to the needs and wishes of relevant stakeholders. Therefore, quality assurance means the quality of pupils, teachers, and other supporting services which finally results in quality



education in any country (Shahid & Wahab, 2015). According to Knight (2003), audit, accreditation, and evaluation are three important parts of quality assurance generally (Haider, ulHusnain, Shaheen, & Jabeen, 2015). For the consistent progress of content, delivery, and progress of teacher education programs quality assurance and management plays a significant role (Chong, 2014). Throughout the world, the provision of quality education is a basic aspect to gain and maintain the credibility of programs, institutes, and the national system of higher education (Oyebade, Oladipo, & Adetoro, 2012). It has become a compulsory requirement for the accreditation bodies of higher education institutions offering different programs regarding different disciplines (Usmani & Khatoon, 2016).

Review of Literature

The current status of QA in higher education institutions in Pakistan is not up to mark. This is a challenge for HEC to reform the agenda in terms of the quality of understanding being conveyed in these institutions. There is a dire need to establish an internal quality assurance system according to international academic standards and performances. The identified gap between the current status of quality assurance and the desired level of quality, demands the enrichment of practices of quality assurance in Pakistan (Batool & Qureshi, 2007). Teacher education in Pakistan is being expanded quantitatively, whereas the qualitative aspect of teacher education is receiving marginal attention. As a result of this expansion, a large number of teachers with poor knowledge of both content and tactic of education is taking place (Hina & Ajmal, 2017).

In Pakistan, the evaluation and assessment system used in higher educational institutions is included

1. Internal quality assurance (IQA) System
2. External quality assurance (EQA) System.
3. Meta Quality Assurance System by the government mainly through the HEC for HEIs (Raouf, 2006).

Two aspects of IQA are the Self-Assessment of programs and the University's Internal Quality and these are executed through Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) (Ismail, 2015). Internal quality assurance usually occurs within the academic program/department. In this way, information is collected about the quality of education being achieved. The self-assessment report (SAR) has a vital role in the quality assurance process. It is prepared by the concerned institution under the guidance of the QEC and the self-assessment (SA) manual prepared by the HEC. Objectives of SA are to 1) retain and constantly boost academic standards 2) confirm that current programs meet the institutional goals and objectives 3)



enhance students' learning 4) provision of feedback on academic programs for QA and last is 5) prepare the academic program for review by discipline councils. QAA has made self-assessment compulsory for all institutions. The guidelines for conducting SA are provided in "The Manual of self-assessment published by HEC to improve quality in HEIs (Raouf, 2006). Even though HEC's QA framework emphasizes internal quality audits after SA but only a couple of universities conduct this audit. The purpose of this audit conducted by the university's internal panel is to remove insufficiencies at the institutional level and to prepare the administration of the University for External Review (Ismail, 2015).

Even though HEC's QA framework emphasizes internal quality audits after SA but only a couple of universities conduct this audit. The purpose of this audit conducted by the university's internal panel is to remove insufficiencies at the institutional level and to prepare the administration of the University for External Review (Ismail, 2015).

Institutional performance evaluation of universities and accreditation are two important aspects of the EQA System. It works on the baseline information provided through the process of IQA. For Institutional Performance Evaluation (IPE) on-site visits are arranged by the review panels constituted by QAA. HEC awards the recognition of an institution only after successful review and evaluation. HEC has developed performance evaluation standards for the HEIs, to conduct these visits.

Accreditation is the process of external review adopted by higher education to assess the institutes and educational programs of higher education for improving the quality (Raouf, 2006). After completing this process, the program or institution is accredited. It is a two-tier process. Institutional Accreditation is the responsibility of the HEC. Peer review is conducted through QAA or Programme Accreditation Councils for QA at all levels. Peer-reviewers are appointed for this purpose. For all universities, funds are allocated by the government of Pakistan (GOP) to run the universities through HEC. Therefore, Higher Education Commission is liable to the public for providing quality education all over the country. Therefore, HEC performs the role of a Meta evaluator for the assessment of quality in higher education. This is the duty of the HEC to check that internal and external quality assurance systems are working efficiently according to the requirements of the community in higher education (Usmani & Khatoon, 2016).

Statement of the Problem

It is generally controversial and difficult to judge quality assurance matters. It is also a complicated task to make a comparison of universities across countries and even within a country. A little effort has been made by researchers and educationists in the assessment of



higher education institutions in Pakistan. Different criteria are used by different countries in the world. In Pakistan, Higher Education Commission is making efforts to adopt the quality assurance mechanism for the enhancement of the quality of education. The current study was designed to investigate the current practices and the effectiveness of quality enhancement cells at university level in Pakistan.

Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to achieve the following objectives of the study to:

1. To examine the current practices for the evaluation of institutional performance by the Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) at the university level.
2. To analyze the implementation of the quality measures by the Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) at the university level.
3. To assess the effectiveness of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) in developing quality culture at the university level.

Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to only HEC-recognized public sector universities offering teacher education programs along with their HEC-recognized sub-campus of the selected universities were considered in the province of Punjab, Pakistan.

Research Methods

Research Design

The present study focused on finding out the current practices and effectiveness of quality enhancement cells at the university level in Punjab, Pakistan. As per the demand of the study, the nature of the study was descriptive. The survey method was adopted to carry out this study. In the current study, the data was collected from university heads of the departments of universities. A questionnaire was designed to collect data.

The population of the Study

The population of the study is all the possible cases (persons, objects, and events) that constitute people (Donald, 2013). The population of this research consisted of all public sector universities in Punjab. All the heads of the departments of public sector universities were the population of the study.

Sample

Sample selection is the process or method of choosing a suitable sample, or an illustrative portion of the population to select factors or features of the whole population (Best & Khan, 2007). The researcher used random sampling for collecting the data. Out of the total population, 300 heads from 7 universities were chosen as a sample of the study.



Development of Research Instrument

A questionnaire was self-developed to know the current practices and the effectiveness of quality enhancement cells at the university level in Punjab, Pakistan. It included two parts.

Part I; contained demographic information

Part II consisted of 47 close five-point Likert scale questions.

Validity of Tools

Validity is described as the degree to which a tool assesses, what it intended to measure (Cozby, 2001). For qualitative and quantitative research soundness and rationality measures of a tool is very essential (Cohen et al., 2011; Mertler & Charles, 2005). After tools development, the validity of the tools was tested and analyzed. After preparing the first draft of the tools (quantitative), the researcher met 5 experts from the education department and discussed with them the questionnaire item-wise. After taking feedback, recommendations were discussed with the supervisor. In light of the discussion, some items from tools (quantitative) were removed and some were added.

Reliability of the Tools

Internal consistency was measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The internal reliability measured was 8.9.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was distributed by the researcher. A total of 228 questionnaires were collected from the seven universities of the Punjab province. Based on ease of access, some questionnaires were personally filled by the respondents while for the remaining universities the questionnaires were sent to the responsible people through the post for the completion of a self-reported questionnaire. The return rate was 76 percent.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed in two phases: First of all, data was coded. Data was organized and entered into a single data sheet of SPSS. After completing the process of data feeding it was analyzed by calculating frequencies, percentages, mean score, standard deviation.



Results

Table 1.

Vision and Mission of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)

Sr. No.	Statement		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	M	SD
1	QEC is committed to providing excellence in educational services	<i>f</i>	9	60	6	94	59	3.59	1.237
		%	3.9	26.3	2.6	41.2	25.9		
			30.2				67.1		
2	QEC reviews the quality of teaching and learning in each subject.	<i>f</i>	17	45	16	83	67	3.61	1.295
		%	7.5	19.7	7.0	36.4	29.4		
3	QEC reviews the quality standards of each department.	<i>f</i>	13	68	27	56	64	3.39	1.322
		%	5.7	29.8	11.8	24.6	28.1		
4	QEC enhances the academic rigor and professional relevance of all programs.	<i>f</i>	9	16	19	58	126	4.21	1.110
		%	3.9	7.0	8.3	25.4	55.3		
5	QEC is reviewing the international recognition of research activities of scholars	<i>f</i>	11	45	36	58	78	3.64	1.267
		%	4.8	19.7	15.8	25.4	34.2		
6	QEC ensures the collection of data and set a benchmark for each department.	<i>f</i>	17	57	32	56	66	3.43	1.334
		%	7.5	25.0	14.0	24.6	28.9		
Vision and Mission of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)			5.1	20.4	10.2	29.7	34.5	3.64	1.260

Note: Low level (1-2.0), medium level (2.1-3.0), and high level (3.0-4.0)

Table 1 shows the responses of heads regarding the vision and mission of the quality enhancement cell (QEC). Data reveal that 67.1% of respondents agreed about the QEC's commitment to providing excellence regarding educational services whereas 30.2% of heads disagreed. Moreover, 65.8% of heads agreed about the review of the teaching and learning quality in each subject whereas 27.2% of respondents disagreed about the statement. Data also shows that 52.7% of heads agreed about the review of the quality standard of each department whereas 35.5% of respondents disagreed. 80.7% of heads of departments agreed that QEC is enhancing the academic and professional importance of the programs and only 10.9% of respondents disagreed. 59.6% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC reviews the international relevance of the researchers and 24.5% of respondents disagreed about the statement. 53.5% of heads of departments agreed that QEC ensures the collection of data and set a benchmark for each department and 32.5% of respondents disagreed about the statement. The aggregate mean score (3.64) lies under the category of high level, this



indicates that the majority of the head agreed about the given statements about the vision and mission of the quality enhancement cell.

Table 2.

Implementation of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)

Sr. No.	Statement		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean	SD
7	QEC checks the eligibility criteria for appointments of faculty members given by HEC.	<i>f</i>	12	34	15	65	102	3.93	1.259
		%	5.3	14.9	6.6	28.5	44.7		
8	QEC ensures the selection of faculty members to the next grade in time.	<i>f</i>	7	32	26	76	87	3.89	1.152
		%	3.1	14.0	11.4	33.3	38.2		
9	QEC implements HEC criteria for Ph.D. programs.	<i>f</i>	29	29	8	84	78	3.67	1.390
		%	12.7	12.7	3.5	36.8	34.2		
10	QEC handles plagiarism cases according to the HEC plagiarism policy.	<i>f</i>	17	10	27	85	89	3.96	1.166
		%	7.5	4.4	11.8	37.3	39.0		
Implementation of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)			7.2	11.5	8.3	34	39.1	3.86	1.241

Note: Low level (1-2.0), medium level (2.1-3.0), and high level (3.0-4.0)

Table 2 shows the responses regarding the implementation of quality enhancement cells. Results reveal that 73.2% of heads of the departments agreed that the QEC checks the eligibility criteria for appointments of faculty members given by HEC whereas 20.2% disagreed about the statement. 71.5% of heads agree that the QEC ensures the selection of faculty members to the next grade in time whereas 17.1% disagreed about the statement. Results reveal that 71% of heads of the department agreed about the implementation of HEC criteria for Ph.D. programs whereas 25.4% disagreed about the statement. The mean value of the Table identified is 3.67 and the standard deviation is 1.390 showing a positive response to the statement about the QEC implementing HEC criteria of Ph.D. programs. 76.3% of heads of the departments agreed about the handling of plagiarism cases per HEC policy whereas 11.9% of respondents disagreed about the statement. The aggregate mean score (3.96) falls under the range high level, this indicates that heads of the departments agreed about the implementation of the quality enhancement cell effectively.



Table 3.
Current Practices of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)

Sr. No.	statement		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean	SD
11	The QEC head is reporting directly to the vice chancellor.	<i>f</i>	4	13	8	98	105	4.26	.905
		%	1.8	5.7	3.5	43.0	46.1		
12	The QEC is reviewing the quality of teaching and learning in each subject.	<i>f</i>	6	11	16	116	79	4.10	.917
		%	2.6	4.8	7.0	50.9	34.6		
13	The QEC systematically evaluates teachers' performance regularly.	<i>f</i>	9	13	23	85	98	4.10	1.053
		%	3.9	5.7	10.1	37.3	43.0		
14	The QEC plays a role in the approval of new programs.	<i>f</i>	10	22	16	97	83	3.97	1.104
		%	4.4	9.6	7.0	42.5	36.4		
15	The QEC enhances the capacity of teachers through regular seminars and workshops.	<i>f</i>	14	16	25	74	99	4.00	1.176
		%	6.1	7.0	11.0	32.5	43.4		
Current Functions of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)			3.8	6.6	7.7	41.2	40.7	4.08	1.031

Note: Low level (1-2.0), medium level (2.1-3.0), and high level (3.0-4.0)

Table 3 shows the responses of heads about the current practices of the Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC). Results of data reveal that 89.1% of heads of the departments regarding the statement that the QEC head reports directly to the vice chancellor and 7.5% of respondents disagreed with the statement. 85.5% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC reviews the quality of teaching and learning and 7.4% of respondents disagreed with the statement. 80.3% of heads of the departments agreed that the QEC systematically evaluates the teachers' performance on regular basis and 9.6% of respondents disagreed with the statement. 77.9% of heads of the department agreed that the QEC plays a role in the approval of new programs and 14% of respondents disagreed about the statement. 75.9% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC enhances the capacity of teachers through regular seminars and workshops and 13.1% of respondents disagreed about the statement. The aggregate mean score (4.00) falls under the range high level, this indicates that heads of the departments strongly agreed about the current practices of the quality enhancement cell effectively.



Table 4.

Effectiveness of the Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)

Sr. No.	Statement		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean	SD
16	QEC evaluates faculty members of my department through students' feedback every semester.	<i>f</i>	11	17	9	74	117	4.18	1.122
		%	4.8	7.5	3.9	32.5	51.3		
17	QEC give feedback report on the performance of teaching staff.	<i>f</i>	10	14	20	77	107	4.13	1.089
		%	4.4	6.1	8.8	33.8	46.9		
18	QEC evaluates alumni of my department.	<i>f</i>	4	35	18	76	95	3.98	1.128
		%	1.8	15.4	7.9	33.3	41.7		
19	QEC evaluates non-teaching employees of my department.	<i>f</i>	4	40	26	76	82	3.84	1.146
		%	1.8	17.5	11.4	33.3	36.0		
20	QEC provides training to faculty members to improve their quality of teaching.	<i>f</i>	7	9	18	84	110	4.23	.972
		%	3.1	3.9	7.9	36.8	48.2		
21	QEC provides training to non-teaching staff members to enhance their performance.	<i>f</i>	13	18	16	106	75	3.93	1.108
		%	5.7	7.9	7.0	46.5	32.9		
22	The QEC follow up on the performance of teachers based on feedback report.	<i>f</i>	19	15	16	103	75	3.88	1.185
		%	8.3	6.6	7.0	45.2	32.9		
Performance of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)			4.3	9.3	7.7	37.3	41.4	4.02	1.107

Note: Low level (1-2.0), medium level (2.1-3.0), and high level (3.0-4.0)

Table 4 shows the responses of heads regarding the effectiveness of the Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC). The results of the data illustrate that the mean score of all items falls in the criterion of acceptance. 83.8% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC evaluates faculty members of their department through students' feedback every semester 12.3% of respondents disagreed about the statement. 80.7% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC gives feedback reports on the performance of teaching staff and 10.5% of respondents disagreed about the statement. 75% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC evaluates alumni of their department whereas 17.2% of respondents disagreed about the statement. The majority of 69.3% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC evaluates non-teaching employees of their department whereas 19.3% of respondents disagreed about the statement. 85% of heads of the departments agreed that QEC provides training to faculty members to improve their quality of teaching whereas others disagreed about the statement. 78.1% of



heads of the departments agreed that QEC follows up on the performance of teachers based on feedback reports whereas 14.9% of respondents disagreed about the statement. The overall mean score (4.02) falls under the range high level, this indicates that the effectiveness of the quality enhancement cell was excellent in the views of heads of the departments.

Conclusion and Discussion

The first objective of the study was about the current practices of QEC in this regard conclusions were made from the findings of the study that More than half percent of the respondents agreed about the QEC's commitment to providing excellence regarding educational services and made a review of the teaching and learning quality in each subject. Heads agreed about the review of the quality standard of each department. Heads of the departments agreed that QEC is enhancing the academic and professional importance of the programs. Educational monitoring and assessment was also an important practice of QA pointed out by the heads of the departments. One more factor of QA i.e. teaching-learning procedure and methods. Heads have an opinion that the quality of lectures delivered by the teachers is good and it takes place in a supportive environment, relevant pedagogical approaches are used by the teachers and teachers coordinate with each other to provide a flexible teaching-learning environment. Teaching practice and internship evolved from students' questionnaires. Adedipe (2007) found various components at the university level such as assessment, accreditation, carrying capacity and admission quota, academic standards, visitation, research and development, publications and research assessment, and infrastructures and utilities. Saketa (2014) also identified some other factors that determine the quality of education; namely, curriculum development and revision, students' assessment process, graduates and academic performance assessment, teaching and research, and publications. Munshi and Bhatti (2009) mentioned four important aspects of QA. i.e. transparency, assessment, systematic monitoring, and student support services in their study. Similarly, Ameen (2007) stated that teaching activity is perceived as a significant determinant of quality in our education system. The importance of physical infrastructure is mentioned by Tatlah et al., (2015) said without physical facilities students, teachers, and directors of QEC face a lot of problems in Pakistan in the QA process and this is a very important factor of QA. According to Agatha (2015), a checklist of QA is Institution/ faculty mission and objectives, assessment/evaluation, teaching programs, students' selection, teaching arrangement, course structure and documentation, postgraduate supervision and student support, grievance procedures, and monitoring of outcomes, research and development, staffing issues, community service, infrastructure/resources, and governance.



The higher education relevance and quality agency (HERQA) recognized ten areas for institutional quality audits. The basic purpose of this audit is to ensure quality within the Ethiopian HE system. Ten focused areas are: 1) infrastructure and learning resources, 2) teaching and non-teaching staff, 3) governance and management system, 4) admission of the students, 5) relevancy of programs and curriculum, 6) teaching, learning, and assessment, 7) student progression and graduate outcomes, 8) research and outreach activities, 9) internal quality assurance and, 10) infrastructure and learning resources (Adamu & Adamu, 2012). Admission to PhD programmes, and departments also follow the criteria for admission provided by the HEC. Other QA practices adopted by universities and their sub-campuses were the evaluation of faculty members through students every year and all cases of plagiarism are handled by departments according to the policies of HEC. No clear opinion was provided by the faculty about the display of mission and vision statements. Training for non-teaching staff is not provided by the QEC and faculty members are not selected for the next grade in time. The study by Rasool (2010) said that most universities in the private and public sectors have a mission statement and QA policy. This result is different in the sense that universities have mission and vision statements but they did not display them in their departments.

A study conducted from the Pakistani perspective by Shabbir et al., (2014) supported the results of the current study. The study showed that heads of QECs, teachers, and students face a lot of problems while implementing the QA process. These issues were a shortage of resources, scarcity of permanent faculty members, deficiency of awareness related to up-to-date research studies, poor assessment and evaluation system, incompetent non-teaching staff, and shortage of guidance and counseling centers. Malik and Urooj (2012) also supported the results of the current study by mentioning that delay in the promotion of teachers is also one of the issues faced by teacher training institutions in Pakistan. The study of Shahid and Wahab (2015) also reinforced the results of the study that there are no satisfactory research facilities in universities. Ugwoke et. al., (2012) stated that poor condition is caused by aspects such as meager staff development programs, scarce infrastructure, and the absence of ICT facilities. Rasool (2010) expressed that faculty members of the private sector face more difficulties than faculty members of the public sector in the implementation of the QA process. Moreover, they face a lack of general awareness, scarcity of training for faculty members, no provision of time and resources, and QA practices considered a burden by teachers of the universities of the public sector. Keeping in view all the problems, the study of Ahmed and Abdul Aziz (2012) recommended that to



ensure the quality of teacher education in Pakistan, the provincial department of education, HEC, and NACTE should develop a new framework. Rasool, Arshad, and Ali (2019) described that even though enough resources are available in HEIs but there is mismanagement in the allocation and utilization of resources. Other problems highlighted by the study were, no sharing of good practices within and outside with other universities. Unavailability of QA reports to concerned people, inconsistent policies from the administration, scarcity of time, and motivational factors of the employees deputed for QA and lack of funds for QA in both public and private sector universities in Pakistan. The research work of Saketa (2014) identified similar problems in Ethiopia as described above. The researcher mentioned that scarcity of commitment from heads, shortage of financial resources for the implementation of internal quality assurance (IQA), absence of training and experience in QA, non-availability of any incentives of internal reviewers, scarcity of follow-up and lack of measure on the part of QAA and government are the problems in QAA. The study by Alharbi (2019) was conducted to identify the level of hurdles faced by the faculty members of departments of the Faculty of Education of Umm Al-Qura University while implementing IQA. The researcher categorized the results into human obstacles, administrative and financial obstacles, obstacles related to the educational program, and obstacles to the formation of the internal system. The results of Boateng (2014) found quality management decisions as a major barrier to the implementation of IQA. Other hurdles were deficiency of coordination, student involvement, weaker weightage to strategic planning and quality management, and a dominant culture not open to change or improvement. Agatha (2015) mentioned that poor teaching, brain drain, poor physical facilities in classrooms, lack of commitment to the teaching profession, and a rise in students' enrollment are the challenges to QA.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, discussion, and conclusions of the current study followings were the recommendations of the study.

1. Universities should implement quality assurance practices such as the in-time selection of teachers' to the next scale, training to non-teaching staff, and display of mission and vision statement.
2. Financial resources, proper infrastructure, and permanent faculty members should be provided to universities for the quality assurance process. More financial resources may be allocated to sub-campuses for QA.



3. For the enhancement of quality assurance, teacher training should be provided to teaching and non-teaching staff. Moreover, research facilities should be provided to teachers.
4. In summer and winter, no cooling and heating systems for classrooms are available in departments. These systems for students may be provided.
5. Universities should allocate more budgets for research purposes.
6. Photocopying or printing facilities and a sufficient number of computers in libraries should be provided for the facilitation of students as well as teachers.
7. Overall quality assurance in main campuses is better than in the sub-campuses. Further steps should be taken by the HEC, the Chancellor, Vice-chancellors, and QEC's directors of the universities to improve the quality of education in sub-campuses.
8. This research should be expanded to all departments of all provinces of Pakistan.

References

- Aly, J. H. (2007). Education in Pakistan: A White paper, Document to Debate and Finalize the National Education Policy. Islamabad, Pakistan: Ministry of Education.
- Batool, Z., Qureshi, R. H., & Raouf, A. (2010). Performance evaluation standards for the HEIs. *Higher Education Commission Islamabad, Pakistan*. <http://numl.edu.pk/qa/QA%20Documents/PERFORM>.
- Butt, M. H., & Shams, F. (2007). *Final report on quality assurance of teacher training programs*. Islamabad: Directorate of staff development, World Bank & UNESCO.
- Chong, S. (2014). Academic quality management in teacher education: a Singapore perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 22(1), 53–64.
- Government of Pakistan. (2009). *National Education Policy*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Haider, A., ulHusnain, M. I., Shaheen, F., & Jabeen, S. (2015). *Quality Assurance of Higher Education in the Context of Performance Models: The Case of Pakistan*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Azad_Haider/publication/280658318_Quality_Assurance_of_Higher_Education_in_the_Context_of_Performance_Models_The_Case_of_Pakistan/links/55c0e10e08aec0e5f448b829.pdf.
- Ismail, M. (2015). A comprehensive QA framework. *The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education*–July, 2(3). Retrieved from <http://www.tojqih.net/journals/tojqih/articles/v02i03/v02i03-01.pdf>.
- Khan, W. (2015). Quality of Teacher Education in Pakistan. *The Dialogue*, 10(2), 212-219.
- Knight, J. (2003). *Gats, trade and higher education: Perspective 2003-where are we?* London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.



- Mahmood, K. (2016). Overall assessment of higher education. *Higher Education Commission Pakistan*. Retrieved from [https://hec.gov.pk/english/universities/ project s/ TESP/Documents/ FR-Assessment%20HE%20Sector.pdf](https://hec.gov.pk/english/universities/project_s/ TESP/Documents/ FR-Assessment%20HE%20Sector.pdf).
- Malik, S. K., & Urooj, T. (2012). Status of teacher education in Pakistan- A problem-centered approach. *Leadership Management*, 46, 8581-8586.
- Oyebade, S. A., Oladipo, S. A., & Adetoro, J. A. (2012). Determinants and strategies for quality assurance in Nigeria University education. Retrieved October 30, 2013.
- Raouf, A. (2006). Self-assessment manual. *UMT, Lahore*. Retrieved from <http://www.sbbuvas.edu.pk/QEC/selfassessmentmanual.doc>.
- Shahid, H., & Wahab, Z. (2015). Quality Assurance Mechanism in Higher Education Institutions-A Thematic Analysis of Experts' Perspectives. *Ma'arif Research Journal*, 61-70. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from <http://mrjpk.com/wp content /uploads /Issue%2010/ ng/07Quality%20Assurance%20Mechanism%20in% 20 Higher%2 0Education %20 Institutions.pdf>.
- Ugwoke, S. C., Ofoegbu, C. A. & Ugwuanyi, F. N. (2012). Quality assurance in teacher education for teacher productivity in Anambra State. *BasseyyAndah Journal*. (5), 215-229.
- USAID & UNEESCO (2009). *Directory of Teacher Education Institutions in Pakistan*.
- Usmani, M. A. W., & Khatoon, S. (2016). Impact of quality assurance initiative on Pakistani universities. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 5(4), 83-90.
- World Bank (2006). Program Document for a Proposed Third Punjab Education Sector Development Policy Credit. Report No. 35441-PK.