Quality Enhancement Cell and its Effectiveness: Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities' Teachers and Students' Perceptions and Expectations

Muhammad Naeem Butt
Institute of Education and Research
University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan
Romina Mansoor
Institute of Education and Research
Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat, Pakistan
&
Muhammad Shafiq
Institute of Numerical Sciences
Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat, Pakistan

Abstract

The study encompassed perceptions and expectations of teachers and students regarding the efficacy of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) in 07 public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The effectiveness of QECs was analyzed on 09 domains, standard criteria, set by HEC. The sample of the study comprised 105 teachers and 105 students selected through simple random sampling technique. Two closed-ended questionnaires were constructed consisting 34 question items, with same essence, one each for students and teachers. Gamma correlation coefficient technique was employed to analyze the data. The results of University of Peshawar revealed that QEC required improvement in the domains of implementation of plans, teachers' evaluation by students, weaknesses rectified, and corrective actions taken by university, course evaluation and teaching department's interaction with teachers regarding their evaluation and internal evaluation of teachers' performance. The University of Agriculture Peshawar, UET Peshawar and UST Bannu did not achieve the required standards in any of the 09 domains. Results further elicited that QECs of Islamia College University Peshawar, Gomal University D.I. Khan and Kohat University of Science and Technology did not address the domains of membership of international bodies, participation of students in international events and external evaluation of teachers' performance. The performance of QECs was not satisfactory in the selected universities.

Keywords: HEC; QEC; Quality teaching; Standards; Teachers-Students' Perceptions

Introduction

In the first decade of 21st century, Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) introduced semester system and launched 4-year undergraduate program in all the universities of Pakistan. HEC also established Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) in every university to standardize the excellence of teaching and ensure the amplification of academic programs. However, it is assumed that the

newly established QECs need some resources to yield the required standards in the universities. This study may help QEC to play its role more efficiently, which brings harmony and fruitful results in teaching-learning process in the universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Furthermore, the study also provides a base for stakeholders and policy-makers in education system to mold their plans to achieve international standards of quality in teaching and produce maximum output.

Batool & Qureshi (2007) states that the status of the quality teaching in Pakistan lies open before Higher Education Commission and it consciously develops plans to resolve the relevant issues and set up the standards to compete in the world. HEC mostly concentrate on 07 domains of quality viz. qualification of faculty members; improvement of basic framework of system; conducive environment of research and learning; curricula development; manage governance issues; measurement and evaluation issues and approval of new academic program as well as Universities and Degree Awarding Institutions (DAIs). To achieve the goal of acquiring international standards, it is inevitable to enhance the quality of higher education system. So HEC established the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in form of independent and autonomous body for enhancing quality of teaching. Shaukat (2009) reports that establishment of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) got extended with the passage of time. QECs are functional in 69 public sector universities and fifteen private sector universities for improvement of standards within period of 2006-11.

According to Irshad (2011) QEC is responsible for maintaining the quality and standards of teaching in universities. It assesses the content of each subject to provide new and updated material to the new generation. QEC is supposed to associate with institutions of strong management and effective programs. QEC helps the employees to enrich their capabilities and skills of candidates to employ them for apt posts. The abilities of Master's, M. Phil, and Doctoral degree holders can be inferred through the reflection of framework and content of those degrees. QEC, in the universities, holds the responsibility to highlight expected skill, comprehension and proficiency of students after completion of a certain program. QEC is responsible to develop standard techniques of evaluation to ensure the provision of standard curriculum, subjects and quality teaching along with research and related scholarly activities. QEC approves new programs, supervises and evaluates annual programs, evaluates student perceptions; reviews the feedback of departments, students and faculty members, manage quality assurance of undergraduate and graduate programs.

Significance of QECs is evident from the fact that none of the Pakistani universities made it to world ranking list. However, after the establishment of

HEC and QECs, 03 universities of Pakistan: UET Lahore, University of Karachi and University of Lahore were ranked amongst 700 top world universities in 2014 according to Quacquarelli Symonds (QS).

According to economic survey of Pakistan (2002) the quality of education in Pakistan is on its last legs. Science education needs to be improved drastically as the quality of science education is declining. Teachers' shortage needs to be addressed. Laboratories ought to be well equipped and curriculum development requires intensive refurbishing. Schools results are not up to the mark. Most probably present critical situation of education is due to the factors of irrelevant and non-beneficial curricula, untrained and teachers, lack of conducive environment, and use of unfair means in examinations.

According to Dilshad (2010) common defective issues in the education system of Pakistan are lack of institutes and resources, untrained teachers, huge volume of unbeneficial content, irrelevant curricula, unequipped teachers' training centers, lack of interest of teachers towards training, unequipped laboratories, lack of relevant books in libraries, low funding and lack of interest of government to implement reforms in institutes, over-emphasis on theory, lack of coordination between education departments and policy makers and defective examination and checking structure.

Ahmed (2012) states that political volatility in Pakistan severely affects the policies that meant for reforms related to education system. Most of Political leaders show indifferent attitude towards implementation of reform policies and uplift of quality education in Pakistan. This reckless and imprudent attitude of political leadership has damaged the foundation of education system in Pakistan. A gulf has been created among policy makers, educators and teachers, which resulted in deterioration of education in Pakistan. To overcome this situation a firm and effective planning and its strict implementation is required.

According to Ahmad and Aziz (2012) quality in education is a must concern in Pakistani perspective at every level. The same concern turns into the demand for quality education from society that eventually influenced the government to set up National Assessment and Accreditation Council in 2006 for the quality assurance and accreditation of teacher education institutions.

Likewise, researchers also believe that Pakistan is progressing in the field of higher education; even the public in general, and youth have developed interest in quality education and they aspire to see Pakistani Universities ranked among the world top-notch universities. However, at present the universities of Pakistan are

inept to produce the desired outcomes, which result in brain drain, corruption and other undesired activities.

Mustafa (2012) reports that location of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in Pakistan is very significant not only geographically but economically too. The province is spread over an area of 74,521 square km and its 26.62 million population increasing at the rate of 2.8% per year. About 7million people in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa are deprived from education. Recently the literacy rate has been improved to 53% from 37% in past.

Shaheen (2013) argues that National Education Policy 2009 emphasized on quality education as quality of education is dependent on quality teaching in classroom. Teacher are agents of change and they not only influence the education system but place impact on every walk of like. The academic qualification, command on subject matter, teaching methodology and techniques, dedication, and approach of teachers greatly affect the quality and standard of education along with students' cognitive development at every level.

According to Shah (2015) despite a lot of weaknesses the previous government took great initiatives to boost up higher education in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa by establishing new universities. However, the current government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa fails to improve the quality of education in province during the last two years. Most of government's energy got wasted on modifying the two-year-old universities model act. It is worth mentioning that none of the universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa made it to top ten ranking list of HEC 2014-15. Even the University of Peshawar, UET Peshawar, and Gomal University, which are regarded to be the oldest institutes of the province, failed to make the difference. This might be lack of interest on the part of provincial or federal governments in the past.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
The study is a survey and focuses at exploring the perception and expectations of teachers and students about the performance of Quality Enhancement Cells towards promotion of quality of teaching in those Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa where QECs have been working at least for the last 8 years. One of the researchers personally visited all the sampled universities and distributed the questionnaires to the respondents. The researcher, specially, briefed the students about the study and various question items and responded to individual queries of the students. Respondents were given one-week time to fill-in the questionnaires; subsequently the questionnaires were collected by the researcher in person. The researcher also shared email with the respondents; in case they have any query about the questionnaires, but none contacted the researcher on email.

Population and Sample of the Study
All the students and teachers of the following 07 Public Sector Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa comprised the population of the study:

    i.   University of Peshawar
    ii.   University of Agriculture Peshawar
    iii.   University of Engineering and Technology of Peshawar
    iv.   Islamia College University of Peshawar
    v.   Kohat University of Science and Technology
    vi.   University of Science and Technology Bannu
    vii.   Gomal University of D. I. Khan

Sample of the study comprised 105 teachers and 105 students from 03 teaching faculties of each sampled university. The samples faculties and respondents were selected by employing simple random sampling technique. The total number of respondents, including teachers and students, from each university was 30.

Design of Research Instruments and Pilot Testing
The researchers concentrate on the following 09 domains, in accordance with HEC's standards, affecting the quality of teaching in the universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa:

    i.   Implementation of plans
    ii.   Weakness rectified, and corrective actions taken
    iii.   Teachers evaluation by students
    iv.   Course evaluation by teachers/students
    v.   Conduction of seminars/workshops/meetings at university
    vi.   Membership of international bodies
    vii.   Participation in international/national events
    viii.   QEC's and departmental interaction regarding teachers' evaluation
    ix.   Internal and external evaluation.

Two closed-ended questionnaires, one each for students and teachers, were developed keeping in view the 09 domains. The instruments include 36and 55question items for students and teachers respectively. The respondents opted for their responses on 3-point Likert rating scale. Subsequently, research instruments were distributed among 05 students and 05 teachers in KUST. The received responses were analyzed separately to check the flaws in instruments. The respondents for pilot testing were not included in main study. The respondents mentioned some shortcomings and vagueness of items in questionnaires, which were removed before the commencement of the actual data

collection. Originally question items in instruments of teachers and students were 60 and 41, which were reduced to 55 and 36 respectively as a result of pilot testing.

Data Collection and Interpretation

Gamma correlation coefficient is used to interpret and analyze the received data. The gamma statistics is employed when the researcher deals with ordinal natured data that is meant to rank the individuals in a small number. According to Goktas (2011) by using the gamma statistics one can determines the rank of one variable keeping in view the information got for another variable. The perfect correlation is concluded between the two variables if value +1of gamma is obtained for received information while value -1 is the indication of perfect negative correlation. The gamma statistic measures the intensity of association between the two variables. For the purpose of correlation, 34 common question items from both the questionnaires were selected.

The following table deals with the correlation responses of the respondents form all the seven universities and data are tabulated and interpreted as follow:

Table-1: Correlation of Teachers' and Students' Responses of All the Seven Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

S. No.	Items	Correlation (p-value)						
		UET	KUST	UoP	UoA	ICU	UST Bannu	Gomal Uni.
1	University/QEC seriously collects teachers' performance with the intention to improve quality teaching.	-0.077 (0.84)	0.268 (0.52)	0.574 (0.04)	-0.019 (0.95)	0.125 (0.73)	-0.412 (0.35)	0.190 (0.57)
2	The assessment tool (teacher evaluation proforma) includes all aspects of teaching.	-0.200 (0.56)	-0.600 (0.21)	-0.040 (0.87)	-0.077 (0.89)	-0.281 (0.49)	-0.279 (0.48)	0.286 (0.33)
3	Students evaluate teachers honestly.	0.000 (1.00)	-0.105 (0.81)	-0.625 (0.02)	-0.074 (0.83)	0.444 (0.37)	0.333 (0.74)	0.254 (0.33)
4	QEC gives importance to the students' evaluation of teachers and facilitates teachers to overcome teaching problems; if any.	-0.387 (0.12)	-0.143 (0.49)	-0.619 (0.01)	-0.49 (0.88)	-0.889 (0.02)	0.261 (0.54)	0.524 (0.46)
5	The assessment proforma helps enough to identify the strengths and weaknesses in teaching of faculty members.	-0.143 (0.57)	0.424 (0.06)	0.332 (0.35)	0.000 (1.00)	0.000 (1.00)	-0.429 (0.23)	-0.125 (0.79)
6	Faculty members regularly take their classes.	-0.707 (0.02)	0.102 (0.77)	0.478 (0.29)	-0.600 (0.12)	-0.143 (0.72)	0.393 (0.22)	-0.947 (0.00)
7	The teachers/ supervisors always ready to extend academic guidance to the students.	-0.018 (0.95)	0.306 (0.32)	-0.273 (0.38)	-0.405 (0.34)	-0.318 (0.32)	-0.220 (0.41)	-0.102 (0.78)
8	Teachers objectively mark the students' papers.	-0.182 (0.62)	0.070 (0.86)	-0.130 (0.76)	0.064 (0.88)	-0.278 (0.57)	0.556 (0.06)	0.579 (0.15)
9	Some teachers do not have command over their subject.	0.220 (0.53)	0.524 (0.21)	-0.158 (0.65)	-0.038 (0.91)	-0.188 (0.54)	-0.111 (0.71)	-0.242 (0.40)
10	Teaching methodology of most of the teachers is satisfactory.	-0.143 (0.74)	0.478 (0.33)	0.000 (1.00)	0.525 (0.17)	0.069 (0.78)	0.022 (0.95)	0.103 (0.83)
11	Teachers provide clear concept of the	-0.222	-0.024	-0.688	0.021	-0.535	-0.91	-0.677

	subject in teaching learning process.	(0.57)	(0.95)	(0.04)	(0.96)	(0.14)	(0.83)	(0.08)
12	Teachers always come prepared to the class.	0.115 (0.73)	-2.265 (0.43)	0.103 (0.70)	0.100 (0.66)	0.231 (0.52)	0.192 (0.52)	-0.283 (0.35)
13	Teachers have capability to satisfy students' questions with appropriate answers.	-0.269 (0.42)	0.244 (0.46)	-0.106 (0.71)	0.00 (1.00)	-0.417 (0.21)	-0.467 (0.20)	-1.00 (0.08)
14	Students are encouraged by teachers to perform well.	-0.238 (0.46)	0.525 (0.27)	-0.154 (0.59)	-0.438 (0.39)	0.234 (0.58)	0.622 (0.10)	-0.636 (0.13)
15	There is communication among HoDs, teachers and parents of students to address students' problems.	0.154 (0.68)	-0.457 (0.09)	0.015 (0.94)	0.632 (0.77)	-0.592 (0.04)	-0.470 (0.08)	-0.774 (0.14)
16	Faculty members take initiative for students' counseling.	-0.544 (0.04)	-0.246 (0.47)	0.077 (0.88)	0.632 (0.05)	-0.318 (0.38)	0.00 (1.00)	-0.774 (0.00)
17	The teaching departments take strict action against serious misconduct of students.	0.409 (0.28)	-0.119 (0.73)	0.019 (0.96)	-0.023 (0.96)	-0.150 (0.67)	0.200 (0.52)	-0.478 (0.25)
18	Current course fulfills the demands of society and modern age.	-0.556 (0.05)	-0.074 (0.84)	0.437 (0.05)	-0.133 (0.71)	-0.911 (0.00)	-0.087 (0.81)	0.345 (0.29)
19	The current course is dynamic and beneficial enough for students' overall development.	-0.227 (0.52)	-0.055 (0.87)	0.320 (0.30)	-0.500 (0.28)	-0.667 (0.09)	0.395 (0.29)	-0.538 (0.09)
20	Course contents are according to the students' interest.	-0.538 (0.20)	-0.952 (0.00)	0.182 (0.54)	-0.806 (0.03)	-0.028 (0.32)	0.070 (0.85)	-0.594 (0.00)
21	The current course contents are too lengthy to be covered in a semester.	-0.400 (0.25)	0.071 (0.84)	0.069 (0.84)	0.556 (0.06)	-0.40 (0.89)	-0.277 (0.45)	-0.130 (0.62)
22	Usually the course contents are not covered by teachers.	-0.085 (0.78)	0.452 (0.09)	0.016 (0.94)	0.333 (0.20)	0.051 (0.86)	0.051 (0.88)	0.137 (0.70)
23	Seminars are conducted frequently in university to improve the quality of teaching learning process.	0.400 (0.12)	0.125 (0.58)	-0.548 (0.00)	0.137 (0.56)	0.255 (0.46)	0.385 (0.21)	-0.458 (0.08)
24	Regular seminars and workshops enhance capacity building of teachers.	0.034 (0.91)	0.515 (0.02)	0.526 (0.11)	0.184 (0.62)	-0.211 (0.65)	0.630 (0.07)	-0.261 (0.43)
25	Faculty members and students take interest to attend the enrichment seminars.	0.333 (0.43)	-0.235 (0.36)	-0.190 (0.58)	-0.261 (0.39)	-0.200 (0.60)	-0.111 (0.78)	-0.098 (0.82)
26	Most of the faculty members are foreign graduate.	-0.088 (0.74)	0.360 (0.31)	-0.119 (0.68)	-0.137 (0.62)	0.434 (0.13)	0.647 (0.00)	-0.594 (0.00)
27	University offers indigenous scholarships to students for higher education.	-0.407 (0.18)	-0.178 (0.89)	-0.406 (0.18)	0.103 (0.10)	-0.333 (0.27)	0.074 (0.80)	-0.300 (0.34)
28	University provides international scholarships to motivate students to get higher education.	-0.016 (0.95)	0.515 (0.09)	0.091 (0.78)	-0.284 (0.27)	0.404 (0.33)	-0.016 (0.96)	-0.015 (0.96)
29	University offers opportunities to students to participate in technical and professional societies.	0.415 (0.10)	0.238 (0.41)	-0.046 (0.90)	0.250 (0.39)	0.511 (0.14)	-0.059 (0.84)	-0.254 (0.43)
30	Students are encouraged to participate in national / international events.	-0.652 (0.02)	0.127 (0.63)	0.036 (0.90)	0.440 (0.14)	-0.277 (0.37)	0.000 (1.00)	0.254 (0.41)
31	Co-curricular activities are arranged by the university on regular basis.	-0.821 (0.00)	0.115 (0.76)	-0.538 (0.09)	-0.080 (0.39)	0.043 (0.91)	0.290 (0.36)	-0.250 (0.57)
32	Sports facilities are available for students.	-0.348 (0.24)	0.095 (0.80)	-0.043 (0.89)	0.062 (0.86)	-0.333 (0.37)	0.019 (0.96)	-1.00 (0.08)
33	Study trips are arranged by university on regular basis.	-0.800 (0.02)	0.000 (1.00)	-0.022 (0.94)	0.185 (0.61)	0.875 (0.11)	0.259 (0.46)	-0.381 (0.24)
34	QEC systematically evaluates teachers' performance time to time.	-0.651 (0.00)	0.343 (0.21)	0.418 (0.14)	-0.143 (0.87)	0.294 (0.35)	0.283 (0.45)	0.288 (0.32)

Discussion

The data presented in Table-1 elicit correlation between teachers and students' responses with corresponding p-value. The sign with the estimated correlation, direction of responses, and p-value illustrate the significance. The established

rule of thumb suggests that any p-value less than 0.05 is considered significant. The table further explains that correlation between teachers and students' responses are insignificant, which indicates disagreement of the respondents on most of the responses.

In most of the question items one category of respondents disagreed with the other, which clearly indicates dissatisfaction of the respondents in respective category. Both the categories of respondents in all the seven university lucidly show their discontent on the performance of QECs in their respective universities. They believed that the performance of QEC is not up to the mark in accordance with HEC standards and their expectations are not met.

Findings

Based on data collection and interpretation from the responses of teachers, students, and QEC representatives, the following university-wise findings are drawn:

1. *University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar:* QEC's has not achieved the required standard in any domain of the study. It requires improvement in domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation by Students, Weaknesses Rectified and Actions Taken by University, Course Evaluation, Participation of Students in National Events, and QEC and Departments Interaction and Internal Evaluation. However, QEC has not touched the domains of Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, Membership International bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, and External evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

2. *Kohat University of Science and Technology:* The performance of QEC is better in domain of Participation of Students in National Events and Providing co-curricular Activities for Students. It requires expansion in domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation System, Weaknesses Rectification, Course Evaluation, Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, QEC and Departments Interaction, and Internal Evaluation of Teachers' Performance. However, university has not properly worked on the domains of Membership of International bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

3. *University of Peshawar:* The performance of QEC is better in Participation of Students in National Events and providing them co-curricular Activities. It needs improvement in the domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation by Students, Weaknesses Rectified and Actions

Taken by University, Course Evaluation, QEC and Departments Interaction Regarding Teachers' Evaluation, and Internal Evaluation of Teachers' Performance. While the university has not touched the domains of Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, Membership of International Bodies, Participation of Student in International Events, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

4. *University of Agriculture, Peshawar:* The QEC's performance is not up to the mark in any of the domains of the study. It needs improvement in domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation by Students, Weaknesses Rectified, Actions taken by University, Course Evaluation, Participation of Students in National Events, and Internal Evaluation of Teachers' Performance. However, QEC has not touched the domains of Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, Membership of International Bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, QEC and Departments Interaction, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

5. *Islamia College University, Peshawar:* QEC is performing better in the domains of Participation of Students in National Events, and Providing co-curricular Activities. It requires improvement in the domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation System, Weaknesses Rectification, Course Evaluation, Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, QEC and Departments' Interaction, and Internal Evaluation of University. However, university has not worked on the domains of Membership of International Bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

6. *University of Science and Technology Bannu:* QEC's performance is not up to the mark in any of the domains of study. It needs enhancement in domains of Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation System, Weaknesses Rectified and Actions Taken by University, Course Evaluation, Participation of Students in National Events and Providing co-curricular Activities, QEC and Departments Interaction, and Internal Evaluation of University. However, university has not touched the domains of Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, Membership of International Bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

7. *Gomal University of D.I.Khan:* The QEC's performance is better in domains of QEC and Departments Interaction Regarding Teachers'

Evaluation. It requires further progress in Implementation of Plans, Teachers' Evaluation by Students, Course Evaluation, Conduction of Seminars/Workshops/Meetings, Participation of Students in National Events, Providing co-curricular Activities, and Internal Evaluation of Teachers' Performance. However, QEC has not touched the domains of Weaknesses Rectification and Actions Taken by University, Membership of International Bodies, Participation of Students in International Events, and External Evaluation of Teachers' Performance.

Recommendations

Considering data interpretation and findings, following recommendations are made, which are effective to all the universities alike:

1. The results reveal that QEC in the universities are somehow not successful in implementing the plans. To perform effective role QEC needs strong supervision and funding. Production based on quality approach needs to be adopted. Mission and vision of the university be established based on resources in hand and its future needs. HEC may establish an interaction with QECs about plan implementation in the universities and may assist QECs to execute their role autonomously up to final step. The performance of QEC be enhanced by close association of Head of Departments (HODs) of departments with their respective QECs.

2. Universities may ensure professional, logistic and technical support for the promotion of teaching-learning process. Up-to-date and sufficient libraries be established in the universities, which cater the need of students, faculty and staff.

3. Refreshers courses for the teachers be ensured on regular basis, which not only enhance their professional capabilities but also align with the Government and HEC's policies.

4. Teaching performance requires improvement on two facets: Accountability and Progress. SARs need to be efficacious and the input of respective (HoD) on teachers' performance needs to be ensured in the meetings with QEC staff. The component of reliability be ensured in students' feedback on teachers' evaluation by rigorously developing inter consistency in the assessment tool (Teachers' evaluation proforma).

5. Financial support be provided to teachers for research publications and other achievements in the field of research and teaching. Industrial based researches be publicly announced and advertised through the office of ORIC. The impact of research be evaluated in a proper time framework for its effective and up-to-date usage.

6. Course content be updated regularly and be relevant to field value. The feedback of students during the process of course revision may be of prime assistance.

7. Motivational seminars be arranged both for teachers and students on regular basis besides the professional ones. In addition to this Students may be facilitated to participate in national and international events, which could develop their various innate capabilities.

8. Teachers as well as students be offered performance-based scholarships especially to those countries with which universities have academic partnerships. Proper advertisement of scholarships be ensured besides educating them, through seminars, how to apply and earn a scholarship.

9. QEC evaluation report of teachers' performance be shared with both teachers and HoDs and meeting of all the stakeholders be ensured regularly regarding the evaluation reports.

10. The frequent interaction between parents and teachers may resolve various issues pertaining to students' academics; hence universities need to take parents on board through continuous correspondence about their children's academic performance.

References

Ahmad, S. N. & Aziz, S.A. (2012). "Quality in Teacher Education: A Situational Analysis of Quality Assurance Strategies of Teacher Education Institutions in Pakistan." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 4 (7)**.** Pp.173-182.

Akhter, N. (2013). "An Investigation of Pakistani University Teacher Educators' and Student-Teachers' Perceptions of the Role and Importance of Inquiry-based Pedagogy in their Professional Learning Experiences in Initial Teacher Education." A PhD Thesis. University of Glasgow, Scotland.

Batool, Z. & Qureshi, R. H. (2007). *Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education in Pakistan*. Higher Education Commission, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Dilshad, M. & Iqbal, H. M. (2010). "Quality Indicators in Teacher Education Programmes." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*. 30 (2). Pp. 401-411.

Göktaş, A. & İşçi. Ö. (2011). "A Comparison of the Most Commonly Used Measures of Association for Doubly Ordered Square Contingency Tables via Simulation." *Metodološki Zvezki*. 8 (1). Pp.17-37.

Irshad, S. (2011). "Quality Assurance Agency." Retrieved on 5th Aug 2014 from http://www.hec.gov.pk/Main.aspx.

Memon, G. R. (2007). "Education in Pakistan: The Key Issues, Problems and the Challenges." *Journal of Management and Social Sciences.* 3 (1). Pp. 47-55.

Mustafa, G. (2012). "Education Policy Analysis Report of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa." UNESCO, Pakistan.

Shah, H. (2015, Mar 17). "Higher Education in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa." *Daily Times*, Pakistan. P. 7.

Shaheen, I. (2013). "Education in Pakistan: A Case Study of Hurdles and Proposals for Improvement of Education Sector in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa." *Educational Research International*. 2 (3). Pp. 79-85.

Shaukat, F. (2009). "Quality Assurance Agency." Retrieved on 5th August 2014 from http://www.hec.gov.pk/Main.html.