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Summary

Providing increased access has resulted in establishment of a large number of universities. Strengthening management and governance in the universities has been one of the core strategic aims of HEC. A number of steps undertaken in this regard have yet to yield fruitful results.

Multiple issues of complex nature have arisen and are having a profound effect on education governance since the devolution of education to the provinces as a result of a constitutional amendment. In the newly emerging relationship between the center and federating units, the future status remains unclear and would be dependent on the next National Finance Commission Award and decision of the Council of Common Interests.

Overall, in spite of the universities depending on government funding to manage their affairs enjoy both substantive and procedural autonomy to a large extent. Acts/Ordinances through which a university is governed vary in their governance structure and contain many lacunas. In some cases the oversight bodies- Senate and/or Syndicate are too large to arrive at any meaningful decisions. Meetings as per the provisions of the Acts are sometimes not held and members especially government/public representatives probably not playing a more active role.

One positive step currently being implemented is the appointment of Vice Chancellors through Search Committees. However, final selection resting with the government raises questions about transparency and political influence.

Role of QEC in strengthening the internal quality assurance process is yet to attain maturity as is role of ORIC's. External quality assurance through professional councils is yet to be fully implemented. Steps are needed to accelerate the Institutional Evaluation Process in universities.

Like public universities, the private universities are enjoying significant autonomy and measures need to be accelerated for their monitoring and evaluation.

It is important to realize that without an effective system that could provide information on the different functions being performed in the universities (high quality data accessibility) would adversely affect the many positives that have occurred in the higher education sector of Pakistan.
Part I

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Higher Education Commission (HEC) was established in 2002 with the mandate to promote higher education, research and development in the country. Mission of HEC is to facilitate Institutions of Higher learning to serve as an engine of socio-economic development of Pakistan.

Considering the major challenges confronting the higher education sector, the core strategic aims identified as part of its reform framework related to faculty development; improving access; promoting excellence in learning and research; relevance to the economy (industrial linkages); developing leadership, governance and management; enhancing quality (quality assessment and accreditation); and physical and technological Infrastructure development. In this regard, a number of structural and functional changes have been undertaken by HEC since its inception, and under its Medium Term Development Framework (MTDF) - I (2005-10) and MTDF- II (2011-15).

To continue with its efforts of further improving and strengthening the tertiary education sector, a MTDF- III (2016-20) is planned to be launched with assistance from the World Bank under its Technical Education Support Program. In this connection, a series of ten short term background studies by individual consultants are being undertaken by HEC on important issues currently affecting the higher education sector so that feedback provided may help the government during the formulation of MTDF- III.

PRESENT STUDY

The author was appointed as Individual Consultant under the contract signed by him and the Project Coordinator TESP, HEC for the study titled “Management and governance (Federal/Provincial roles and responsibilities; HEI managers appointment, autonomy and accountability). The Objectives and Scope of Work as given in the TOR are given below.

Objectives

(i) To shed light on the regulatory framework regarding the operation of HEI’s and the actual enforcement of the framework clauses

(ii) To assess to which extent the existing regulations defining both the relationships between central, provincial and institutional entities and the internal institutional
governance rule and practices are conducive to an optimal balance between institutional autonomy and accountability and consistent with the harmonious development of the whole sector.

**Scope of Work- Specific Tasks**

(i) The exact delineation of responsibilities between federal and provincial government agencies as it is currently organized after the 18th Amendment of the constitution, and a discussion on how this delineation could be rationally revised, were the CCI to propose a new model of governance for the entire tertiary education sector of the country.

(ii) An analysis of the degree of autonomy (and accountability) enjoyed by public universities and colleges in academic, administrative and financial matters.

(iii) A survey of the acts establishing universities and the degree of (and rationale for) variation of these acts, and the need to move towards more uniformization.

(iv) A survey of the legal modalities and actual practices to select Vice-Chancellors and Deans and of the dominant model of internal governance concentrating powers in the hands of one person vs a more collegial model.

(v) A survey of the collaboration between the QEC’s, DDE’s, Affiliating Councils and ORIC’s and their contribution to common academic goals.

(vi) An analysis of the mechanism by which bilateral and multilateral agencies partner with the sector (HEC/MST Vs HEI’s) and the efficiency of such mechanisms.

(vii) The organic nature of relationships between HEC and private HEI’s (in collaboration with consultancy # 6)

(viii) The status of the information system and its contribution to the management of the sector and its planning.

**Plan of Work and Methodology**

The tasks assigned under objectives and scope of work mostly required literature review, documentary analysis, meetings with concerned officials at HEC, preparation of three questionnaires (semi structured) and their quantification, incorporating qualitative information on governance obtained recently (Feb. / March) during meetings with VC’s and concerned officials of 22 universities, and quantification of HEC checklist data obtained during these visits. Additional Checklist data was shared partly by QAA but could not be quantified as currently it is being processed by them.

From the above it follows that the strategy adopted to complete the assignment can be termed as Mixed Method or Methodological Triangulation since it involved more than one method for data acquisition (interviews, questionnaires, documents). In order to extract meaningful and actionable conclusions, a variety of approaches were adopted. Following
steps (not in sequential order) were adopted to address the TORs based on the varying scope of work required for each activity.

i. Obtaining relevant information and documents from concerned officials of HEC as part of background information.

ii. Examining government documents available in the public domain. A few confidential documents related to the Scope of Work-specific task (a) were also perused.

iii. Literature review to gain an understanding of different issues relevant to present study.

iv. Meetings and discussions with concerned officials in HEC. Discussions with officials from Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Quality Assurance Division (QAD) were held a number of times. List of HEC officials met is attached as Annex. 1.

v. Development of three semi-structured questionnaires for interview with VC’s. Registrars and Faculty members (shown as Annex. 2, 3 and 4). HEC had provided a facilitation letter for the purpose (attached as Annex. 5) Response was poor and received from 9 VC’s, 7 Registrars and 21 Faculty members only. Faculty questionnaire response was also obtained from the FGD participants thereby increasing the total of faculty responses to 43.

vi. FGD with faculty members and officials of Quality Enhancement Cells of universities. List of participants attached as Annex. 6.

vii. Compilation of information obtained from literature, documents, meetings/discussions and questionnaires.

viii. Quantification of checklist data (Annex. 9) obtained during February/March and some made available by QAA. Questionnaire data also quantified/.

**Analysis, Findings and Recommendations**

Eight specific tasks required to be undertaken and mentioned in the TOR under scope of work have been presented separately in Part 2 of the report. For each of them, the information/data obtained through various means mentioned under plan of work and methodology has been incorporated separately under the specific heads. Also included are the Analysis and Findings for each assigned task. The important issues and challenges identified are also mentioned and have contributed towards the formulation of Recommendations that are given in Part 3 of the report.
Part II

This part of the report contains eight sections, dealing separately with the specific tasks assigned under Scope of Work in the TOR. For each area/issue, the major findings are also mentioned.

(a) The exact delineation of responsibilities between federal and provincial government agencies as it is currently organized after the 18th Amendment of the constitution, and a discussion on how this delineation could be rationally revised, were the CCI to propose a new model of governance for the entire education sector of the country.

Responsibilities related to educational governance are being redefined in the newly emerging scenario. In order to gain an understanding of the reconfigured relationship between the Federal Government and provinces, the scheme followed to deal with the assigned task firstly provides information on the 18th Amendment and educated related items. This is followed by a discussion on the role of Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, Higher Education Commission, post-eighteenth amendment scenario of higher education in provinces and lastly the current status of significance on which would rely the future relationship between federal and provincial authorities on educational governance i.e. the decision to be made by the constitutional body Council of Common Interests on all matters pertaining to higher education.

Eighteenth Amendment

The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 2010 transferred legal and administrative authorities from federal control to the provinces thereby enhancing provincial autonomy. 102 Articles from a total of 280 Articles were amended resulting in the abolishment of 17 ministries/divisions (Development Advocate, 2015). Devolution was undertaken in three phases by the Implementation Commission and completed in June, 2011. This included the Ministry of Education being devolved to the provinces.

Prior to the constitutional amendment, most of the roles (between federal-provinces) on education (like policy, planning etc.) were in the Concurrent Legislative List. For more information see Isani and Virk (2004). The Amendment has removed the List thereby placing them in the jurisdiction of the provinces.
Key functions related to education that were devolved to the provinces are Policy, Planning, Curriculum, Syllabus, Standards for Education, Centers of Excellence, Islamic education, Area Study centers, Pakistan Study Centers and Higher education (I-SAPS, undated).

As part of the constitutional amendment, under Article 70 (4), the fourth schedule, a Federal Legislative List comprising of two parts contains entries that relate to education. For entries in Part I of the Federal Legislative List (FLL) the jurisdiction is federal whereas for listings in Part II, the Council of Common Interests (CCI) is mandated to advise.

**Part I of FLL has the following entries that most likely relate to education.**

Entry 15: Library, Museums and similar institutions controlled or financed by the Federation.

Entry 16: Federal agencies and institutes for the following purposes that is to say, for research, for professional or technical training or for the promotion of special studies.

Entry 17: Education as respects Pakistani students in foreign countries and foreign students in Pakistan.

**Part II of FLL has**

Entry 6: All regulatory authorities established under a Federal law.

Entry 7: National planning and national economic coordination including planning, and coordination of scientific and technological research.

Entry 11: Legal, medical and other professions.

Entry 12: Standards in institutions for higher education and research, scientific and technical institutions.

Entry 13: Inter-provincial matters and coordination

Entry 14: Council of Common Interests.

**Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training**

The Ministry of Education (parent organization of Higher Education Commission) was abolished after the 18th Amendment thereby creating problems for many education related organizations that remained with the Federal government.
Realizing the need, a renamed federal ministry, the Ministry of Professional and Technical Training was created in July 2011. This was followed by designating it as the Ministry of Education and Training in July, 2012. CCI endorsed this name on November 8, 2012. Again there was a change in nomenclature and on June 7, 2013, it started functioning as the Ministry of Education, Training & Standards in Higher Education. However, some new developments within the corridors of power resulted in yet again its renaming as the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training (MoFE & PT) on June 19, 2014.

The Ministry has been restructured resulting in dilution of its administrative control due to shifting of some organizations that were previously under it. Some points described below indicate that even for subjects that had been devolved, the relationship of federal government with the provinces is being reasserted again with its modified role being more of a coordinator and facilitator.

Presently the Ministry is overseeing the activities of 13 organizations (including Higher Education Commission). Information on its web site states that as per the Constitutional provisions (25-A and Federal Legislative List part-I and II) the Ministry has to function in the following fields: Higher Education and Standards in Higher Education; Technical Education and Vocational/Professional Training; Non Formal Basic Education; Adult Literacy; Coordination with Provinces/ Areas; Secretariat of Inter Provincial Education Ministers’ Conference (IPEMC); National Curriculum Council (NCC); National Education Policy (NEP); and International Cooperation. The functions include coordination, facilitation, technical and financial assistance as well as taking care of International obligations and commitments.

From the functions mentioned above, although education till 12th grade is now a subject to be dealt by the provinces (Article 25-A), the setting of NCC with approval of IPEMC (for setting minimum standards for school education) is indicative of a new phase of center- provinces relationship. Earlier, the Supreme Court in a decision on Article 2-A had ruled in 2011 that the Federal Government cannot absolve itself from the responsibility of providing education to its citizens. The Senate Standing Committee on Inter-Provincial Coordination in June, 2013 had recommended that there should be uniform curriculum all over the country.

From above description, three other important indicators indicating perhaps a newly evolving shared relationship of responsibilities between federal and provincial agencies are that (1) even after devolution, higher education continues to be a federal subject. (2) the provinces continue to be involved with the agenda of the National Education Policy (NEP) that was formulated before the eighteenth amendment. Provinces in tandem with the
Federal Ministry are currently engaged in work on the new education policy that is to be announced this year. Earlier, the Senate Standing Committee on Inter-Provincial Coordination in its meeting held in June, 2013 had recommended that a National Education Policy should be formulated and launched. (3) The revival of the Interprovincial Education Ministers Conference (IPEMC) whose last (7th meeting) was held recently in February, 2016 at HEC. It is helping in establishing of closer cooperation between provinces and center, and contributing to removal of irritants that continue to exist between the Center and federating units.

In the newly emerging relationship between the center and federating units, it is significant to note that NEP (pre-18th amendment) had recommended that IPEMC with representatives from all the federating units will be the highest body to oversee progress of education in the country. Its role will be that of a coordinator and facilitator. Presently, the policy is that if improvement is required, IPEMC will consider and approve all such improvements which can be proposed by any of the federating units. Important to note is that it is not a statutory body. Pre-amendment IPEMC had also been established through a notification of the then Ministry of Education (I-SAPS, undated).

Brief discussion above is indicative of the attempts being taken to have cohesion on policies. However, multiple issues related to administrative and jurisdictional affairs of education still remain to be resolved even after five years after devolution.

Higher Education Commission (HEC)

HEC was established for the improvement and promotion of higher education, research and development through the Ordinance LIII of 2002 and called the Higher Education Commission Ordinance, 2002. Since then HEC has been endeavoring to meet its obligations taking into consideration the 25 functions assigned to it by the Ordinance. Development and strengthening of the higher education sector was being managed under its Medium Term Development Framework (MTDF) - I (2005-10) and MTDF- II (2011-15). Presently, efforts are continuing to meet its desired objectives and plans are underway for another MTDF – III.

This organization is another federal government entity whose role in the post-18th amendment period remains uncertain. The government had issued a notification in March 2011 regarding its devolution. However, a ruling from the supreme judiciary in April, 2011 on a number of petitions filed by concerned citizens against its devolution stated that HEC shall continue discharging its functions and duties as it had been doing in the past unless and until a fresh legislation is promulgated.
Till now, in spite of uncertainty prevailing even after five years of the devolution process and recent actions taken by some provinces HEC continues to perform all functions as per its mandate. Funding continues to be provided by the Federal Government for its operation and to meet its obligations. Also, as per the decision of CCI, financing of provincial universities would be responsibility of Federal government (i.e. to be managed by HEC) till next National Finance Commission (NFC) Award.

**Federating units and HEC**

Multiple issues of complex nature have arisen and are having a profound effect on education governance. Problems continue to be considered and resolved by the government even after five years since the adoption of the 18th constitutional amendment. The provinces, in this period of uncertainty have adopted different approaches to education governance. A new relationship between HEC and the provinces seems to be evolving. Some important developments that have a bearing on the relationship between the center and provinces on higher education are summarized below.

Gilgit-Baltistan has a single university (Karakorum International University) established under federal charter whereas In Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJ&K), four public and two private universities are operating. In the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) a university by the name of FATA University has only just started functioning with the appointment of its first Vice-Chancellor. In IPEMC, no issue on devolved power distribution has been raised by them.

The Balochistan Education Sector Plan 2013-2017 (p.76) states that the province has no new recommendations for university level education as HEC has advanced the reform process to a point where envisaging further improvements will require a detailed study of the higher education sector. 4 year degree programs curriculum and standards recommended by HEC are to be introduced in selected colleges. An oversight committee with representative of HEC has been formed. However, plans are in the offing of establishing a Balochistan Education Authority (Dawn, January 2015).

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) has established a Higher Education Department. Among the functions assigned to it is Improvement of Quality/Standard of Higher Education, College & University Education, Formulation of policies relating to Higher Education, and Coordination with the Federal Government, other Provincial Departments and concerned Directorates. The Higher Education Regulatory Authority (HERA) for regulation, registration
and supervision of private Higher Education Institutions/Universities also works under the department.

The KPK government promulgated the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities Act 2012 (KPK Act No. X of 2012) in order to reconstitute and reorganize the Universities established by the Government of KPK to further improve their governance and management by ensuring accountability, transparency and giving due representation to all stakeholders in decision making. Amendments in the Act were carried out through the KPK Universities (Amendment) Act 2015. As per the Act (2012), Chairman HEC or his nominee not below the rank of Director General is member of the Senate thereby indicating no effect of devolution.

In one of the meetings of CCI Committee held on 7th October, 2015 the representative of KPK had expressed the view that the province considers the implementation of 18th constitutional amendment in its true spirit as ordained by the parliament. Present status (till 2014) is summarized in a report as follows: A comprehensive system of quality benchmarks is needed for promotion of education in the province. It further adds that *Devolution has necessitated a wide range of fresh legislation as well as amendments in existing piece of legislation. It seems that provincial government departments lack sufficient capacities for coming up with requisite legislation (CPDI, 2014).*

Sindh has established its own Higher Education Commission through legislation by the Sindh Provincial Assembly. The enacted Sindh Higher Education Commission Act, 2013 is a replica of the Higher Education Commission Ordinance LIII of 2002 and the text contains only slight modifications. A case against the establishment of the Sindh Higher Education Commission is pending a decision in the Sindh High Court. Existence of the (Federal) Higher Education Commission is not recognized as evident from its composition. No representative of HEC is included as a member of the Commission. Also the Charter Inspection and Evaluation Committee has now become part of SHEC.

The table 1 given below shows that on the date when Sindh Higher Education Commission was established, at least two other Bills related to establishment of new universities were also approved by the provincial assembly. Assent of the Governor for the SHEC Act and for these two universities followed by Sindh government gazette notification also occurred on exactly similar dates. Observation is that on examination of the Acts of these universities, the word Higher Education Commission is not found to be included under the title of *Definitions* in the Acts. However in both Acts, Chairman HEC or his nominee is a member of BOG In the three other acts of universities shown in the table with the last one enacted just a couple of months ago, HEC representation is included. It remains unclear what role/representation Sindh Higher Education Commission will have in the statutory
bodies of universities of the province. The Sindh Universities and Institutes Laws (Amendment) Act 2014 has also not made any changes to the composition of the universities functioning prior to the SHEC Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.</th>
<th>Name of Act</th>
<th>Passed by Provincial Assembly</th>
<th>Assent of Governor</th>
<th>Date of Gazette Notification</th>
<th>HEC Representation in BOG/Senate</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Qalandar Shahbaz University of Modern Sciences Act 2013</td>
<td>21 February, 2013</td>
<td>27 February, 2013</td>
<td>1 March, 2013</td>
<td>Chairman HEC or his nominee</td>
<td>Nominee of HEC is also a member of Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Metropolitan University Act, 2016</td>
<td>26 February, 2016</td>
<td>5 April, 2016</td>
<td>12 April, 2016</td>
<td>Chairman HEC or whole time member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Representation of HEC in universities established on and after enactment of Sindh Higher Education Commission Act 2013.

Punjab has a functional Higher Education Department that was established prior to the `eighteenth amendment. In the post-eighteenth amendment period, an important step similar to that of Sindh was undertaken and the Punjab Higher Education Commission Act, 2014 was enacted. Unlike Sindh, a nominee of the Higher Education Commission not below
the rank of whole time member of HEC is to be a member of PHEC. Further, in the act under the heading of powers and functions, the following entries are HEC specific:

- Clause 10 (a): coordinate with HEC in a result oriented manner.
- Clause 10 (b): formulate guidelines and recommend policies in line with national standards prepared by HEC under which public and private institutions may be opened and operated in the province
- Clause 10 (q): develop guidelines and facilitate the implementation of a system of quality assurance of institutions, based on the standards developed by HEC.

Another matter of great significance that will determine the future directions of HEC and its relationship with the federating units would depend on the decision on higher education pending before the CCI. In order to understand the important role that CCI is to play in determining the future of HEC, a brief description about this constitutional body and issue related to HEC that is pending before it is briefly described below.

**Council of Common Interests and HEC**

CCI is a constitutional body that has the specific mandate of resolving inter-provincial and province-center disagreements regarding items listed in FLL II as mentioned earlier on.

In the post-eighteenth scenario, devolution of education has been interpreted by two provinces (Sindh and Punjab) and perhaps KPK in a manner that is not in consonance with the federal view on higher education governance.

As a result, as mentioned earlier on, Sindh Higher Education Commission Act was enacted in 2013. This was followed by enactment of the Punjab Higher Education Act, 2014. Adjudication on a case filed against the promulgation of the Sindh Higher Education Commission Act is pending in the Sindh High Court. Further, the Sindh government has approached the Center that since HEC has been restricted in its role to deal only with standards at national level after the 18th Amendment, the share of funds needs to be transferred to the provinces.

Divergence in views of the Center and provinces is now before the CCI. It constituted a high powered committee in March, 2015. The committee has the mandate to deal with all matters pertaining to Higher Education in post-eighteenth scenario. Recommendations of the Committee and proposals from the provinces (yet to be submitted) are then to be considered by CCI for a decision.
As per the functions and rules of procedure of CCI, in case the Federal Government or a Provincial Government is dissatisfied with a decision of the Council, it may refer the matter to Majlis-e-Shoora (Parliament) in a joint sitting whose decision in this behalf shall be final.

**Future of education governance**

Multiple issues of complex nature have arisen after the eighteenth amendment and are having a profound effect on education governance. Problems continue to be considered and resolved by the government even after five years since the adoption of the 18th constitutional amendment. The provinces, in this period of uncertainty have adopted different approaches to education governance. Therefore, future model of governance may be adopting any of the following three approaches.

(1) HEC continues to function in similar manner as now
(2) Provinces have a more participatory role in the affairs of HEC
(3) Education as a devolved subject becomes responsibility of the provinces only.

The Federation will have an influencing effect on any decision. Federal Government view as summarized in a document states that the provinces have major, wide and deep rooted challenge of improving the quality, management and governance of Primary, Secondary, Higher Secondary Education and Affiliated Colleges. Acquiring additional responsibility of Universities would leave the Provincial Governments in greater complicatedness. Fragmentation is expected to adversely impact the development of Higher Education Sector and will:

i. Create disparities amongst the provinces and diffuse national harmony
ii. Derail the process of national planning and coordination
iii. Create serious issues of national and international recognition of degrees and qualifications, equitable access, nationhood – through divergent curriculum, citizenship and ethical standards
iv. Demotion of research on national priorities and issues
v. Weaken quality assurance and compliance of national Higher Education Standards
vi. Impede international treaties and collaboration opportunities
vii. Weaken the role of higher education in economic development

It may be mentioned that earlier attempts in 2000 to devolve parts of the education system i.e. transfer powers from provincial governments to local governments at district levels through the Local Government Plan (also called Devolution Plan 2000) can provide
useful insight into the problems encountered and role of the provincial education departments. Earlier, Winkler and Hatfield (2002) had observed that devolution have significantly changed the roles of key actors and levels of government and the ambiguities concerning their roles and responsibilities need to be quickly resolved. In the post-eighteenth scenario, Aziz et al., 2014 state that there has been little change in Pakistan’s schools since 2010, when the 18th Amendment enshrined education as a fundamental human right in the Constitution. Problems of accessibility, quality, infrastructure and inequality of opportunity, remain endemic.

On the other hand, Chairman, Punjab Higher Education Commission states that the earliest rationalization of HEC’s role ordained in the constitution and a higher degree of empowerment for the provincial higher education set ups would enable the respective provincial governments to manage and provide financial, technical and logistical resources for improving quality, enhancing access and ensuring relevance of research and development at par with national and international standards. There is a danger that the debate and disappointments simmering in the federating units may unravel the 18th constitutional amendment altogether, if not resolved (Nizamuddin, 2015).

Overall, the advantages and disadvantages of devolution are still being debated upon. HEC should create awareness among the stakeholders regarding the benefits that may accrue to society through its continued functioning. Summarizing, it can be said that many ‘ifs’ and ‘buts’ surround the future governance structure of higher education in this post 18th amendment scenario. Pending decisions on important issues that will determine the future directions of education governance are:

- Vision 2025 document of the government states that education development will be led by the provinces as it is a devolved subject. However, Federal Government will play the role of catalyst. What this catalytic effect is going to be needs further elaboration/clarification considering the prevailing situation.
- Supreme Court in its judgment of 12 April, 2011 had stated that HEC shall continue discharging its functions and duties as it had been doing in the past unless and until a fresh legislation is promulgated.
- New National Education Policy with participation of the provinces is under preparation by the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. Planned to be announced this year, it will help in determining the future action plan thereby defining or indicating the future role of HEC.
- A decision against the creation of the Sindh Higher Education Commission is pending before the Sindh High Court.
• National Finance Award covers the financial allocations. How much is allocated to the provinces for higher education or status quo is maintained will have a significant impact on education governance. Presently, as per the decision of CCI, financing of provincial universities would be responsibility of Federal government (i.e. to be managed by HEC) till next National Finance Commission (NFC) Award.

• Recommendations of Committee of CCI on all matters pertaining to Higher Education are to be discussed and decided upon by CCI.

• In case the Federal Government or a Provincial Government is dissatisfied with a decision of the Council, it may refer the matter to Majlis-e-Shoora (Parliament) in a joint sitting whose decision in this behalf shall be final. Probably, as things stand today this last recourse seems to be an eventuality, perhaps followed by litigation.
(b) An analysis of the degree of autonomy (and accountability) enjoyed by public universities and colleges in academic, administrative and financial matters

Background

Autonomy of a university has been described in many ways and debated upon on a very large scale, such that a large body of literature dealing with its different aspects exists.

It refers to the freedom to administer the institution through its own rules and regulations (Hagg, 2009). A similar expression has been made by Gandhi (2013) that Autonomy of Institutions broadly emphasizes (a) freedom to function to achieve academic excellence and (b) freedom to administer the institution through its own rules and regulations.

A common moot point deals with lessening state control (e.g. Nyborn, 2008) as there is a general perception that relying less on government funding increases institutional autonomy.

Present study

Raza, 2009 (quoting Fielden, 2008) has described three ways by which governments supervise the autonomous institutions. They are (1) delegation from center to lower tiers of government (2) delegation to a specialized buffer body and (3) delegation to the academic institution itself. In the case of buffer body the center, specifically the Ministry of Education delegate authority over all elements of funding and operations to it. This leads to considering HEC as a buffer body that directly influences the degree of autonomy in a university.

The discussion to follow examines the relationship of HEC as a buffer body in terms of two groupings of institutional autonomy referred to as Substantive (academic) and Procedural (non-academic) autonomy. The former refers to the power of the university or college to determine its own goals and programs (Altbach, 2005) where as procedural autonomy is largely linked to the finances.
**Substantive autonomy**

(a) Curriculum design an important component of Substantive autonomy is the responsibility of the National Curriculum Revision Committee (NCRC) that works under the Academic Division of HEC. It is supposed to carry out research and analytical study of the existing syllabus and its comparison with the curriculum followed by universities of the advanced countries for each discipline for consideration by a committee. Final decision rests with the respective committees that comprise of mostly Teachers from the different universities. In case of professional degree programs, the concerned Accreditation Council has to be involved.

The implementation status of the courses prepared by NCRC in universities is not known, but there are many universities that are teaching courses prepared by their own teachers. Most recent is the advertisement in the newspapers by Dow University of Health Sciences regarding the development of an Integrated Modular Medical Curriculum by their faculty (Dawn, 15 May, 2016).

The courses circulated by NCRC for adoption or the courses prepared by the university themselves usually follow the procedure of first being considered by the concerned Board of Studies chaired by the Chairperson of the teaching department in the university. This then is considered by the Board of Faculty chaired by the Dean. Representatives of other departments from within the faculty are also members of the Board of Faculty (Faculty Board). Finally the Academic Council, a larger body comprising mostly of members from all the faculties and some from outside the university has to grant approval. The Academic Council is chaired by the VC.

In all Acts describing the powers and functions of universities the common phrase of one of the clauses is *prescribe course of studies to be conducted by it.* Authors opinion based on informal discussions indicate that in a large number of universities the NCRC curriculum is not being followed in its entirety. Thus it follows from the above that till the status regarding adoption of the NCRC curriculum is known it is difficult to determine the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the university on this important issue. Perhaps, the universities are partly autonomous.

(b) Research policy of the universities is usually available for the universities, but in most cases document the agenda laid down by HEC for the establishment of Offices of Research Innovation and Commercialization.

From time to time, HEC identifies and gives directions to universities to focus on some priority areas. In 2012-2013, researchers were asked to concentrate on the energy sector, water resources and food security. However, research proposals in all fields are
considered and there is no limitation or allocation of funds for a particular area of research. In most universities, funding for research is not available or is too meager to cater to the research need of researchers. External sources of funding are scarce. Thus research activities in universities rely mostly on HEC funding.

HEC interacts with universities by providing funding for promotion of research under its National Research Program for Universities (NRPU), University-Industry-Technology Support Program and from funds obtained from donor agencies. Besides, many activities categorized under capacity building of researchers, support to universities in promoting research and commercialization of research is funded by HEC. This leads to the conclusion that universities are dependent on government support for research and are not autonomous.

(c) Entrance standards. In case of professional degree programs the Accreditation Council determines the entrance standards that a university has to follow. For other programs, the university determines the admission requirements. These requirements vary in different universities and in some cases the university may specify slightly more stringent conditions for some programs. Besides the general seats, there are reserved seats for Federally Administered Tribal Areas, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, University employees and wards of armed forces personnel. Since the last few years reserved seats for displaced people from Balochistan have also been allotted by the universities.

The admission requirements are sometimes dependent on the domicile of the applicant seeking admission who then has to compete within the quota set forth by the university as in the case of Quaid-i-Azam University. Only 10% of seats are merit based in each department and are determined based on total obtained from weightage allotted to the previous marks obtained and entry tests. The remaining seats are filled following a similar procedure but within the allotted quota (e.g. 50% of the seats are filled by applicants having Punjab domicile). As it is a Federal university, it is able to admit students from different parts of Pakistan. On the other hand is the University of Karachi that has categorized the applicants into three types. It gives first preference to those who have studied for their matriculation and Intermediate qualifications in Karachi. Second preference is given to those obtaining any one of these certificates from within the province of Sindh whereas the other provinces applicants are given third preference. The same procedure is being followed for admissions in M.Sc programs.

(d) Academic staff appointments are managed by the university themselves. All recruitments are undertaken by the university and involve the following steps: advertisement in newspapers and university website; processing of applications by the
respective departmental Chairman and then by the Dean or a Scrutiny Committee headed by the Dean. Finally the case is placed before the Selection Board, a powerful entity within the university. Two experts are usually co-opted as members of the Selection Board to interview the candidates on the subject.

The above procedure is for appointments to the posts of Lecturers and Assistant Professors. In case of Associate Professors and Professors two or even three foreign experts are co-opted. List of foreign experts is usually approved by the Syndicate. Experts are chosen from this approved list by the VC and are asked to comment on the suitability of the candidates based on the bio-data provided by the university. These recommendations or otherwise are also placed before the selection board for consideration. The final recommendations for all posts are required to be approved by the Syndicate and Senate.

(e) Awarding degrees is the prerogative of the university. The Acts of universities stipulate that holding examinations, and to award and confer degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions is one of the power/functions assigned to a university. Thus universities in this respect are autonomous bodies.

**Procedural autonomy**

(a) Budgeting. HEC is the main financier of higher education. One of the functions of HEC as per Clause 10 (h) of the HEC Ordinance is to review and examine the financial requirements of public sector universities, approve and provide funds to these institutions on the basis of annual recurring needs as well as for development projects and research based on specific proposals and performance and while approving funds for a public sector institution the Commission shall ensure that a significant proportion of the resources of the institution are allocated to research support and libraries.

The majority of the universities are unable to generate enough funds to manage their affairs. Information in this regard has not been accessed in the present study, if it exists will indicate that a few universities are able to meet more than 50% of their needs from their own resources. Generally the one major source of income is the fees collected from the students. Although inadequate to meet the rising needs of universities, HEC allocates funds according to a set formula that considers many factors. Since the last few years some portion of the allocation is incentive linked like implementation status of quality measures in the university that are measured through a scorecard system. The budgeting is undertaken by the Finance and Planning Committee, a statutory body of the University. Final approval is granted by the Syndicate and/or Senate. Overall budgeting is highly dependent on the allocation of funds by HEC.
(b) Financial management is undertaken under the supervision of the Treasurer whose appointment is made with the approval of the Chancellor. Overall he is responsible for budgeting, management and ensuring that the funds are spent for the purpose for which they are provided. Data about the number of posts of Treasurer lying vacant or filled through officials on deputation from the government Account departments or temporarily filled on additional charge basis is lacking. Perhaps this information can reflect upon the performance of the department in managing the budgeting and financial management affairs. In most universities, an Audit Officer (Auditor) is a requirement as per the Acts of Universities. All transactions usually undergo a pre-audit from the Audit Office. An annual audit from the federal and provincial audit departments as the case may be is usually undertaken. In regards to financial management the universities appear to be autonomous.

(c) Non-academic staff appointments are undertaken by the university itself. Common practice is to ask all the teaching departments and administrative sections to submit their demands that may be considered firstly by a committee set up for the purpose and then by the Finance and Planning Committee. Problem existing to variable degree in the universities is not the number of sanctioned posts but the way in which they have been filled i.e. permanent, contractual or temporary and the process adopted for this purpose. Considering that the university itself is responsible for this activity, conclusion is that they are autonomous in this matter

(d & e) Purchasing and entering into contracts are activities undertaken by the universities themselves. It is common to have a Purchase Section that processes the demands submitted. A Purchase Committee mostly comprising senior academics and administration officials assists the Purchase Section to finalize the quotations in case of the teaching departments. For repairs/maintenance and construction activities, a Tender Committee assisted by the Project Directorate undertakes the task. In both cases, Processing/finalization is carried out as per government rules.

**Findings** The findings are summarized in table 2 and can be further improved if more quantifiable parameters are determined and incorporated in the interpretation. The universities enjoy autonomy to a large extent as regards to many substantive and procedural issues. These can be further strengthened if opportunities are made available to administrative officials (Registrar, Controller of Examinations, Treasurer and other officials) for improving their managerial skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive (academic and research)</th>
<th>University's Autonomy</th>
<th>Procedural (non-academic areas)</th>
<th>University's Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Design</th>
<th>Partly Yes</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Non-academic Staff Appointments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Appointments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarding Degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Entering into Contracts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Autonomy in Public universities**

The variety of colleges (autonomous, degree, inter and post graduate colleges) is too large a subject to be dealt in this short term study. Further a separate study specially dealing with colleges is concurrently being undertaken by another consultant. Higher Education Departments of the provinces supervise the operations in the colleges that are considered by many to be the weakest link in the education system of the country.
(c) A survey of the acts establishing universities and the degree of (and rationale for) variation of these acts, and the need to move towards more uniformization

Background

The Acts/Ordinances provide details about the organizational structure, principles, functions and other related norms that a university has to adopt for its smooth functioning.

The normal procedure has been to enact or proclaim the granting of charter to a university by the government. Mostly the provincial assemblies, if not defunct or governor of the province through an ordinance proclaim the establishment of the university in the official gazette. Similarly, in the case of Federal capital the national assembly, if not dissolved or the President of Pakistan through an Ordinance are the authorities that can grant approval for the establishment of a university.

A few exceptions to the above procedure also exist like in the case of Aga Khan University functioning in Karachi, Lahore University of Management Sciences and National College of Arts, both operating in Lahore. All these have been established by a Presidential Order/Ordinance i.e. under a Federal Charter (without involvement of the provincial governors). Then there is another federally chartered university, the National Textile University. It was supposed to have its main campus at Islamabad according to its charter but operates from Faisalabad.

A prominent shift occurred when a charter was granted in 1983 to Aga Khan University, the first private university to be established in the country. This five page document ushered in a change from the collegial to corporate model of governance. Private universities established later have adopted more or less the same pattern of corporate governance. In some public universities too, a reflection of a stronger managerial structure with less involvement of the academia has been introduced.

Establishment of a public university is mostly a political decision of the government. Feasibility study, if any, is conducted after the announcement of its establishment and stakeholder involvement probably is non-existent. Since public universities have been established at different times, their charter too has varied in its content incorporating the sections//clauses of earlier established universities with or without amendments as well as new insertions in the body of the Act. The larger structure (framework) including the organs of governance usually remained the same.
Findings: Acts/Ordinances of Universities

The large number of universities and time constrains prevent examining all the acts/ordinances. Access to some of them could also not be made as universities do not display them on their websites. In others, consolidated acts incorporating the amendments carried out at different times are also usually not available making it difficult to understand the changes made in them. However, within these limitations, a broad sample of acts studied forms the basis to determine and summarize the governing structures prescribed in them. Provisions in the acts regarding appointment of VC and Deans have been discussed separately later on under the specific tasks of (d).

Examination of the Acts reveals that all provide information about the various aspects that are considered essential for managing the affairs of a university. However the details within them are variable. Two extremes are a seven page Act in the case of IBA, Karachi to a 59 page University of Turbat Act.

The governance and management structure contained in the Acts is not the same. In some two important bodies, senate and syndicate are the responsible bodies, where as in others Syndicate is the only governing body existing. Thus, both unitary and dual types of governing structures exist in the public universities.

Besides the above, exceptions noted in the present study were The IBA, Karachi; Sukkur Institute of Business Administration; Air University, Bahria University; National University of Science and Technology, Islamabad; National Textile University and National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. These have a Board of Governors. In Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad there is neither a Senate, nor Syndicate or BOG. Its governing body is referred to as the Executive Council.

Tables 3 and 4 lists the governing bodies structure of some universities. Senate is the highest body that is required to meet at least twice a year and is to be chaired by the Chancellor (mostly the governor of the province). Exception shown in the table is the Institute of Business Administration (IBA), where the BOG is chaired by the Director of the institute. In the absence of the Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor (Minister for Education commonly) chairs the meeting. In most cases, if he is unable to attend then the Chancellor nominates another person. In some acts, it is specified that such situations, the VC will chair the meeting. Similar procedure is described for the convocation of a university. Minutes of meetings are not available on the websites of the universities, but can reveal important details regarding the number of meetings presided by the Chancellor or Pro-Chancellor and other members.
The Senate mostly comprises of a mix of members having representation of the government, politicians, teachers and officials of the university. In some industry representatives have also been included. The total number of members varies greatly from a high of about 180 to 190 members to a low of 18 members in the Senate (Table 3).

Detailed study or comparisons regarding the composition or decisions taken in the meetings of the Senates has not been undertaken in the present study, but examination of minutes of the meetings can be a useful indicator for determining the effectiveness of especially large sized bodies making important policy decisions. In some universities, like the University of Turbat that are relatively new universities, the acts specify that the maximum number should not exceed 21 as is the case in the Federal Universities Ordinance, 2002.

Syndicates are less small bodies as compared to the Senates. Chaired by the VC, up to four government representatives (Secretaries of ministries), Chief Justice or his nominee, one to three Deans, four teachers representatives and some university officials usually are members of the Syndicate. In universities having a Senate, the decisions taken by the Syndicates need ratification from it.

An important aspect of Senate and Syndicate is that the frequency of meetings to be held in a year may or may not be specified in the respective Acts as is also shown in Table 3. Omission is resulting in a university not conducting any meeting or a minimum of one meeting in a year. Checklist data recently obtained by HEC indicates that in some cases even the stipulated number of meetings required to be held as per the Acts are being ignored.

Table 3 also shows the quorum required in the meetings of Senate and/or Syndicate of 14 universities. Required number for holding the meeting varies from 30% to 50% thereby indicating that important decisions related to university affairs and for determining the future directions to be adopted by the university can be taken by only a few.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Syndicate</th>
<th>BOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1* 2* 3*</td>
<td>1* 2* 3*</td>
<td>1* 2* 3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government College University. Lahore Ordinance 2002 (amended 2012)</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>26 NS 8</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Gujrat Act 2004 (amended 2012)</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>23 NS 8</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government College Women University. Sialkot Act 2012</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>22 NS 8</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Sargodha Ordinance 2002 (amended 2012)</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>24 NS 8</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Agriculture. Faisalabad Act 1973</td>
<td>37 + 2/year 1/3</td>
<td>19 NS 1/3</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fatima Jinnah Women University. Rawalpindi. Ordinance 1999 (amended 2012)</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>27 NS 8</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Institute of Business Administration Act 1994 (amended 2013)</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td>16 2/yr ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shah Abdul Latif University Act 1986 (amendment 2002, 2015)</td>
<td>34+ 2/yr 1/3</td>
<td>16 NS 1/3</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Karachi Act 1972 (amended 2013, 2015)</td>
<td>45+ NS 1/3</td>
<td>15 NS 1/2</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Turbat Act 2011</td>
<td>21 2/yr 2/3</td>
<td>10+ 4/Yr 50%</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University. Quetta. Bill 2009 (amendment 2014)</td>
<td>18 2/yr 1/2</td>
<td>8+ 4/yr 50%</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings mentioned above following the wording of the National Educational Policy, 2009, are that both the commitment gap and Implementation gap are noticeably present.

Creating uniformity in the Acts of universities

Many a times the academicians in Pakistan have debated upon the issue of having a common policy and procedure for governance of universities and each time the debate has produced a stalemate. Pros and cons mentioned need a more detailed examination. Leaving the merits and demerits aside, attempts to create uniformity have been made at the Federal level and in the province of KPK.

The Federal Universities Ordinance (2002) based on the guiding principles of having a framework of effective accountability, separation of policy making/oversight and executive functions, meaningful faculty participation, and reduced interference of government was to be adopted by the federal universities (Minutes, Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and Technology, 2006). The schedule in the Ordinance mentioned seven federal universities (Table 4) on which it may be applied through notification in the official gazette.

This was probably the first attempt at establishing a uniform system of governance for the universities. It was followed by considering it as a model university ordinance for other universities to adopt. HEC with some modifications currently displays the 5th edition on its website as a part of the guidelines for the establishment of a new university or an institution of higher education. As a result, new universities were asked to adopt the Ordinance whereas in the case of old ones the government had the authority to notify adoption of the ordinance.
Restructuring of seven universities set up by the Federal Government in order to provide autonomy while improving governance and management so as to enhance the quality of higher education in the country has not occurred as evidenced from the table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Syndicate</th>
<th>BOG</th>
<th>Executive Council/Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Universities Ordinance. 2002</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaid-Azam University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allama Iqbal Open University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahria University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal University of Arts, Science and Technology</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Modern Languages</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Universities listed in Schedule of Federal Universities Ordinance (2002) and their governing bodies. Also the recommended governing structures of the Ordinances are shown.

Except, the Federal University of Arts, Sciences and Technology whose Ordinance was promulgated on the same date as the Federal Universities Ordinance i.e. 13th November, 2002 the other universities are functioning as per their previous set up. However, there are universities in the provinces like the University of Turbat and the University of Loralai in Balochistan that have adopted the model ordinance displayed on the HEC website.

Besides the attempt of HEC in creating a nearly uniform system of governance, a similar step has recently been undertaken for the provincial universities in KPK.

The KPK government promulgated the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities Act 2012 (KPK Act No. X of 2012) in order to reconstitute and reorganize the Universities established by the Government of KPK to further improve their governance and management by ensuring accountability, transparency and giving due representation to all stakeholders in decision making. Amendments in the Act were carried out through the KPK Universities
(Amendment) Act 2015. As per the Act (2012), Senate and Syndicate are the two governing bodies stipulated in the Act. The Senate with the Chancellor as Chairman is to have 23 members out of which one Dean and four university teachers are from the university. The provincial government is represented by four secretaries of the government departments. Two industrialists and a nominee of the KPK Chamber of Commerce and Industry will also be members. At least twice a year meetings are stipulated in the act and quorum required shall be 2/3. In the absence of Chancellor, the meetings are to be chaired by a member who is not a university employee.

The Syndicate has 21 members out of which one Dean, four teachers, two Principals of affiliated colleges, one Principal from the constituent college and one Director/Chairman of Institute/Department represent the university. Government is represented by four secretaries. VC is the Chairperson. The Syndicate is required to meet at least twice a year and the quorum specified is 2/3 of the total members.

Schedule lists a total of 19 universities of the province for implementation of the provisions of the Act. It will come into force on such dates that Government by notification publishes in the official gazette. Will this attempt of KPK for creating uniformity in the governance structure of universities follow the same fate as in the case of Federal Universities is difficult to foresee at this stage.

Concluding, no information is available to indicate that feedback is obtained from the stakeholders at the time of formulation of Acts/Ordinances for universities or what are the determinant factors that form the basis that lead to having a Senate and Syndicate, Syndicate only or BOG in a university. A critical rethink with involvement of all stakeholders is essential to debate upon these fundamentals.
(d) A survey of the legal modalities and actual practices to select Vice-Chancellors and Deans and of the dominant model of internal governance concentrating powers in the hands of one person Vs a more collegial model

Background

In September, 2002 Higher Education Commission was established. Soon after on 13th November, 2002 in order to constitute and restructure universities set up by the Federal Government the Federal Universities Ordinance was promulgated. Among many changes, the Section 11 of the Ordinance referred to the Appointment and Removal of the Vice Chancellor. It stated in Section 11 (1) that VC shall be appointed by Chancellor on the basis of recommendation of Senate.

As per the Ordinance, the Senate was required to constitute a Search Committee for the purpose comprising of: Two eminent members of society nominated by the Chancellor of whom one shall be appointed as the Convener; Two members of Senate; Two distinguished University Teachers who are not members of the Senate (to be selected through a process prescribed by statute); One academic of eminence not employed by the University. It may be mentioned that prior to this decision, the Acts of some individual universities (like the University of Punjab Act, 1972) did have the provision of having a Search Committee for appointing a Vice-Chancellor but compared to the present involved bureaucracy as compared to a more open system now.

Persons proposed by Search Committee shall be considered by Senate and a panel of three in order of priority shall be recommended to the Chancellor. The Chancellor may decline to accept any of the proposed persons and seek recommendation of a fresh panel. The Search Committee will again make a proposal to Senate and will remain in existence till appointment of VC is made by the Chancellor for a renewable term of five years.

At the same time, the Ordinance (with its proviso of Search Committee) was made part of the guidelines for the establishment of a new university or an institution of higher education. Presently the 5th edition incorporating earlier amendments is on display on HEC website. As a result, new universities were asked to adopt the Ordinance whereas in the case of old ones the government had the authority to notify adoption of the ordinance. In majority of the new or old acts/ordinances of public universities the Chancellor is the appointing authority who happens to be the President of Pakistan in case of federal universities and Governor in the provinces.
Selection of VC/Rector through a Search Committee in all public universities was made possible by a decision taken in the 2nd Chancellors Meeting held on 11th May, 2006. The Governor of a province was made responsible to form a Search Committee for appointment of VC. However the legality of the decision was questioned in a meeting of Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and Technology held on 31st July, 2006. Some major queries were:

(a) Under what provision of law the Chancellors Committee functions
(b) Provision of Search Committee is not in any of the Ordinances/Acts of universities
(c) Under what provisions of law the decision of having Search Committee can be deemed to be amendment in the Act itself.

HEC contention was that Chancellors are free to appoint a VC under existing law in accordance with procedure they deem appropriate and the process of formulation of Search Committee does not contradict the statute of concerned university. Further, new universities were asked to adopt the Ordinance whereas in the case of old ones the government had the authority to notify adoption of the ordinance.

Present procedure for appointment of a Vice Chancellor

Appointment of VC through a Search Committee was a departure from the past. For the first time, an open (vacancy advertised in print media), competitive, merit based system was introduced in the country.

During the initial stages of implementation of the Search Committee process a major problem arose due to the stipulation in the Federal Universities Ordinance, 2002 that the Senate will appoint the Search Committee (Section 11). All seven universities listed in the Schedule of the Ordinance have not made amendments in the act to adopt the Ordinance and do not have a Senate (Table 4). Thus with no Senate, the process of Search Committee had be handled by the Higher Education Commission.

Formulation of a Search Committee for selecting persons for appointment as Vice Chancellors in Federal Universities seems to have generated a tussle between HEC and its parent organization (the Federal Ministry) as is evidenced in the case for appointment of VC’s in three universities (Quaid-i-Azam University, Allama Iqbal Open University and International Islamic University). Search Committee with HEC chairman as Convener had begun processing of applications but was reconstituted by the Ministry (Dawn, 19th June,
The Search Committee re-constituted with the approval of President (Chancellor) and comprising of seven members is shown at Annex. 7.

All provinces have put in place the process for appointment of Vice-Chancellors through a Search Committee. An important development resulted from a dispute between the Punjab Governor and Chief Minister regarding appointment of VC in the Bahauddin University, Multan. Chancellor (Governor) did not agree/approve the recommendation made by the Chief Minister and instead proposed another name. Finally the Supreme Court in 2011 (Civil petition No. 1017-L of 2011) had to decide that the Governor is bound by the advice of the Chief Minister. Amendments in the Acts of universities to this effect have been undertaken in many universities. The Search Committee recommends names in order of merit except in Punjab where only the names, not listed in order of merit, are to be forwarded to the Chief Minister. There have been instances reported in the media where the Governors and/or Chief Minister have interviewed the short-listed candidates also. In quite a few instances the issue of final selection still becomes a bone of contention between these two powerful authorities. This recently happened in the case of appointment of VC at DoW University of Health Sciences.

Administratively the process is being dealt by the Higher Education Departments in KPK and Punjab. In Sindh the Chief Minister Secretariat is involved whereas in Balochistan the Governor secretariat is responsible. Commonly the Senate of a university constitutes the Search Committee and Governor is the appointing authority in Balochistan. For some unexplained reasons, delays in the appointments are occurring and having an adverse effect on the universities functioning. There are many instances when the VC, on expiry of his term, has been asked to continue working till a new person is appointed or a Pro-VC/ senior Dean has been appointed as Acting VC. This interim period in many cases have lasted for a year or even more.

Amendments in the Acts of universities show that real authority now vests with the Chief Minister in Punjab, Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In order to demonstrate the procedure that is nearly uniform in the provinces, the case of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is described below.

The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) government promulgated the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities Act 2012 (KPK Act No. X of 2012) in order to reconstitute and reorganize the Universities established by the Government of KPK to further improve their governance and management by ensuring accountability, transparency and giving due representation to all stakeholders in decision making. Amendments in the Act were carried out through the KPK

Section 12 of The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities Act, 2012 dealt with the process of appointment of VC. In the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Amendment) Act 2015 and 2016 the following changes were carried out in Section 12.

The Vice Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor on the advice of Government from a panel of three candidates recommended by the Academic Search Committee. Section 12 (1).

Section 12 (2) states that An Academic Search Committee, for the recommendation of persons suitable for appointment as Vice-Chancellor shall be constituted on the advice of Government and shall consist

(a) An academician of national/international repute with at least 50 international publications who shall be the chairman and convener of the Academic Search Committee to be nominated by the Chief Executive of the Province

(b) Two of the most eminent educationist of Pakistan outside the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa having academic administrative experience as Chairman/Deans/Vice-Chancellors etc.

(c) One eminent academician/researcher of the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa with additional experience of working with the industry/Government agencies.

(d) Secretary Higher Education Department of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa will act as the Secretary of the academic search committee.

As a result of amendment, the composition of the Committee has been reduced to five members from the previous 10 members. Four pages of the amended act (Schedule II) are devoted to the Essential Qualification and Experience, Desirable experience, Expected Skills and Competencies, Leadership Skills, and Interpersonal communication and collaborative skills.

Some other points of significance are that as in the original act, the Chief Minister as is the case in Punjab would advice the Governor. For general universities a doctorate in any discipline is essential. In the case of Medical, Engineering and Agricultural Universities doctorate in the respective fields is a requirement. Besides the term of VC would be three years extendable for another term on the basis of performance to be evaluated by Government against the key performance indicators to be set up by the Government.
Fig. 1 based on the feedback provided by 43 Faculty members (includes QEC officials as most of them are involved in teaching also) indicate that 56% consider it to be the appropriate method. Another 8 teachers (19%) do not disagree, but want improvement in the process. In discussion they revealed that transparency is required. Overall, it can be concluded that the majority (75%) are in favour of having a VC appointed through a Search Committee. Further, all 9 VC’s and 7 Registrars in their responses also deemed the process as appropriate.

To another query of whether it would be desirable to appoint a VC from amongst the three senior most faculty members of the university, the opinion of 42 respondents indicates that nearly half (45%) are opposed to the idea whereas 55% support it (Fig. 2).
Appointment of Dean

Dean is considered to be an important functionary of a University. However, the role of Dean in University affairs was found to vary in the different universities. Nearly all Acts under the title of ‘Officers of the Universities’ acknowledge his existence. However, his responsibilities as done for other Officers (Registrar, Controller of Examinations, Treasurer etc.) are not mentioned. Procedures for his appointment and role are usually included in the Statutes/Regulations.

Statutes/Regulation/Rules of universities are not easily available and time constrains prevent delving deeper to obtain and examine all of them. However, those examined reveal disparities in their powers and functions. Federal Universities Ordinance, 2002 in Section 2 (h) has the following definition for Dean. ‘Dean means head of Faculty or head of an academic body granted the status of a Faculty by the Act or by the Statutes or Regulations’. As per the Ordinance the Dean is to be appointed by the Senate.

Air University is included in the Schedule of the Federal Universities Ordinance. However, the Air University Ordinance, 2002 neither has a Senate nor uses the designation of Dean. In the case of Quaid-i-Azam University which is also included in the Schedule of the Federal Universities Ordinance, no Senate exists and the Dean is appointed by the Chancellor (President of Pakistan) for a term of five years.

The term of office of Dean is variously described ranging from three to five years. There may be no representation of Dean in Senate or one Dean may be a member. In Syndicate all Deans may be member or only one of them. In Academic Council usually all
Deans are members. Selection Board of a university may or may not have the concerned Dean as a member for selection of a teacher in a department that is part of the Faculty he/she heads. More detailed study is needed to examine the role of Dean in all the universities.

Dominant model of internal governance (concentrating powers in the hands of one person Vs a more collegial model)

In MTDF-II (2011-2015) it was mentioned that internal governance remains inefficient, administrative staff are under qualified and excessive power remains in the hands of VC and Registrar. Apparently it seems that authoritarian rule prevails in the universities as both the administrative and executive functions are overseen by the VC by virtue of the authority vested in him by the Act of the university.

Generalizing it can be said that collegial or participatory model rather than the corporate model exists in the public universities. This is evidenced from the composition of the statutory bodies. Further for each statutory body besides its composition, the functions of the bodies are specified in the Act according to which they have to perform.

Further, if the VC as Chief Executive Officer) in cohort with the Registrar (chief administrative officer) are involved in mismanagement, then provision is available in the Acts/Ordinances for the oversight bodies like Senate and/ or Syndicate to act accordingly.

The organogram of any university will show that a number of sections/divisions exist within it to deal with the affairs of the university. Broadly the Administration comprises of senior officials like Registrar, Controller of Examinations and Treasurer; whereas on the Academic side are the Deans of Faculties and Chairpersons of Departments/Directors of Institutes. Besides, there are other officers reporting directly to the VC like Director of Student Affairs, Provost, Directors of QEC and ORIC etc. Putting in the equation the students, research scholars, subordinate staff and funds available makes the whole situation become more complex. It was noted that in the Act of IBA, Karachi there is no provision of Registrar.

The powers and functions bestowed on VC as the Chief Executive require that he oversees all the multifarious activities being managed by these senior officials. To assist him in his dealings involving a complex array of issues, provision has been made in many Acts of having a Pro- Vice Chancellor who is appointed from amongst the three senior most faculty members. In few cases, there is a provision of having 3 Pro-VC’s. If any one of the officers
under performs, this directly or indirectly affects the smooth functioning of the university and sometimes even have a domino effect. There can be many reasons to explain the non-performance of these officials. Actual cause needs to be determined for each of them.

From the university officials mentioned earlier on, the Registrar plays a very crucial role. The power bestowed on him in managing the daily affairs seems to be more than that of the Pro-VC. Nature of work, being the administrative head, requires providing support to all the authorities of the university (including academic). Previously, it was believed that so much power being concentrated in the hands of the duo of VC and Registrar, if misused can play havoc with the university governance system. To dilute the role of Registrar, Federal Universities Ordinance and other Acts stipulated that appointment of Registrar will be made for a renewable period of three years.

Figs. 3 and 4 show responses of 36 and 35 respondents respectively regarding what experience should a Registrar possess and whether Registrar should be appointed on additional charge basis from amongst the faculty. As evidenced, 72 % are of the opinion that a Registrar should be someone having both administrative and academic experience. Nearly a similar number (71 %) oppose the appointment of Registrar on additional charge basis.
Presently, in many universities, those with experience and qualifications needed for appointment as Registrars are not available as the post is being considered as a temporary post. As a result mid-level or senior level persons hesitate to apply. This has resulted in filling of this important post on a temporary basis from amongst the faculty on additional charge basis. How this selection (preferential treatment) is given to one out of so many faculty members is not known. Capability, performance or output of the person chosen is a subject of conjecture as data regarding it is also not available. However, its influencing role and effect on the internal governance cannot be ignored. One has only to imagine what an inappropriate selection can do.

**Findings**

VC has to manage the affairs depending on the variable capabilities and competencies of his administrative and academic team members. Rules and regulations are available to govern the university. Good or bad, the VC has to report to the highest governing body of the university (Senate or Syndicate as the case maybe).

According to the Acts, the **Senate/Syndicate shall hold the VC and the authorities accountable for all the functions of the university**. If this important responsibility of checks and balance is being undertaken in an effective manner then the problem instead of being aggravated should have been removed or diluted to a great extent. In many cases, even the number of meetings required to be held as per the Act are not being arranged as indicated by checklist data of HEC. Role of HEC nominees serving in these august bodies can prove helpful in determining the ground realities. It may be mentioned that the Chancellor is supposed to chair the meetings of the Senate or in his absence the Pro- Chancellor. This event is also usually a rarity.
Provisions exist in the Acts regarding removal of the VC with the supreme authority vesting with the Chancellor who can order an inquiry if he deems that serious irregularity or mismanagement has occurred. Status of such actions, if carried out is not known.

The government representatives, including nominees of HEC roles in the supreme governing bodies need examination. Summarizing, the Consultant believes that problems of internal governance can to a large extent be removed if the oversight committees play a more assertive role. Probably they are not aware of their responsibilities.
A survey of the collaboration between the QEC’s, DDE’S, Affiliating Councils and ORIC’s and their contribution to common academic goals

Quality Enhancement Cells, Offices of Research Innovation and Commercialization, and Directorates of Distance Education are three distinct entities within a university who are trying to accomplish the goals set forth for them by HEC.

Each has a different role to play. QEC is responsible for internal quality assurance and coordination with the external quality assurance organizations (The Accreditation Councils). DDE is dealing with external students who are unable to enroll in the formal university programs. ORIC has to build research capacity, manage research contracts and commercialize the university research products.

These three units and the accreditation councils (external) are being provided facilitation by HEC through the following divisions

QEC.............................................. Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)
Accreditation Councils............ Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)
DDE......................................................Quality Assurance Division (QAD)
ORIC............................................... ......Research and Development Division (R &D)

Quality Assurance Agency is overseeing the activities of 164 QEC’s. In addition, besides the five affiliating (accreditation) councils established by HEC it has to coordinate with the nine accreditation councils established by the government for accreditation of professional degree programs. Close cooperation has been established by HEC with the professional councils through MoU’s.

Quality Assurance Division is dealing with a total of thirteen DDE’s. In a recent meeting held on 25th March, 2016, the DDE’s informed that Quality Assurance mechanism is being developed and will be put in place in consultation with the respective QEC. If it materializes then this would be the first indication of collaboration between DDE and QEC of a university. Perhaps some modalities will be developed to introduce course evaluation from students in the initial phase.

R & D at HEC is facilitating the establishment of ORIC’s in the universities. Like the QEC’s they are being established in a phased manner and currently 46 universities have a functional ORIC.

No record is available to indicate that QAA, QAD and R & D hold formal meetings together at HEC for promoting collaboration between these entities that they are
overseeing. The guidelines prepared for them also are silent on this aspect. Informal contacts do occur especially between QAA and QAD.

In the universities also, all these three units of the university are working according to the objectives set forth for them without any noticeable cooperation. Discussions with HEC and QEC officials reveal that no issue of common concern has arisen so far to warrant a meeting of QEC with ORIC or with DDE (if existing). One probable collaborative effort, as mentioned earlier on, would be at the time of introduction of the quality assurance mechanism by the DDE with assistance of the QEC. Thus it can be concluded that presently collaboration does not exist between them.

In the feedback provided by faculty to the question What type of collaboration do you foresee between the QEC, ORIC, Accreditation Councils and DDE; the majority did not put in any reply. Inference drawn is that they probably were not aware of any existing collaboration. Those who did put in a reply (11 out of 41 respondents) also gave a vague answer of ‘need collaboration’.

The only noticeable cooperation and collaboration is that between QEC and the Accreditation (Affiliating) Councils. According to Information available with QAA, in majority of the universities, QEC with assistance of the concerned teaching department is responsible for preparation of the documentation required by the Councils. They also coordinate the visit of the Accreditation team. Only, in a few cases, the concerned teaching department deals with this work.

Since all the three units have been established in phases they are at various stages of their development and concentrate firstly on achieving their primary objectives. Those which have reached maturity can explore the possibility of (1) QEC and DDE collaborating in initiating the quality assurance exercise of course and teacher evaluation from the students. (2) ORIC in one of its task of improving recruitment and retention of faculty perhaps can interact with QEC in ways to be decided between them.

Findings

Except for collaboration between QEC and Accreditation Councils, indications are that these entities of the university have yet to establish formal collaboration among themselves. One probable future effort between QEC and DDE relates to the introduction of Quality Assurance mechanism.
An analysis of the mechanisms by which bilateral and multilateral agencies partner with the sector (HEC/MST) Vs HEI’s and the efficiency of such mechanisms

HEC is involved whenever the bilateral or multilateral agencies deal with any government ministry or department on matters concerning higher education. In some cases, it may directly deal them. Nature of work may entail signing of agreements, Pacts and Protocols, Linkages and collaboration.

On the other hand, the universities were encouraged to establish collaboration with foreign universities/organizations. As a result, MoU’s were signed by them on a large scale and there are some universities claiming collaboration with even more than 50 foreign universities. The work required to be undertaken requires access to a large number of documents not only from HEC but other government departments also, an onerous task within the limited time available.

The issue was discussed with the Chairman HEC Steering Committee and FM Specialist, TESP who agreed to exclude this specific task.
(g) The organic nature of relationships between HEC and private HEI’s (in collaboration with consultancy #6)

BACKGROUND

Even prior to the establishment of HEC, a limited number of private universities had started to operate in the country like the Aga Khan University that was granted a federal charter in 1983. Increasing access was one of the core strategic aims of the HEC agenda and steps were undertaken to increase the number of private universities. Standards referred to as Cabinet criteria for establishing private universities were introduced in 2002. Presently about 75 private universities operate in the country out of which about 29 are eligible for financial support from HEC.

Realizing the need for further strengthening the private universities, a committee comprising of Chairman HEC, Deputy Chairman Planning and Secretary Finance Ministry approved conditions for providing financial support to the private universities. The 2nd Chancellors Committee held on 11th May, 2006 and chaired by the President of Pakistan agreed with the recommendations of the Committee. A special Committee was constituted and empowered to decide on all eligibility issues of private universities to apply for funding. No limit on amount of funding to be provided was set and like public universities they were required to undergo the same procedures for financial support through DDWP/CDWP/ECNEC.

The Special Committee recommended that Private universities assigned ‘W’ category would be eligible for funding in the following areas

- Research Support, Faculty Development and Training Facilities (100% government funding)
- Digital Library (up to 50% cost sharing by government). Also included was the now dormant Foreign Faculty Hiring Program.
- Development of Infrastructure, academic and research facilities (up to 50% cost sharing).

Findings

A separate study titled ‘Private HEI’s (regulatory framework, access, program, quality)’ is part of the HEC sponsored series of studies currently in progress. Assignment required collaboration with this study but time constrains and other limitations prevented such
collaboration to materialize. However, during February and March, eleven private universities had been visited. Based on the checklist data in combination with similar data shared by QAA, some observations/information that can be used to supplement the contribution of this major study are given below.

In Private universities, a Foundation (Trust) mostly oversees the activities of the university. Chancellor is appointed by the Patron (the Provincial Governor) on the recommendations of the Foundation and Board of Governors. Commonly the proceedings of the Foundation/Trust are not publicized. Chancellor is the appointing authority for a VC/Rector who is the academic and administrative head of the university. Unlike most public universities there is no Senate and/or Syndicate, but a Board of Governors and a corporate model of governance.

One or more of the problems mentioned below exist in the private universities

- 30% or even more faculty posts lying vacant.
- Scarcity of senior faculty. Mostly Assistant Professors managing the teaching departments.
- Part time teachers employed in large number. In quite a few cases faculty from public universities also
- Frequency of Board of Studies/Board of Faculty meetings very less.
- One Dean looking after more than one faculty.
- Introduction of new programs without formal approval from HEC.
- Professional degree programs being offered without accreditation from concerned professional Accreditation Councils.
- Introduction of M.Phil/Ph.D programs with large intake of students and insufficient number of supervisors.
- High teacher student ratio

Interaction between HEC and the private universities is an on-going activity and some of them are summarized below

(1) All BOG’s have a HEC nominee as a member. The contribution of the HEC nominee in the meetings is not known.
(2) HEC nominee as member of University Plagiarism Committee. Access to ‘Turnitin’ Plagiarism software provided on payment of subscription fees.
(3) HEC initiated the process of Institutional Performance Evaluation based on eleven standards in the private universities also. Reports are shared with the respective universities. Status of follow up actions is not known.
(4) M.Phil/Ph.D programs are being reviewed by Review Teams set for the purpose.
(5) Faculty participation in Training programs organized by Learning Innovation Division at HEC.
(6) Participation of QEC in meetings/workshops arranged by QAA.
(7) Facilitation including trainings provided to universities for establishing Offices of Research, Innovation and Commercialization.
(8) Funding provided to HEC recognized research journals.
(9) Best Teacher Awards
(10) Participation of faculty as members of National Curriculum Revision Committees.
(h) The status of the information system and the contribution to the management of the sector and its planning

Background

HEC has tried to keep pace with the rapidly changing information and communication technology innovations at least within its head office and regional centers at Karachi, Quetta, Lahore and Peshawar. HEC strategy in this respect is an integration of computing services with digital resources, and processes automation utilizing the information highway infrastructure (HEC Annual report 2012-2013).

Sanyal (1995) had observed that there is increased pressure on universities to rationalize the decision-making process, ensure better allocation of resources, increase accountability, transparent operation and evaluation of objectives. These require rapid and efficient methods of planning, communication and analysis of their management functions. Thus to deal with the many interdependent operations and the associated complexities involved, and for obtaining better communication, feedback and control, the universities since 1980s are increasingly adopting integrated information systems. In fact, these are now considered an indispensable aid to university operation.

The need for this indispensable aid was realized by HEC in 2006 during the formulation of its MTDF-1 (2006-2010). The framework recommended establishment of an Education Management Information System (EMIS) in the universities and considered it essential for providing facilitation to the students, administration personnel and other stakeholders like alumni, parents etc.

Like the earlier MTDF-1, MTDF-II (2011-15) of HEC (p.57) again reemphasized that in order to streamline governance and process management there is a need for a comprehensive Higher Education Information Management System (HEMIS) to help in development of solid forecasts and facilitate strategic decision making. Establishment of HEMIS was considered as one of the major programs to be undertaken by HEC and was mentioned as one of the performance indicators also. The physical target set to be achieved till the end of 2015 was that it would become operational in 50 public universities.

Present study

During the life of MTDF I steps were undertaken by HEC to initiate a pilot study. Oracle’s PeopleSoft Enterprise Campus Solutions was initially introduced in the University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar and the DoW University of Health Sciences at Karachi in 2007 in order to automate their student administration and management processes. Till 2010, CMS modules were introduced in another six universities (Quaid-i-Azam
University, Islamabad; Punjab University, Lahore; Balochistan University of Information Technology and Management Sciences, Quetta; Karachi; Islamia University, Bahawalpur; Institute of Business Administration, Karachi; and Sukkur Institute of Business Administration). Perhaps the last system upgrade was undertaken in 2010.

The seven to eight CMS modules introduced are student centric covering the life cycle of a student from admissions to graduation to alumni relations. Students have access to online course selection and registration along with timetable, grades, exam schedule, hostel accommodation etc. all phases of student lifecycle thereby streamlining information flow, improving quality of services and increasing productivity. Information available on the websites indicates that substantial benefits have accrued to the students, faculty and administration; and the introduced features are now part of these universities management activities with trained staff available.

The only substantial progress made during the second MTDF (2011-2015) was that an independent review was conducted by a committee comprising of Vice-Chancellors, Project Directors, CMS Team members and experts/academicians for evaluation of the performance of CMS in the above mentioned eight universities. Another study by IBM was conducted to determine the usage of hardware provided to these universities for implementation of CMS.

Another major step undertaken during this period was the formulation of plans for introducing CMS and the associated Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) dealing with financial management, human capital management, asset management, grant management and master data management in another 30 universities. Funds were also allocated for the purpose from the recurring budget of HEC to introduce CMS in 10 universities each year. However, following the open competitive bidding process as per the government procurement rules, since only one bidder responded award of contract could not materialize in 2012. In addition, future plans that envisaged the establishment of HEMIS Academies in three selected universities did not make any progress. T

The target set forth in MTDF (2011-2015) of making CMS operational in 50 public universities has not been achieved. However, some universities besides the earlier mentioned eight, perhaps on their own initiatives have implemented various CMS modules. These include Aga Khan University, Habib University, National University of Science and Technology, Institute of Business Management, and Lahore University of Management Sciences (Techlogix report, 2012).

Although limited number of responses were received, all nine VCs and seven Registrars who responded to the questionnaire have expressed the desire of having this
system introduced in their universities. Faculty response is shown in Fig. 5. From a total of 34 responses, the majority have indicated that no MIS exists. Some of those replying in the affirmative revealed during discussion that their understanding of MIS was in regards to availability of basic facilities like internet connection and email services and they want an upgrade of the facilities.
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**FIG. 5**

Management Systems and Business Intelligence Systems are now considered to be essential components of university operations. Management system has been referred to as the nervous system of a university. All the different steps undertaken by HEC under its reform agenda especially the agenda of improving governance in universities with proper strategic planning as per international standards are adversely being affected and require immediate attention of the concerned authorities for implementing HEMIS.

The following two options can be considered for implementing HEMIS. Either HEC continues to remain a major player as was the case during the introduction of CMS in the eight universities. In such a situation, a separate unit would need to be established within HEC as present staffing in its IT division seems to be inadequate. Alternatively, the universities may implement the systems on their own (with financial support from HEC) as has been done by some universities (mentioned earlier on).
Part III

RECOMMENDATIONS

In part 2 of this study during the discussion on the specific tasks, some recommendations have already been made. These earlier mentioned recommendations in combination with the specific recommendations given below on consideration can bring into focus some major problems and remedial measures required to be undertaken for improvement in the higher education sector.

(1) A multi-pronged approach is required to create awareness among the different segments of society that a unified policy on education is essential to promote a uniform set of values and national unity.

(2) Devolution should not affect the national reform agenda. Efforts need to be increased to strengthen the already weakened higher education system through a unified approach instead of fragmenting it.

(3) The less number of universities in the federating units like Balochistan, Azad Jammu and Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan does not warrant creation of new organizations (financials would also increase). Creation of provincial higher education councils where established need to be re-examined. Parallel systems resulting in duplication of work can prove harmful. A complementary and supplementary role for them could prove more beneficial for the nation.

(4) The universities enjoy autonomy as regards to many substantive and procedural issues. These can be further strengthened if opportunities are made available to administrative officials (Registrar, Controller of Examinations, Treasurer and other officials) for improving their managerial skills.

(5) Possibilities of establishing a Teachers Academy for training of academic and non-academic staff should be explored. Modern University Governance program of HEC may be reactivated and new initiatives for faculty development introduced. Continuous Professional Development Centers established in universities need to be strengthened.

(6) As part of the good practices, the Acts/Ordinances of Universities should be accessible to stakeholders by displaying them on their websites.

(7) The tedious procedure for removing minor errors and omissions in the Acts should be simplified. Universities recognize these mistakes, but hesitate to proceed further to
rectify them due to the cumbersome process involved. In this respect, delegation of power to the governing bodies may be considered.

(8) Acts governing universities need to be reexamined. However, before proceeding further there is a need of firstly determining the reasons of non-acceptance of the Federal Universities Ordinance 2002 by the seven universities listed in the schedule of the ordinance.

(9) Powers bestowed on the Chancellor require participation in the proceedings of the governing body of the university. Indications are that it is a rare event. A survey is required in this regard to determine the ground realities existing in the universities. If Chancellor or Pro-Chancellor are unable to participate in the deliberations of the governing bodies, then changes to this effect in the Acts requires consideration.

(10) It seems that Government representatives (including HEC nominee) in the governing bodies have not been able to help maintain proper checks and balance. Mismanagement, if any can be reduced if they along with the other government representatives and political appointees play a more pro-active role. This statement needs verification by determining their contributory roles in these oversight bodies through a study.

(11) Both unitary and binary governing structures exist in the public universities. There is a need for rationalization. A critical rethink with involvement of all stakeholders is essential to decide upon the future governing structure.

(12) Related to the above, policy decision on whether to follow the collegial or corporate model of governance or a hybrid Pakistani model needs to be debated upon and critically reviewed by the authorities.

(13) The Acts in some cases stipulate the number of meetings required to be held in a year while in others this specification has been omitted. As a result it was found that in many universities hardly one meeting in a year was being held. Immediate action to rectify this anomaly is required.

(14) Pro-VC’s role needs to be strengthened.

(15) For effective oversight, consideration may be given to increase the frequency of meetings of governing bodies.

(16) Quorum required for holding meetings of the governing bodies in some cases is as low as 30%. This needs an upward revision for effective decision making.

(17) The number of members in some senates/syndicates is too high and needs to be drastically reduced.

(18) The Schedule II of KPK (Amendment) Act (2015) lists the parameters that are to be taken into account by the Search Committees for appointment of VC’s. These may be considered for adoption by other Search Committees also.
(19) Search Committee should be empowered to select three aspirants for the post of VC in order of merit.

(20) Delays in the appointment process of VCs are adversely affecting the functioning of universities. VC on expiry of their term being asked to continue performing till further orders or Acting VCs being appointed during the interim period that may last for more than a year should be avoided.

(21) till appointment of a new VC thereby resulting in QAD/QAA may explore possibility of introducing a quality assurance mechanism in the 13 DDE’s.

(22) Management Information and Business Intelligent Systems are currently considered to be the nervous systems of university operations internationally. Continued progress of the HEC reform agenda for universities requires immediate implementation of HEMIS.

(23) Immediate steps are required to be undertaken to achieve the targets set forth in MTDF II for HEMIS.

(24) Two options that can be considered for implementing HEMIS are that either IT Division at HEC with adequate manpower provided to it manages its implementation as was the case during establishment in eight universities. Alternatively, the universities may implement the systems on their own with financial support from HEC.

(25) Appointment of Registrar for three years needs reconsideration and on additional charge basis needs to be discouraged. QEC’s and ORIC’s are also being managed by faculty on additional charge basis. Follow up action on Program Self Assessment Reports required.

(26) The M.Phil/Ph.D Review Process needs to be accelerated and follow up actions monitored.

(27) Institutional Performance Evaluation (IPE) exercise should cover all the universities. HEC involvement required as follow up.

(28) Review of Annual Reports/IPE Reports/QEC activities in a university can be used as an indicator of the performance of a VC.

Besides the above, some other recommendations could be made like Deans committee in universities having a large number of faculties or Chairpersons committee elsewhere. Frequent interactions and discussions in these committees with the VC and Pro-VC participating can help in removing irritants/bottlenecks that accumulated together can sometimes prove harmful.
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- Bahria University Ordinance. 2002
- Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education Ordinance. 2003
- DoW University of Health Sciences Act 2004 (amended 2006)
- Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi Ordinance 1999 (amended 2012)
- Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences and Technology Ordinance 2002
• Government College University Lahore Ordinance. 2002
• Government College Women University. Sialkot. 2012
• Institute of Business Administration Act 1994 (amended 2013)
• National Textile University Ordinance, 2005
• National University of Science and Technology Act 1997 (amended 2016)
• Qalandar Shahbaz University of Modern Sciences Act 2013 (Tando Muhammad Khan)
• Quaid-i-Azam University Act 1973.
• Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University Quetta Bill 2009 (amended 2014)
• Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Dewan University Act 2013
• The Metropolitan University Act 2016
• University of Balochistan Act 1976 (amended 2001)
• University of Gujrat Act 2004 (amended 2912)
• University of Sargodha Ordinance 2002 (amended 2012)
• University of Karachi Act 1972 (amended 2013, 2015)
• The Punjab Agricultural Universities (Amendment) Act. 2012
ANNEXURE 1

List of HEC Officials Met

- Dr. Mehmood-ul-Hasan Butt. Consultant to Chairman HEC
- Mr. Khwaja Zahid Hussain. FM Specialist TESP
- Mr. Awais Ahmad. DG Administration and Coordination
- Dr. Muhammad Rafiq Baloch. DG Quality Assurance Agency
- Air Cdre (R) M. Ismail DG Quality Assurance Division
- Ms Fakiha Zafar HE Quality Improvement Specialist TESP and Focal person
- Dr. Ishrat Siddiqa Lodhi. Director Academics
- Dr. Anwar Amjad. DG Information Technology
- Ms. Aneela Naseem. Deputy Director Information Technology
- Mr. Shoaib Irshad. Assistant Director Quality Assurance Agency
- Mr. M. Raza. Assistant Director Quality Assurance Agency
ANNEXURE 2

Questionnaire for Interview with the Vice-Chancellor

Name of the University

Name of the Vice-Chancellor/Rector

(If applicable, your answers to the queries/points given below based on your vast experience and involvement in education, would help in gaining a better understanding of some important issues and challenges facing the higher education sector).

1. Is appointment of VC/Rector through Search Committees appropriate?
2. Do you agree with the procedure presently adopted for appointment of VC/Rector? If not, please suggest improvements.
3. In your opinion, before start of term as VC/Rector, should there be trainings/leadership courses/briefings on governance and management? If yes, please specify name(s) of sponsoring authority, organizations and/or foreign countries where this activity could be arranged.
4. In your opinion, who should be responsible for formulation of policies and guiding principles for higher education in the post-eighteenth amendment scenario?
5. Should the Acts governing HEI’s be (a) similar or nearly similar for all public and private HEI’s. (b) Separate for public and private HEI’s. (c) Specific to a particular HEI. Please select one.
6. Do you consider the provisions in the Act/Ordinance of your university satisfactory for managing the affairs? If not, kindly specify.
7. Are you satisfied with the composition of the statutory bodies like BOG/Senate/Syndicate or have alternate suggestions.
8. Besides the above, would you consider it appropriate to have representation of Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC), Offices of Research Innovation and Commercialization (ORIC) Business Incubation Centers in relevant statutory bodies?
9. If functioning, are you satisfied with the performance of the distance education directorate (DDE) or are planning to further strengthen its activities.
10. Is any difficulty encountered in arranging meetings of statutory bodies of your university? If yes, please elaborate on how they can be overcome.
11. Are you satisfied with the system of planning and setting of strategic goals at your university or would like them to be further strengthened?
12. Would you like assistance in establishing a Management Information System? If already operating, has it helped you in planning, maintaining proper checks and balances, and achievement of strategic goals? Please suggest ways of making it more effective.

13. Can the establishment of an academy contribute in strengthening capacity building of teachers and administrators? If yes, should it be established at provincial or federal level.

14. Would it be helpful if all new entrants (teachers and administrators) undergo training at the academy before assuming their responsibilities in the university?

15. Would you like such an academy to produce Master Trainers who can replicate similar activities within your university?

16. Can an establishment of a Continuous Professional Development Center be helpful to your university? If already operating, are you satisfied with its performance? If not, please suggest how it can be improved.

17. In your opinion, how effective are the Linkages (national and international) that may have been established by your university?

18. In case of the university having affiliated colleges, are you satisfied with the system of monitoring or would like to suggest improvements?
ANNEXURE 3

Questionnaire for Interview with the Registrar

Name of the University

Name of the Registrar

(If applicable, your answers to the queries/points given below based on your experience and involvement in education would help in gaining a better understanding of some important issues and challenges facing the higher education sector).

1. In your opinion, the position of Registrar should be for a specified period of time or till reaching the age of superannuation?

2. For appointment of Registrar (please select one)
   (a) Administrative experience should be the main criterion or
   (b) Administrative cum academic qualifications or
   (c) Academic qualifications only

3. Do you consider the responsibilities assigned to you by the Act/ Ordinance of your university satisfactory for managing the affairs? If not, kindly specify the shortcomings.

4. Based on your experience, are you satisfied with the composition of the statutory bodies like BOG/ Senate/Syndicate or do you have any alternate suggestions.

5. Is any difficulty encountered in arranging meetings of statutory bodies and maintaining records of such meetings? If yes, please elaborate on how they can be overcome.

6. Are records of meetings of statutory bodies accessible to all faculty members and other stakeholders? If yes, please specify mode of circulation.

7. Are all academic and administrative policies implemented as per the time lines? If not, what are the major reasons of delay?

8. In your opinion, what improvements can be undertaken to improve the internal control mechanism currently operative at your university?

9. Are you satisfied with the system of planning and setting of strategic goals at your university or would like them to be further strengthened?

10. If a Management Information System is functioning at your university, please describe in what ways it is helping you in your work. Can it be made more effective? Please suggest.
11. Are there sufficient opportunities available for capacity building of administration officials? If not, please identify any preferred trainings/courses that may be organized?

12. Can the establishment of an academy contribute in strengthening capacity building of the administrative staff and faculty? If yes, should it be established at provincial or federal level?

13. Can the establishment of a Continuous Professional Development Center be helpful to your university? If already operating, are you satisfied with its performance? If not, please suggest how it can be improved.

14. What type of collaboration exists between the QEC, ORIC, Accreditation Councils and DDE and what are your suggestions in this regard?

15. If the university has affiliated colleges, are you satisfied with the system of their monitoring? Based on your experience, do you have any suggestions for improvement in the process?
ANNEXURE 4

Questionnaire for Interview with the Faculty

Name of the University

Name of the faculty member, department and designation

(If applicable, your answers to the queries/points given below based on your experience and involvement in education would help in gaining a better understanding of some important issues and challenges facing the higher education sector).

1. In your opinion, should a VC/Rector be (a) an academic (b) academic cum administrator (c) administrator. Please select one.
2. Would you consider it desirable if appointment of VC/Rector is made from amongst the three senior most faculty members?
3. Is the prevailing procedure of appointment of VC/Rector through Search Committees appropriate or you would like to suggest improvements in the process.
4. For appointment of Registrar (please select one)
   (a) Administrative experience should be the main criterion or
   (b) Administrative cum academic qualifications or
   (c) Academic qualifications only
5. What is your opinion as regards to appointment of a Faculty member as Registrar on additional charge basis?
6. Are you satisfied with the composition of the statutory bodies like BOG/Senate/Syndicate or do you have any alternate suggestions?
7. Are records of meetings of statutory bodies accessible to you? If yes, please specify mode of circulation.
8. If a Management Information System is operative in your university, please describe how it is helping you. Can it be made more effective?
9. Can the establishment of an academy contribute in strengthening capacity building of faculty? If yes, should it be established at provincial or federal level?
10. If a Continuous Professional Development Center is functioning in your university, please describe how it has helped you in your professional work?
11. Are you satisfied with the system of planning and setting of strategic goals at your university or would like more involvement of faculty in the decision making process?
12. Is there a mechanism by which faculty is able to provide feedback on the academic and administrative policies of the university? If not, would it be desirable to have one put in place.

13. In your opinion, what improvements can be undertaken to improve the internal control mechanism currently operative at the departmental level?

14. Is the Quality Enhancement Cell helping you in introducing internationally accepted best practices on quality assurance? If yes, do you have suggestions for making it more effective?

15. Is any facilitation being provided by ORIC? Do you have any suggestions for increasing interaction with it?

16. What type of collaboration do you foresee between the QEC, ORIC, Accreditation Councils and Directorate of Distance Education (if existing)? Please elaborate.
Letter from ED, HEC to VC'S

Prof. Dr. Arshad Ali  
Executive Director  
No.-13/000/09/2015  
April 11, 2016

Subject: Request to Facilitate the Consultant for short term study

My dear Vice Chancellor/Rector

You will be pleased to know that for implementing Federal Government's higher education reforms, as a part of the Third Medium Term Development Framework (MTDF HE III), Higher Education Commission and the World Bank jointly initiated thematic studies pertaining to the vital areas of the higher education sector under its Tertiary Education Support Project (TESP). The purpose of the program is to enhance the capacity of Pakistani institution of higher learning to produce high quality graduates, support innovation and improve the overall governance and management of higher education sector.

Prof. Dr. Azam khwaja has been awarded Consultancy Contract/activity for a short term study on "Management and governance, Federal/Provincial roles and responsibilities; HEI managers' appointment, autonomy & accountability". This study aims to assess the current situation and trends in Higher education sector in Pakistan.

For smooth execution of the study, HEC requests facilitation to the above mentioned consultant from your organization by providing him required information, data, feedback on questionnaires and any other relevant document for timely completion of this study. This study is highly significant for Higher Education sector and will promote National cause.

Thank you very much in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Dr. Arshad Ali

Distribution:
- The VC / Rector / Director as per list attached
- Concerned Division of HEC
- Consultant

Ph: +92-51-90400150, Fax: +92-51-90400154, E-mail: arshad.ali@hec.gov.pk
ANNEXURE 6

FGD Participants List (28th April, 2016)

- Dr. Farman Ullah. KPK Agriculture University. Peshawar
- Mr. Babar Ali Kalhoro. Liaqat University of Medical and Health Sciences. Jamshoro
- Nisar Ahmad Gorsi. Mirpur University of Science and Technology. Mirpur. AJ&K.
- Prof. M. Sajidin. University of Karachi
- Ms. Shahida Muneer. University of Engineering and Technology. Lahore
- Mr. M. Haroon. University of Peshawar
- Prof. Dr. Aamir Ijaz. University of Punjab. Lahore
- Prof. Dr. Riaz Ahmad. PMAS Arid Agriculture University. Rawalpindi
- Prof. Dr. Gul Hasan. Lasbela University. Uthal
- Prof. Dr. Arshad Sami Khan. Mehran University of Engineering and Technology. Jamshoro.
- Prof. Dr. Murad Ali Khan. Kohat University of Science and Technology. Kohat.
- Dr. Shahzad Memon. Sindh University. Jamshoro
- Ms. Mahwish Asmatullah. Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University. Peshawar
- Ms. Iram Sohail. Government College Women University. Lahore
- Mr. Nasrullah Channa. Quaid-i-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology. Nawabshah
- Mr. Shamroze Satakzai. BUITEMS. Quetta
- Dr. Zahoor Ahmad Bazai. University of Balochistan. Quetta
- Mr. Shahid Iqbal. COMSATS Institute of Information Technology. Islamabad
- Prof. Dr. Ahrar Khan. University of Agriculture. Faisalabad
- Prof. Dr. Rana Qamar Masood. DoW University of Health Sciences
- ----, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences. Lahore.
Search Committee reconstituted by President vide notification No. F. 1(11))/2013-PT-II dated 5th June 2014

- Minister for Education, Trainings and standards in higher education
- Secretary, Ministry of Education, Trainings and Standards in Higher Education
- Chairman Higher Education Commission
- Chairman and Minister of State may co-opt four eminent persons from academia as members. Co-opted members may be Ph. D degree holders.

According to The Daily Dawn 19th June, 2016, Co-opted members are

- Dr. U.A.G. Isani
- Dr. Ishrat Hussain
- Dr. Junaid Zaidi
- Dr. Sara Safdar
LIST of HEI’s (Visited in Feb – Mar 2016)

- Liaqat University of Medical and Health Sciences. Jamshoro
- University of Sindh. Jamshoro
- Hamdard University. Karachi
- Institute of Business and Technology. Karachi
- Newports Institute of Business and Technology. Karachi
- Institute of Business Management. Karachi
- Qarshi University. Lahore
- University of Gujrat
- Institute of Space Technology. Islamabad
- National College of Arts. Lahore
- Kinnaird College for Women University. Lahore
- Forman Christian College. Lahore
- National Textile University. Faisalabad
- University of Sargodha
- Lahore School of Economics
- Government College Women University. Sialkot
- Aga Khan University. Karachi
- University of Turbat
- Indus Valley School of Arts and Architecture. Karachi
- Karakorum International University. Gilgit
- Lahore University of Management Sciences.
- Institute of Business Administration. Karachi
# HEC Checklist

## Panel Review Checklist (PRC)

Documents to be verified/checked by the Panel during Review Visit

The Institution is required to prepare following documents for the review by the experts during the Review visit. The Review Panel will verify that these documents are available with the HEI and that proper procedures have been followed for the establishment of the Institution. Panel shall also determine whether the institution is functioning as per the approved statutes and the quality parameters/standards prescribed by the HEC and the respective Councils. Besides the listed documents, the Panel may require any other relevant document for review.

Panel will use the list of following documents as a checklist to see the compliance of the guidelines, policies and procedures given by HEC and the respective Councils and write down the visit report accordingly.

### 1. General Documents:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Name of Institution &amp; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Type of the Institution (Public/ Private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Nature of the Campus: Main Campus/Sub-Campus/Affiliated Institute etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>If Affiliated Institution, name of the Institution with whom affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Approved Statutes [Current as well as old (if any)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Vision and Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Approval of Documents from the Competent Forum:

( Please tick the appropriate column(s) after reviewing the documentary evidence(s) and enter the remarks as applicable. )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S #</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If Yes, Evidences Provided (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Remarks*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Approval for the establishment of the institution from Statutory Bodies, Respective Government Department and HEC (as applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Approval of HEC for establishment of the institution on present location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Approval of each Program and Department from the concerned statutory body (With date of approval and launch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Evidence of Accreditation of Professional Program(s) from the concerned Accreditation Council(s) (Where Applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please use extra page if required, same may please be mentioned under “Remarks” column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S #</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If Yes, Evidences Provided (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Remarks*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Approval/NOC for offering MS/M.Phil. &amp; Ph.D. Programs from HEC (In case program has been launched after October, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Admission Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>SOPs for faculty selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Examination Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Plagiarism Policy handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; Procedures for affiliating colleges/institutes etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Provision within the Charter empowering the University to affiliate colleges/institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Composition of “Affiliation Committee” with the name of HEC Representative/Nominee in the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. List of all approved affiliated colleges/institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Detailed agreement with the affiliated colleges such as memorandum of agreement or terms of engagement etc. against each affiliated college in the list.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Approved Criteria for awarding affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Approval documents for affiliation (letter, minutes etc. from competent forum).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Quality assurance mechanism for affiliated colleges (if any)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Approval of programs being conducted at affiliated colleges from university’s own competent forum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Approval of programs by the respective professional councils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td><strong>Approval of Statutory Body/Competent Forum for adoption of following HEC guidelines for (where applicable):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Plagiarism Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Faculty Appointment Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. MS/MPhil and Ph.D. Admission criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. University’s own Tenure Track Statutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Semester Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Curricula of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Quality Assurance System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Grievance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Career Counseling/ Placement System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please use extra page if required, same may please be mentioned under “Remarks” column.
3. Date-wise lists of Meetings:

Please present date-wise lists of meetings of the following bodies of the institution (as applicable) held during last 03 years:

| Parameters | Information | Remarks*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Senate / Syndicate / Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Academic Council or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Board of Advanced Studies and Research (BASR) or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Boards of Faculties or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Boards of Studies or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Selection Boards or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Finance and Planning Committee or equivalent body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. University related Information: Please provide following details:

| Parameters | Information | Remarks*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Total No. of Departments and the related Programs (Please provide list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b No. of currently enrolled students in each program (Semester-wise/Year-wise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c No. of students graduated in last three years by each program (year-wise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d No. of Approved posts for Faculty members (Please Provide Department Wise List in terms of designation; Prof, Associate Prof, Assistant Prof and Lecturer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e No. of currently employed Permanent Faculty members in each department (Please provide list in terms of qualification, designation and date of appointment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Total No. of student sections and classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Total number and name(s) of college(s)/institute(s) affiliated with the University/Institution (if any)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Total No. of books &amp; subscribed journals in the library and access to Books &amp; Journals through Digital Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please use extra page if required, same may please be mentioned under “Remarks” column
3. **Additional documents:** Please ensure the following documents are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Information/Data</th>
<th>Remarks*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Prospectus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Department-wise lists of Administrative/Technical Staff members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Names of the laboratories in each department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Faculty and Students support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Faculty Hand Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Students Guide Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Annual Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Master Plan of Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please use extra page if required, same may please be mentioned under “Remarks” column*