

QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY



Quality Enhancement Cell

Women University Swabi

DOCUMENT TITLE	QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY												
Prepared/Amended and Compiled by	Dr. Surrya Khanam QEC Coordinator												
Reviewed by	Policy Review Committee Constituted vide Registrar Notification No.												
Policy Review Committee	<table> <tr> <td>Concerned Section Head</td><td>Convener</td></tr> <tr> <td>Additional Director Academics II</td><td>Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>Deputy Director Academics I</td><td>Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>HoD, Department of Political Science</td><td>Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>HoD, Department of Biochemistry</td><td>Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>Section Senior Member</td><td>Member/Secretary</td></tr> </table>	Concerned Section Head	Convener	Additional Director Academics II	Member	Deputy Director Academics I	Member	HoD, Department of Political Science	Member	HoD, Department of Biochemistry	Member	Section Senior Member	Member/Secretary
Concerned Section Head	Convener												
Additional Director Academics II	Member												
Deputy Director Academics I	Member												
HoD, Department of Political Science	Member												
HoD, Department of Biochemistry	Member												
Section Senior Member	Member/Secretary												
Institutional Quality Circle (IQC) Recommendation	29 June, 2026												
Academic Council Recommendation	8 July, 2026												
Syndicate Approval													
Weblinks	https://wus.edu.pk/qec https://www.wus.edu.pk/downloads												

CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
	Definitions	4

	Abbreviations	5
Section 1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	Background	7
1.2	Aim	7
1.3	Vision	7
1.4	Mission	7
1.5	Quality Assurance Policy Statement	7
1.6	Objectives/Tasks	8
1.7	Establishment of Quality Enhancement Directorate	9
1.8	Quality Assurance Tool Kit	9
Section 2	REVAMPED QA POLICY: PSG-2023	10
2.1	Pakistan Precepts, Standards and Guidance (PSG - 2023)	10
2.2	Review the Effectiveness of QA & Accreditation Bodies (REQAAB)	10
2.3	Review Institutional Progress Enhancement (RIPE)	10
2.4	Programme Review for Effectiveness and Enhancement (PREE)	10
2.5	Judgement Framework	10
Section 3	IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE	11
3.1	Institutional Quality Circle (IQC)	11
3.2	Institutional Performance Enhancement Report (IPER)	11
3.3	Committee of Research Ethics (COPE)	12
3.4	Self-Assessment Review (SAR) Process	12
3.5	Program Team (PT) & Assessment Team (AT)	13
3.6	Starting of New Programs & Accreditation	15
3.7	Graduate Programmes Review (PGPR)	15
3.8	Continual Quality Improvement (CQI)	16
3.9	Publication Verification & Authorship	16
Section 4	AFFILIATED COLLEGES (QECAC)	17

DEFINITIONS

In this Policy, unless the context requires otherwise:

Assessment: The process of identifying and ensuring that appropriate internal procedures are in place and operational and that outcomes of academic programmes and activities are in accord with established standards.

Audit: A process of identifying and ensuring that appropriate internal Quality Assurance and Control processes are in place and operational.

Programme Review: A process of holistic appraisal of a course/programme and resources, aiming at its further evolution and improvement.

Stakeholders: Agencies (government and private) that control Institutions, individuals, or groups that participate in or have responsibilities towards Higher Education in Pakistan.

Quality: Women University Swabi interprets quality as 'fitness for purpose' as summarized in the PSG-2023.

Quality Assurance and Control: The process of evaluating/assessing the extent to which the individual/unit/institution is delivering on its promises, including operational techniques, procedures, and objectives used to fulfill quality requirements.

Quality Assurance and Control Policy: A document promulgated to maintain an effective and efficient Quality Assurance and Control process designed to eliminate deficiencies and ensure high quality standards.

Abbreviation	Meaning
AC	Academic Council

Abbreviation	Meaning
A&R	Advance Studies & Research
AT	Assessment Team
CQI	Continuous Quality Improvement
COPE	Committee of Research Ethics
DQE	Directorate of Quality Enhancement
EQA	External Quality Assurance
HEC	Higher Education Commission
HoD	Head of Department
IQC	Institutional Quality Circle
IPER	Institutional Performance Enhancement Report
IPERC	Institutional Performance Enhancement Report Preparation Committee
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
LQE	Liaison for Quality Enhancement
PGPR	Post Graduate Programs Review
PREE	Program Review for Effectiveness and Enhancement
PSG	Pakistan Precepts, Standards and Guidelines
PT	Program Team
QA	Quality Assurance
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency (HEC)
QAAB	Quality Assurance and Accreditation Bodies

Abbreviation	Meaning
QECAC	Quality Enhancement Cell in Affiliated Colleges
REQAAB	Review the Effectiveness of Quality Assurance & Accreditation Bodies
RIPE	Review Institutional Progress Enhancement
SAR	Self-Assessment Report
WUS	Women University Swabi
WUSQAP	Women University Swabi Quality Assurance Policy

SECTION I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In recent year, the higher education system in Pakistan is rapidly evolving with a strong focus on learning outcomes as a core element of quality assurance, academic performance, and institutional evaluation. Clearly defined objectives are essential to ensure meaningful results, provide a shared understanding of educational value for students and stakeholders, and support continuous improvement in teaching, curriculum development, and academic practices.

These objectives also contribute to strengthening program quality, enhancing accreditation processes, improving institutional ranking, and building public trust in the university's performance. Effective quality assurance mechanisms help transform academic quality from an abstract concept into a structured and measurable process.

In this context, policy guidelines are developed to ensure systematic and aligned quality assurance practices. These guidelines enable Women University Swabi to align its quality framework with national and international standards, in accordance with the Pakistan Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (PSG-2023) issued by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.

1.2 Aim

The Quality Assurance Policy of Women University Swabi aims to strengthen the Quality Culture in learning & research activities, enhance the quality of research output, and provide support for implementing National and International standards, with a special focus on creating a supportive and excellent environment for female students and faculty.

1.3 Vision

To be a leading higher education institution recognized for a strong and sustainable quality culture aligned with national and international standards.

1.4 Mission

To promote and implement effective quality assurance systems, procedures, and practices in academic programs, research, and administrative services across Women University Swabi.

1.5 Quality Assurance Policy Statement

To promote a quality culture in higher education & research at Women University Swabi based on self-assessment, to obtain improved outcomes in view of the University's main vision/objectives, duly in compliance with the University's Mission.

a. Compliance with Statutory Requirements:

Women University Swabi ensures that every individual working for or studying at WUS shall comply with the University Act, Statutes, Regulations, Rules, and Policies.

b. Basic Principle of Quality Assurance Policy:

WUS will serve the community and meet the challenging needs of the national and international market by providing quality higher education through an effective and efficient quality assurance system underpinned by quality teaching, learning, and research.

c. Students' Focus:

As students are the primary stakeholders, WUS is committed to producing highly qualified manpower in multidisciplinary fields, ensuring their professional needs and expectations are met, and appreciating their role in maintaining a progressive learning environment.

d. Stakeholders Focus:

WUS endeavors to provide an encouraging, flexible, empowered, cohesive, and congenial working environment to create, assimilate, and analyze knowledge for the ultimate benefit of academia, industry, government, and society.

e. Knowledge Creation and Dissemination:

WUS is focused on conducting multidisciplinary research to resolve political, socio-economic, technological, and environmental issues and to disseminate this knowledge through trainings, workshops, conferences, and research journals.

f. Business Startup & Empowerment:

WUS is focused on facilitating startups and creating businesses, with a special emphasis on women-led enterprises based on multidisciplinary fields.

g. Linkages and Networking:

WUS will establish strong ties with national and international HEIs, industries, organizations, and government bodies, including membership in INQAAHE, APQN, and PNQAHE.

h. Optimization of Resources:

WUS is focused on the optimal utilization of human capital, infrastructure, and financial resources for accruing and sustaining benefits.

i. Environment Friendly:

WUS is committed to making its campus environment the safest, greenest, and cleanest, providing a rewarding and challenging environment for faculty, staff, and students.

1.6 Objectives

1. To promote a culture of continuous quality improvement and stakeholder involvement in all academic and administrative processes.
2. To ensure that academic programs and institutional practices meet national (HEC) and international quality standards.
3. To implement effective internal quality assurance systems including self-assessment, program review, and follow-up mechanisms.
4. To establish clear quality benchmarks for teaching, learning, research, and support services.
5. To facilitate faculty and staff capacity building for enhancing institutional performance and quality culture.
6. To strengthen collaboration with national and international quality assurance bodies for best practice sharing and improvement.

1.7 Establishment of Quality Enhancement Directorate:

Establishment: The Directorate Quality Enhancement (DQEC) was initially established 2016 .

1.8 Quality Assurance Tool Kit

The main QA toolkit, as per HEC's PSG-2023, includes:

A - Review of Institutional Performance and Enhancement (RIPE)

B - Self Review of Institutional Performance and Enhancement (S-RIPE)

C - Programme Review for Effectiveness and Enhancement (PREE):

- Post Graduate Program Review (PGPR)
- Self - Post Graduate Program Review (S-PGPR)
- Programme Self-Assessments (SARs)

D - Institutional Quality Circle (IQC)

E - Institutional Performance Enhancement Report Preparation Committee (IPERC)

SECTION - 2: REVAMPED QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY OF HEC: "PAKISTAN PRECEPTS, STANDARDS AND GUIDLINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION (PSG-2023)"

2. Pakistan Precepts, Standards and Guidelines (PSG - 2023)

The Revamped Quality Assurance (QA) Framework is a collaborative effort between QAA UK and QAA Pakistan. According to HEC-QAA directives, the PSG-2023 is effective for implementation from 01 July 2024 and is applicable for all QE/QA/CQI activities for EQA and IQA. Women University Swabi has redesigned its QA processes in compliance with PSG-2023.

2.1 Review the Effectiveness of Quality Assurance & Accreditation Bodies (REQAAB)

REQAAB is a systematic mechanism to assess the effectiveness of QAABs. For REQAAB, the PSG has defined fourteen quality standards for fulfillment by the university, including official status, independence, internal quality assurance, and complaints and appeals.

2.2 Review Institutional Progress Enhancement (RIPE)

RIPE is a toolkit for judging the efficiency, effectiveness, and yearly progress of the university. It is processed through 16 quality standards backed in three pillars: Strategic Development, Academic Development, and Institutional Development.

2.3 Programme Review for Effectiveness and Enhancement (PREE)

PREE focuses on academic programs, comprising:

- a. Programmes self-assessments (SARs) for each degree program.
- b. Post Graduate Programmes Reviews (PGPR) for PhD and MPhil programs on an annual basis.

2.4 Judgement Framework

The PSG-2023 introduces a colour-scheme for the classification of universities based on performance using a Quality Evaluation & Enhancement Matrix (QEE-Matrix):

- Green (Effective Institutions): Effective Improvement Retained (EIR)
- Blue (Progressive Institutions): Limited Improvement Required (LIR)
- Yellow (Average Institutions): Adequate Improvement Required (AIR)
- Grey (Unclassified Institutions): Significant Improvement Required (SIR)

Section - 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

3.1 Institutional Quality Circle (IQC)

Women University Swabi has established an Institutional Quality Circle (IQC), a completely authorized quality council to implement all quality standards and assure quality enhancement. IQC The IQC shall meet at least **four times a year** in its role as the ultimate delegated authority for the management of quality assurance at the University.

3.1.1 Constitution of IQC

Role

- i. Vice Chancellor (Chairman)
- ii. Pro-Vice Chancellor / Senior most Dean (Deputy Chair)
- iii. Director Quality Enhancement (Member/Secretary)
- iv. Heads of Departments (as per need-base) (Members)
- v. Deans, Directors (ORIC, A&R, P&D), Registrar, Controller of Exams (Members)
- vi. Student Council representative (01) (Member)

3.1.2 Terms of Reference of IQC

1. To monitor all external guidance related to quality assurance.
2. To develop and keep under review the university's Academic Policy and Quality Framework.
3. To maintain operational oversight of academic and student-related policy.
4. To consider proposals for the addition, withdrawal, or suspension of programmes.
5. To constitute the Institutional Progress Report Preparation Committee (IPERC).
6. To approve RIPE/Self-RIPE reports and develop Compliance-Action-Plans (CAPs).
7. To monitor departmental self-assessments and ensure the preparation of documents for EQA/IQA reviews.

3.2 Institutional Performance Enhancement Report (IPER) and IPER Committee

3.2.1 Institutional Performance Enhancement Report (IPER)

IPER is a complete document based on all university activities for the Quality-FY (01 July to 30 June). It is used for RIPE and Self-RIPE exercises.

3.3 Committee of Research Ethics (COPE)

There shall be a Committee of Research Ethics (COPE) with a mandate to review research involving human participants to ensure their dignity, rights, and welfare are protected.

General Constitution:

- a. Senior Most Dean (Chairperson)
- b. Deans of Faculties (Members)
- c. 04 Senior Chairpersons (not below Professor rank) (Members)
- d. Director ORIC (Member)
- e. Director QE (Member)
- f. Director A&R (Secretary)

All members shall comply with the Conflict-of-Interest Policy of the Government/University.

3. 4 Self-Assessment Review (SAR) Process

Self-Assessment is a systematic process for improving student learning and evaluating academic standards.

3.4.1 SAR Writing Procedure

- a. Upon receipt of the initiation letter from QEC, the Chairperson/HOD (as LQE) initiates the SA process.
- b. The department forms a Program Team (PT) to prepare the SAR.
- c. The department submits the SAR to the Director QE through the Dean.
- d. The Director QEC forms an Assessment Team (AT) comprising 2-3 faculty members, including at least one expert in the program area.
- e. The QEC schedules the AT visit.
- f. The AT conducts the assessment, submits a report, and presents its findings.
- g. The department prepares and submits an implementation plan to the QEC based on the AT findings.
- h. The LQE follows up on the implementation plan and submits progress/compliance reports.

3.4.2 Role and Responsibilities of Director Quality Enhancement

The Director QE is responsible for ensuring QA procedures are designed as per PSG-2023, reviewing quality standards, developing QA processes, initiating the SAR process, forming ATs, reviewing SARs, and submitting final reports to HEC.

3.4.3 Role and Responsibilities of Chairperson/HOD

The Chairperson/HOD is responsible for initiating the SA process upon receipt of the letter, reviewing SARs before submission to QEC, proposing AT members, coordinating AT visits, and following up on the implementation plan.

Major Responsibilities

1. Propose a panel of experts for the formation of the Assessment Team (AT) and submit it to the Director, Quality Enhancement (DQE) through the Dean of the respective Faculty.
2. Coordinate and facilitate the scheduling of Assessment Team (AT) visits and meetings.
3. Finalize the Assessment Team (AT) Report, submit it to the Directorate of Quality Enhancement, and prepare the corresponding Implementation Plan.
4. Prepare the Rubric Evaluation for the Assessment Team (AT).
5. Submit the draft Executive Summary, along with the Implementation Plan, to the Director, Quality Enhancement.
6. Ensure the timely distribution and collection of all required feedback forms.
7. Submit both hard and soft copies of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), along with its Executive Summary, to the Directorate of Quality Enhancement for onward processing and submission to the Higher Education Commission (HEC).
8. Monitor and follow up on the Implementation Plan until all recommendations have been implemented, and submit the compliance report before the commencement of the next academic semester.

3.5 Program Team (PT) and Assessment Team (AT)

3.5.1 Program Team (PT)

The **Program Team (PT)** is a group of professionals nominated by the Head/Chairperson of the concerned department to carry out the self-assessment process for an academic program. The team serves as the focal point throughout the assessment process and is responsible for preparing the Self-Assessment Report (SAR).

The Program Team is constituted by the department upon receipt of the self-assessment initiation letter and is approved by the Director, Quality Enhancement (DQE). The PT is responsible for collecting and analyzing the required information, compiling the evidence, and preparing the SAR for the program under review within the prescribed timeline, normally over the course of one academic semester.

No. of Students in the Program	Program Team Composition
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Up to 300	1 Chairman & 3 Members
Between 300 to 1000	1 Chairman & 5 Members
More than 1000	1 Chairman & 6 Members

3.5.2 Responsibilities of the Program Team

1. Attend all meetings arranged by the Directorate of Quality Enhancement (DQE) or by the Chairperson/Head of Department (HOD), as and when required.
2. Provide constructive suggestions to improve the effectiveness and suitability of the Self-Assessment (SA) mechanism.
3. Ensure that the Self-Assessment mechanism is implemented in accordance with the prescribed guidelines.
4. Verify that every criterion and standard specified in the HEC Self-Assessment Manual is adequately addressed during the preparation of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) for each academic program.
5. Provide valid and well-reasoned justifications for any criterion or standard in the Self-Assessment Manual that is not applicable.
6. Provide documentary evidence, where required, to support compliance with the standards while developing the SAR.
7. Obtain and collect relevant documents and information from concerned departments (including faculty, students, library, laboratories, and infrastructure) through the proper channel to fulfill the requirements of each criterion.
8. Adhere to the timelines established by the Directorate of Quality Enhancement to ensure timely completion of all activities and compliance with HEC deadlines.
9. Maintain a complete record of all supporting documents used in the preparation of the SAR.
10. Distribute all applicable feedback forms among the relevant stakeholders and incorporate the analysis of the collected feedback into the SAR by conducting all mandatory surveys.
11. Ensure that Self-Assessment (SA) proformas are completed by faculty members, students, alumni, and employers.
12. Prepare summaries of the feedback received through the completed proformas.
13. Analyze the feedback, draw meaningful conclusions, and include the findings in the SAR.
14. Communicate with the University management regarding the effectiveness and suitability of the Self-Assessment mechanism.
15. Coordinate with relevant departments and faculty members, either directly or through the nominated focal person, to facilitate the timely completion of the SAR.
16. Ensure the security and confidentiality of all documents and survey results until officially released by the Directorate of Quality Enhancement.
17. Prepare the foreword of the SAR, including a brief history of the academic program, details of the Program Team, and the dates of commencement and completion of the report.

18. Compile the Self-Assessment Report by addressing each criterion and standard of the HEC Self-Assessment Manual and integrating all collected information and feedback.
19. Obtain the signatures of the Convener/Chairperson of the Program and all Program Team members on the finalized report.

3.5.3 Assessment Team (AT)

The **Assessment Team (AT)** comprises professionals with expertise in the relevant academic discipline, including experts from within and/or outside the University. The team is responsible for reviewing the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) prepared by the Program Team (PT) and evaluating its compliance with the standards prescribed in the HEC Self-Assessment Manual. The findings and recommendations of the review are documented in an Assessment Team (AT) Report.

The composition of the Assessment Team shall be approved by the Vice Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Directorate of Quality Enhancement (DQE), based on the panel of nominees submitted by the Chairperson of the concerned department.

3.6 Starting of New Programs & Accreditation

3.6.1 Starting of New Program

- a. A complete feasibility report (Academic, Financial, Administrative) is mandatory.
- b. The case file must be referred to the DQE for comments under the HEC Quality Framework PSG-2023.
- c. Advertisement for admissions can only be done after receiving positive comments from the DQE.

3.6.2 Accreditation

All UG and PG programs must be accredited by the relevant professional bodies as listed by HEC (e.g., PEC, PM&DC, NBEAC, NCEAC, etc.). Departments will ensure batches are accredited well before graduation.

3.7 Graduate Programmes Review (PGPR)

3.7.1 Conduct of PGPR

- a. Updated dossiers for PhD and MPhil programs are submitted to DQE.
- b. The DQE evaluates the dossiers, and the status is presented to the IQC.
- c. The Self PhD/MPhil Review is conducted preferably by June each year.
- d. Dossiers consist of Templates A, B, C, D, & E as prescribed by HEC.

3.7.2 Focus of PGPR

The review validates post-graduate academic programmes, assures adherence to HEC's minimum criteria, and provides feedback to the QAA-HEC.

3.8 Continual Quality Improvement (CQI)

3.8.1 Implementation Strategies (Feedback Forms)

To ensure CQI, feedback will be taken from multiple stakeholders using:

- Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
- Faculty Course Review Report
- Survey of Graduating Students
- Research Student Progress Review Form
- Alumni Survey
- Employer Survey
- Teacher Evaluation Form

Analysis of feedback from various stakeholders is required for improvement of the respective programs and for making part of SARs. The content of the feedback forms may be revised, modified, or updated by the competent authority from time to time, as deemed necessary to meet the University's quality assurance requirements and institutional needs.

3.9 Publication Verification and Authorship

3.9.1 Verification of PhD Scholars' Publications

- a. The publication performa is filled and certified by the Supervisor and Chairperson.
- b. The dossier is forwarded to DQE for verification of the journal category and paper.
- c. Verification follows HEC's policies (currently GEP-2023).

3.9.2 Authorship Guidelines

- Authors must provide an undertaking that the work is original and not plagiarized.
- Redundant publication (splitting one study into multiple papers) will result in rejection.
- The person who contributed the most will be the first author. Position or scientific level does not determine author order.
- Gift/Guest authors and Ghost authors are strictly prohibited.

Section - 4: QUALITY ENHANCEMENT CELL IN AFFILIATED COLLEGES (QECAC)

4.1 QECAC

The QECAC has been established at WUS to improve the quality of education delivered by Affiliated Colleges. QECAC focuses on:

- (a) Developing a functional Quality Enhancement Cell in Affiliated Colleges.
- (b) Improvement of undergraduate education (ADs and 4-year programs).
- (c) Training staff and faculty for self-QA practices.
- (d) Evaluating and reviewing the process as per PSG and PREE.
- (e) Suggesting corrective measures to improve quality.

4.2 Feedback System for SARs under PREE

Upon receipt of annual SAR targets from QAA-HEC, the QECAC initiates the SAR process in affiliated colleges after approval from IQC. Program Teams (PT) and Assessment Teams (AT) are notified for each affiliated program, following the same process as on campus.

4.3 RIPE of Affiliated Colleges

The Quality Enhancement Cell of Affiliated Colleges (QECAC) does not exercise direct administrative control over affiliated colleges for the collection of information and data required under PSG-2024 for the Review for Institutional Performance Evaluation (RIPE). For this purpose, the University's Affiliation Section or the Registrar's Office shall provide the Directorate of Quality Enhancement (DQE) or the QECAC with the required information,