Citation: Ayaz, S., Rashid, K., & Ramzan, M. (2020). A Study on the Quality Assurance Practices being Adopted in Public and Private Universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *Global Regional Review, V*(I), 460-470. doi:10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).49

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).49 **DOI:** 10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).49

A Study on the Quality Assurance Practices being Adopted in Public and Private Universities of Punjab, Pakistan

Sadia Ayaz* | Khalid Rashid† | Muhammad Ramzan‡

Vol. V, **No.** I (Winter 2020) | **Pages:** 460 – 470

p- ISSN: 2616-955X | **e-ISSN:** 2663-7030 | **ISSN-L:** 2616-955X

Abstract

Study was undertaken to find quality assurance practices being adopted in public and private sector higher education institutes of Punjab Pakistan. There were total 156 faculty members (male &female) in the selected four departments of 10 selected universities (5 from public and five from private) which constitute as accessible population of this study. Self-constructed instrument was validated by expert opinion and pilot testing. The responses of the faculty members were measured with the help of frequency and their percentages, mean and standard deviations. It was concluded that the quality assurance practice regarding quality learning environment, quality learning outcomes, quality content etc are contributing towards the provision of learning environment. Institutions wise no significant difference was found in all quality assurance practices discussed in the study. It was recommended that practical application of other countries may be put to practice on small scale first and thereafter on extensive level.

Key Words: Quality Assurance, Quality Content, Quality Learning Outcomes, Quality Learning Environment

Introduction

The level of education around the world is rising rapidly, and this has led to a decline in the level of qualified education in various countries. It has been investing in quality standards since the early 2000s. Moreover, education problems are increasing day to day in developing countries. In developing countries higher education institutions go through many studies in order to catch up with the other universities throughout the world regarding the following features; (a) Technology, (b) Institutional facilities and (c) Financial aspects (Noreen & Hussain, 2019).

Higher education refers to the training of people with rich knowledge and experience based on the interests and abilities of people in the fields required by the country. As can be seen from the statement, the country's higher education institutions have several direct and indirect grants. Therefore, the goal of all developed and developing countries is to create the most powerful knowledge-based economy in the world (UNICEF, 2000). According to Shukla (2014), higher education institutions are the collective name for higher education institutions. At university, following are the most reprehensible element of quality. (a) integration of professors, (b) keeping them in the institution and (c) flourishing and increasing renewal.

On August 14, 1947, when Pakistan appeared on the world map, there was only one fully functional university, Punjab University (founded in 1882), and only one recently established university (Sindh University, Jam Sholo University) In 1947). In this newborn country, it was difficult to accommodate the needs of higher education of 75 million people (Isani & Virk, 2005), (Batool & Qurashi, 2007). The founder of Pakistan, Quad-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, convened the first education committee, reflecting that education is the topmost priority of the new youth state. Only one month after the establishment of Pakistan. The national leader

*PhD Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: sadihaamid@hotmail.com
†Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
‡PhD, School Education Department, Al-Jannat Villas, 13/G Road Chishtian (Bahawal Nagar), Punjab, Pakistan.

emphasized the importance of higher education at the meeting, that "the future of our country will largely depend on the type of education we provide for our children" (Government of Pakistan, 1947). Almost all governments are trying to improve Pakistan's education system. Governments have reflected this in the numerous constitutions and committees composed of their regimes. So far, the two governments have announced six education policies and in addition to these policies, several committees and working groups have been established. Reports have been published in 1947, 1951, 1959, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1979, 1992, and 1998-2010. And the reform of the education sector in higher education: 2001-2004 Strategic Plan and Improvement (Government of Pakistan, 2002, 2007 & 2009), (Boston Group, 2001), (UNDP, 2007), (Varonism, 2014).

Higher education refers to education in Pakistan above grade 12, usually related to the 17-23 age group (USAID, 2008). In Pakistan, universities can usually be divided into ordinary universities and professional universities. Professional courses are usually provided by professional universities in a discipline (ie engineering, agriculture, medicine, etc.). Ordinary universities offer courses ranging from liberal arts to information technology. The oldest and largest university is Punjab University, which consists of four campuses, 13 colleges, 9 polling stations, more than 63 departments, centers, research institutes and more than 500 affiliated colleges (Punjab University, 2010). This highlights the diversity of courses offered by ordinary universities. HEC is designed for different types of professional universities. HEC divides universities into the following categories: (a) agriculture/veterinary, (b) art/design, (c) business/IT, (d) engineering, (e) general and (f) scientific health (UNESCO, 2000), (Anderson, 2006), (Shabbir, et. al., 2014).

In addition to these universities and colleges and degree-granting institutions [DAI], a large number of affiliated colleges and research institutes also provide higher education needs. These affiliated universities are all over the country's nuclear weapons and corners, and provide education in remote areas. Degrees are awarded by affiliated universities to students who graduate from these affiliated colleges and institutes (Isani & Virk, 2005), (Ayub, Shahzad & Ali, 2019), (Arshad, Ahmed, Noreen & Shamas, 2019). Recently, higher education in Pakistan has exploded into a new phenomenon of sub campuses.

All countries seek an understanding of the "quality of education" appropriate to their education system. To this end, these countries have established their own quality standards and promoted the educational standards. Their practice and control in higher education institutions based on the quality standards they manage. Expansion and growth often cause problems in the quality standards of higher education institutions (World Bank, 2002, 2006, 2007 & 2008), (Woodhouse, 2006). It is very important to regulate the development direction of the quality of universities. In recent research, especially among students, administrative management (leadership) and academic staff are very important to think hatch and march with other world crazy of quality. In university following are the most condemning elements of quality; (a) The induction of faculty, (b) Retain them in the institution and (c) Updated flourishing and growing (Walsh, 2002).

Sequential steps are taken by quality administration, wherein quality administration is put to assessment and evaluation, which opens the opportunities for encouragement and punishment (Sari, Firat & Karaduman, 2016). In Pakistan higher education institutions are under the responsibilities to keep an eye on the following's aspects; Infrastructure services investments their operational effectiveness so as to empower a regular improvement in the quality of administration and extension of facilitation to other services as well. Therefore, the understanding of the quality of the organization must conform to world standards, so that continuous seminars and training must continue (Rasool, Arshad & Ali, 2019), (Cetinsaya, 2014), (Karaim,2011).

In higher education, quality assurance is a process designed to maintain the trust (input, process, result) of the relevant parties provided, and to meet the minimum required standards for expectations or measurement (Hou, 2012), (Harvey, 2008), (Hou, Morse & Chiange, 2012). It is related to evaluation (indicating all methods used to judge the performance of individuals, groups or organizations) and certification (determining the status, acceptability or applicability of higher education institutions or programs) (Harvey, 2017). At this time, the understanding of the quality of higher education institutions is considered. Education drives the development of quality assurance systems and quality management practices (Rasool, Khan & Ali, 2019). Quality assurance and intuition also involve the following aspects; (a) teaching status, (b) research, (c) publications and (d) student academic performance (Taylor & Braddock, 2007).

With the passage of time, both public and private higher education sectors in Punjab are developing rapidly and timely work aimed at exploring the current state of quality assurance in the higher education sector. This research attempts to investigate the quality assurance models and practices that are being implemented by public and private higher education institutions in Punjab, Pakistan.

Objective

To investigate the quality assurance practices currently being adopted in the higher education institutes of Punjab.

Research Question

What are the quality assurances practices currently being adopted in the higher education institutes?

Methodology

Research Design

Present study was descriptive type based on the quantitative data.

Target population

There are total 52 universities in Punjab 29 in public sector and 23 in private sector. All these universities, their faculty members, heads of department and heads of QEC's will constitute target population for this study.

Accessible population

There are total 156 faculty members (male & female) in two departments of 10 selected universities which constitute accessible population of this study.

Sampling

Random sampling technique was used to select the respondents using three stages. In the first stage five universities were selected from public sector and five from private sector randomly. In the second stage four departments were selected from each university. At the last stage all faculty members of four departments and heads of department were included in the sample (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2004).

Instruments of the Study

Two questionnaires were developed for the heads of department and all the faculty members of selected four departments.

Validity of the instrument

The validity of the questionnaire was determined and improved through experts' opinion. The suggestions of the experts were incorporated and then sent for pilot testing.

Reliability of the Instrument

A pilot test was conducted on 20 teachers (ten from public sector and ten from private sector universities) who were not included in the sample to determine the reliability of the instrument. Cronbach Alpha test was applied to find the alpha value.

Data Collection

The self-constructed questionnaire having variety of items i.e. tabular form, Likert scale items and open-ended questions format was used by the researcher to collect data. Data was collected personally by the researcher. The questionnaire face and content validity were established by the panel of experts in the relevant field area. A Cronbach's alpha reliability of 0.78 was obtained for the questionnaire during pilot study on 20 faculty members.

The questionnaire was self-administered by the researcher through direct contact with the sampled population. The return rate was encouraging and recorded to be 80%. Three days were given to the respondents for returning the filled questionnaire. It took more than a month to distribute and recollect the filled instruments from respective university campuses. After receiving the filled questionnaire from the respondents the researcher entered the results.

Data Analysis

The responses of the faculty members were measured with the help of frequency and their percentages, mean and standard deviations. Each table is formed on the basis of variables of the study. The results are arranged in descending order to indicate the most agreed quality assurance practices from the instrument.

Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1. Quality Learners in QA Practices

S. No	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA	Mean	S. D
				%				
1.	Good programs include components of psychological development of learners.	0	0	4.8	40	55.2	4.50	0.59
2.	Physically and psychosocially healthy children learn well.	0	6.7	7.6	21	64	4.44	0.90
3.	Positive early practical experiences and interactions are vital to preparing a quality learner.	0	2.9	4.8	39	53	4.43	0.72
4.	This educational program enrolls healthy learner.	0	0	12.4	36.2	51.4	4.39	0.70
5.	Family support is sought by the program through their participation in education enrichment practices.	0	1	13.3	42.9	42.9	4.28	0.73
	Total	0	2.1	8.6	35.8	53.3	4.40	0.72

The above table indicates the frequency distribution of the responses of faculty members regarding quality learners. The responses ranged from strongly agree (53.3%) to neutral (35.8%) and had the overall mean value of 4.40 (S. D= 0.72).

The most agreed quality assurance practice regarding quality learner was about Good programs include components of psychological development of learners (M= 4.50, S. D= 0.59). The second most favored quality learner practice was regarding physically and psychosocially healthy children learn well (M= 4.44, S. D= 0.90). The third highest agreed statement was Positive early practical experiences and interactions are vital to preparing a quality learner (M= 4.43, S. D= 0.72). It was observed from the results of above table that all the mean response values were from the category nearest to highest level of mean value i.e. 5.00.

Table 2. Quality Learning Environments in QA Practices

S. No	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA	Mean	S. D
				%				
1.	Constructive reinforcement helps develop behaviors reflects focus on concerns to learn.	0	0	8.6	61	30.5	4.22	0.59
2.	Well-managed departments and classrooms contribute to interactive learning.	0	2.9	5.7	60	31.4	4.20	0.67
3.	The quality of school buildings adds to ease in learning.	0	0	7.6	66.7	25.7	4.18	0.55
4.	Socialization and group efforts are responsible for creating high quality physical, psycho-social and service environment at the departments	0	2.9	4.8	66.7	25.7	4.15	0.63
5.	The good quality of school facilities seems to have an indirect effect on learning.	0	9.5	2.9	52.4	35.2	4.13	0.87
	Total	0	3.0	5.9	61.4	29.7	4.18	0.66

The above table indicates the overall response of the faculty members regarding quality learning environment. The responses ranged from agree (61.4%) to strongly agree (29.7%) with the overall mean score of 4.18 (S. D= 0.66) indicating that the responses were nearest to the highest level of agreement.

Majority of the respondents were strongly agreed (M= 4.22, S.D= 0.59) about constructive reinforcement helps develop behaviors reflect focus on concerns to learn. Secondly the most agreed practice was about well-managed departments and classrooms contribute to interactive learning (M= 4.20, S. D= 0.67) and thirdly faculty members were quite agreed upon the quality of school buildings add to ease in learning (M= 4.18, S. D= 0.55).It was observed from the above table that all the faculty members were quite agreed upon the quality learning environment practices as the means scores were nearest to the highest level i.e. 5.00.

Table 3. Quality Content in QA Practices

S. No	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA	Mean	S. D
				%				
1.	Curriculum offers market-oriented subjects/reading	0	4.8	4.8	47.6	42.9	4.29	0.76
2.	Curriculum coordinates and integrates the contents of subject where necessary.	0	3.8	8.6	53.3	34.3	4.18	0.74
3.	Curriculum emphasizes deep coverage of important areas of knowledge.	0	13.3	4.8	39	42.9	4.11	1.00
4.	Curriculum matches gender-sensitive, inclusive and diverse needs of students.	0	10.5	5.7	45.7	38.1	4.11	0.92
5.	Curriculum leads the way to the development of concepts.	0	4.8	10.5	55.2	29.5	4.10	0.77
6.	Curriculum focuses on critical ways to learn.	0	1.9	22.9	41.9	33.3	4.07	0.80
7.	Cultural patterns are discussed in the realm of curriculum.	0	0	20	54.3	25.7	4.06	0.68
8.	Ideas conceived in other regions of the world are included in local context.	0	1	17.1	57.1	24.8	4.06	0.68
9.	The content embraces local and national values.	0	0	17.1	61	21.9	4.05	0.63
10.	Curriculum provides for exercise of choice among subjects of study.	0	9.5	13.3	41.9	35.2	4.03	0.94
11.	Individual differences are considered on developing students' evaluation strategies.	0	11.4	3.8	57.1	27.6	4.01	0.88
12.	Quality based curriculum considers knowledge of the subject rather than content.	0	0	21	58.1	21	4.00	0.65
	Total	0	5.0	12.4	51.0	31.4	4.08	0.78

The above table indicates about the responses of faculty members regarding quality control practices. The overall responses ranged from agree (51.0%) to strongly agree (31.4%) and the mean response was 4.08 (S. D= 0.68). Most faculty members were quite agreed to curriculum offers market-oriented subjects/reading (M= 4.29, S. D= 0.76). The second highest agreed practices were about curriculum and integrate the contents of subject where necessary (M= 4.18, S. D= 0.74) and the third most agreed was about Curriculum emphasize deep coverage of important areas of knowledge(M= 4.11, S. D= 1.00).It was observed from the above results that all mean response values were nearest to the highest level of agreement level i.e. 5.00.

Table 4. Quality Processes in QA Practices

S. No	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA	Mean	S. D
				%				
1.	Teacher uses student-centered method of instruction.	0	0	12.4	48.6	39.0	4.27	0.67

2.	Policies about programs are continuously revisited.	0	4.8	16.2	30.5	48.6	4.23	0.89
3.	Student teacher involvement makes elevation in student achievement.	0	1.9	16.2	39	42.9	4.23	0.79
4.	Teacher's research is put to practice to enrich programs and contents.	0	0	22.9	39	38.1	4.15	0.77
5.	Cultural patterns are followed in teaching to groom ethics/civic sense.	0	0	18.1	51.4	30.5	4.12	0.70
6.	Efficient use of time makes possible more coverage for student learning.	0	5.7	18.1	41.9	34.3	4.05	0.87
7.	Professional development remains a regular feature.	0	3.8	24.8	40	31.4	3.99	0.85
8.	Teachers are paid according to current market trend	0	8.6	21	35.2	35.2	3.97	0.96
9.	Concern of evaluation remains focused on stretching the student's caliber to the optimum.	0	1.9	24.8	50.5	22.9	3.94	0.75
	Total	0	2.8	19.3	41.8	35.9	4.10	0.80

The above table indicates the responses of faculty members regarding quality process practices. The overall responses were ranged from agree (41.8%) to strongly agree (35.9%) with the overall mean value of 4.10 (S. D= 0.80). All the faculty members were quite agreed upon the process of teacher uses student-centered method of instruction (M= 4.27, S. D= 0.67). The second most agreed practice was about policies about programs are continuously revisited (M= 4.23, S.D= 0.89) and the third most favored practice was student teacher involvement makes elevation in student achievement (M= 4.23, S. D= 0.79).It was observed from above results that the least agreed or the practice that was having neutral agreement was about concern of evaluation remains focused on stretching the student's caliber to the optimum (M= 3.94, S. D= 0.75).

Table 5. Quality Outcomes in QA Practices

S. No	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA	Mean	S. D
		%						
1.	Care is taken about educational quality for improving participants' health.	0	2.9	15.2	45.7	36.2	4.15	0.78
2.	Parents appreciate high academic achievement because it helps their children to get high paid jobs in future.	0	3.8	14.3	47.6	34.3	4.12	0.79
3.	Teaching students to read, write and calculate is often considered as the primary purpose of formal education.	0	8.6	25.7	38.1	27.6	3.85	0.93
4.	Assessment of academic achievement outcomes has most often been used in a summative way.	0	20	13.3	35.2	31.4	3.78	1.10
5.	Assessment and testing information is used to improve learning of students.	0	19	16.2	32.4	32.4	3.78	1.10
6.	Parents appreciate school environment and infrastructure	0	13.3	17.1	48.6	21	3.77	0.93
	Total	0	11.2	16.9	41.3	30.4	3.90	0.93

The above table indicates the responses of faculty members about quality outcome-based practices in quality assurance. The overall responses ranged from agree (41.3%) to strongly agree (30.4%) with the overall mean value 3.90 (S. D= 0.93). Majority of the faculty members were quite agreed about care is taken about educational quality for improving participants' health (M= 4.15, S. D= 0.78). The second highest agreed practice was about parents appreciate high academic achievement because it helps their children to get high paid jobs in future (M= 4.12, S. D= 0.79). The third highest agreed practice was about teaching students to read, write and calculate is

often considered as the primary purpose of formal education (M= 3.85, S. D= 0.93). It was also observed that the practice that was about parents appreciate school environment and infrastructure constituted neutral agreement (M= 3.77, S. D= 0.93).

Significant Difference in Opinions of Respondents Regarding Quality Assurance Practices

The significant difference in mean responses of faculty members regarding quality assurance practices was calculated with the help of independent sample t-test where there were a group of two categories only and one-way ANOVA where there was a group of more than two categories in a variable

Table 6. Gender Wise Significance of Difference in Opinions Regarding Quality Assurance Practices

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	SD	*df*	*t*	*P*
Quality Learner	M	86	4.36	0.43	154	0.08	0.78
	F	70	4.47	0.47			
Quality Learning Environment	M	86	4.08	0.34	154	4.56	0.04
	F	70	4.30	0.47			
Quality Control	M	86	3.99	0.44	154	0.88	0.35
	F	70	4.20	0.42			
Quality Process	M	86	4.04	0.49	154	0.99	0.32
	F	70	4.19	0.43			
Quality Outcomes	M	86	3.77	0.55	154	0.75	0.38
	F	70	4.07	0.16			

The above table indicates that female was more agreed (M= 4.47, S. D= 0.47) about quality learner practices than male respondents (M= 4.36, S. D= 0.43). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality learner practices (p= 0.78, *df* = 154). Female respondents were more agreed (M= 4.30, 0.47) regarding quality learning environment than males (M=4.08, S. D= 0.34), while there was found a statistically significant difference (p= 0.04, *df* = 154) in opinions of male and female respondents regarding quality learning environment practices. Female were more agreed (M= 4.20, S. D= 0.42) about quality control practices than male respondents (M= 3.99, S. D= 0.44). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality control practices (p= 0.35, *df*= 154). Female were more agreed (M= 4.19, S. D= 0.43) about quality process-based practices than male respondents (M= 4.04, S. D= 0.49). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality process-based practices (p= 0.32, *df* = 154). Females were more agreed (M= 4.07, S. D= 0.61) about quality outcome-based practices than male respondents (M= 3.77, S. D= 0.55). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality outcome-based practices (p= 0.38, *df* = 154).

Table 7. Institution Wise Significance of Difference in Opinions Regarding Quality Assurance Practices

Variables	Institution	N	Mean	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Quality Learner	Public	84	4.40	0.47	154	0.33	0.56
	Private	72	4.42	0.44			
Quality Learning Environment	Public	84	4.24	0.39	154	0.12	0.72
	Private	72	4.10	0.43			
Quality Control	Public	84	4.11	0.45	154	0.57	0.45
	Private	72	4.06	0.42			
Quality Process	Public	84	4.12	0.49	154	0.46	0.49
	Private	72	4.08	0.44			
Quality Outcome	Public	84	3.90	0.59	154	0.90	0.78
	Private	72	3.92	0.61			

The above table indicates that private sector members were more agreed (M= 4.42, S. D= 0.44) about quality learner practices than public sector respondents (M= 4.40, S. D= 0.47). Yet there found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of public and private sector respondents regarding quality learner practices (p= 0.56, *df* = 154). Public sector respondents were more agreed (M= 4.24, 0.39) regarding quality learning environment than private ones (M=4.10, S. D= 0.43), while there was found no statistically significant difference (p= 0.72, *df* = 154) in opinions of public and private sector respondents regarding quality learner environment practices. Public sector respondents were more agreed (M= 4.11, S. D= 0.45) about quality control practices than private respondents (M= 4.06, S. D= 0.42). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality control practices (p= 0.45, *df* = 154). Public sector participants were more agreed (M= 4.12, S. D= 0.49) about quality process-based practices than private sector respondents (M= 4.08, S. D= 0.44). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality process-based practices (p= 0.49, *df* = 154). Private sector participants were more agreed (M= 3.92, S. D= 0.61) about quality outcome-based practices than public sector respondents (M= 3.90, S. D= 0.59). Yet there was found no statistically significant difference in the opinion of male and female respondents regarding quality outcome-based practices (p= 0.78, *df* = 154).

Table 8. Designation Wise Significance of Difference in Opinions Regarding Quality Assurance Practices

Variables	Groups	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Squares	*F*	*p*
	Between Groups	0.39	2	0.19	0.93	0.40
Quality Learner	Within Groups	21.05	153	0.21		
	Total	21.43	155			
	Between Groups	1.81	2	0.91	5.70	0.00
Quality Learning Environment	Within Groups	16.21	153	0.16		
	Total	18.03	155			
	Between Groups	.10	2	0.05	0.25	0.77
Quality Control	Within Groups	20.15	153	0.20		
	Total	20.25	155			
	Between Groups	.42	2	0.21	0.96	0.39
Quality Process	Within Groups	22.16	153	0.22		
	Total	22.58	155			
	Between Groups	1.62	2	0.81	2.33	0.10
Quality Outcome	Within Groups	35.39	153	0.35		
	Total	37.00	155			

The above table indicates that there was found no difference in opinions of faculty members of various designations about quality learner (p= 0.40, df = 155), quality control (p= 0.77, df= 155), quality process (p= 0.39, df= 155) and quality outcome (p= 0.10, df= 155). It was also observed in the above results that there was found a significant difference in opinions of faculty members of various designations regarding quality learning environment (p= 0.00, df = 155).

Discussions and Conclusions

The quality assurance measures adopted by HEC can be regarded as the first step in establishing a quality assurance system in Pakistan's higher education sector (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, 2008 & 2009), (Government of Pakistan, 2017). However, in Pakistan's HEI, there is usually no diagnostic review and evaluation of these standards. Both public and private universities in Pakistan do not have external institutions or institutions to review the academic courses of the institution, except for HEC approval (only mandatory for private universities) (Aslam & Akbar, 2017). The results of this study indicate that public universities that have established QEC have now prepared mission statements, quality assurance policies and procedures (Altbach, 2012), (William & Dyke, 2008). Each department of the university has appointed a coordinator and is conducting a self-evaluation Pandya, 2011).

The main results of the study indicate that, in terms of student quality, quality assurance practices are about good courses, which include components of student psychological development, and classrooms are contributing to the provision of a learning environment. The conclusion is that the course provides market-oriented topics/reading, and through the content and process coverage, teachers use student-centered teaching methods to maximize students' talents. It was also concluded that the quality of education was taken care of to improve the health of the participants, and that parents also appreciated this practice. Gender wise no significant difference was found in respondents' opinions regarding quality assurance practices like quality learners, quality learning outcomes, quality control and quality process while significant differences were found in respondents' opinions regarding quality assurance practice like quality learning environment. Institutions wise no significant difference was found in respondents' opinions regarding all quality assurance practices discussed in the study. Designation wise no significant difference was found in faculty members opinions regarding quality assurance practices like quality learners, quality learning outcomes, quality control and quality process and significant differences were found in faculty members opinions regarding quality assurance practices like quality learning environment.

Recommendation

It is the right of every human to get a quality education. It involves sketching the students' potential and stretching the students' potential to the optimum. Necessary orientation sessions may be arranged by the university to impart the basic knowledge relating to quality assurance practices like quality learner; quality learning environment, quality control, quality process and quality outcome to the university faculty. Some exercises should be followed for quality assurance and it may continue throughout the year which is essential for monitoring, mentoring and evaluation. The research guidelines may be submitted by the quality assurance cells to the departments and program in charge to match their courses with the market needs, teachers to cope with the job market requirements and to universities enabling them to enter into a competitive environment. The lessons learnt out of the practical application of other countries may be put to practice on small scale first and thereafter on extensive level.

References

Altbach, P. G. (2012). The globalization of college and university rankings. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *44*(1), 26-31.

Anderson, G. (2006). Assuring Quality/Resisting Quality Assurance: Academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities. *Higher Education*, 12(2), 161-17.

Arshad, M., Ahmed, G., Noreen, F., & Shams, B. A. (2019). Teachers perceptions regarding in-service trainings and national professional standards for teachers in Pakistan, *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, *9*(2), pp.1-10.

Aslam, M. I. & Akbar, R. A. (2017). Validation of the higher education commission's quality assurance indicators used for self-assessment mechanism at universities in Punjab province. *Bulletin of Education and Research. 39*(3), 237-250.

Ayub, U., Shahzad, S., & Ali, M. S. (2019). University teachers' attitude towards inclusion. Efficacy and intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms in higher education. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR), 4*(1), 365-372. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-I).47.

Batool, Z., & Qureshi, R. H. (2007). Quality assurance manual: For higher education in assurance, accreditation and the recognition of qualifications in higher education assurance: A selection of papers from the 3rd European quality Assurance forum. Retrieved on March 22, 2020. www.oecd.org.els.stats.edu_db/def_uoe2.htm.

Boston, G. (2001). Higher education in Pakistan: Towards Reform Agenda: A contribution to the task force on improvement of higher education in Pakistan: Author

Cetinsaya, G. (2014). *A Road Map for Turkish Higher Education, Growth Quality Internalization*. Higher Education Council Publication. pp.25.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (9th ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Pearson Merrill.

Government of Pakistan (2002). *Higher Education Commission Ordinance 2002*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (2017). *Minimum Standards for Quality Education in Pakistan: Attaining standards for improved learning outcomes and school effectiveness.* Islamabad: Policy and Planning Wing Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan. (1947). *Proceedings of the Pakistan International Conference held at Karachi from 27th to 1st December 1947.* Ministry of Interior Education Division: Karachi.

Government of Pakistan. (1979). *National Education Policy and Implementation Programme 1979*, Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan. (2002). *The task force on improvement of higher education in Pakistan: Challenges and opportunities,* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan. (2007). *Annual Budget 2007*. Islamabad: Ministry of Finance.

Government of Pakistan. (2009). *National Education Policy 2009*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Harvey, L. (2008). *Rankings of higher education institutions*. A critical review: Routledge.

Harvey, L. (2017). Analytic quality glossary, quality research international. http://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/glossary/.

Hou, A. (2012). Mutual recognition of quality assurance decisions on higher education institutions in three regions: A lesson for Asia. *Higher Education*, *64*(6), 911–926. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9536-1

Hou, A. Y. C., Morse, R., & Chiang, C. (2012). An analysis of mobility in global rankings: making institutional strategic plans and positioning for building world-class universities. *Higher Education Research & Development, 31*(6), 841-857.

Isani, U. A. G. & Virk, M. L. (2005). *Higher Education in Pakistan: A Historic and Futuristic Perspective*, National Book Foundation: Islamabad.

Islam, G. M. N., Ali, M. I., & Islam, M. Z. (2017). Quality assurance and accreditation mechanisms of higher education institutions: Policy issues and challenges in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Education Studies, 3*(5), 278-304. http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.495792.

Karaim, R. (2011). Expanding higher education. *CQ Global Researcher*, *5*(22), 525–572. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/.

Noreen, F., & Hussain, B. (2019). HEC ranking criteria in the perspective of global university ranking systems. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR),* 4(2), 43-50. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-II).06.

Pandya, S. R. (2011). *School Effectiveness*. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, (2008). Higher education credit framework for England: Guidance on academic credit arrangements in higher education in England: QAA. http://www.qaa.ac.uk/england/credit/creditframework.pdf.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2009). An introduction to QAA. Reterieved on November 15 2019. www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/IntroQAA.pdf

Rasool, S., Arshad, M., & Ali, M. S. (2019). Current trends and issues in quality assurance practices: higher education Pakistan. *Global Regional Review (GRR),* 4(3), 250-257. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019(IV-III).28.

Rasool, S., Khan, K. B., & Ali, M. S. 2019). Impediments in quality assurance of higher education sector of Pakistan. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR), 4*(4), 52-60. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-IV).08.

Sari, A., Firat, A. & Karaduman, A. (2016). Quality assurance issues in higher education sectors of developing countries; Case of Nothern Cyprus. *Procedia, 229.* pp. 326-334. Available at www.sciencedirect.com.

Shabbir, M., Khalid, M. I., Dogar, A. H., Amin, M., Saleem, K., Masood, Sajid. & Tatlah, I. A. (2014). Problems and issues in relation to quality assurance practices in higher education: Views of students, teachers and heads of quality enhancement cells (QEC's). *AYER, vol. 4.* pp. 116-122.

Shukla, R. (2014). *Dictionary of Education*. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.

Taylor, P., & Braddock, R. (2007). International university ranking systems and the idea of university excellence. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *29*(3), 245-260.

UNESCO. (2000). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise*. Washington, D.C: World Bank.

UNICEF (2000). *Defining Quality in Education*. USA: Working Paper Series, Education Section, Program Division, New York.

USAID. (2008). Evaluation of USAID Higher Education Portfolio Task Order No. REE-I07-05-00053-00.

Varonism, E. M. (2014). Most courses are not born digital: An overview of the quality matters peer review process for online course design. *Campus-Wide Information Systems, 31*(4), 217–229. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CWIS-09-2013-0053.

Walsh, A. (2002). Total quality management continuous improvement: is the philosophy a reality? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *26* (6), 299-307.

Williams, R., & Van Dyke, N. (2008). Reputation and reality: ranking major disciplines in Australian universities. *Higher Education*, *56*(1), 1-28.

Williams, D. & Kristoffersen, D. (2006). *An Overview of World Issues in Quality Assurance*. Melbourne: Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) Occasional Publication.

Woodhouse, D. (2006). The Role of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education in the 21st Centuy. In A. Rauf & N. Ahmed (Eds.). Quality assurance in higher education: A global perspective (pp. 29-37). Islamabad: Higher Education Commission.

World Bank (2007). *Higher Education Quality Assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa Status, Challenges, Opportunities, and Promising Practices*. Washington, D.C: The World Bank Paper No. 124.

World Bank, 2006). *Pakistan: An Assessment of the Medium-Term Development Framework* Report No. 37247.

World Bank. (2002). *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education*. Washington, D.C: World Bank.

World Bank. (2008). *The road not traveled: Education reform in the Middle East and North Africa*. Washington, DC: World Bank.