Virtual University of Pakistan

Assessment Team Report

Department:	**Education**
Program Title:	**B.Ed. (Hons) Elementary**
Assessment Cycle:	**Cycle-IV**
Assessment Year:	**2024-25**

Criteria Referenced Evaluation

#	Standards' Title	Weightage	Approved	Approved with Recommendations	Approved with Conditions	Not Approved	Score
Standard-1	Programme Mission, Objectives & Outcomes	15%		✓			12.30
Standard-2	Curriculum Design & Organization	20%		✓			16.50
Standard-3	Subject-Specific Facilities	15%		✓			11.25
Standard-4	Student Support & Advising	10%		✓			8.67
Standard-5	Teaching Faculty/Staff	20%		✓			17.50
Standard-6	Institutional Policies & Process Control	10%		✓			8.92
Standard-7	Institutional Support & Facilities	5%					NA
Standard-8	Institutional General Requirements	5%					NA

Signature of Assessment Team Lead:
Name | Prof. Dr. Muhammad Amir Hashmi
Designation | Chairman Centre for Institutional Development & Policy Analysis IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore

Signature of DQE Coordinator:
Name | Mr. Mehboob Ahmed Khatri
Designation | Manager Quality Assurance

Standard-1 Programme Mission, Objectives & Outcomes		Weight = 0.15					
Factors Score		NA	5	4	3	2	1
1	Institution and department mission statements are documented and aligned with the Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs).	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
2	PEOs define expected graduate achievements a few years after graduation, supported by a strategic plan outlining necessary actions.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
3	Every PEO includes evidence of its alignment with institutional mission, assessment strategies and timelines, along with documentation of implemented improvements.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
4	Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are aligned with the PEOs and use of action verbs support their attainment.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	The extent to which graduates achieve PLOs is assessed using defined methods such as alumni, graduating student, and employer surveys.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	Survey data are collected systematically, analyzed, and presented in the report, with documented use of results for timely program improvements.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	Accreditation outcomes and feedback are documented, with corresponding actions taken and planned improvements clearly described.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
8	The program's strengths, weaknesses, and major future development plans are identified and supported by evidence.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
9	The department conducts periodic performance reviews using quantifiable measures to inform strategic decisions and continuous improvement.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
10	Students are actively engaged in program evaluation, with documented evidence of their participation and feedback impact.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		0	15	24	0	2	0
Score 1 (S1) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		12.30					

Standard-1 Programme Mission, Objectives & Outcomes				
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:			**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	The University Vision and Mission is available but no yet approved by the Statutory bodies.	1	The Vision Mission statement is required to be approved from statutory bodies.	
2	Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs) are aligned with the institution's mission statement. Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are also aligned with the PEOs and use action verbs.	2	Strengthen the existing student course-evaluation survey by adding CLO-aligned and concept-specific questions that generate granular, actionable data on outcome attainment and concept comprehension, enabling evidence-based revisions to course content.	
3	Students actively participate in program evaluation, providing balanced feedback that highlights both strengths and areas for improvement, demonstrating meaningful engagement with documented impact.	3	Employer Survey is missing. Proper measures are required to be taken to collect feedback from the employers.	
4	The faculty feedback survey on the course content is lacking.	4	Strengthen the end-of-semester instructor reflection process by introducing a structured, data-driven Student-Performance Diagnostic Report that translates learning-outcome attainment and content-quality analytics into targeted curriculum and pedagogy improvements.	
5	Program requirements are up to mark.	5	Accreditation process is required to be initiated followed by the implementation of ODL policy at NACTE end.	
6		6		
7		7		
8		8		
9		9		
10		10		

Standard-2 Curriculum Design & Organization		NA	5	4	3	2	1
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	The curriculum is consistent and support the programme's documented objectives.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Theoretical background, problem analysis and solution are stressed within the programme's core material.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
3	The curriculum satisfies the core requirements for the programme, as specified by the respective accreditation body and HEC curricula.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
4	The curriculum satisfies the major requirements for the programme as specified by HEC and the respective accreditation body/councils.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
5	The curriculum satisfies general education, arts, and discipline requirements for the programme, as specified by the respective accreditation body/council.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
6	Information technology components of the curriculum is integrated throughout the programme.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
7	Oral and written communication skills of the student are developed and applied in the programme.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
8	Different feedback surveys conducted each semester for each course from students and faculty.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**0**	**5**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Score 2 (S2) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**16.50**					

Weight = 0.20

Standard-2 Curriculum Design & Organization			
	Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**
1	Program requirements are up to mark.	1	
2	The 'Teaching Internship' and 'Research Project' courses effectively enhance oral communication skills through real-world interaction. Additionally, online sessions of courses like EDU406 also contribute to improving these skills.	2	
3	The program is aligned according to HEC undergraduate policy 2023.	4	The department may follow the university's guidelines in terms of strategic plan proposed by HEC (NQF, 2015).
4		4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	

Standard-3 Subject-Specific Facilities						Weight = 0.15
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	Laboratory and computing facilities supporting the program are documented, including their adequacy, accessibility, and alignment with program requirements.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Students and faculty have timely access to up-to-date manuals, instructions, and safety documentation, with evidence of availability and use.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
3	Each laboratory includes details on technical support personnel, the level and nature of instructional support, and resource availability.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	Computing infrastructure (hardware, software, and networks) is sufficient to meet the program's teaching and learning needs.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
5	Laboratory and computing facilities are regularly assessed against similar programs at top HEIs, with deficiencies and improvements documented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**1**	**5**	**8**	**0**	**2**	**0**
Score 3 (S3) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**11.25**					

Standard-3 Subject-Specific Facilities			
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	Laboratory facilities are rightly marked NA due to the online nature of the program.	1	Establish a benchmarking framework to compare computing facilities with other HEIs at institutional level.
2	Computing facilities are modern and well-distributed among faculty and students.	2	- Implement regular feedback collection from students/faculty on computing services at institutional level. -Integrate emerging technologies in LMS —particularly generative AI—to enhance pedagogical methods for improved learning outcomes.
3	No evidence of benchmarking practices was provided.	3	
4		4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	

Standard-4 Student Support & Advising						Weight = 0.10	

Factors Score		NA	5	4	3	2	1
1	The department has a documented strategy for course offerings, including the frequency of major, elective & allied courses offered by other departments.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Courses taught by multiple instructors have clear coordination mechanisms to ensure effective student–faculty interaction and instructional consistency.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Students are clearly informed about program requirements through accessible and timely communication channels.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	An academic advising system is in place, with mechanisms for evaluating its effectiveness.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
5	A student counselling system exists, providing access to professional support services when needed, with evidence of availability and utilization.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
6	Students have documented opportunities to engage with practitioners and participate in technical and professional societies.	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**0**	**15**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**0**
Score 4 (S4) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**8.67**					

Standard-4 Student Support & Advising			
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	The program has an effective system for course delivery coordination.	1	Introduce formal assessment tools (e.g., survey) to evaluate academic advising effectiveness.
2	Communication through LMS, helpdesk, MDBs, and live sessions is well-integrated.	2	Establish a formal counselling unit with trained professionals for emotional and academic support at university level.
3	Informal counselling services are offered in specific cases.	3	
4		4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	

Standard-5 Teaching Faculty/Staff						Weight = 0.20	
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	A web page shows program areas and the number of specialized teaching staff, along with faculty CVs is publicly available.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Teaching staff strength is sufficient to deliver the curriculum and achieve programme objectives.	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
3	Student feedback on teaching and assessment is collected each semester and used for instructional improvement.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	The department has defined criteria for faculty currency in the discipline, and the percentage of faculty meeting these criteria is documented.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	Mechanisms are in place to ensure full-time faculty have adequate time for scholarly and professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
6	Teaching staff development programs are available at departmental and institutional levels, with documented evidence of effectiveness.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	Faculty development programs are evaluated regularly, and results are used for program enhancement.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
8	Programs for faculty motivation and job satisfaction are implemented, with effectiveness measured through periodic faculty surveys.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**0**	**25**	**4**	**6**	**0**	**0**
Score 5 (S5) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**17.50**					

Standard-5 Teaching Faculty/Staff			
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	Faculty currently have limited time for scholarly and professional development, despite the need and interest due to limited faculty number.	**1**	To support academic growth and maintain program quality, dedicated time and institutional support for research and development activities may be prioritized.
2		**2**	
3		**3**	
4		**4**	
5		**5**	
6		**6**	
7		**7**	
8		**8**	
9		**9**	
10		**10**	

Standard-6 Institutional Policies & Process Control							Weight = 0.10
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	Admission criteria are clearly defined and communicated to prospective students, and periodically evaluated for improvement.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Policies and procedures for credit transfer are documented and accessible.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Student registration processes are clearly outlined, and academic progress is systematically monitored to ensure adherence to degree requirements.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	Procedures are in place to verify that graduates meet all programme requirements, with periodic evaluations to inform improvements.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
5	Processes for recruiting and retaining qualified teaching staff are documented, aligned with the institutional mission, and evaluated for effectiveness.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
6	Faculty evaluation and promotion processes reflect institutional mission and are periodically reviewed for continuous improvement.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
7	Teaching and learning processes are designed to ensure instructional effectiveness and student-centered learning, using evaluation mechanisms for improvement.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
8	Academic and support information is provided to prospective and current students to support informed decision-making and successful progression.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	Programme expectations and student responsibilities are clearly communicated throughout the study period.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	Upon graduation, students receive a comprehensive academic record reflecting their achievements.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	Programme practices align with institutional values, ethical standards, and policies on equality, diversity, inclusion, and academic integrity.	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
12	Transparent procedures exist to safeguard the rights and interests of students, faculty, and staff, including handling of complaints and appeals.	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	All critical processes (admissions, teaching, student progress, evaluation) are periodically reviewed, and evaluation results are used for enhancement.	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**0**	**35**	**20**	**3**	**0**	**0**
Score 6 (S6) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**8.92**					

Standard-6 Institutional Policies & Process Control			
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	Admission and credit transfer policies are transparent, inclusive, and consistently applied.	1	Develop a university-wide data-analytics strategy that transforms the information captured by digitised processes into key performance indicators, interactive dashboards, and feedback loops—enabling evidence-driven decisions and sustained continuous improvement across all functions.
2	Student registration and academic monitoring leverage a centralized LMS system that enables smooth processing and intervention.	2	Refining complaints and query handling procedures to make them more transparent and time-bound. Evaluate for continuous improvement.
3	Students receive detailed academic records post-graduation, with rechecking options available.	3	
4	The faculty hiring process is rigorous, incorporating merit-based criteria, technology skills, and mission alignment.	4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	

Standard-7 Institutional Support & Facilities				Weight = 0.05			
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	The programme provides a self-evaluation of its compliance with standards, identifying gaps and plans for improvement where needed.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Secretarial support, technical staff, and office equipment are sufficient to support programme operations.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Data on graduate students, research assistants, and PhD students over the past three years are provided, along with teacher-to-graduate student ratios.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	Library, laboratory, and computing resources are documented, and their adequacy assessed relative to programme needs.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	Facilities and infrastructure supporting modern teaching and learning practices are available and evaluated for adequacy.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	The library's technical collection and user support services are sufficient to meet academic and research needs.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	Classrooms and faculty offices are adequate in number, space, and functionality to support effective teaching and learning.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Score 7 (S7) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**Not Applicable**					

Standard-7 Institutional Support & Facilities			
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:		**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1	Computing resources and LMS are strong: labs are not applicable.	1	Appoint library staff and establish physical libraries at key campuses to improve resource access and support blended learning.
2	E-learning infrastructure is adequate.	2	Invest in emerging educational technologies and related faculty training.
3	Good access to e-resources via HEC Digital Library, but limited usage and no physical libraries.	3	
4		4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	

Standard-8 Institutional General Requirements		NA	5	4	3	2	1
Factors Score		**NA**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	Postgraduate research programmes are offered only when institutional academic standards—aligned with national expectations—can be met.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Detailed regulations on admission, registration, assessment, and awarding are documented, accessible, and open to review by the institution and department.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Research activities align with regional, national, and international societal and industrial needs.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	Research opportunities are offered only where appropriate academic supervision, research infrastructure, and student support are available.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	Publicity materials for research programmes are clear, accurate, and detailed enough to support informed student choice.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	Admission procedures are well-defined, consistently applied, and ensure that only qualified candidates are selected through a multi-expert review process.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	Admissions processes are fair, transparent, and promote equality of opportunity.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	Research student entitlements and responsibilities are clearly defined and communicated at the start of the programme.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	New research students are supported with orientation activities that help them understand the academic and social environment of the institution.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	The feasibility of research projects is assessed prior to admission, for both full- and part-time students.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	Research students have access to sufficient training to develop the skills required for completing their research and preparing for future careers.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	Supervisors are qualified subject experts with the skills and experience necessary to guide, monitor, and support research students.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	Research supervision is structured to ensure consistent progress tracking and timely communication with students.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	Research assessment processes are clearly defined, rigorous, fair, consistent, and well communicated to both students and supervisors.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	Systems have been set up to collect and address feedback from students and supervisors about the research experience and support infrastructure.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	Clear procedures for complaints and appeals are documented, consistently enforced, & readily available to provide support throughout the process.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	The institution regularly reviews its effectiveness in meeting the quality standards (Precepts) of research degrees awarded in its name.	⊘	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Total Encircled Value (TV)		**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Score 8 (S8) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight =		**Not Applicable**					

Weight = 0.05

Standard-8 Institutional General Requirements				
Comments/Observations/Key Findings:			**Recommendations/Conditions**	
1		1		
2		2		
3		3		
4		4		
5		5		
6		6		
7		7		
8		8		
9		9		
10		10		

$$\text{ASSESSMENT SCORE} = \text{S1} + \text{S2} + \text{S3} + \text{S4} + \text{S5} + \text{S6} + \text{S7} + \text{S8}$$

$$= 12.3 + 16.50 + 11.25 + 8.67 + 17.50 + 8.92 + \text{NA} + \text{NA}$$

$$= 75.14 / 90 \quad (83.49\%)$$

Note: Score Normalized as '02' Standard(s) is (are) 'Not Applicable'.

OVERALL JUDGEMENT = **Approved with Recommendations**

Overall Comments by Assessment Team:

The Assessment Team finds the program well-structured and aligned with quality assurance standards, with notable strengths in curriculum design, academic planning, and learner support. To sustain program quality, it is recommended to provide faculty with dedicated time and institutional support for research and professional development. Additionally, appointing establishing physical libraries at key campuses will enhance resource access. Strengthening stakeholder engagement and continuous improvement documentation will further contribute to the program's growth and effectiveness.

Comments by DQE Coordinator:

The program is well-structured with strengths in key areas; enhanced faculty support, resource access, and improved documentation of continuous improvement are recommended for sustained quality.