Namal University Mianwali

Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)

Academic Audit 2026

Program: Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (BS CS)

Assessment: Self- Assessment Report on NCEAC Standards

STANDARDS REFERENCED EVALUATION RUBRIC

Accreditation/Regulatory Body: **NCEAC** Date of External Review: **January 29, 2026**

Scoring of Standard Items

Key areas of each standard are required to be ranked by considering the evaluation of each standard approach taken by the university and the department. The Assessment team is required to award the rubric as per NCEAC guidelines. Following are the guidelines to be used to rank the each key area/standard of a criterion.

Assessment rubric as per NCEAC:

G	**Good**	(Exceeds compliance requirements)
S	**Satisfactory**	(Compliant)
C	**Concern**	(Complies with room for improvement)
W	**Weakness**	(Partially compliant)
D	**Deficient**	(Not compliant)

Criterion 1 –Program Objectives (POs)

Evaluate the extent to which the program attains the following elements of the criterion.

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a.	The institution has defined program objectives (POs) which are consistent with the vision and mission of the institution.	The Program Objectives are clearly defined and are aligned with the refined vision and mission statements of the university. The separation and clarity of vision and mission statements have improved since the previous review. Mapping between Vision–Mission–POs is explicitly documented and approved by relevant statutory bodies.	S		
b.	There is a process in place to evaluate the attainment of POs and the institution has set some Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for this purpose.	Yes, the process is in place to evaluate the PO, but there is room to improve the KPIs. Yes, there is a well-defined process for evaluating PO attainment using indirect assessment tools such as alumni and employer surveys, and KPIs have been specified. However, PO attainment continues to rely predominantly on indirect evidence. Direct assessment of POs through mapped CLOs, capstone projects, or internships is not sufficiently demonstrated. Additionally, uniform KPIs across all POs lack contextual justification.	S		
c.	There is a process in place by which the institution takes steps to review its program considering POs attainment.	The SAR documents a formal review mechanism for Program Objectives based on attainment data. However, evidence of closed-loop actions showing how PO attainment results led to curriculum or policy changes and subsequent improvement is limited. In our opinion, the first review cycle can be targeted with a 2–3 year and subsequent cycles can be after 4-5 years.	C	HoD CS	June 2026
d.	There exists a mechanism that involves alumni, faculty, and industry in the formulation and review of POs	Yes, there is a process that indicates involvement of alumni and industry through surveys and advisory interactions. However, a formal, documented mechanism demonstrating structured participation of alumni, faculty, and industry in the formulation and periodic revision of Program Objectives is yet to be approved by the required statutory bodies.	C	HoD CS	June 2026

Criterion 2 – Graduate Attributes (GAs)

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a	Graduate Attributes are clearly defined, encompassing attributes outlined in Section D.5 of the Seoul Accord Document. These have been adopted by the institution's relevant statutory body.	The Graduate Attributes are clearly defined and comprehensively cover all attributes outlined in Section D.5 of the Seoul Accord. These attributes have been formally adopted by the relevant statutory bodies of the institution. The definitions are clear, consistent, and aligned with international accreditation requirements.	G		
b	There is a well-defined process for the periodic review and revision of GAs.	Yes, a well-defined documented process exists for the periodic review and revision of GAs; internship assessment continues to be treated largely as a direct GA measurement, rather than being clearly positioned as an indirect assessment tool, as recommended in the previous review.	S		
c	The institution has mapped its GAs to the POs of the program.	Yes, there is a clear mapping of GAs to POs which is consistent with OBE principles,	S		
d	There is a documented process for the assessment and evaluation of GAs attainment?	Yes, the process is in place to evaluate the GAs attainment through both direct and indirect assessment mechanism, however, the logical relationship between direct and indirect assessments (AND vs OR) remains insufficiently specified. The absence of a clearly defined aggregation and decision rule may introduce ambiguity in GA attainment.	S		

Criterion-3: Curriculum and Learning Process

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a.	Curriculum is in compliance with program program-specific HEC curriculum guidelines. It is spread over 8 semesters, covering at least 130 credit hours of coursework. And it: Covers required breadth, depth, and content distribution.	Yes, the curriculum remains compliant with HEC and NCEAC requirements in terms of structure, duration, credit hours, and content distribution. Breadth and depth requirements are adequately addressed. However, despite prior recommendations, the internship continues to be assessed using a grading mechanism rather than a qualifier/non-qualifier model.	S		

b.	Adequate exposure to Complex Problems(CPs) and design activities	The SAR 2026 document provides examples of projects and assignments intended to address complex problems. However, a formal mechanism for identifying, categorizing, and consistently assessing Complex Problems across the curriculum is still not clearly demonstrated. Evidence remains subjective rather than systematic.	C	PT/ HoD CS	July 2026
c.	Availability of program-specific, well-equipped labs to supplement theoretical knowledge/ classroom learning.	The program continues to have adequate and well-equipped lab facilities that support course delivery. However, comprehensive laboratory safety documentation, visible safety signage, emergency exit guidance, and first-aid arrangements are still not sufficiently evidenced Moreover, the department requires a dedicated general-purpose computing lab, and a high-performance computing (HPC) lab in addition to the project lab.	C	PT/ Manager Admin/ HoD CS	March 2026
d.	Lab work and its assessment mechanism supports attainment of the required skills.	Number of labs is still less than the recommended 14 labs (refer to precious report).	C	HoD CS	June 2026
e.	Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are defined for all courses and are mapped to relevant GAs.	CLOs are defined and mapped to GAs across courses; However, many CLOs still lack complete specification in terms of action verb, condition, and performance standard, affecting assessment quality and taxonomy alignment.	S		
f.	Formal involvement of industry in curriculum development / revision.	An Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) exists and periodic interactions with industry representatives is evident. However, documented evidence linking industry feedback directly to curriculum revisions remains limited, and formal records of decisions are insufficient.	S		
g.	Employment of other aspects (supplementary tools and practices) of student learning such as tutorial system and seminar / workshops, etc. to enhance student learning, in addition to regular classroom interaction and lab experimentation. Minimum expectation is that faculty office hours are announced and adhered to.	The institution exhibits strong commitment to promote student learning through workshops, seminars, industrial visits, competitions, and faculty office hours. These activities are well-documented and supported by institutional funding.	G		

h	Exposure to cooperative learning through a supervised and mandatory internship program with formal feedback from the employer.	The internship program is mandatory and supervised, with employer feedback mechanisms in place. However, the assessment approach continues to rely on conventional grading, and the recommended qualifier/non-qualifier evaluation aligned with OBE principles has not yet been fully implemented.	C	HoD CS	August 2026
i	Sufficient opportunities to invoke intuitiveness and originality of thought through Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Design Projects, and Open-Ended labs.	SAR acknowledges the inclusion of problem-based learning and design-oriented activities. However, open-ended labs and complex problem courses are not explicitly identified or documented, and separate repositories for such activities are still lacking.	C	HoD CS	July 2026
j	Assessment of various learning outcomes (GAs/CLOs) employing appropriate direct/indirect methods.	Processes for evaluating Graduate Attributes (GAs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) exist but require refinement. Key issues include an undefined relationship between direct/indirect GA assessment methods, CLOs that are not well-aligned with taxonomy levels, a curriculum overly focused on the cognitive domain, and an oversimplified GA calculation that uses equal weighting for all CLOs. It is recommended to define a clear policy on how direct and indirect assessments combine (AND/OR) to confirm GA achievement and replace the equal-weight CLO model with a justified, differential weighting scheme for accurate GA score calculation.	C	PT / HoD CS	October 2026
k	Final Year Design projects (FYDP) include complex problems and design of systems, components or processes integrating core areas and meeting specified religious, cultural and societal aspects.	Majority of FYDP are industry-defined and address real-world problems. Projects integrate core computing areas and consider societal and contextual factors.	G		
l.	FYDP project deliverables and the reports are graded according to well-defined mechanism.	The FYDP assessment mechanism is well-documented. However, CLOs are not defined for FYDP. CLOs are required to be defined and each and evaluation criteria should be linked to defined CLOs	C	HoD CS	April 2026

Criterion-4: Students

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a	Admission Criteria meets / exceeds minimum eligibility criteria prescribed by NCEAC Regulations.	The university follows the admission criteria laid out by NCEAC. However, a proper mechanism regarding admission of students with medical background should exist.	S		
b	Annual intake is in-line with the maximum intake allowed by NCEAC.	The department has consistently exceeded its NCEAC-approved annual intake cap of 50 students. Fall 2024 Intake: 78 students (exceeds cap by 28) Fall 2025 Intake: 61 students (exceeds cap by 11). This is a major non-compliance that may threaten accreditation status. The intake needs to be regularized.	W	HoD CS	June 2026
c	Well documented policy on transfer of students only from other accredited programs restricting transfer of less than 50% of credit hours required for the degree.	SAR report provides transfer policy and the same was presented during the audit session. However, the approved policy document was not provided for verification.	C	Registrar/ HoD	April 2026
d	Availability of designated student counselors to advise / counsel students regarding academic / career matters and provide assistance in managing their health, financial, stress, emotional and spiritual problems.	Yes, the student counseling system and facilities are in place	G		
e	Manageable class-size (maximum of 50 for theory classes) and lab groups (2-3 students per workstation for hands-on type experiments, larger groups may be manageable for demonstration type)	The intake of over 50 students directly violates the stipulated maximum of 50 for effective theory instruction. The practical resources are critically insufficient as one programming lab has seating capacity issues. With an intake of 50+ students, the lab containing only 41 systems cannot facilitate the required hands-on experience.	C	HoD CS	Sep 2026
f	Manageable semester academic load (i.e. 15- 18 credit hours on the average)	Compliant	G		
g	Completion of courses as evident from course-files and through student feedback	Compliant	S		
h	Students' participation in national / international engineering exhibitions and / or competitions, and facilitation by program for such participations	Student learning is actively supported through participation in various forums, including workshops, seminars, industrial visits, and competitions, with substantial	G		

		financial backing from the university. The university has well-documented student support structures and facilitates participation in competitions.			
i	Quality of process to evaluate student performance and suggest/take corrective measures	The process exists; however, there is a need to clearly outline the procedure for issuing a letter of advice or warning to students, as well as specifying the departmental actions to be taken if CLOs and/or GAs are not attained at the end of course/program.	C	HoD CS / CoE	April 2026
j	How the program is inculcating community services	The process is in place, and community services are well documented.	G		

Criterion-5: Faculty and Support Staff

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a	Faculty Strength as per NCEAC guidelines.	Compliant	S		
b	Balanced qualified faculty as specified in NCEAC guidelines.	Compliant	S		
c.	Formal mechanism for faculty training and mentoring on pedagogical skills and outcomes based implementation methodologies.	Compliant	S		
d	Effectiveness of faculty development program to ensure their professional growth and retention.	Compliant	S		
e	Faculty workload as specified in NCEAC guidelines.	Compliant	S		
f	Course files maintained as per NCEAC guidelines.	Though course files are generally maintained in accordance with NCEAC guidelines, however, inconsistencies in OBE documentation indicate a need for improved rigor and internal verification by the CS Department	C	Course Folders Coord. CS / HoD CS	July 2026
g	Faculty research, publications and sponsored projects from industry/donor agencies, etc.	Compliant	S		
h	Qualified support staff in the program to look after the administrative functions of the program and to look after	Compliant. Required support staff are available to manage administrative functions and laboratory operations. Laboratory	G		

	laboratories.	and research facilities are effectively supported by motivated staff who actively assist in maintenance, research, and collaborative activities.			

Criterion-6: Facilities and Infrastructure

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a	Adequacy of teaching and learning facilities, e.g. classroom environment and availability of various teaching aids, etc.	Compliant	S		
b	Provision of program specific labs (as per curriculum), workshops, and associated lab equipment for complementing the class / theory work.	Lab's infrastructure needs improvement. One programming lab contains only 41 computer systems, which is not sufficient to accommodate a class of 50 students. Therefore, computing labs capacity should be increased to 50+. Moreover, there is a need for a general purpose specific to CS students.	C	HoD CS	Sep 2026
c	Adequacy of library resources and facilities.	Library services could not be effectively demonstrated due to the absence of trained staff, incomplete availability of subscribed journal issues, poor organization of discipline-specific resources, and lack of clarity in book issuance procedures. It is recommended to ensure the availability of trained library personnel, maintain complete and well-organized academic resources particularly for CS. Additionally, a transparent and well-documented book issuance and tracking mechanism should be demonstrated to support effective student and faculty use of library resources.	W	Librarian/ HoD CS	March 2026
d	Provision of sufficient computing facilities and internet access / resources allocated for the program.	Although resources are sufficient to accommodate current students; however, CS department has only 2 dedicated classrooms. It is recommended that the department should have 3 dedicated classrooms for CS program as per NCEAC requirements.	C	HoD CS	Sep 2026

e	Provision and effectiveness of consulting and career placement services provided to the students	Compliant	G		
f	Adequacy of support facilities such as hostels, sports and recreational centers, health care centers, student centers, and transport facilities	Most of the facilities are in place. However, transport bus service from campus to city need improvement in terms of more routes with flexible timing	S		
g.	Adequacy of arrangements made / measures taken to ensure work-place safety (EHS concerns) in general, and while performing experiments in the labs. in particular	The institution has basic safety equipment available in laboratories; however, comprehensive workplace safety arrangements remain inadequate. Safety drills and awareness workshops have not been conducted, and first aid boxes are absent in most laboratories. Although fire extinguishers are available and not expired, laboratory support staff are not adequately trained in their use. Similar concerns were raised during the previous visit, and no documentary evidence has been provided to demonstrate corrective actions or improvement in this regard.	W	Manager Admin / HoD CS	May 2026

Criterion 7: Institutional Support and Financial Resources

		Evaluator's Comments	**Compliance Level**	***Resp***	***Deadline***
a.	Adequacy of institutional financial resources to ensure program's sustainability and meeting of recurring as well as developmental requirements.	Compliant	S		
b.	Evidence of continued financial commitment in the form of increasing endowment and recurring /development budget since last accreditation visit.	Compliant	S		
c	Provision of funding for R&D pursuits and presentations/publication of research papers	Compliant	S		

Criterion 8: Steps to Improve the Program

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a.	Documented and institutionalized policies to review POs, GAs and CLOs after every semester/ academic year based on previous years' experience and feedback.	Department has initiated OBE-based practices. However, a formally documented and institutionalized policy for the periodic review of CLOs at the course level is still lacking. Evidence of systematic semester-wise or annual CLO review and revision based on assessment data is not sufficiently demonstrated.	C	HoD CS / Registrar	June 2026
b.	Actions taken / implementation plans worked out to address the weaknesses identified in the Last accreditation visit report.	SAR 2026 includes compliance report addressing the majority of concerns raised during the previous NCEAC accreditation visit. Several corrective actions have been implemented, and progress is evident. However, a few identified gaps remain partially addressed, and comprehensive evidence of complete closure for all action items is still in progress.	C	PT/ HoD CS	May 2026
c.	Improvement in Faculty Strength / Qualifications since last accreditation visit, if required.	Compliant The current faculty profile is adequate to support program delivery and outcome attainment.	S		
d.	Continuation of Faculty Publications, R&D and Consultancy activities	Compliant The institution actively encourages faculty engagement in research, development, and consultancy through incentive and reward mechanisms. Faculty participation in scholarly activities is evident, and the overall research culture appears positive and sustained.	G		
e.	Addition of any new facilities, i.e. infrastructure, lab equipment, teaching aids, etc. to assist in the attainment of program objectives / outcomes, since last accreditation visit	Several PCs were upgraded with NVIDIA GPUs.	S		
f.	New initiative(s) taken since last accreditation visit including content delivery, assessment and evaluation processes, etc.)	For all students admitted from 2023 and after, the department has begun teaching and evaluating courses based on OBE. However, evidence of impact analysis and closed-loop improvement is still evolving.	S		

Criterion 9: Industrial and International Linkages

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	*Resp*	*Deadline*
a.	Existence of Industrial Advisory Board/Committee	Yes, IAB is in place.	S		
b.	Formal mechanism for seeking feedback from Industry and its analysis for the attainment of POs	Yes, A formal mechanism for seeking feedback from industry exists, and employer surveys are regularly conducted. However, the employer survey instrument contains multiple questions that are not explicitly mapped to the Program Objectives (POs). The absence of clear PO-wise mapping and analysis limits the effectiveness of industry feedback as an indirect assessment tool for OBE.	S		
c.	Opportunities for students to acquire industrial experience via internship and existence of Industry-Liaison office	Namal provides ample opportunities for students to acquire industrial experience through a structured internship program, supported by active industrial linkages. The presence of an Industry-Liaison mechanism facilitates coordination with industry partners.	S		
d.	Design projects sponsored / supervised jointly by Industry Professionals and faculty members	The majority of FYPs are industry-defined, reflecting effective engagement with the industrial sector.	G		
e.	Faculty members involved in design / supervision / consultancy role with the industry in the execution of applied research/design project that are relevant to society/Industry.	Yes, FYPs are jointly supervised by the faculty.	S		

Remarks:

The faculty retention rate is relatively low, resulting in periodic hiring of less-experienced faculty. To address this, it is recommended to

1- strengthen hiring process (particularly at the lab engineer and lecturer levels) through proper entry tests and teaching demonstrations.
2- Course feedback should be analyzed and discussed with junior faculty to enhance teaching quality and soft skills in upcoming semesters.
3- While most final-year projects are industry-defined, all such projects should be approved by the Proposal Evaluation Committee in accordance with the approved proposal evaluation policy.

Strengths

NAMAL University consistently attracts high-quality intake in the Computer Science program and provides full funding to admitted students.

The department maintains strong industrial links, and a majority of final-year projects are industry-defined. Moreover, faculty is satisfied and motivated. The university provides clear incentives for research publications and research grants, along with support for conference registration and participation.

Campus Visit Report

a) Class Rooms / Department

The department lacks sufficient dedicated space. There is a pressing need for **three** dedicated classrooms, a dedicated general-purpose computing lab, and a High-Performance Computing (HPC) lab to complement the existing project lab. Though, DLD lab managed by EE department is sufficient to accommodate CS students, however, a separate DLD lab will be encouraged to meet NCEAC requirement of having a dedicated DLD lab for each program separately. One programming lab contains only 41 computer systems, which is not sufficient to accommodate a class of 50 students.

It is **recommended** to allocate and equip the necessary physical infrastructure to support effective teaching and advanced computing. The computing labs capacity should be increased to 50+.

b) Curriculum and Academic Processes

The curriculum requires significant revision, particularly regarding course sequencing and prerequisites. For example, Theory of Automata should be a prerequisite for Compiler Construction. Additionally, the timing of several courses is suboptimal. For example, Entrepreneurship and Professional Ethics are currently offered too early (4th semester) and should be moved to the 7th or 8th semester. Technical and Business Writing, presently offered in the 8th semester, is recommended to be offered in the 7th semester or earlier. Computer Networks and Information security are offered in the same semester (5^{th} semester). Information security needs to be moved in the subsequent semester.

The new curriculum document has inconsistencies, such as placing Discrete Mathematics in the 1st semester without reviewing course codes.

c) Students Interaction

The following observations were gathered from student interactions during the visit. While students acknowledged institutional efforts to improve faculty quality, several specific concerns require attention.

- Students perceive a gap in subject-matter depth and teaching effectiveness between junior and senior faculty. Moreover, there are reports of attitude issues and demotivating behavior from some young faculty members.
- Department has allocated advisers for each batch. Batch advisors are normally used to conduct sessions with the whole class to listen to their concerns and resolve the same. However, a structured, documented system for one-on-one student counseling and academic advising is currently non-existent.

- Students agree that AI tool use should be restricted in the first two years to solidify core cognitive skills. They express a need for well-defined pedagogical guidelines and active mechanisms to ensure this restriction effectively builds their critical thinking and logical reasoning skills.
- There are serious concerns among students regarding food quality and the limited variety of food available on campus.

It is **recommended** that department should

- formalize a mandatory mentoring program pairing junior faculty with senior colleagues for pedagogical guidance and content support and incorporate structured student feedback on teaching attitude and methods into the faculty review and development process.
- Develop and implement a documented model for mandatory one-on-one academic counseling sessions for all students. This system should include record-keeping (e.g., signed advisor forms) to track student progress and concerns.
- develop specific guidelines on the responsible and supplemental use of AI in learning
- review and improve the campus catering services to address these fundamental welfare issues.

d) Faculty Interaction

It is noticed that the awareness on performance evaluation and increment mechanisms is low among junior faculty and there is no documented policy for faculty development in higher education and advanced training.

The faculty also expressed serious concerns regarding food quality and variety. This aspect needs immediate attention and improvement.

It is **recommended** that the institution strengthen its hiring process for junior faculty and laboratory engineers by introducing rigorous entry assessments, including subject-specific tests and teaching demonstrations. In addition, student feedback should be systematically analyzed and discussed with faculty members to support continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness and soft skills. The institution is further advised to develop a transparent and well-documented faculty performance evaluation and professional development policy. Finally, a clear policy for upgrading existing positions should be established to retain experienced faculty and support their career progression within the institution.

e) Laboratory

The existing programming lab infrastructure is insufficient for the current intake. With over 50 students, a lab containing only 41 workstations cannot support all the required students for effective hands-on learning. It is recommended to immediately enhance lab capacity by adding workstations to accommodate students well for all hands-on sessions.

f) Library

During the evaluation visit, the adequacy and operational effectiveness of library resources and services were reviewed as part of the academic support infrastructure. Although documentary evidence of journal subscriptions was presented, the overall effectiveness of library resources and services could not be satisfactorily demonstrated during the visit. The librarian was not available, and the assisting staff member was unable to adequately explain the library systems and procedures. Several queries

raised during the visit could not be properly addressed.

While a document indicating subscription to printed journals up to December 31, 2025, was shown, a significant number of journal issues were not available on shelves. In addition, newly purchased books were found to be mixed with older collections, and no clear segregation of Computer Science specific books was observed. The process for book issuance and tracking for students was also not clearly demonstrated, raising concerns regarding operational effectiveness and accessibility of resources.

It is advised to ensure the presence of properly trained and dedicated library staff, establish clear organization and segregation of discipline-specific resources, and maintain complete and accessible journal collections.

Additionally, a transparent and well-documented book issuance and tracking mechanism should be demonstrated to support effective student and faculty use of library resources.

g) Research Centers

Due to time constraints, the research centers could not be physically visited; however, based on documentary evidences and discussions with faculty members and active researchers, it is understood that the institution provides well-equipped and supportive research facilities through its two research centers.

h) Course Files

Upon detailed inspection of course files, several discrepancies were observed that affect the integrity of outcome-based assessment. Course outlines are generally available; however, several outlines lack complete OBE information, particularly with respect to the explicit mapping of CLOs to GAs. For example, the course outline for *Database Systems* and Theory of Automata did not include mapping of its stated CLOs to the relevant GAs. Since each CLO is required to be aligned with one or more GAs, the absence of this information in course outlines limits outcome traceability and weakens OBE compliance.

Another concern relates to the alignment of CLOs with defined taxonomy levels. In the course *Analysis of Algorithms*, CLO-4 and CLO-5 are mapped to taxonomy levels 5 and 6, respectively; however, the corresponding student assessments do not demonstrate the level of complexity associated with these higher-order cognitive levels. Moreover, given that this course is offered in the second year of the program, students at this stage are generally not expected to demonstrate learning at taxonomy levels 5 and 6. This indicates a mismatch between CLO definitions, student evaluation practices, and the program's curricular progression.

The department is advised to (i) standardize CLO–GA mapping practices across all course files and ensure that course outlines explicitly include this mapping, and (ii) revise CLO taxonomy mappings to ensure they are realistic, measurable, and appropriate to the year of study, and that student assessments accurately reflect the intended cognitive level. Moreover, it is advised that these mappings are reviewed and validated prior to course offering to maintain consistency and compliance with NCEAC OBE requirements. Faculty training and periodic internal reviews of course files by the CS department are recommended.

General section based on Remarks, Interactions (Students, Faculty) and Campus Visit

		Evaluator's Comments	Compliance Level	Resp	*Deadline*
a.	The faculty retention rate is relatively low, resulting in periodic hiring of less-experienced faculty	It is recommended to strengthen hiring process (particularly at the lab engineer and lecturer levels) through proper entry tests and teaching demonstrations.	C	HR / HoD CS	July 2026
b.	Course feedback should be analyzed and discussed with junior faculty to enhance teaching quality and soft skills in upcoming semesters.	Department shall make necessary arrangements for discussion with junior faculty to enhance teaching pedagogy	C	HoD CS	July 2026
c.	While most final-year projects are industry-defined, all such projects should be approved by the Proposal Evaluation Committee in accordance with the approved proposal evaluation policy.	FYPs should be approved by the Proposal Evaluation Committee in accordance with the approved proposal evaluation policy.	C	HoD CS	Aug 2026
d.	The curriculum requires significant revision, particularly regarding course sequencing and prerequisites. For example, Theory of Automata should be a prerequisite for Compiler Construction. .	The new curriculum document has inconsistencies, such as placing Discrete Mathematics in the 1st semester without reviewing course codes. The timing of several courses is suboptimal. For example, Entrepreneurship and Professional Ethics are currently offered too early (4th semester) and should be moved to the 7th or 8th semester. Technical and Business Writing, presently offered in the 8th semester, is recommended to be offered in the 7th semester or earlier. Computer Networks and Information security are offered in the same semester (5th semester). Information security needs to be moved in the subsequent semester.	C	Dir Academics/ HoD CS	May 2026
e.	**Students Interaction** Students perceive a gap in subject-matter depth and teaching effectiveness between junior and senior faculty. Moreover, there are reports of	It is recommended that department should formalize a mandatory mentoring program pairing junior faculty with senior colleagues for pedagogical guidance and content support and	C	Dir Academics/ HoD CS	June 2026

	attitude issues and demotivating behavior from some young faculty members	incorporate structured student feedback on teaching attitude and methods into the faculty review and development process.			
f	Department has allocated advisers for each batch. Batch advisors are normally used to conduct sessions with the whole class to listen to their concerns and resolve the same. However, a structured, documented system for one-on-one student counseling and academic advising is currently non-existent.	Develop and implement a documented model for mandatory one-on-one academic counseling sessions for all students. This system should include record-keeping (e.g., signed advisor forms) to track student progress and concerns.	C	HoD CS	June 2026
g	Students agree that AI tool use should be restricted in the first two years to solidify core cognitive skills. They express a need for well-defined pedagogical guidelines and active mechanisms to ensure this restriction effectively builds their critical thinking and logical reasoning skills.	Develop specific guidelines on the responsible and supplemental use of AI in learning	C	HoD CS	June 2026
h	There are serious concerns among students regarding food quality and the limited variety of food available on campus.	Review and improve the campus catering services to address these fundamental welfare issues. This aspect needs immediate attention and improvement	C	Mess Committee/ HoD	April 2026
i	The awareness on performance evaluation and increment mechanisms is low among junior faculty and there is no documented policy for faculty development in higher education and advanced training.	The institution strengthen its hiring process for junior faculty and laboratory engineers by introducing rigorous entry assessments, including subject-specific tests and teaching demonstrations.	C	HR / HoD	June 2026
		The institution is further advised to develop a transparent and well-documented faculty performance evaluation and professional development policy. Finally, a clear policy for upgrading existing positions should be established to retain experienced faculty and support their career progression within the institution.	C	HR / HoD	July 2026

		In addition, student feedback should be systematically analyzed and discussed with faculty members to support continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness and soft skills.	C	QEC / HoD CS	June 2026

Assessment Team

Member
Dr. Arshad Ai
Professor HoD, FAST- NU, Lahore

Member/Coordinator
Dr. Shoaib Irshad
Director QEC, Namal University Mianwali

Convenor
Dr. Ayyaz Hussain
Professor / Chairperson, QAU, Islamabad