



National Agriculture Education Accreditation Council



MINUTES OF THIRTEENTH MEETING OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURE EDUCATION ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

15 JANUARY 2018

The 13th Meeting of the National Agriculture Education Accreditation Council (NAEAC) was held on **15 January 2018 at 10:30 A.M. in the Mural Hall of Higher Education Commission (HEC), H-9, Islamabad.** Dr. M. E. Tusneem, Chairman, National Agriculture Education Accreditation Council (NAEAC) Chaired the meeting attended by 19 members including three proxies. There were two apologies. (Annexure-I).

2. The meeting commenced with the recitation from the Holy Quran. The Chair in his opening remarks welcomed the Members to the 13th Meeting of the Council. He complimented the Council Members for their support and commitment to the objectives of the Council. He also complimented Prof. Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi, Ex-Advisor HEC and Council Member of NAEAC since its inception for making significant contributions to the evolution of the Council to its current status. His continuing support and involvement in the activities of the Council are highly appreciated and commended.

Overview of NAEAC's Operational Activities by Chairman, NAEAC

3. The Chairman highlighted major activities and achievements of the Council during 2016-17 including the accreditation and evaluation visits by the Accreditation Inspection Committees (AICs), review meetings with the Heads of agriculture education institutions. He observed that majority of the substandard degree programs are from newly established institutions and departments and expressed serious concerns about their predominantly substandard ratings. The Chair noted that main reasons for low ratings are that most of the newly established institutions are set up without need assessment and inadequate resources allocation. The large enrollment of students without adequate and qualified faculty and physical infrastructure facilities like class rooms, laboratories, faculty offices, etc. are the main cause of poor quality of education. He emphasized the need to ensure adequate human and financial resources to the newly established institutions to enable them meet the required education standard and produce graduates who are competitive nationally and internationally. Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi suggested continuous follow-up by the Council and comparison of evaluation ratings of these degree programs overtime to monitor the improvements.

4. After the introductory remarks by the Chair; Secretary NAEAC presented item-wise agenda of the meeting for consideration of the Council members. A summary of the decisions taken in the meeting is given below:

Item# I: Confirmation of the Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting of NAEAC

5. Secretary NAEAC presented minutes of 12th meeting of the Council for confirmation of the Council members. In the absence of any comments and objection, *the minutes of twelfth Meeting of the Council were approved as presented.*

Item# II: Approval of the Accreditation Ratings of Agriculture Degree Programs evaluated during 2016-17

Decision: *The Council members examined the evaluation ratings of 62-degree programs in 13 institutions reviewed by NAEAC during 2016-17 and approved the ratings as recommended.*

They however, expressed their concern over the HEC policy regarding ten percent annual increase in the students enrollment without corresponding increase in teaching-learning infrastructure and resources considered a major factor in the decline of quality. The Council Members emphasized that HEC policy regarding Vice Chancellor evaluation criteria needs to be reviewed to include quality rating aspects to safeguard and encourage quality improvement of higher education.

Item# III: Review Meetings with Directors and HODs regarding Implementation Status of AIC Recommendations

6. The Secretary, NAEAC briefed the Council on the review meetings conducted during 2016-17. The recommendations of these three review meetings were shared with the meeting. It was noted that the Council needs a continuous follow-up to ensure the implementation of these recommendations with focus on the strength and quality of faculty, infrastructure, and learning resources. All newly established institutions are encouraged to prepare development projects and motivate their PhD qualified faculty to win the research grants to establish labs, procure chemicals and glassware, etc.

Decision: *Members appreciated the review meeting process as this involves concerned VCs, Deans, HoDs and the Council to discuss the issues in detail that need improvement and recommended its continuation and follow-up.*

Item# IV: Proposed Annual Work Plan and Budget Allocations FY 2017-18

7. Secretary NEAC presented annual work plan for FY 2017-18 consisting of four major activities of accreditation process covering external evaluation and assessment of 74-degree programs comprising on-site visits of 19 institutions, follow-up visits and on-site visits. In addition. four review meetings, eight zero visits, and four awareness seminars are also planned for FY 2017-18. In all, the Council plans to undertake at least 35 visits of the concerned institutions. Based on the budget utilization of FY 2016-17 and as per operational plan of work, the estimated budget for FY 2017-18 is Rs.6.764 million, compared to budget utilization of 6.00 million during 2016-17.

Decision: *The Council members noted the work plan activities and endorsed the same along with proposed budget allocations for FY 2017-18.*

Item# V: Proposal for Enhancement in NAEAC Annual Grant Received from HEC

8. In 2012, HEC increased Council grant from Rs. 2.00 million to Rs. 4.00 million for next ten years. However, this amount has been falling short due to inflation, rise in the salary and benefits of the staff and higher logistics related costs of accreditation. It may be noted that NAEAC exercises maximum financial prudence in its budget utilization and maintains record and submits annual financial and audit reports in a timely manner.

In the previous meetings of the Council, the Council Members showed reluctance to increase the accreditation fees for the agriculture degree programs beyond a certain limit due to the following reasons; i). All the agriculture education institutions are in the public sector having low tuition fee structure; ii). Public sector institutions receive funding/grants from HEC to make up their budgetary deficits; iii). As such need for additional funding due to annual increase in the staff salaries and benefits, and accreditation related costs should be met through additional budgetary allocations from HEC.

9. Accordingly, the proposal is submitted for consideration and approval of the Council for NAEAC to approach HEC authorities for the increase in the HEC annual grant from Rs.4.00 million to at least Rs.7.00 million to ensure the timely implementation of NAEAC annual work plan envisaged for FY 2017-18 onward.

Decision: *The Council members agreed that enhancement in the HEC grant is required based on the current costs for next 4-5 years and endorsed the proposal for enhancement of NAEAC grant from Rs. 4.00 million to Rs. 7.00 million for the next four years. At the same time, it agreed to review the Accreditation Fee and revise it to off-set part of the additional cost.*

Item# VI: Revision of the Accreditation Fee Structure

10. Payment of accreditation fee is obligatory for the accreditation of agriculture degree programs. The amount and structure of accreditation fee varies among five HEC established accreditation Councils. NAEAC charges very modest and affordable accreditation fee as compared to other HEC established Councils. However, in the recent years, the accreditation related costs have increased due to price escalation, TA/DA of program evaluators, etc. Recently, a few private as well as public-private partnership institutions of higher learning have initiated a single degree program (Food Science) in agriculture and Council desires to charge the accreditation fee on full cost recovery basis from such institutions. Following is the proposed revised accreditation fee structure for the **public, private and public-private** partnership institutions.

S#	Existing Accreditation Fee Structure 2016-17		Proposed Accreditation Fee* Structure 2017-18		
	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	Public – Private Partnership Institutions
i.	Rs. 100,000 up-to three disciplines	Rs. 150,000 per discipline. (Based on full cost recovery)	Rs. 120,000 up-to three disciplines	Rs. 150,000 per discipline. (Based on full cost recovery)	Rs. 120,000 per discipline
ii.	Rs.150,000/- Four to six disciplines	Rs.200,000/- two to four disciplines	Rs.200,000/- Four to six disciplines	Rs.200,000/- two to three disciplines	Rs.150,000/- two to four disciplines
iii.	Rs. 200,000/- Seven to Ten disciplines	Rs. 250,000/- five to seven disciplines	Rs. 250,000/- Seven to Ten disciplines	Rs. 250,000/- four to six disciplines	Rs. 200,000/- five to seven disciplines
iv.	Rs.250,000/- more than ten disciplines	Rs.300,000/- more than seven disciplines	Rs.300,000/- 11-12 disciplines	Rs.300,000/- 7-9 disciplines	Rs.250,000/- 8-10 disciplines

* Accreditation Fee for zero visits, formal visits, and follow-up visits.

Decision: *The Council Members agreed that the proposed increase in the accreditation fee structure is duly justified based on actual costs incurred and inflation factors in case of both public, private/ public-private partnership institution and endorsed the same with effect from January 15, 2018.*

List of Participants of 12th Council Meeting held on October 24, 2016

1. **Dr. M.E. Tusneem**, Chairman – NAEAC
2. **Prof. Dr. Riaz Hussain Qureshi**, Ex-Advisor, HEC, Islamabad
3. **Prof. Dr. Nadeem Akhtar Abbasi**, Vice Chairman, NAEAC/Dean FCFS, PMAS AAU Rawalpindi
4. **Prof. Dr. Muhammad Amjad Aulakh**, Dean Faculty of Agri., University of Agriculture, Faisalabad
5. **Prof. Dr. Saghir Ahmed Sheikh**, Dean Faculty of Crop Production, Sindh Agri. University, Tandojam
6. **Prof. Dr. Ghulam Jilani**, Pro-VC, Lasbela Uni. of Agriculture, Water & Marine Sciences, Lasbela, Uthal
7. **Prof. Dr. Saifullah**, Dean Faculty of Crop Protection, The University of Agri., Peshawar
8. **Dr. Nadeem Amjad**, Member Natural Resource Division, PARC, Islamabad
9. **Prof. Dr. Ishtiaq A. Rajwana**, Pro-VC, Muhammad Nawaz Sharif University of Agriculture, Multan
10. **Mr. Muhammad Zafar Yab Haider**, Director General, Agriculture Extension, Govt. of Punjab, Lahore.
11. **Prof. Muhammad Aslam Niazi**, Principal, Balochistan Agriculture College, Quetta
12. **Mr. Ahmad Said**, Chief Planning Officer, Dept. of Agriculture, KPK
13. **Mr. Abid Hussain Qureshi**, Director, Agriculture Extension, Hyderabad
14. **Dr. Liaqat Ali Bhutto**, Cotton Botanist, Agriculture Research Institute, Tandojam
15. **Mr. Waseem Amjad Mahmood**, Secretary, Pak. Fruit Processors Association, Lahore
16. **Mr. Iskandar Mehmood Khan**, Director, Premier Sugar Mills Ltd, Islamabad

Proxies:

1. Dr. Muhammad Tariq, Director, BARI, Chakwal.
2. Mr. Sadaqat Shah, Director Research Planning, Agriculture Research, Peshawar.
3. Mr. Muhammad Asif Malik, Manager, M/s Barkat Rice Mills, Islamabad

Apologies:

1. Dr. Muhammad Javed Tareen, Director General, Agriculture Research, Quetta.
2. Mr. Sheikh Muhammad Akmal, Director M/s Acro Spinning & Weaving Mills Ltd, Lahore

NAEAC Secretariat Staff:

1. Mr. Naseer Alam Khan, Secretary, NAEAC
2. Mr. Raja Mehtab Yasin, Dy. Director, Admin & Finance
3. Mr. Abdullah, IT Coordinator