



National Agriculture Education Accreditation Council

30

Report of the
Accreditation Inspection Committee
(AIC)

Mr. Mohammad Hashim Laghari
Dr. Khalid Mehmood Qureshi

Horticulture Department
The KPK Agriculture University
Peshawar

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Committee gratefully acknowledges the excellent support provided to the Accreditation Inspection Committee (AIC) by the Vice Chancellor and the Dean Faculty of Plant Sciences, besides the Chairman and faculty staff of the Horticulture Department of the KPK Agriculture University Peshawar.

The AIC also acknowledges with thanks the guidance and facilities provided by the Chairman, NAEAC. The committee records its gratitude to Mr. Naseer Alam Khan, Secretary and Malik M. Kashif Anwar, IT Coordinator, NAEAC Secretariat for the excellent arrangements made for undertaking the visit to Horticulture Department of the KPK Agriculture University, Peshawar and their valuable contributions during the preparation of the report.

Accreditation Inspection Committee (AIC) of NAEAC

Table of Contents

	Acknowledgment	i
	Section-A. General	
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Accreditation of Agriculture Education Institutions in Pakistan	1
1.3	Mission and Objectives of the University/ Department	2
1.4	The horticulture department	2
	Section-B. AICs' criteria and observations with critical analysis	
2.1	Criteria-I. Strength and quality of faculty.	3
2.2	Criteria-II. Curriculum design and development	6
2.3	Criteria-III. Students support and progression	7
2.4	Criteria-IV. Infrastructure and learning resources	9
2.5	Criteria-V. Research and consultancy activities	11
2.6	Criteria-VI. Governance and leadership	12
2.7	Criteria-VII. Innovative practices	13
	Section-C. SWOT Analysis of Degree Programs	
3.1	Major strengths	14
3.2	Major weaknesses	14
3.3	Major opportunities	15
3.4	Major challenges	15
	Section-D. Recommendations	
4.1	General recommendations	16
4.2	Final Assessment	17
4.3	Chairman of the Horticulture Department	17
4.4	Name and designation of the AIC Members	17
	Section-E. Annexes	
5.1	Annex-I: Itinerary of Accreditation Visit	18
5.2	Annex -2: List of Faculty	20

A. General:

1.1 Introduction:

The Accreditation Inspection Committee (AIC) setup by the National Agriculture Education Accreditation Council (NAEAC) for the review of the Horticulture Department of The KPK Agriculture University Peshawar, visited the department on June 13-14, 2011 for the in-depth review of horticulture program. The report of the Committee is presented below:

1.2 Accreditation of Agriculture Education Institutions in Pakistan

In pursuance to its mandate given by the HEC, the NAEAC constituted a Review Team comprising the following scientists to review the Horticulture Department of KPK-AUP for the assessment and accreditation for degree awarding academic programs:

- i) Mr. Mohammad Hashim Laghari, Convener
CSO/ Sr. Director (Retd.) PARC, Islamabad.
- ii) Dr. Khalid Mehmood Qureshi, Member
Associate Professor, PMAS Arid Agriculture University,
Rawalpindi.

The main terms of reference of the committee were as follows:

- To validate the self-assessment report (SAR) of the degree programs (B.Sc and M.Sc Hons.) prepared by the department/ discipline.
- To carry out an external evaluation of the degree programs in a transparent, neutral, holistic and participatory manner for accreditation and rating of the degree programs based on seven evaluation criteria given in the Evaluation Manual.
- To submit synthesized and concise analytical report (7-8 pages) consisting of self explanatory SWOT Analysis and explicit actionable recommendations based on the interaction with the Dean, Chairman, Faculty Members, Students and support staff and Alumni as well as detail visit of physical infrastructure, facilities and other teaching/ learning resources available for the degree programs.
- To submit clear, specific and justified degree programs actionable accreditation and rating recommendations to NAEAC Chairman.

The itinerary of accreditation visit schedule is given at Annex-I.

1.3: The Mission and Objectives of the University/ Department

The KPK University of Agriculture was established to provide quality education to the youth of the province in different fields of agriculture and develop trained and skilled human resource to address various problems of the sector in KPK province in particular and the country in general.

The mission of the Horticulture program is to establish and promote high quality teaching and research to address growers problems in the province and the country. The main objectives of the program are as under:

- a) To enable horticulture graduates to gain the relevant knowledge and skill for the improvement of horticulture crops.
- b) To build capacity of horticulture graduates for solution of farmer problems related to horticulture crops.
- c) To enable the students to gain knowledge of subject to international standards.

Historical background

The Islamia College, Peshawar is the oldest education institution of the province where agriculture education was started in 1933. Horticulture was introduced as main subject in the college during 1963 and the department started M.Sc. classes in early seventies. The full-fledged department of Horticulture was established in 1981 with inception of the then NWFP Agriculture University and PhD classes were started from 1997. The department does not have a separate building and the offices of the faculty, class rooms and labs are housed in the Plant Science Building. The department has so far produced about 526 graduates with bachelor degree, 401 with Masters and 06 PhD scholars.

1.4 The horticulture department

The department has a faculty strength of 12 members. It is headed by the Chairman (Professor), and is assisted by three Professors, two Associate Professors, three Assistant Professors and three Lecturers. (List of Faculty is given at Annex-II). The faculty members are hardworking and cooperative and work in a team thus providing better atmosphere for learning. The horticulture department offers degrees of B.Sc Hons., M.Sc Hons. and Ph.D. (since 1997) in Horticulture.

B. AICs' criteria and observations with critical analysis

CRITERIA I: STRENGTH & QUALITY OF FACULTY.

1.1. Full time and Part time Faculty:

The Faculty is adequately staffed with qualified manpower (Total 12 members and 9 possess PhD degrees). They are all fulltime members having adequate teaching/research experience. However, it was informed that two Professors have retired in the current month where as two have proceeded for higher degrees. With this situation the number would be significantly reduced putting more pressure on remaining staff for teaching load. Further, the expertise of senior staff may be difficult to regain from other members. There seems also no system of getting the senior staff through re-hiring as there are no positions allocated to each department which may affect the quality of teaching. (Marks 45/50).

1.1.1. Status of Faculty:

There is enough number of regular Faculty members but there is no visiting Faculty or Foreign Faculty which is required to meet the deficiencies if any. Currently two Professors have retired in June 2011 and two Lecturers have proceeded for higher studies, thus the number of faculty members has significantly reduced which certainly shall put more pressure on remaining staff to complete the course load as well as have adverse impact on quality of teaching (Marks 30/40).

1.2. Faculty Qualifications and Experience:

The faculty is well qualified possessing required experience as per HEC criteria but the departure of some faculty members may create some imbalance (Marks 30/35).

1.3. Teaching Load:

It is observed that the total teaching load is enough and is as per the courses required and offered but it is noted that it is unevenly distributed among the faculty. Some of the members are having heavy load (up to 24 credit hours) while some are very much relaxed. This seems because of expertise of individuals or their involvement in other activities. It was also informed that the whole landscape, grounds and other indoor / outdoor plantation management of the University Campus was the responsibility of the faculty along with the departmental farm. This situation has put more pressure on faculty staff particularly those involved in such management resulting in less time allocation for teaching. There is a need to have additional positions for farm and landscape management to release pressure from teaching faculty (Marks 12/15).

1.4. Use of Students Assessment Instruments:

It was noticed that different assessment tools were used for evaluation of students but the record was either not maintained or poorly maintained. It is suggested that the system should be made formal with proper record maintained (Marks 10/15).

1.5. Faculty Course Review Reports:

It is noted that such reports were maintained by the faculty but were in-formally discussed (Marks 10/15).

1.6. Program Monitoring System:

The program monitoring system exists in the department and the programs are reviewed regularly in the departmental meetings and improvements made accordingly (Marks 8/10).

1.7. Training of Newly Inducted Faculty:

There is no regular program for the training of newly inducted faculty, however, informal training is provided through interaction with the existing faculty. It is also informed that the Planning Department of the University plans for formal training in future (Marks 5/10).

1.8. Faculty Development and Carrier Planning:

The University has undertaken developmental activities for different departments through development projects. A project was also submitted by the department to HEC which although was agreed but could not materialize due to financial crunch at higher level. There is no regular system for carrier planning but members are supported through personal contacts (Marks 8/15).

1.9. Salaries and Fringe Benefits:

The faculty is satisfied with the existing salary structure but is also looking for other benefits to face current inflation (Marks 8/10).

1.10. Environment at Workplace:

Most of the faculty members were satisfied about the environment, however, one member raised serious concerns and mentioned about favoritism, nepotism and biasness hence was not satisfied (Marks 3/5).

1.11. Faculty Stability Computed Index:

There seems good stability among the faculty members (Marks 4/5).

1.12. Awards/ Recognitions received by Faculty:

There seems hardly any award for the Faculty, however, the department has received awards in different exhibitions particularly for floriculture and design arrangements (Marks 5/10).

1.13. Participation in Seminars/ Conferences:

There seems low participation in seminars and conferences probably due to low linkages although the Faculty is highly qualified and competent. (Marks 2/5).

1.14. Text Books/ Chapters of Books Written:

It seems that there has been little effort for writing books. One of the Professors had written three books but were published by himself and thus were being used by the local students only and are neither available in market or in any library (Marks 4/10).

1.15. Graduate Research Supervision:

Most of the faculty members were having enough of MSc students and some of them were overloaded while PhD students were registered with selected senior faculty members (Marks 8/10).

1.16. Job Satisfaction:

Most of the faculty members were satisfied with their job except one who was very critical and thus planned to quit (Marks 4/5).

1.17. Opportunities for Academic Progress:

There were hardly any formal opportunities for academic progress but the authorities were helpful in finding such facilities (Marks 3/5).

1.18. Faculty Perception about Degree Programs:

The faculty feels that the degree programs were performing quite well but the interaction with the students revealed that all is not good and lot of improvements were required (Marks 2/5).

1.19. Teaching-Learning Methods Adopted by Faculty:

It is observed that the faculty is obliged to use the routine methods of Teaching / Learning because they do not have the access to much facilities. However, the faculty involves the students in discussions and questioning which can promote critical thinking (Marks 10/15).

CRITERIA – II: Curriculum Design and Development.

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 2.1. Curriculum Objectives of Degree Programs: | (15/20) |
| 2.2. Curriculum Contents. | (10/15) |
| 2.3. Curriculum Revision. | 15/15) |

It was informed that the curriculum objectives, development and design is mainly the responsibility of HEC and the instructions/ guidelines are followed, however, some changes to adjust local requirements are made if required (Marks 40/50).

2.4. Student Perception About Curricula.

The students feel that some of the courses are well developed and meet the demand of the market but some are not well developed and thus cannot meet the demand for local problems (Marks 6/10).

2.5. Text Books, Reference Books and Journals.

It is observed that most of the text / reference books are of old editions and seem outdated hence lack modern technologies. The journals are hardly available and there is no departmental library and main library has limited number of books on the subject. The students expressed serious hardships. The Net facility was also not available (Marks 4/10).

2.6. Course Contact Hours.

The credit hours for different courses were as per HEC guidelines but teachers and students feel it insufficient to cover all the contents. The practicals were also not conducted properly (Marks 6/10).

2.7. Completion of Courses.

The completion of courses is satisfactory (Marks 8/10).

2.8. Course Registration and Withdrawal Policy.

The policy is existent as per HEC guidelines but the details not available (Marks 8/10).

2.9. Course Evaluation System Enforced by the Department.

There is no course evaluation system by the department, however, the QEC is undertaking it but with minimum interest (Marks 6/10).

2.10. Admission Policy.

The admission policy existed but the students expressed lack of transparency, hence need improvements (Marks 8/10).

2.11. Maintenance of Course Files.

The course files were not maintained by the department, however, some of the teachers followed the process of evaluation through quizzes, tests, etc but did not maintain the record (Marks 5/10).

2.12. Meetings of Board of Studies/ Faculty.

The meetings of Board of Studies are held regularly but meetings of faculty for other purposes are held occasionally (Marks 15/20).

CRITERIA – III. INFRASTRUCTURE AND LEARNING RESOURCES:

3.1. Adequacy and Quality of Lab Equipment.

In our opinion the department is highly deficient for Lab Equipment. Some of the old models of some equipment were available and there has hardly been any addition to the facility. What so ever equipment is available, is mainly used by the teachers or the PhD Scholars and the B.Sc & MSc students have little access, as such there is serious lapse in training and updating knowledge of students. There is an urgent need to upgrade the facility with adequate number of modern equipment for different fields of the department. It was noted that there was no lab facility for Post Harvest Technology, Tissue Culture, Physiology/ mineral analysis and for any such work assistance was obtained from sister departments who extend the help on availability basis (Marks 10/20).

3.2. Equipment utilization.

As indicated above, the labs are not well equipped, however, the available equipment were used mainly by the teachers and the PhD Scholars and thus it is felt that the equipment is not properly utilized. The main reason could be the availability of chemicals and non-availability of trained lab staff along with lack of facility of maintenance (Marks 8/10).

3.2.1. Students Views about Lab Practicals.

The students of B.Sc. class showed serious concern and informed that they were not allowed to conduct lab practicals but only the teachers inform in theory and conduct the practical themselves to demonstrate. They feel that unless they conduct the practical, it is difficult to understand the system properly. The M.Sc. students, however, were sometimes allowed to conduct the practical (Marks 2/5).

3.3. Availability and Qualification of Lab Staff.

Two Lab Assistants were available with Matric qualification but they were neither trained nor associated hence were totally unaware about the equipment and its maintenance/ use (Marks 4/10).

3.4. Technical Competency of Lab Staff.

It is very poor as they are neither qualified nor trained hence do not get involved in the operation of equipment (Marks 4/10).

3.5. Labs and their Capacity.

There are two Labs with the department being used for both research and teaching out of which one lab seem to be operational with equipment (for 10-15 students) while the other is mainly used for physical demonstration (for 20-25 students) or as class room for 40-50 students (Marks 5/10).

3.6. Annual Budget Allocation for Maintenance and Operation of Labs.

There is no specific budget allocation for labs, however, demand is sent on need basis and generally it was accepted (Marks 3/5).

3.7. Library Annual Budget.

There is no departmental Library, however, the Main Library has some facility for the department. The budget of main library was also not specified (Marks 2/5).

3.8. Subject Books:

There is no departmental library or books; however, the main library has some books for the department students. The details could not be obtained (Marks 2/5).

3.9. Subscription to Foreign Journals During Last Two Years.

The department has no library hence no journal was purchased; however, the main library purchases journals on the availability of funds. Accordingly a few journals were purchased for the department during last two years (Marks 5/10).

3.10. Book Bank.

There is no Book Bank. (0/5).

3.11. Library Equipment.

The central library has the facility for different equipment but is not sufficient for the large number of students enrolled every year (3/5).

3.12. Local and Foreign Journals.

The main library has sufficient number of journals but those related to the subject are not enough. This was particularly complained by the students (2/5).

3.13. Library Space.

The library has enough space to accommodate the interested students, however, the furnishing and air conditioning was not enough and up to the mark (2/5).

3.14. Students Access to Various Facilities.

The students has the access to the facilities but due to shortage of equipment they faced problems many a times (2/5).

3.15. Quality of Service Provided by Library.

The quality of services is of medium standard (3/5).

3.16. Faculty/ Students Computer Ratio.

Most of the faculty members have access to computers but it is reported that there is no computer for the students, however, the PhD and M.Sc students share the computers of their supervisors. As such there is acute shortage of computers and internet facility for the students (2/5).

3.17. Website of the Institution/ Department.

The University has a website which is updated regularly but the department has no website (2/5).

3.18. Building and Total Covered Area.

The department has no separate building but is sharing the facility in the Plant Sciences Building. The offices are located at different places and are not considered enough. The farm area is enough but farm infrastructure is inadequate (4/5).

3.19. Class rooms and Faculty Offices.

The department has only two class rooms, two labs also used for class room and 8 offices with internet. Some faculty members are obliged to use offices at nursery and farm. As such there is need to add the space for offices and class rooms (2/5).

3.20. Experimental Area and Farm Machinery.

The department has about 40 acres of farm area close to the campus which is considered enough for the experimental / teaching purpose. Farm Machinery was also available for different operations (8/10).

Criteria IV: Student Support and Progression.

4.1. Admission Response to Degree Programs.

There is overwhelming response to the degree programs and a large number of students enroll for admission causing rush of candidates (4/5).

4.1.1 Annual Intake.

About 50-60 for B.Sc., 25-30 for M.Sc. and 10-15 for PhD (4/5).

- 4.2. Yield Index.**
About 95 % students admitted get graduated (4/5).
- 4.2.1. Dropouts.**
Up to 5% only (4/5).
- 4.2.2. Average CGPA.** About 3.5
- 4.2.3. Students Learning Outcomes.**
The outcome as informed by the employers is rated as good, however, reservations are shown about practical work analysis and communication (7/10).
- 4.3. Financial Support to Students.**
Some financial support was available but not enough for large number of students admitted (2/5).
- 4.4. Scholarship Opportunities.**
Very low opportunities of scholarship existed (2/5).
- 4.5. Availability of Interest free Loans.** – Not available (0/5).
- 4.6. Hostels Accommodation.**
Enough hostel accommodation is available but there were complaints of shortage by some of the students who are obliged to stay outside the campus (2/5).
- 4.7. Convocation Hall/ Auditorium.** Available (5/5).
- 4.8. Sports Facilities.** Limited Availability (2/5).
- 4.9. Students Transport.** Limited Available (2/5)
- 4.10. Medical Facilities.** Available (3/5).
- 4.11 Academic Counseling.** Occasional & unarranged (2/5).
- 4.12. Internship/ Practical Training** - Reasonably available but of poor quality (5/10).
- 4.13. Students Interaction with Teachers.** Quite encouraging (2/3).
- 4.14. Student Attitude towards studies.** It is encouraging (1/2).
- 4.15 Students Attendance Record.** Maintained (4/5).

4.16. Students Perception about Degree Programs.

Most of the students had good perception of the program which attracted them for admission but during the studies they showed some reservations of low practical knowledge and attitude of some of the teachers which if improved could add to the importance of the discipline. (3/5).

CRITERIA – V. Faculty Research and Consultancy Activities.

5.1. Size of Annual Faculty Research Grant.

There is no specific grant for faculty research, however, some funds (Rs 4000/) per student are provided for student research for degree which is considered inadequate. (20/30).

5.1.1. Utilization of Faculty Research Grant.

There is hardly any grant for faculty research. The grant for student research is utilized as it is bare minimum. (8/10).

5.2. Faculty Publications (other than student research)

No evidence could be found for publications other than student thesis (0/20).

5.3. Continuity of Faculty Research.

There is no faculty research except student thesis where also continuity is informal as the problems/ issue/ topics are not documented. (4/5).

5.4. Text Books/ Chapters

Only one Professor attempted to write books on specific topics but could not succeed in getting published through reputable publisher/ agency, hence he published himself locally with poor quality. Three books written by him were available with students for guidance. No other teacher has made any such attempt. (3/10).

5.5. Academic Collaboration.

There is hardly any formal collaboration with different institutions but at individual level there is participation in certain events (6/10).

5.6. Budgetary Allocation for Seminars and Conferences.

There is no specific budget allocation for such events, however, the University has positive attitude if some one has brilliant idea. (0/20).

5.7. Funded Research Projects Underway and Completed.

Two projects were completed and two projects are near completion. This reflects lack of interest for research / project formulation and submission to funding agencies. (8/20)

5.8. Advisory Service Rendered.

Very little advisory service (on personal contacts) was rendered to local institutions including PDA, Cantt. Board, ARI, etc. (6/15).

5.9. Dissemination and Use of Research Results.

The research conducted by the students is published in local journals as it is mandatory but its use by end users is not verified. Research by faculty is very low / deficient, however, experience is shared with visiting farmers to solve their problems. (5/10).

CRITERIA-VI: GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP.

6.1. Administrative Authority / Governance: The Administrative Authority is highly centralized and most of the powers rest with the Vice Chancellor and his management team. The situation may result in biased support for certain departments hence are not considered desirable (8/10)

6.2 Organizational Set up: The Organizational set up is well defined but has flaws in implementation resulting in confusion in the system and hence need to be rationalized (12/15).

6.3. Rules and Procedures Documented: The rules are documented at the University level and are followed by all the departments. There are hardly any rules for respective departments (8/10).

6.4. Administrative Control: Most of the Administrative powers rest with the Vice Chancellor and his team and are highly centralized. There is a need to review the system and delegate some of the powers to respective departments for smooth running of day to day affairs (7/10).

6.5. Financial Resources: All the financial resources are centrally available with the University management headed by the Vice Chancellor. The department does not have any separate funds at its disposal hence there is no stability. It is the discretion of the VC to allow or not any expenditure by the department (7/10).

6.6 Operational Budget: There is no specifically allocated budget for the department but demands are met when submitted subject to the availability of funds. As such the department is not in a position to make advanced planning (6/10).

6.7. Development Budget: There is no development budget allocated for the department, however, the University management may provided some funds for specific purposes from the overall development funds if available (0/5).

6.8. Placement Bureau: There is no formal system of Placement Bureau in the department, however, information is maintained informally and the graduating students are assisted in job hunting and placement in potential institutions (3/5).

- 6.9. Alumni's Profile:** No such facility existed in the department (0/10)
- 6.10. Calendar of Activities:** The Calendar of Activities is prepared for teaching matters / classes but not for extra curricular, conferences / seminars and other events. The details are displayed on Notice Boards but not circulated individually (2/5).

CRITERIA-VII. ADOPTION OF BEST PRACTICES

7.1. Ensuring the quality of Instructions:

Maximum efforts are made by the experienced faculty to maintain the quality of instructions and there is a good blend of theory and practicals for quality education, however, it was felt that due to higher number of students and shortage or non-availability of major equipment, the practical could not be maintained properly. The students also complained that their practical knowledge was being compromised and they were not allowed to use the available equipment. (16/20)

7.2 Maintaining balance in Praticals and Theory as per HEC Criteria:

According to the written program given to the students, the HEC criteria is fully followed but the conduct of practical was weak which is affecting the knowledge gain by the students. (8/10)

7.3. Student – TeacherAssessment Exercise:

Student assessment exercises were undertaken by respective teachers through various means but there was hardly any mechanism for assessment of teacher's performance. Such exercise must be introduced to make the teachers accountable. (6/10)

7.4. Degree Program Assessment Mechanism

Assessment of degree programs has been initiated by QEC of the University in collaboration with respective departments but it is yet in initial stage and the results lack quality and confidence. There is a need for improvement involving all stake holders. (7/10)

:

C. SWOT ANALYSIS OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

1. Major Strengths of Degree Programs:

- Highly qualified faculty (75% PhD) and well experienced capable to impart quality education.
- The faculty has enthusiasm to guide for problem oriented research by students.
- Prescribed rules and procedures are followed for admission and conduct of teaching programs.
- Adequate field/farm area is available for field experiments.
- Collaboration with sister institutions in the province like PDA, Cantonment Board, Agriculture Research Institute & stations.

2. Major Weaknesses:

- Inadequate space for class rooms, laboratories and faculty offices.
- Inadequate lab equipment particularly for Post-Harvest Management/ Physiology, Tissue Culture, Nutrient Analysis, etc.
- Non-availability of Green House, Shade House, Plastic Tunnels, Growth Chambers, Cold Store, Lath House, etc.
- Shortage /non-availability of trained support staff for lab to operate and maintain the equipment.
- Insufficient funds for research and maintenance of lab equipment and research farm.
- Imbalance of teaching faculty for different sub-sectors and confused system for filling of positions of retired Professors.
- Non-availability of departmental Library and required funds.
- Shortage of internet/computer facility for graduate students and faculty members.
- Lack of IT teaching facilities and power back-up.

- Using old production technologies and having old plots of perennial crops at field farm.
- Lack of infrastructure to support the technology development, education and training.

3. Major Opportunities:

- Horticulture declared as high priority area at national level and has vast opportunity in the province because of highly suitable climate and topography.
- Vast potential of new horticultural crops like Olive, Kiwi Fruit, Passion Fruit, Loquat, Avocado, Different Nuts, Tea, etc exist for the province.
- Potential for innovative horticulture initiatives like Off season vegetable production, tunnel farming, drip irrigation for horticulture crops, etc existed and need to be exploited.
- Large potential for export of different fruits and vegetables existed and need to be exploited.
- Diversity in horticulture production attract private sector entrepreneurs thus creating more job opportunities.
- High demand for certified vegetable seed and fruit nursery plants.

4. Major Threats:

- Shortage of development and operational budget for degree programs due to overall financial constraints in the country.
- Increasing demand for certified vegetable seed/hybrids, fruit nursery plants, cut flowers, flower extracts, processed products, etc.
- High post harvest losses for horticultural crops.
- No system for transfer of technology for horticultural crops.
- Value addition and processing is in high demand but not available in the country.
- Safety standards and WTO requirements becoming mandatory for exports to high end markets.

D. Recommendations

a) General recommendations

- **Curriculum** development and revision is the main responsibility of HEC, however, the department also should review the situation to add subjects of local importance and global importance.
- **Training programs** should be explored for capacity building of teaching and support staff to improve quality of work. Currently there is hardly any formal program in this regard.
- **Collaboration** with local institutions existed at informal level which needs to be formalized. The collaboration with national and international institutions is too weak and need to be strengthened to up-grade teaching and research efforts.
- **Laboratory** equipment is quite insufficient particularly for post harvest, tissue culture and mineral analysis research. The facility must be updated with modern equipment through hunting of development funds. There is no technician for operation and maintenance of lab equipment and thus there is urgent need for provision of such technical staff with the department.
- **Infrastructure** for post harvest and tissue culture research like Cold Store/ Chamber, Packing/ Grading line, Green House, Plastic Tunnels, Lath House, etc is completely lacking. Such infrastructure is urgently required for quality education and training of students in these very important areas of horticulture development.
- **The Faculty Strength** has shrunken due to retirement of two Professors and proceeding of two Lecturers for higher education. There is an urgent need for hiring of Visiting Faculty to make up the deficiency and complete the course work on sound basis.
- **Farm and Nursery Management** is assigned to Faculty Staff which is affecting their efficiency for teaching. It is suggested that an independent Farm Manager may be posted to release pressure on Faculty.
- **Space** for laboratories, class rooms and offices is quite insufficient and needs to be improved to cope up with the increasing number of students. Proper maintenance of lab equipment and safety arrangements must be ensured.
- **Central library** should be up-graded in respect of space, equipment and staff to accommodate the increasing number of students. Latest edition of text books and journals of international repute for respective subjects be added every year. Besides, the **Departmental Library** also needs to be established and up-graded.
- **Computer and inter-net facilities** are insufficient for the increasing number of students which need immediate attention of the management.

- *Student counseling* should be provided for career planning.
- *Operational budget:* There is no separate provision of budget for the department although expenses are met on demand basis. There is a need for specific allocation of budget so that the department could plan for important activities related to quality research and teaching. Different stake holders and national/ international institutions be approached for necessary grants and technical support.
- *Linkages* with stakeholders, industry and respective institutions should be established for significant contribution in socio-economic development.
- *Outreach activities* should be strengthened with the participation of stakeholders.

b) **Final Assessment:**

The department has significant importance in the province due to favorable climate and topography thus it has to play a leading role for development in agriculture sector. However, challenges in the horticulture profession are also equally enormous hence the deficient areas identified above may be redressed in a shorter time frame to enable the department to play its vital role.

In view of the performance of the department and the opportunities available for further headway, the Committee recommends the department to be graded as “Y” category. This leaves scope for up-gradation to higher category after appropriate improvements in due course of time.

Name/ Designation of Reviewer

Signature

Mohammad Hashim Laghari
CSO/ Sr. Director (Retd.) PARC, Islamabad.

(Convener)

Dr. Khalid Mehmood Qureshi
Associate Professor,
PMAS Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

(Member)

Chairman of the Horticulture Department

I agree with the contents of the Peer Team Report.

Annexure-II

FACULTY OF KPK AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY PESHAWAR

S.No	Name	Position	Qualification	Specialization	Experience	Publications
1.	Dr. Noor-ul Amin	Professor/Chairman	Post Doc (UK)	Floriculture	28 years	26
2.	Dr. Nawab Ali*	Professor	Post Doc (USA)	Olericulture / Pomology		
3.	Dr. Abdul Rab	Professor	PhD (USA)	Post Harvest	18 Years	22
4.	Dr. Sher Mohammad*	Professor	PhD (AUP)	Olericulture / Pomology		
5.	Dr. Mateen Khattak	Associate Professor	PhD (UK)	Floriculture	20 Years	15
6.	Dr. M.Zubair	Associate Professor	Post Doc (UK)	Floriculture/ Tissue Cult.	22 Years	20
7.	Dr. Abrar H. Shah	Asstt. Professor	PhD (AUP)	Olericulture		
8.	Dr. M.Sajid	Asstt. Professor	PhD (AUP)	Post Harvest	11 Years	13
9.	Dr. Gohar Ayub	Asstt. Professor	PhD (Australia/ UK)	Plant Physiology	22 Years	10
10.	Ms Neelum Ara **	Lecturer	M.Sc. (AUP)	Veg./ Fruit Breeding	9 Years	4
11.	Fazl-i-Wahid	Lecturer	M.Sc. (AUP)	Pomology	7 Years	-
12.	Imran Ahmed **	Lecturer	M.Sc. (AUP)	Floriculture	11 Years	1

* Retired from service on superannuation in June 2011.

** Proceeded for PhD.

**STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR AGRICULTURE DEGREE PROGRAM
EVALUATION (KPK-Agriculture University Peshawar)**

S.No.	Criteria	Points Assigned	Points Awarded
a) Major Criteria			
1.	Strength and Quality of Faculty	300	211
2.	Curriculum Design and Development	150	106
3.	Infrastructure and Learning Resources	150	75
4.	Student Support and Progression.	100	58
Sub-Total (a)		700	450
b) Minor Criteria			
5.	Research and Consultancy Activities	150	64
6.	Governance and Leadership	100	53
7.	Innovative/ Best Practices	50	37
Sub-Total (b)		300	154
Grand Total (a+b)		1000	604

Name/ Designation of Reviewer

Signature

Mohammad Hashim Laghari
CSO/ Sr. Director (Retd.) PARC, Islamabad.

(Convener)

Dr. Khalid Mehmood Qureshi
Associate Professor,
PMAS Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

(Member)
