

**FINAL DRAFT**

**TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR TWO YEAR AND  
FOUR YEAR BACHELOR'S LEVEL.**

**PROJECT TEAM**

Project Leader:	Ijaz Hussain
Project Co-Leader:	Tahir Sadiq
Project Sub-Leader:	Sumbal Rana
Research Assistant:	Aisha Khalid

**DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
And  
INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC POLICY**

**BEACONHOUSE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY LAHORE, PAKISTAN**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We as a team are highly grateful to GINI for providing us an opportunity to contribute to its valuable activities. We are also grateful to Technical Resource Person (NIBR), Daniyal Aziz (GINI), Brig. Saleem (GINI), Dr Aisha G. Pasha (Supervisor, GINI), Dr. Hafiz A Pasha (Dean, SSS, Beaconhouse National University, Lahore) for their time, valuable comments and input and guidance. We are also grateful to the all institutions and individuals who cooperated and assisted us in collection of data and information.

We accept any shortcomings and assure adequate response for any identified improvements.

Project Leader: Ijaz Hussain

Project Co- Leader: Tahir Sadiq

Project Sub-Leader: Sumbal Rana

## COMMENTS

I extend my warm gratitude to GINI for providing an opportunity to our research team to contribute to its initiative for improvement of the situation of governance and resolve public policy issues in the country.

I find this report research very interesting, relevant, informative and reflective of shocking facts with strong recommendations. I must appreciate the finding of relatively larger size of student enrollment in private sector, migration of senior, PhD and foreign qualified faculty to private sector. This must be taken as a challenge for public sector. I also find interesting the criticism, discussion and recommendations on selection procedure of public servants and introduction of governance and public policy related curriculum as minor or elective courses at bachelor level. Findings and conclusions on self assessment for training needs identified by faculty are also strongly indicative of intensity of training needs for governance and public policy.

Based on findings and conclusions of the research team, I strongly feel immediate need for a plan of action to address governance and public policy issues in the country.

I appreciate and recognize the hard work, dedication and sincere effort of my research team.

DR AISHA G. PASHA

SUPERVISOR

## CONTENTS

CHAPTERS	TITLES	PAGE NO
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
1.1	Terms of Reference	1
1.2	Objectives of the Study	2
1.3	Scope of the Study	3
1.4	Research Areas	3
1.5	Methodology	4
1.5.1	Survey Forms and Questionnaires	4
1.5.2	Extensive Internet Search	4
1.5.3	Interviews	5
1.5.4	Sample Size	5
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS OF GOVERNANCE AND EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN</b>	7
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN PAKISTAN</b>	19
3.1	Assessment of Teaching Capacity	21
3.1.1	Faculty	21
3.1.2	Faculty Time Allocation	24
3.1.3	Teaching Methods	27
3.1.4	Student Assessment Methods	27
3.1.5	Self Assessment: Training Needs Identified by Faculty	30
3.2	Program Assessment and Student Preparedness	31
3.2.1	Skills Gap	35
3.3	Assessment of Infrastructure	40
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	45

## REFERENCES

### ANNEXURE

<b>Annexure 1</b>	Questionnaire For Administration	47
<b>Annexure 2</b>	Questionnaire For Faculty	52
<b>Annexure 3</b>	Questionnaire For Students	60
<b>Annexure 4</b>	Research Team	75

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
Table 1.1	LIST of the Universities Selected for Survey	3
Table 2.1	Worldwide Governance Indicators, 2007 for Selected Countries	8
Table 2.2	Corruption Perception Index for Selected Countries	9
Table 2.3	Percentage of Population Between Age Group of 18 To 26 Years, Enrolled at University Campus For Higher Education	10
Table 2.4	Percentage of Population Between Age Group of 18 To 23 Years, Enrolled at University Campus for Higher Education	10
Table 2.5	Gross Enrollment Ratio for Tertiary Education	11
Table 2.6	Number Of Universities by Area and Sector (2008-09)	12
Table 2.7	Number Of Public And Private Sector Universities & Degree Awarding Institutions (DAIs) In Pakistan	12
Table 2.8	Enrollment at Universities and DAIs During 2001-06	13
Table 2.9	Number of Students Enrolled by Sector and Level of Degree over the Years	14
Table 2.10	Share (%) of Public & Private Sector Universities/DAIs in Total Enrollment, Excluding Distance Learning Universities Classified by Area.	15
Table 2.11	Gender Wise Enrollment at Universities/DAI (Including Constituent Colleges) by Level of Degree During the Period 2001-06.	17
Table 2.12	Student Gender Ratio (Students Enrolled)	17
Table 2.13	Number of Students Produced by Gender and Public And Private Sector During 2001-04	17
Table 2.14	Student Gender Ratio (Students Produced	18
Table 3.1	Universities/Colleges Offering Governance and Public Policy Linked Disciplines	19
Table 3.2	Number Of Universities/Colleges Offering Governance and Public Policy Linked Disciplines	20
Table 3.3	Faculty by Designation in Public Policy Linked Disciplines in Selected	21

### Sample from Public Sector Academic Institutions

Table 3.4	Faculty in Public Policy Linked Disciplines in Selected Sample From Public Sector Academic Institutions	22
Table 3.5	Faculty by Designation in Public Policy Linked Disciplines in Selected Sample from Private Sector Academic Institutions	22
Table 3.6	Faculty In Public Policy Linked Disciplines In Selected Sample From Private Sector Academic Institutions	23
Table 3.7	Faculty by Disciplines	23
Table 3.8	Faculty Time Allocation in Public Sector Institutions	24
Table 3.9	Faculty Time Allocation in Private Sector Institutions	24
Table 3.10	Teaching Methods: Assessment by Faculty of Private Sector	25
Table 3.11	Teaching Methods: Assessment by Students of Private Sector	25
Table 3.12	Teaching Methods: Assessment By Faculty Of Public Sector	26
Table 3.13	Teaching Methods: Assessment by Students of Public Sector	27
Table 3.14	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Methods: Assessment by Faculty of Private Sector	28
Table 3.15	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Methods: Assessment by Students of Private Sector	28
Table 3.16	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Methods: Assessment by Faculty of Public Sector	29
Table 3.17	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Methods: Assessment by Students of Public Sector	29
Table 3.18	Preferences for Level Academic Programs for Training Identified by Faculty of Private Sector	30
Table 3.19	Preferences for Level Academic Programs for Training Identified by Faculty of Public Sector	31
Table 3.20	Modalities for Training Identified by Faculty of Private Sector	31
Table 3.21	Program Structure	32

Table 3.22	Comparison of Two Years and Four Years Bachelor	35
Table 3.23	Student Preparedness: Assessment by Faculty of Private Sector	36
Table 3.24	Student Preparedness: Assessment by Students of Private Sector	37
Table 3.25	Student Preparedness: Assessment by Faculty of Public Sector	38
Table 3.26	Student Preparedness: Assessment by Students of Public Sector	39
Table 3.27	Areas of Significant Need for Improvement <sup>1</sup> Identified by Respondents	40
Table 3.28	Infrastructure: Assessment by Faculty of Private Sector	41
Table 3.29	Infrastructure: Assessment by Students of Private Sector	42
Table 3.30	Infrastructure: Assessment by Faculty of Public Sector	43
Table 3.31	Infrastructure: Assessment by Students of Public Sector	44



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study was carried out to assess training needs and analyze public policy linked programs at bachelor level, existing teaching capacity of the faculty, university Infrastructure and student preparedness and provide recommendations to institute a Masters in Public Policy and Governance.

Poor infrastructure, shortage of trained faculty especially at senior level due to poor incentive system in public sector and financial constraints are apparently the possible factors hindering the supply of these disciplines. But demand side factors indicate a neglect of public policy disciplines on the part of government. Despite of having a long history of bad governance and public policy issues, Government of Pakistan meets its human resource requirements for governance and public policy through Federal Public Service Commission which holds competitive examination for selection in which candidates can participate with a bachelor degree without imposing any restriction on discipline. Government of Pakistan has failed to recognize and therefore has never floated demand for graduates with an expertise in public policy and governance. Therefore, the student body has always preferred to choose the disciplines with higher demand like business administration, engineering, medical etc. and academic institutions have accordingly responded to the situation.

Based on findings of the study our research team recommends that there exists ample scope of training for students as well as faculty in the discipline of governance and public policy in Pakistan. But success of the program of governance and public policy at masters level rests with a special focus on inducement from demand side apart from supply side measures. In current scenario, there exists intense demand for graduates with competence and expertise in governance and public policy in public sector. There is a need to instigate realization in the public sector circles that conventional hiring process in public sector for selection and induction of civil servants through competitive examination or direct placements through political influence is absolutely flawed and we need to devise and introduce new hiring process based on knowledge, skills, competence and expertise in governance and public policy acquired through well structured curriculum and training. Students with two year bachelor degree apparently seem not prepared for training in governing and public policy at masters level. Since the people join public service after completing their bachelors therefore we as a research

team strongly recommend that bachelor level is the most appropriate entry point for governance and public policy courses to create a desired social impact on governance situation. A curriculum of introductory and intermediate level should be introduced as minor or elective courses in four years bachelor degree and students should be trained for governance and public policy issues through well structured advanced curriculum and training at masters level. The candidates for public service with knowledge and expertise of governance should be given an extra benefit in the selection process of public servants.

Most of the faculty has clear and significant predisposition towards fully funded training at Ph.D level as first priority and then at Master/M.Phil level in governance and public policy preferably from some foreign academic institutions. Later part of this finding in itself is also a strong indication for poor teaching capacity and incapability to deliver required standard knowledge and training of Pakistani Universities. Faculty also needs training in modern teaching and student assessment methods.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR BASELINE RESEARCH RELATED TO TRAINING NEEDS ASSESMENT FOR TWO YEAR AND FOUR YEAR BACHELORS' LEVEL PROGRAMS

**Title:** Baseline research on TNA for Bachelors' level programs in Pakistan

**Period:** June- September, 2009:

- i. Selection/contracting of Pakistan short term consultant/ Norwegian expert by GINI in consultation with TNA Sub-committee/NIBR by 15<sup>th</sup> June, 09
- ii. Development of detailed research proposal including survey questionnaire and international input by short term consultant and its approval by TNA Sub-committee by 30<sup>th</sup> June, 09
- iii. Conduct of research including international input on TNA by short term consultant – July-August, 09
- iv. Review of first draft research report by TNA Sub-committee in 1<sup>st</sup> week of September, 09
- v. Review of final research report by TNA Sub-committee in 4<sup>th</sup> week of September, 09.

**Budgeted amount for research:** To be decided by consultatively between GINI and Sub Committee

**Scope of work:**

1. Assess capacity of the representative sample of both public and private universities' Bachelor level faculties in Public Policy linked disciplines, effectively social science programs in lieu of student preparedness for Master's in Public Policy and governance. The evaluation will appraise the programs against a defined baseline of student knowledge required for entry into Master's program. In addition, university infrastructure and more importantly faculty capacity will also be assessed for effectively instituting a program which can meet the defined standards.
2. The consultant/researcher will be expected to obtain the requisite information in the following manner:
  - 2.1 A survey may be conducted to assess the training needs, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and tools required for addressing the complex issues of governance.

- 2.2 Contacts established with or requests made to the universities, in person or using the good offices of Focal Persons representing member organizations on the Network/GINI.
- 2.3 Extensive internet search including the site-search of the network members.
3. The Consultant/ researcher are required to work in close coordination with the NIBR designated technical resource person. Any details arising from such coordination requiring clarifications may be directed to the respective Sub-Committee Chair/designate and GINI Secretariat for consultation with NIBR and appropriate response.
4. The NIBR designated technical resource person will provide inputs based on an appraisal of the existing conditions as stated in section one above for Norwegian institutions as well as internationally. This is with a view to identify the core competencies of either side in order to identify areas where partnerships could be mutually beneficial.
5. The NIBR designated technical resource person will be required to provide tangible inputs in terms of draft reports separately for Norwegian and internationally offered courses/ programs in line with the objectives of these TOR as well as any revisions that may be required.
6. Consultant/ researcher will be supervised by the designated member of TNA Sub-committee in consultation with GINI Secretariat and the terms will be agreed with the Sub Committee designated member interactively.
7. Consultant/researcher and NIBR designated technical resource person shall provide research outputs as specified in these TOR and receive remuneration as per following schedule:

## **1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The key objective of the base line research is training needs assessment and to assess capacity of the representative sample of private and public sector universities at bachelors' level in public policy linked disciplines. The key objective of research can be broken down into following sub-objectives:

1. To assess public policy linked programs at bachelor level
2. To assess existing teaching capacity of the faculty engaged in teaching public policy linked programs at bachelor level
3. To assess student preparedness for Masters in Public Policy and Governance

4. To assess university Infrastructure to institute a Masters Program in Public Policy and Governance.

### 1.3 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Though the study mainly focuses on educational Institutions which offer public policy linked disciplines, however, it also reflects on some background research in public policy and governance issues and current situation in education sector in Pakistan to assess the need, scope and significance of instituting an academic program at Masters Level in Public Policy and Governance.

Following 10 universities/colleges including from both public and private sector are part of our sample selected for the survey:

TABLE 1.1 LIST OF THE UNIVERSITIES SELECTED FOR SURVEY		
Territory	Public Sector	Private Sector
Federal Capital (Islamabad)	1. Quid-i-Azam University, Islamabad 2. International Islamic University, Islamabad	1. SZABIST, Karachi
Punjab	3. University of the Punjab, Lahore 4. Government Islamia College, Civil Lines, Lahore 5. Government College University, Lahore	2. Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore 3. FC College, Lahore
Sindh	6. Karachi University, Karachi	
NWFP	7. University of Peshawar, Peshawar	

Universities/colleges from the province of Balochistan has been dropped from the sample in view of the security conditions and insignificant proportion of student enrollment at bachelor level. Preliminary website search and visits revealed that Quid-i-Azam University, Islamabad and University of the Punjab, Lahore do not have bachelor programs in the selected disciplines, therefore have been excluded from survey and analysis.

Public policy linked disciplines at bachelor level from the selected universities primarily include the following three disciplines in this report:

- Economics
- Political Science

- Public Administration

#### **1.4 RESEARCH AREAS**

Key research areas in the study are as follows:

1. Program Assessment
2. Teaching Capacity
3. Student Preparedness for Masters in Public Policy and Governance
4. Infrastructure

#### **1.5 METHODOLOGY**

Methodology varies based on identified research areas.

##### **1.5.1 Survey Forms and Questionnaires**

A set of survey forms and questionnaires (please see Annexure) has been used to gather information in the listed areas of research to assess the teaching capacity (qualifications, experience, teaching methods, student assessment methods, teaching skills and research contribution), student preparedness (content, theory, application of knowledge, skills, values, critical thinking and future) and infrastructure (academic and non-academic facilities).

##### **1.5.2 Extensive Internet Search**

Extensive browsing of website of the selected universities/colleges has been used to collect following information:

- Programs in the selected disciplines
- Objectives of the academic programs
- Course structure
- List of courses
- Course contents
- Faculty of the department
- Research institutes or centers in the selected disciplines

##### **1.5.3 Interviews**

Information on some aspects was not available; therefore, meetings/Interviews have been conducted from the following officials of the institutions depending on the nature of the required information:

- Head of Department
- Dean of School

- Director of a the program
- Principal of the College
- Registrar
- Controller Examination

#### 1.5.4 Sample Size:

Sample size for the study is as follows:

<b>TABLE 1.2 SAMPLE SIZE</b>			
	Students	Faculty	Institutions
Private Sector	40	10	3
Public Sector	140	40	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>10</b>

#### 1.6 Organization of the Report

This report has been divided into the following chapters: Chapter 1 is about introduction the report. Chapter 2 explores some background statistics and research in public policy and governance issues and current state of affairs in education sector in Pakistan to emphasize the need, scope and significance of instituting an academic program at Masters Level in Public Policy and Governance. Chapter 3 of the report analyzes academic program structure, teaching capacity, student preparedness and infrastructure in the identified public policy linked disciplines in the selected universities in Pakistan and identifies the knowledge and skills gap for faculty and students. Chapter 4 presents its conclusions and findings for training needs identified from the analysis of previous sections and then gives its recommendations based on recognized areas of training needs.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS OF GOVERNANCE AND EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN**

Global governance arrangements are viewed evolving in context of social, economic, technological and political changes. Body of relevant knowledge shapes the mode of governance at all levels. Is there any need for this kind of knowledge to determine the mode of these governance arrangements for Pakistan? An answer to this question will certainly justify the need for conducting training need assessment for governance and public policy linked disciplines in Pakistani universities.

Pakistan in its over six decades long history has failed in developing a coherent framework for efficient governance at all public and private tiers. Most of the governance indicators for Pakistan paint a bleak picture of either an unchanging or worsening governance situation with a few exceptions. Various reports show that corruption remains pervasive, widespread and systematic in most of the areas and at all levels of the government with long history.

Worldwide Governance Indicators, 2007 of World Bank in Table 2.1 indicate lack of improvement with weak scores in most of the areas. Table 2.2 presents the Transparency International Ranking of Countries in terms of Corruption Perception Index. Pakistan's rank is among the lowest (the lower the score, the higher the level of corruption). The tables highlight the gravity of the governance situation in Pakistan.

The National Corruption Perception Survey 2009 (NCPS 2009) of the National Chapter of Transparency International in Pakistan indicates that police and power have maintained their ranking as the top two most corrupt sectors though there has been an evidence of remarkable improvement in judiciary. Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007 (GCB 2007) for Pakistan also reports police and the tax department as the most corrupt sectors amongst 14 sectors surveyed.

According to GCB 2007, only 20% of the citizens in Pakistan have perception that the government efforts to fight corruption are somewhat effective. Results of GCB, 2009 indicate that more than 50% of those polled for the survey believe that private sector pays bribes to influence laws, regulations and public policy of the country.



**TABLE 2.1  
WORLDWIDE GOVERNANCE INDICATORS, 2007 FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES**

	Control of Corruption		Rule of Law		Regulatory Quality		Government Effectiveness		Political Stability		Voice and Accountability	
Country	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5)
<b>Afghanistan</b>	1.4	-1.64	0.5	-2.01	3.9	-1.58	8.5	-1.31	1.0	-2.64	11.1	-1.26
<b>Bangladesh</b>	10.6	-1.10	27.3	-0.70	20.8	-0.82	22.7	-0.77	9.6	-1.54	30.8	-0.61
<b>Bhutan</b>	74.9	0.72	60.8	0.37	19.3	-0.86	59.2	0.11	77.5	0.89	26.0	-0.73
<b>India</b>	44.4	-0.37	56.5	0.12	46.9	-0.21	53.6	-0.03	16.7	-0.99	58.7	0.45
<b>Maldives</b>	32.9	-0.60	49.3	-0.24	37.2	-0.42	44.1	-0.35	39.2	-0.10	36.1	-0.39
<b>Nepal</b>	29.0	-0.68	24.9	-0.76	26.6	-0.66	24.2	-0.75	7.7	-1.69	25.0	-0.79
<b>Pakistan</b>	24.6	-0.77	19.1	-0.92	34.8	-0.47	25.6	-0.73	1.4	-2.16	19.2	-1.01
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	54.1	-0.15	54.5	-0.01	44.4	-0.28	46.9	-0.29	2.9	-2.04	33.7	-0.44

Source: World Bank: Governance Matters, 2008

Current scenario of corruption and governance situation in Pakistan draws our attention to the scope and demand for human resource development for governance and public policy. University education caters to the needs of quality human resource development of a country in the relevant field or discipline. Quality of human resource along with others factors becomes an imperative input to shape up the governance structure and public policy. Therefore, it is very important to look at the access of population of a country to university education. The facts in Table 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 below speak loud to indicate alarming situation of access to university education in Pakistan. Only less than 3% of the population in university age group was attending universities by the end of 2003-03 (Table 2.4) which has slightly risen to 4.52% by the end of 2007 (Table 2.5) due to some measures taken during Musharraf's Period. Access to university education ratio is alarmingly low in Pakistan as compared with those of world, selected regions and countries (Table 2.5).

**TABLE 2.2  
CORRUPTION PERCEPTION INDEX FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES**

Country Rank 2008	Country	CPI Score		
		2006	2007	2008
45	Bhutan	6.0	5.0	5.2
72	China	3.3	3.5	3.6
85	India	3.3	3.5	3.4
121	Nepal	2.5	2.5	2.7
134	Pakistan	2.2	2.4	2.5
176	Bangladesh	2.0	2.0	2.1
115	Maldives	-	3.3	2.8
92	Sri Lanka	-	3.2	3.2
176	Afghanistan	-	1.8	1.5

Source: Transparency International

**TABLE 2.3**  
**PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION BETWEEN AGE GROUP OF**  
**18 TO 26 YEARS, ENROLLED AT UNIVERSITY CAMPUS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Year	Est. Pop Age Group 18 to 26 yrs. (Million)			Enrollment Including Ph.D. (Million)			Enrollment at University Campus (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
2001-02	11.98	11.74	23.72	0.175	0.102	0.276	1.46	0.87	1.16
2002-03	12.23	11.96	24.19	0.204	0.128	0.332	1.67	1.07	1.37
2003-04	12.26	12.63	24.90	0.245	0.179	0.423	1.99	1.41	1.70

Source: Economic Survey of Pakistan 2004-05 and Pakistan Statistical Year Book 2002-03

**TABLE 2.4**  
**PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION BETWEEN AGE GROUP OF 18 TO 23 YEARS,**  
**ENROLLED AT UNIVERSITY CAMPUS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.**

Year	Est. Pop Age Group 18 to 23 yrs.(Million)			Enrollment Excluding Ph.D. (Million)			Enrollment at University Campus (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>2001-02</b>	8.39	8.28	<b>16.67</b>	0.172	0.101	<b>0.273</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>1.64</b>
<b>2002-03</b>	8.56	8.43	<b>16.99</b>	0.201	0.127	<b>0.328</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.93</b>
<b>2003-04</b>	8.58	8.91	<b>17.50</b>	0.240	0.177	<b>0.417</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.38</b>

Source: Economic Survey of Pakistan 2004-05 and Pakistan Statistical Year Book 2002-03

**TABLE 2.5**  
**GROSS ENROLLMENT RATIO FOR TERTIARY EDUCATION**  
**TOTAL ENROLLMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION OF THE AGE GROUP**

Selected Regions													
	East Asia & Pacific	Europe & Central Asia	High income	Latin America & Caribbean	Low & middle income	Low income	Lower middle income	Middle East & North Africa	Middle income	South Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Upper middle income	World
2000	11.05	38.69	56.89	22.58	13.46	7.18	14.25	21.22	18.54	8.12	3.96	29.54	18.78
2001	13.00	42.07	58.53	24.11	14.59	7.38	15.93	21.13	20.55	8.39	4.05	32.28	19.89
2002	14.97	45.19	63.32	25.71	15.76	7.72	17.69	21.45	22.52	8.75	4.37	34.83	21.42
2003	16.95	46.75	65.15	27.30	16.76	8.07	19.29	20.80	24.12	9.11	4.87	36.62	22.43
2004	19.62	48.87	66.13	28.90	17.73	7.64	21.76	22.79	26.31	8.08	4.97	38.33	23.31
2005	20.46	51.17	66.64	29.67	18.64	8.50	22.75	23.76	27.32	9.37	5.11	39.71	24.11
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Selected Countries													
	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	China	India	Pakistan	Norway	Korea, Rep.	United Kingdom	United States			
2000	..	5.38	2.67	6.45	..	..	66.18	65.95	59.67	72.99			
2001	..	5.39	3.14	7.68	9.60	..	69.27	72.58	58.15	69.03			
2002	..	6.36	3.07	9.92	9.85	..	70.30	78.44	58.97	69.94			
2003	..	6.04	..	12.71	10.41	2.54	73.63	83.27	62.88	80.46			
2004	1.25	6.04	..	15.50	10.93	2.51	79.43	86.83	62.67	82.29			
2005	1.25	5.52	..	..	9.53	3.11	79.41	88.52	59.87	82.05			
2006	..	5.99	..	..	11.03	4.47	78.47	89.94	59.36	82.24			
2007	..	..	5.54	21.58	..	4.52	..	91.03	..	..			

Source: World Development Indicators

Most of the universities are based in public sector in all regions except for Sind where a relatively larger number of universities is based in private sector (Table 2.6). It is interesting to find that number of universities in Punjab and Sind is equal and Balochistan needs special attention to higher education (Table 2.6).

<b>Region</b>	<b>Universities</b>	<b>Public</b>	<b>Private</b>
AJK	4	2	2
Balochistan	8	6	2
Islamabad	17	14	3
Northern Areas	1	1	-
NWFP	22	13	9
Punjab	38	21	17
Sindh	38	13	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>58</b>

Source: Higher Education Commission

Progressively rising number of public and private sector universities & degree awarding institutions (Table 2.7) and enrollment of students (Table 2.8) in these academic institutions is indicative of growing demand for education in Pakistan especially after late 90s. It is interesting to know that the proportion of female student enrollment though is low at all degree levels but is increasing overtime because of string growth (Table 2.8). It is encouraging to know that in recognition to significance of university education in recent past, public and private sector both have responded positively (Table 2.7).

<b>Year</b>	<b>Universities</b>				<b>Degree Awarding Institutions</b>				<b>Overall Total</b>
	<b>Public</b>		<b>Private</b>		<b>Public</b>		<b>Private</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	
1985-86	19	-	2	-	3	-	0	-	24
1990-91	20	-	2	-	3	-	0	-	25
1995-96	25	-	7	-	3	-	3	-	38
2000-01	32	2	14	1	5	-	8	-	59
2005-06	50	4	39	1	11	1	17	-	117
2007-08	54	4	40	1	13	1	17	-	124

Source: Higher Education Commission

**Table 2.8**  
**Enrollment at Universities and DAIs during 2001-06**

Year	Bachelor			Masters			M. Phil			Ph. D			Male
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
2001-02	116723	69112	185835	48315	30289	78604	2556	1315	3871	2435	689	3124	3431
	62.81%	37.19%	100.00%	61.47%	38.53%	100.00%	66.03%	33.97%	100.00%	77.94%	22.06%	100.00%	80.37%
2002-03	136547	86923	223470	56826	37859	94685	3150	1692	4842	3122	1016	4138	2998
	61.10%	38.90%	100.00%	60.02%	39.98%	100.00%	65.06%	34.94%	100.00%	75.45%	24.55%	100.00%	75.88%
2003-04	166022	128880	294902	65021	43855	108876	4708	2746	7454	4662	1810	6472	3192
	56.30%	43.70%	100.00%	59.72%	40.28%	100.00%	63.16%	36.84%	100.00%	72.03%	27.97%	100.00%	64.73%
2004-05p	190996	138937	329933	73167	51729	124896	6016	2340	8356	3596	847	4443	2634
	57.89%	42.11%	100.00%	58.58%	41.42%	100.00%	72.00%	28.00%	100.00%	80.94%	19.06%	100.00%	60.75%
2005-06p	<u>210293</u>	<u>149390</u>	359683	<u>84445</u>	<u>56472</u>	140917	<u>6476</u>	<u>3954</u>	10430	<u>3741</u>	<u>1398</u>	5139	<u>3521</u>
	58.47%	41.53%	100.00%	59.93%	40.07%	100.00%	62.09%	37.91%	100.00%	72.80%	27.20%	100.00%	66.38%
Growth (%)	15.86	21.25	17.950042	14.98	16.85	15.7123425	26.16	31.68	28.1195145	11.33	19.35	13.2509616	0.65

Source: Higher Education Commission

Despite of the fact that growth of number of private sector universities has remained notable and encouraging, statistics in Table 2.9 and Table 2.10 highlights that more than 75% of the enrollment at university level in all regions except for Sind is in public sector universities. This also hints at the fact that public sector as compared with private sector has relatively more capacity to accommodate the students at university level and there is need to expand the existing academic and non-academic infrastructure and capacity of private sector universities in Pakistan. Students enroll in public sector universities because of their subsidized fee structure.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Bachelors</b>	<b>Master</b>	<b>M. Phil</b>	<b>Ph. D</b>	<b>PGD</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Public</b>	2001-02	156141	66675	3683	3061	2841	232401
	2002-03	186602	78709	4462	4045	2666	276484
	2003-04	252841	92613	6802	6277	3595	362128
	2004-05	281915	107110	7229	4213	3544	404011
	2005-06	306097	118615	9134	4826	3867	442539
	2006-07 p	380350	147015	11321	5019	4793	548498
	2007-08 p	441112	170905	13161	6876	5572	637626
<b>Private</b>	2001-02	30340	11854	188	63	1428	43873
	2002-03	37688	15815	380	93	1285	55261
	2003-04	42871	16054	652	195	1336	61108
	2004-05	48018	17786	1127	230	792	67934
	2005-06	53586	22302	1296	313	1437	78934
	2006-07 p	62196	25870	1503	326	1667	91563
	2007-08 p	70204	29233	1699	446	1887	103466
<b>Overall</b>	2001-02	186481	78529	3871	3124	4269	276274
	2002-03	224290	94524	4842	4138	3951	331745
	2003-04	295712	108667	7454	6472	4931	423236
	2004-05	329933	124896	8356	4443	4336	471964
	2005-06	359683	140917	10430	5139	5304	521473
	2006-07 p	442547	172886	12824	5344	6460	640061
	<b>2007-08 p</b>	<b>511317</b>	<b>200138</b>	<b>12859</b>	<b>7321</b>	<b>7455</b>	<b>741092</b>

Source: Higher Education Commission

**Table 2.10**  
**Share (%) of Public & Private Sector Universities/DAIs in Total Enrollment, Excluding Distance Learning Universities Classified by Area.**

Area	Public				
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
<b>Federal</b>	86.39	87.79	87.09	86.47	85.40
<b>AJK</b>	96.37	85.08	84.10	75.26	87.65
<b>Balochistan</b>	93.75	88.27	90.24	86.86	89.55
<b>NWFP</b>	84.77	84.08	84.01	80.86	80.30
<b>Punjab</b>	82.93	82.38	83.70	80.00	78.55
<b>Sind</b>	62.46	57.71	58.85	64.35	63.70
<b>Overall</b>	<b>76.48</b>	<b>75.22</b>	<b>76.85</b>	<b>76.11</b>	<b>75.47</b>
Area	Private				
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
<b>Federal</b>	13.61	12.21	12.91	13.53	14.60
<b>AJK</b>	3.63	14.92	13.90	24.74	12.35
<b>Balochistan</b>	6.25	11.73	9.76	13.14	10.45
<b>NWFP</b>	15.23	15.92	15.99	19.14	19.70
<b>Punjab</b>	17.07	17.62	16.30	20.00	21.45
<b>Sind</b>	37.54	42.29	41.15	35.65	36.30
<b>Overall</b>	<b>23.52</b>	<b>24.78</b>	<b>23.15</b>	<b>23.89</b>	<b>24.53</b>
Source: Higher Education Commission					

Another way to look at the picture of university level of education is possibly the number of students produced at various levels of degrees, by private and public sector universities and by region. Here, again, private sector universities are far behind as compared with the public sector universities in producing the number of students (Table 2.9 and 2.11) and interestingly the ratio of male to female students produced by public sector is far low i.e almost 1:1 as compared with that of private sector which is around 3:1 (Table 2.12). Number of students produced by area during 2001-04 (Table 2.13) is indicative of the fact that female student output as compared with that of male at



university level education is alarmingly low except for Punjab (Table 2.13). Lastly, Table 2.14 shows that bulk of females acquire university education up to bachelor level. Thereafter their number declines relatively more though it is encouraging to find that there is strong growth over time. Marriages, looking after their families and other cultural and social are principal reasons constraining female higher education. This calls our attention to the need for motivation and funding for female education at university level.

Level of Degree	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2007-08 p	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Bachelors	117827	68654	137695	86595	167072	128640	190996	138937	210293	149390	272839	238478
Master	48255	30274	56714	37810	64879	43788	73167	51729	84445	56472	106874	93264
M.Phil	2556	1315	3150	1692	4708	2746	6016	2340	6476	3954	8864	5995
Ph.D	2435	689	3122	1016	4662	1810	3596	847	3741	1398	5469	1853
PGD	3431	838	2998	953	3192	1739	2634	1702	3521	1783	4921	2535
Total	174504	101770	203679	128066	244513	178723	276409	195555	308476	212997	398966	342125

Source: Higher Education Commission

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07p
Bachelors	1.72	1.59	1.30	1.37	1.41	1.14
Master	1.59	1.50	1.48	1.41	1.50	1.15
M.Phil	1.94	1.86	1.71	2.57	1.64	1.48
Ph.D	3.53	3.07	2.58	4.25	2.68	2.95
PGD	4.09	3.15	1.84	1.55	1.97	1.94
Total	1.71	1.59	1.37	1.41	1.45	1.17

Source: Higher Education Commission

<sup>2</sup>Male to female ratio

	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Public Sector	47293	36705	83998	52659	45637	98296	53064	53150	106214
	56.30%	43.70%	100.00%	53.57%	46.43%	100.00%	49.96%	50.04%	100.00%
Private Sector	5479	2056	7535	6673	2530	9203	8735	3107	11842
	72.71%	27.29%	100.00%	72.51%	27.49%	100.00%	73.76%	26.24%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>52772</b>	<b>38761</b>	<b>91533</b>	<b>59332</b>	<b>48167</b>	<b>107499</b>	<b>61799</b>	<b>56257</b>	<b>118056</b>

Source: Higher Education Commission

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Public	1.29	1.15	1.00
Private	2.66	2.64	2.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>1.10</b>

Source: Higher Education Commission

Area	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Federal<sup>4</sup></b>	27219	23752	50971	30313	28700	59013	30211	31276	61487
<b>AJK</b>	359	161	520	491	240	731	422	167	589
<b>Balochistan</b>	927	309	1236	909	320	1229	849	321	1170
<b>NWFP</b>	7435	2682	10117	7867	2841	10708	7492	3080	10572
<b>Punjab</b>	8759	6534	15293	11814	10380	22194	12794	15266	28060
<b>Sindh</b>	8073	5323	13396	7938	5686	13624	10031	6147	16178
<b>Total</b>	<b>52772</b>	<b>38761</b>	<b>91533</b>	<b>59332</b>	<b>48167</b>	<b>107499</b>	<b>61799</b>	<b>56257</b>	<b>118056</b>

Source: Higher Education Commission

<sup>3</sup> Male to female ratio

<sup>4</sup> Including Distance Learning.

**Table 2.14**  
**Number of Students Produced by Level of Degree during 2001-04**

Level of Degree	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Bachelor</b>	31714	25535	57249	37243	33372	70615	40350	41714	82064
<b>Master</b>	19178	12305	31483	19879	13729	33608	18928	13105	32033
<b>M. Phil.</b>	393	284	677	470	363	833	516	343	859
<b>Ph. D.</b>	155	72	227	206	84	290	216	78	294
<b>PGD</b>	1332	565	1897	1534	619	2153	1789	1017	2806
<b>Total</b>	52772	38761	91533	59332	48167	107499	61799	56257	118056

Source: Higher Education Commission

### CHAPTER 3 ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN PAKISTAN

Given the situation of governance and education in Pakistan, it is unfortunate that none of the universities/colleges selected in the sample offer a full fledged program in Governance and Public Policy and only 53% of the universities/colleges offer at least one or more public policy linked disciplines at bachelor level (Table 3.1 and 3.2). At the same time, it is encouraging to know the special consideration for Economics and Political Science among governance and public policy linked disciplines because 80% of the universities/colleges offer Economics and 70 % offer Political Science at bachelor level.

Universities/Colleges	Economic	Political Science	Public Administration	Public Policy and
1. Quid-i-Azam University, Islamabad <sup>5</sup>	X <sup>6</sup>	X	X	X
2. University of the Punjab, Lahore <sup>7</sup>	X	X	X	X
3. Government Islamia College, Civil Lines, Lahore <sup>8</sup>	√ <sup>9</sup>	√	X	X
4. Karachi University, Karachi	√	√	√	X
5. Peshawar University, Peshawar	√	X	X	X
6. SZABIST, Karachi	√	√	X	X
7. Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore	√	√	X	X
8. FC College, Lahore	√	√	X	X
9. Government College University, Lahore	√	√	X	X
10. International Islamic University, Islamabad	√	√	X	X

<sup>5</sup> Quid-i-Azam University, Islamabad offers no bachelor

<sup>6</sup> X represents that discipline is not offered

<sup>7</sup> University of the Punjab, Lahore has no bachelor level program on the campus in selected disciplines but most of its affiliated colleges offer only two year BA/B.Sc programs which lack discipline focused specialization.

<sup>8</sup> Government Islamia College, Civil Lines, Lahore offers only two year BA/B.Sc programs and is an affiliated college of the University of the Punjab, Lahore.

<sup>9</sup> √ represents that discipline is offered

TABLE 3.2 NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES/COLLEGES OFFERING GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC POLICY LINKED DISCIPLINES										
No. of universities/colleges	Economic		Political Science		Public Administration		Governance and Public Policy linked disciplines		Public Policy and Governance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Offering the discipline	8	80	7	60	1	10	16	53	0	0
Not offering the discipline	2	20	3	40	9	90	14	47	10	100
Total sample size	10	100	10	100	8	100	30	100	10	100

Non-existence of any of the above disciplines in educational institutions indicates the missing focus on governance and public policy issues in the country. Data in Table 3.2 gives rise to the question, **“Why public administration in special and governance and public policy linked disciplines in general have been neglected by academic institutions.”** The factors behind such neglect may be looked at both from demand side and supply side.

Poor infrastructure, shortage of trained faculty especially at senior level due to poor incentive system in public sector and financial constraints are apparently the possible factors hindering the supply of these disciplines. But demand side factors indicate a neglect of public policy disciplines on the part of government. Despite of having a long history of bad governance and public policy issues, Government of Pakistan meets its human resource requirements for governance and public policy through Federal Public Service Commission which holds competitive examination for selection in which candidates can participate with a bachelor degree without imposing any restriction on discipline. Government of Pakistan has failed to recognize and therefore has never floated demand for graduates with an expertise in public policy and governance. Therefore, the student body has always preferred to choose the disciplines with higher

demand like business administration, engineering, medical etc. and academic institutions have accordingly responded to the situation.

### 3.1 Assessment of teaching capacity:

#### 3.1.1 Faculty

Assessment of faculty in public policy linked disciplines in universities/colleges reveals interesting results. Public sector educational institutions are functioning with relatively more junior faculty (mostly lecturers and assistant professors even heads of department being assistant professors in certain cases). 80% of the total faculty consists of teaching assistants, lecturers and assistant professors, only 20% of the total faculty is foreign qualified and 29% of the total faculty holds PhD in public policy linked disciplines in the selected sample from public sector (Table 3.3 and 3.4).<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, even private sector institutions are also functioning with majority of junior faculty but here 67% of total faculty consists of lecturers and assistant professors but this proportion is far better as compared to the situation of public sector institutions. It is quite encouraging to recognize that 52% of the total faculty holds PhD and 53% is foreign qualified in selected disciplines of private sector educational institutions (Table 3.5 and 3.6).

Designations	Karachi University, Karachi	Government Islamia College Civil Lines, Lahore	Government College University, Lahore	Peshawar University, Peshawar	International Islamic University, Islamabad	Total	Percentage in total faculty (%)
TA's / RA's / Student coordinators	1	-	1	-	7	9	7
Lecturers	11	12	16	4	6	49	41
Assistant Professors	15	6	6	2	10	39	32
Associate Professors	2	2	1	3	2	10	8
Professors	4	-	1	2	7	14	12
						<u>121</u>	<u>100</u>

<sup>10</sup> Estimated based on information from prospectus or websites of respective universities

Faculty	Karachi University, Karachi	Government Islamia College Civil Lines, Lahore	Government College University, Lahore	Peshawar University, Peshawar	International Islamic University, Islamabad	Total	As a Percentage in total faculty (%)
Total	34	19	25	11	32	<u>121</u>	<u>100</u>
Local PhDs	8	-	1	4	12	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>
Foreign PhDs	4	-	1	2	3	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
Foreign Masters	4	-	-	1	9	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>
Local Masters	18	19	23	4	8	<u>72</u>	<u>59</u>

Designations	LUMS <sup>11</sup>	FC	ZABIST <sup>12</sup>	Total	Percentage in total faculty (%)
TA's / RA's / Student coordinators					
Lecturers	13	2		15	33
Assistant Professors	8	8		16	35
Associate Professors	4	4		8	17
Professors	4	3		7	15
<b>Total</b>				<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>

<sup>11</sup>Excluding TA's / RA's / Student coordinators

<sup>12</sup>Administration did not allow the survey

Faculty	LUMS	FC	ZABIST	Total	% of Total Faculty
Total	29	17		<u>46</u>	<u>100</u>
Local PhDs	-	4		<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
Foreign PhDs	16	4		<u>20</u>	<u>43</u>
Foreign Masters	8	1		<u>9</u>	<u>20</u>
Local Masters	5	8		<u>13</u>	<u>28</u>

<b>OVER ALL</b>				
	Economics	Political Science	Public Administration	Total
Local PhDs	13	14	2	29
Foreign PhDs	19	9	2	30
Foreign Masters	10	12	1	23
Local Masters	66	14	5	85
Total	108	49	10	167
<b>Private Sector</b>				
	Economics	Political Science	Public Administration	Total
Local PhDs	1	3	-	4
Foreign PhDs	12	8	-	20
Foreign Masters	7	2	-	9
Local Masters	8	5	-	13
Total	28	18	-	46
<b>Public Sector</b>				
	Economics	Political Science	Public	Total



			Administration	
Local PhDs	12	11	2	25
Foreign PhDs	7	1	2	10
Foreign Masters	3	10	1	14
Local Masters	58	9	5	72
Total	80	31	10	121

Most of the senior faculty especially PhDs apparently seems to have moved to private sector. Private sector has been successful to attract senior faculty from public sector by offering attractive packages in terms of salaries, perquisites, stimulating working environment and flexibility in recent past since establishment of HEC followed by its policies for regulation of education sector. This has also affected the research contribution of public sector institutions. Private sector has also succeeded in attracting relatively more foreign qualified faculty even at junior level as compared with public sector. Therefore, this is challenge for public sector and government should try on urgent grounds to find ways of strengthening the public sector institutions because bulk of Pakistani students cannot afford to pay high costs for education.

### 3.1.2 Faculty Time Allocation

Survey results show more than 55 % of the faculty time is allocated to teaching in both public sector and private sector institutions and time allocated to research is only 18.54% in public sector (Table 3.8 and 3.9) . These results indicate the scope and need for training and motivation of our faculty for research especially in public sector.

TABLE 3.8 FACULTY TIME ALLOCATION IN PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS						
	Government Islamia College Civil Lines, Lahore	Government College University, Lahore	University of Peshawar, Peshawar	University of Karachi, Karachi	International Islamic University, Islamabad	Overall Average

	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Teaching</b>	71.54	56.50	61.50	48.57	<b>59.00</b>	<b>59.40</b>
<b>Research</b>	15.38	24.50	21.10	24.29	<b>16.00</b>	<b>18.54</b>
<b>Administration</b>	13.08	19.00	17.50	27.14	<b>24.50</b>	<b>21.95</b>
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

### 3.1.3 Teaching methods:

Based on survey results, we can conclude that private sector institutions have a practice to use a balanced combination of the listed teaching methods and though the methods are frequently used but faculty is not fully

	<b>LUMS, Lahore</b>	<b>FC College, Lahore</b>	<b>Overall Average</b>
	%	%	%
<b>Teaching</b>	55.05	58.33	<b>56.69</b>
<b>Research</b>	33.50	31.67	<b>32.59</b>
<b>Administration</b>	11.45	10.00	<b>10.73</b>
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

trained specially in use of case studies, research seminars/ workshops, interactive group discussions and problem solving as a teaching method (Table 3.10). Assessment of teaching methods by students also reveals that private institutions use mix of teaching methods (Table 3.11). This finding is closely consistent with the finding of teaching assessment methods by faculty of private sector.

TABLE 3.10 TEACHING METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PRIVATE SECTOR												
Survey Question	How frequently you use the teaching method?									Where do you feel training can help you?		
	Respondents in Percentage									Respondents in Percentage		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
S. No.	Teaching Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)	Yes	No	Total
1	Conventional Lectures	14.29	0.00	0.00	71.43	14.29	100	14.29	<b>85.71</b>	25.00	75.00	100
2	Case Studies Method	0.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	40.00	100	20.00	<b>80.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>	25.00	100
3	Directed Reading Method	33.33	0.00	50.00	16.67	0.00	100	33.33	<b>66.67</b>	33.33	66.67	100
4	Research Seminars/ Workshops	25.00	25.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	100	50.00	<b>50.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	0.00	100
5	Interactive Group Discussion	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	<b>100.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>	25.00	100
6	Problem Solving Method	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	25.00	100	25.00	<b>75.00</b>	<b>83.33</b>	16.67	100

TABLE 3.11 TEACHING METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR										
Survey Question:	How frequently the teaching method is used?									
	Respondents in Percentage									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. No.	Teaching Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(3+4)	(5+6+7)	
1	Conventional Lectures	3.03	18.18	15.15	57.58	6.06	100.00	21.21	<b>78.79</b>	
2	Case Studies Method	3.03	15.15	33.33	33.33	15.15	100.00	18.18	<b>81.82</b>	
3	Directed Reading Method	12.12	24.24	27.27	27.27	9.09	100.00	36.36	<b>63.64</b>	
4	Research Seminars/ Workshops	15.15	24.24	27.27	27.27	6.06	100.00	39.39	<b>60.61</b>	
5	Interactive Group Discussion	6.06	15.15	18.18	48.48	12.12	100.00	21.21	<b>78.79</b>	
6	Problem Solving Method	3.03	24.24	33.33	30.30	9.09	100.00	27.27	<b>72.73</b>	

Conventional lectures and problem solving method are the most common teaching methods used and there exists an ample scope for training in all teaching methods in public sector institutions (Table 3.12). Assessment of teaching methods by students also indicates that except for conventional lecturers and problem solving method, other teaching methods are not very common in public sector institutions (Table 3.13).

**TABLE 3.12**  
**TEACHING METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PUBLIC SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How frequently you use the teaching method?									Where do you feel training can help you?		
	Respondents in Percentage									Respondents in Percentage		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
S. No.	Teaching Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)	Yes	No	Total
1	Conventional Lectures	2.13	12.77	21.28	48.94	14.89	100.00	14.89	85.11	52.00	48.00	100.00
2	Case Studies Method	8.33	56.25	20.83	14.58	0.00	100.00	64.58	35.42	80.77	19.23	100.00
3	Directed Reading Method	38.46	23.08	15.38	15.38	7.69	100.00	61.54	38.46	68.42	31.58	100.00
4	Research Seminars/ Workshops	22.22	44.44	17.78	11.11	4.44	100.00	66.67	33.33	94.44	5.56	100.00
5	Interactive Group Discussion	31.25	33.33	18.75	12.50	4.17	100.00	64.58	35.42	72.73	27.27	100.00
6	Problem Solving Method	21.28	34.04	21.28	12.77	10.64	100.00	55.32	44.68	71.43	28.57	100.00

TABLE 3.13 TEACHING METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PUBLIC SECTOR									
Survey Question:	How frequently the teaching method is used?								
	Respondents in Percentage								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
S. No.	Teaching Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(3+4)	(5+6+7)
1	Conventional Lectures	1.68	17.32	35.20	32.96	12.85	100.00	18.99	81.01
2	Case Studies Method	65.56	7.78	10.00	8.33	8.33	100.00	73.33	<b>26.67</b>
3	Directed Reading Method	57.07	26.63	6.52	8.70	1.09	100.00	83.70	<b>16.30</b>
4	Research Seminars/ Workshops	65.57	17.49	5.46	7.10	4.37	100.00	83.06	<b>16.94</b>
5	Interactive Group Discussion	65.24	11.76	7.49	7.49	8.02	100.00	77.01	<b>22.99</b>
6	Problem Solving Method	22.83	27.72	16.30	19.57	13.59	100.00	50.54	49.46

### 3.1.4 Student assessment methods

The most commonly used student assessment methods are conventional examination, research assignments/projects, quizzes, class participation, and individual presentations in private sector and there exists scope for training in three of the listed student assessment methods namely research assignments/projects, class participation and individual presentations (Table 3.14). Student assessment of assessment methods also shows that mix of the evaluation methods is being practiced in private sector (Table 3.15).

**TABLE 3.14**  
**STUDENT EVALUATION/ ASSESSMENT METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PRIVATE SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How frequently you use the student evaluation/ assessment?									Where do you feel training can help you?		
	Respondents in Percentage									Respondents in Percentage		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
S. No.	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)	Yes	No	Total
1	Conventional Examination	0.00	0.00	57.14	42.86	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	14.29	85.71	100.00
2	Research Assignments/Projects	14.29	14.29	42.86	28.57	0.00	100.00	28.57	71.43	57.14	42.86	100.00
3	Quizzes	0.00	0.00	42.86	57.14	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	42.86	57.14	100.00
4	Class Participation	0.00	28.57	28.57	42.86	0.00	100.00	28.57	71.43	71.43	28.57	100.00
5	Group Assessment	42.86	14.29	14.29	28.57	0.00	100.00	57.14	42.86	85.71	14.29	100.00
6	Individual Presentations	0.00	28.57	28.57	42.86	0.00	100.00	28.57	71.43	57.14	42.86	100.00

**TABLE 3.15**  
**STUDENT EVALUATION/ ASSESSMENT METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How frequently you use the student evaluation/ assessment?								
	Respondents in Percentage								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
S. No.	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)
1	Conventional Examination	13.33	13.33	10.00	53.33	10.00	100.00	26.67	73.33
2	Research Assignments/Projects	0.00	6.67	36.67	46.67	10.00	100.00	6.67	93.33
3	Quizzes	33.33	16.67	20.00	26.67	3.33	100.00	50.00	50.00
4	Class Participation	0.00	12.90	32.26	35.48	19.35	100.00	12.90	87.10
5	Group Assessment	30.77	11.54	15.38	42.31	0.00	100.00	42.31	57.69
6	Individual Presentations	13.33	30.00	23.33	20.00	13.33	100.00	43.33	56.67

Results of the survey indicate that relatively more weight is given to conventional examination and quizzes as compared to other components of student assessment or evaluation in public sector institutions (Table 3.16 and 3.17). Most of the public sector faculty also feels that training can help them in all assessment methods except conventional examination (Table 3.16).

TABLE 3.16 STUDENT EVALUATION/ ASSESSMENT METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PUBLIC SECTOR												
Survey Question:	How frequently you use the student evaluation/ assessment?									Where do you feel training can help you?		
	Respondents in Percentage									Respondents in Percentage		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
S. No.	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)	Yes	No	Total
1	Conventional Examination	0.00	14.00	10.00	60.00	16.00	100.00	14.00	86.00	45.00	55.00	100.00
2	Research Assignments/Projects	36.36	25.45	18.18	12.73	7.27	100.00	61.82	38.18	68.00	32.00	100.00
3	Quizzes	9.62	19.23	34.62	32.69	3.85	100.00	28.85	71.15	70.00	30.00	100.00
4	Class Participation	45.10	35.29	9.80	5.88	3.92	100.00	80.39	19.61	63.64	36.36	100.00
5	Group Assessment	33.33	37.50	10.42	8.33	10.42	100.00	70.83	29.17	73.91	26.09	100.00
6	Individual Presentations	40.38	13.46	3.85	26.92	15.38	100.00	53.85	46.15	73.33	26.67	100.00

TABLE 3.17 STUDENT EVALUATION/ ASSESSMENT METHODS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PUBLIC SECTOR									
Survey Question	How frequently you use the student evaluation/ assessment?								
	Respondents in Percentage								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
S. No.	Student Evaluation/ Assessment Method	Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Total	(1+2)	(3+4+5)
1	Conventional Examination	8.64	19.14	22.84	33.95	15.43	100.00	27.78	72.22
2	Research Assignments/Projects	26.01	32.95	28.90	8.67	3.47	100.00	58.96	41.04
3	Quizzes	20.83	16.67	27.08	26.04	9.38	100.00	37.50	62.50
4	Class Participation	31.87	27.47	24.18	5.49	10.99	100.00	59.34	40.66
5	Group Assessment	17.30	26.49	23.78	22.16	10.27	100.00	43.78	56.22

6	Individual Presentations	32.56	29.65	10.47	12.79	14.53	100.00	62.21	37.79
---	--------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	-------

### 3.1.5 Self Assessment: Training Needs Identified by Faculty

This is one of the shocking findings that despite of the desperate situation of governance, none of the surveyed faculty members has ever attended a program at PhD level or Post Doctoral Level and the proportion of those who participated at Masters/M.Phil level or even of those who have attended a short training in governance is also desperate (Table 3.18 and 3.19). 71% of the faculty of private sector is inclined to join at PhD level and around 43% at Masters/M.Phil level for fully funded training in Governance and Public Policy while the public sector faculty is motivated to join the training program at any level (Table 3.19).

Faculty in both private and public sector has clear tilt towards joining the fully funded training program at some foreign institution (Table 3.20). This finding in itself is also a strong indication for poor teaching capacity and inability to deliver required standard knowledge and training of Pakistani Universities. Only 2% is willing to join on self finance basis (Table 3.20) which also highlights the financial constraints of the faculty of Pakistani universities.

Survey Questions		In which of the academic programs offered purely in public policy and governance <b>did you ever participate?</b>		In which of the academic programs if offered purely in public policy and governance do you <b>like to participate in future?</b>	
		Respondents in Percentage		Respondents in Percentage	
Education Sectors	Academic Programs	Yes	No	Yes	No
Private Sector	1. Short Training Course	28.57	71.43	28.57	71.43
	2. MS/M. Phil	14.29	85.71	<b>42.86</b>	57.14
	3. PhD	0.00	100.00	<b>71.43</b>	28.57
	4. Post Doctoral Program	0.00	100.00	28.57	71.43



Survey Questions		In which of the academic programs offered purely in public policy and governance did you ever participate?		In which of the academic programs if offered purely in public policy and governance do you like to participate in future?	
		Respondents in Percentage		Respondents in Percentage	
Education Sectors	Academic Programs	Yes	No	Yes	No
Public Sector	1. Short Training Course	21.54	78.46	<b>83.87</b>	16.13
	2. MS/M. Phil	12.50	87.50	<b>76.92</b>	23.08
	3. PhD	0.00	100.00	<b>100.00</b>	27.78
	4. Post Doctoral Program	0.00	100.00	<b>78.13</b>	21.88

Survey Question: Where would you like to participate in fully funded academic programs offered purely in public policy and governance to address issues in public policy and governance in Pakistan?			
Listed choices for training	Respondents in Percentage		
	Private sector	Public Sector	Overall
1. At some foreign institution	57	68	67
2. At some home country institution	1	14	11
3. At some home country institution offered with full support of invited foreign faculty	14	8	9
4. Partly at home institution and partly at some foreign institution	14	11	11
5. You would like to participate at some foreign or home institution on self finance basis	14	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.2 Program Assessment and Student Preparedness:

There exist two types of programs in terms of duration at bachelor level in public policy linked disciplines across the country.

- Two years bachelor
- Four years bachelor

Two years program at bachelor level is only offered by public sector institutions especially public sector colleges affiliated with public sector universities while it has completely phased out from private sector institutions. Two years program lacks thoroughness and is very limited in its scope in terms of curriculum and its contents along with poorly designed course structure and lack of specialization and without any mandatory requirement of internship, thesis or even a research project or assignments. Admissions in two year bachelors are only made based on past academic performance only and there is no requirement of aptitude test. Therefore, students coming with two years bachelor are not prepared at all for a Masters program in governance and public policy. While four years programs at bachelor level offer relatively broad based education including interdisciplinary courses, compulsory courses and discipline specific core courses along with mandatory requirement of internship, a research project or assignments or even a thesis. Admissions in four years bachelor are mostly based on aptitude test, interviews and past academic performance (Table 3.21).

**TABLE A  
PROGRAM STRUCTURE AT BACHELOR LEVEL**

	International Islamic University, Islamabad				Government College University, Lahore				Karachi University, Karachi				FC College, Lahore				Government Islamia College Civil Lines, Lahore			
Department/Discipline	Political Science and International Relations		Economics		Political Science		Economics		Economics		Public Administration		Economics		Political Science		Economics		Political Science	
Duration (years)	4				4		4		4		4		4		4		2		2	
No. of semesters	8				8		8		8		8		8		8		-		-	
	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours	No. of courses	Credit hours
No. of compulsory courses	9	27	9	27	9	25	9	25	8	24	8	24	16	51	16	51	3	24	3	24
No. of general courses from other departments/disciplines	8	24	8	24	8	24	8	24	9	27	9	27	10	31	10	31	2	18	2	18
Discipline specific core/major courses	27	81	27	81	25	75	27	78	25	78	27	81	16	48	16	48	1	12	1	12
Total	44	132	44	132	42	124	44	127	42	129	42	132	42	130	42	130	6	54	6	54

Internship :										
▪ Compulsory				√	√	√				
▪ Optional										
▪ Not required	√	√	√				√	√	√	√
Or Research project/thesis										
▪ Compulsory							√	√		
▪ Optional				√	√	√				
▪ Not required	√	√	√						√	√
Admission Criteria:										
▪ Past academic performance			√	√	√	√			√	√
▪ Test										
▪ Interview										
▪ Combination of the above THREE	√	√					√	√		

<b>TABLE 3.22 COMPARISON OF TWO YEARS AND FOUR YEARS BACHELOR</b>		
	<b>Two years bachelor</b>	<b>Four years bachelor</b>
<b>Duration (years)</b>	2	4
<b>No. of semesters</b>	4 <sup>13</sup>	8
<b>No. of credit hours</b>	57-60	124-136
<b>Total no. of courses</b>	6	40-44
<b>Examination system</b>	Annual	Semester system
<b>Research based assignments or projects or thesis</b>	Completely missing	Frequent practice
<b>Internship</b>	Not required	Not compulsory in most of the cases
<b>Offering academic institutions</b>	Only Public <sup>14</sup>	All Private and also few public
<b>Admission requirements</b>	No aptitude test Only Past academic performance	Aptitude test + Past academic performance

All universities from private sector selected in the sample offer only four years program at bachelor level. But there are also some universities from public sector which have also started four years program at bachelor level in public policy linked disciplines. There are also some universities which are currently offering no program at all bachelor level on their campuses like Quid-e-Azam University, Islamabad and University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Unfortunately, there is not even a single university either from private or public sector from the selected sample which has included governance or public policy or a mix of these two areas in its curriculum as a full fledged academic programs at bachelor level.

### **3.2.1 Skills Gap**

Results based on perceived response from faculty and students both from private and public sector show existing gap between the degree of relevance of a learning outcome or a skill and extent of its delivery with a few exceptions which basically identifies skills gap and areas of weakness and strength of students and scope for faculty training to

<sup>13</sup> Two years bachelor does not have semester system but effectively it is equivalent to 4 semesters.

<sup>14</sup> Offered mostly in affiliated colleges of public sector universities

narrow this gap down. Learning outcomes or skills have been listed in descending order with respect to the size of existing gap in Table 3.23, 3.24, 3.25 and 3.26 below. it is interesting to find that skill gap identified by faculty and students of respective sectors for top ten skills in descending order is relatively high in public sector universities as compared with that of private sector.

		Survey Questions		
		Degree of Relevance	Degree of Delivery	
		How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome relevant to your academic program at bachelor's level?	How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome delivered by your academic program at bachelor's level?	Gap
S.No.	Learning skill/outcome	Average Rating Rating Scale: 1=Low 5=High		(1-2)
		1	2	
1.	Knowledge of Current Issues in the Discipline	3.86	3.29	0.57
2.	Critical Thinking	4.00	3.43	0.57
3.	Reading	3.86	3.29	0.57
4.	Creative Thinking & Visioning	3.86	3.43	0.43
5.	Preparedness for higher studies	3.86	3.43	0.43
6.	Decision-Making	3.43	3.00	0.43
7.	Research and Analytical	4.00	3.57	0.43
8.	Quantitative Skills (Mathematical and Statistical)	3.29	2.86	0.43
9.	Effective Communication	3.43	3.00	0.43
10.	Communicating through Evolving Media	3.71	3.43	0.29
11.	Speaking	3.71	3.43	0.29
12.	Problem-Solving	2.86	2.57	0.29
13.	Leadership & Responsible Assertiveness	3.57	3.43	0.14
14.	Resource Management	3.14	3.00	0.14
15.	Employability	4.00	3.86	0.14
16.	Knowledge of relevant Institutions	3.86	3.86	0.00
17.	Teamwork & Interpersonal	3.71	3.71	0.00
18.	Writing	3.86	3.86	0.00
19.	Computer Applications	3.57	3.86	-0.29
20.	Listening	3.71	4.00	-0.29

**TABLE 3.24  
STUDENT PREPAREDNESS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR**

		Degree of Relevance	Degree of Delivery	
Survey Question:		How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>relevant to your academic program</b> at bachelor's level?	How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>delivered by your academic program</b> at bachelor's level?	
S. No.	Learning Skills or Outcomes of Graduates	Average Rating on a scale from 1-5. 1=low 5= high Average Rating		Gap (1-2)
		1	2	
1.	Research and Analytical	3.46	2.58	0.88
2.	Creative Thinking & Visioning	3.72	2.91	0.81
3.	Leadership & Responsible Assertiveness	4.05	3.28	0.77
4.	Communicating through Evolving Media	3.81	3.05	0.76
5.	Preparedness for higher studies	3.71	2.98	0.73
6.	Quantitative Skills (Mathematical and Statistical)	4.03	3.36	0.67
7.	Listening	3.72	3.08	0.64
8.	Knowledge of Current Issues in the Discipline	3.56	2.98	0.58
9.	Problem-Solving	3.98	3.41	0.57
10.	Reading	3.85	3.40	0.45
11.	Effective Communication	3.68	3.31	0.37
12.	Critical Thinking	3.76	3.43	0.33
13.	Decision-Making	3.57	3.28	0.30
14.	Speaking	3.76	3.53	0.24
15.	Resource Management	3.85	3.69	0.16
16.	Teamwork & Interpersonal	3.50	3.36	0.14
17.	Computer Applications	3.73	3.59	0.14
18.	Employability	3.85	3.81	0.05
19.	Knowledge of relevant Institutions	3.92	3.89	0.03
20.	Writing	3.47	3.46	0.01

**TABLE 3.25  
STUDENT PREPAREDNESS: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PUBLIC SECTOR**

		Degree of Relevance	Degree of Delivery	
<b>Survey Question:</b>		<b>How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome relevant to your academic program at bachelor's level?</b>	<b>How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome delivered by your academic program at bachelor's level?</b>	
<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Learning Skills or Outcomes of Graduates</b>	<b>Average Rating on a scale from 1-5. 1=low 5= high Average Rating</b>		<b>Gap (1-2)</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	
1.	Critical Thinking	3.42	2.50	0.92
2.	Communicating through Evolving Media	3.73	2.89	0.84
3.	Research and Analytical	3.73	2.90	0.83
4.	Leadership & Responsible Assertiveness	3.83	3.00	0.83
5.	Reading	3.74	2.92	0.83
6.	Preparedness for higher studies	3.36	2.55	0.81
7.	Knowledge of Current Issues in the Discipline	3.79	3.03	0.76
8.	Creative Thinking & Visioning	3.45	2.73	0.73
9.	Teamwork & Interpersonal	3.79	3.08	0.71
10.	Problem-Solving	3.86	3.15	0.71
11.	Effective Communication	3.94	3.24	0.69
12.	Listening	3.58	2.91	0.67
13.	Computer Applications	3.76	3.16	0.60
14.	Resource Management	3.84	3.35	0.49
15.	Speaking	3.69	3.23	0.46
16.	Decision-Making	3.42	2.98	0.44
17.	Quantitative Skills (Mathematical and Statistical)	3.74	3.31	0.42
18.	Knowledge of relevant Institutions	3.80	3.40	0.40
19.	Writing	3.56	3.22	0.34
20.	Employability	3.78	3.56	0.22



**TABLE 3.26  
STUDENT PREPAREDNESS: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PUBLIC SECTOR**

		Degree of Relevance	Degree of Delivery	
<b>Survey Question:</b>		<b>How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome relevant to your academic program at bachelor's level?</b>	<b>How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome delivered by your academic program at bachelor's level?</b>	
<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Learning Skills or Outcomes of Graduates</b>	<b>Average Rating on a scale from 1-5. 1=low 5= high Average Rating</b>		<b>Gap (1-2)</b>
1.	Writing	3.50	2.76	0.74
2.	Teamwork & Interpersonal	3.26	2.57	0.69
3.	Creative Thinking & Visioning	3.35	2.69	0.66
4.	Preparedness for higher studies	3.45	2.81	0.64
5.	Employability	3.34	2.73	0.61
6.	Reading	3.59	3.00	0.59
7.	Speaking	3.47	2.88	0.58
8.	Listening	3.45	2.96	0.49
9.	Critical Thinking	3.25	2.86	0.39
10.	Knowledge of Current Issues in the Discipline	3.28	2.90	0.38
11.	Communicating through Evolving Media	2.95	2.59	0.36
12.	Problem-Solving	3.16	2.90	0.26
13.	Research and Analytical	3.01	2.84	0.18
14.	Effective Communication	3.31	3.17	0.14
15.	Resource Management	3.16	3.06	0.10
16.	Knowledge of relevant Institutions	3.18	3.09	0.09
17.	Leadership & Responsible Assertiveness	2.94	2.91	0.03
18.	Decision-Making	3.10	3.07	0.03
19.	Quantitative Skills (Mathematical and Statistical)	3.19	3.21	-0.03
20.	Computer Applications	2.96	3.28	-0.33

### 3.3 Assessment of infrastructure:

Based on results in Table we can conclude that both the students and faculty of public sector apparently seems dis-satisfied with infrastructure available in academic institutions but the position of infrastructure in private sector seems to be relatively better. Results of the survey regarding infrastructure assessment by faculty and students of private sector indicate that private sector and public sectors need significant improvement in the following areas of infrastructure (Table 3.27):

Private Sector		Public Sector	
Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
i. Library: electronic /digital resources	i. Faculty ii. Library: books and print resources	i. Faculty ii. Library: books and print resources	i. Faculty ii. Library: Electronic /digital resources
ii. Research labs,	iii. Library: electronic /digital resources	iii. Library: Electronic /digital resources	iii. Computer laboratories
iii. Multimedia	iv. Research labs,	iv. Computer laboratories	iv. Research labs
iv. Overhead projectors	v. Hostel facilities	v. Internet facility	v. Research staff
v. Hostel facilities	vi. Facilities for Co-curricular activities	vi. Research labs	vi. Multimedia
		vii. Research staff	vii. Overhead projectors
		viii. Multimedia	viii. Educational equipment
		ix. Overhead projectors	ix. Furniture
		x. Educational equipment	x. Administrative staff
		xi. Furniture	
		xii. Administrative staff	

<sup>15</sup>Listed areas in table are those for which more than 40% improvement was suggested by respondents. Please Table 3.28, 3.29, 3.30 and 3.31 for details.

**TABLE 3.28**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PRIVATE SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How much improvement do you suggest in the following?								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Academic facilities:</b>									
	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	Total	suggesting 40% or less improvement (1+2+3)	suggesting more than 40% improvement (4+5+6)
1. Faculty	0.00	71.43	0.00	28.57	0.00	0.00	100	71.43	28.57
2. Library: books and print resources	0.00	71.43	0.00	14.29	28.57	0.00	114	71.43	42.86
3. Library: Electronic /digital resources	0.00	14.29	14.29	57.14	0.00	14.29	100	28.57	<b>71.43</b>
4. Computer laboratories	28.57	0.00	42.86	14.29	14.29	0.00	100	71.43	28.57
5. Internet facility	42.86	28.57	14.29	0.00	14.29	0.00	100	85.71	14.29
6. Research labs	14.29	0.00	28.57	28.57	14.29	14.29	100	42.86	<b>57.14</b>
7. Research staff	14.29	14.29	42.86	14.29	0.00	0.00	86	71.43	14.29
8. Multimedia	14.29	14.29	14.29	28.57	14.29	14.29	100	42.86	<b>57.14</b>
9. Overhead projectors	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29	28.57	14.29	100	42.86	<b>57.14</b>
10. Class rooms	42.86	28.57	14.29	14.29	0.00	0.00	100	85.71	14.29
11. Educational equipment	28.57	14.29	28.57	14.29	14.29	0.00	100	71.43	28.57
<b>Non-academic facilities:</b>									
1. Furniture	71.43	14.29	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	100	85.71	14.29
2. Administrative staff	42.86	42.86	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	100.00	0.00
3. Facilities for Co-curricular activities	14.29	57.14	0.00	14.29	14.29	0.00	100	71.43	28.57
4. Hostel facilities	28.57	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29	100	57.14	<b>42.86</b>
5. Cafeteria	28.57	14.29	28.57	14.29	14.29	0.00	100	71.43	28.57
6. Auditoriums/seminar rooms	28.57	14.29	28.57	28.57	0.00	0.00	100	71.43	28.57

**TABLE 3.29**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How much improvement do you suggest in the following?								
Academic facilities:									
	Respondents in percentage								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	total	suggesting 40% or less improvement (1+2+3)	suggesting more than 40% improvement (4+5+6)
1. Faculty	8.11	5.41	27.03	16.22	18.92	24.32	100.00	40.54	<b>59.46</b>
2. Library: books and print resources	6.06	9.09	9.09	18.18	18.18	39.39	100.00	24.24	<b>75.76</b>
3. Library: Electronic /digital resources	7.69	19.23	7.69	11.54	11.54	42.31	100.00	34.62	<b>65.38</b>
4. Computer laboratories	6.25	9.38	15.63	12.50	6.25	9.38	59.38	31.25	28.13
5. Internet facility	21.21	18.18	24.24	12.12	18.18	6.06	100.00	63.64	36.36
6. Research labs	6.45	9.68	16.13	22.58	9.68	35.48	100.00	32.26	<b>67.74</b>
7. Research staff	40.63	12.50	9.38	15.63	12.50	9.38	100.00	62.50	37.50
8. Multimedia	3.33	53.33	13.33	20.00	3.33	6.67	100.00	70.00	30.00
9. Overhead projectors	40.00	17.14	20.00	8.57	14.29	0.00	100.00	77.14	22.86
10. Class rooms	12.90	51.61	16.13	6.45	6.45	6.45	100.00	80.65	19.35
11. Educational equipment	21.21	36.36	15.15	12.12	6.06	9.09	100.00	72.73	27.27
Non-academic facilities:									
1. Furniture	31.25	6.25	15.63	12.50	21.88	12.50	100.00	53.13	46.88
2. Administrative staff	22.58	16.13	0.00	29.03	12.90	19.35	100.00	68.75	31.25
3. Facilities for Co-curricular activities	18.75	9.38	3.13	18.75	21.88	28.13	100.00	31.25	<b>68.75</b>
4. Hostel facilities	13.79	24.14	6.90	6.90	13.79	34.48	100.00	44.83	<b>55.17</b>
5. Cafeteria	9.68	9.68	38.71	12.90	9.68	19.35	100.00	58.06	41.94
6. Auditoriums/seminar rooms	12.90	12.90	3.23	16.13	29.03	25.81	100.00	67.74	32.26

**TABLE 3.30  
INFRASTRUCTURE: ASSESSMENT BY FACULTY OF PUBLIC SECTOR**

<b>SURVEY QUESTION:</b>	<b>HOW MUCH IMPROVEMENT DO YOU SUGGEST IN THE FOLLOWING?</b>								
<b>Academic facilities:</b>									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	Total	suggesting 40% or less improvement (1+2+3)	suggesting more than 40% improvement (4+5+6)
1. Faculty	11.90	9.52	19.05	11.90	23.81	23.81	100	40.48	<b>59.52</b>
2. Library: books and print resources	22.22	26.67	31.11	6.67	2.22	11.11	100	80.00	20.00
3. Library: Electronic /digital resources	22.22	22.22	31.11	8.89	11.11	4.44	100	75.56	24.44
4. Computer laboratories	2.33	6.98	4.65	23.26	32.56	30.23	100	13.95	<b>86.05</b>
5. Internet facility	0.00	6.67	4.44	33.33	31.11	24.44	100	11.11	<b>88.89</b>
6. Research labs	2.38	4.76	4.76	28.57	28.57	30.95	100	11.90	<b>88.10</b>
7. Research staff	0.00	2.27	20.45	25.00	20.45	20.45	89	22.73	<b>65.91</b>
8. Multimedia	0.00	5.00	10.00	12.50	30.00	42.50	100	15.00	<b>85.00</b>
9. Overhead projectors	2.33	6.98	2.33	11.63	25.58	51.16	100	11.63	<b>88.37</b>
10. Class rooms	29.55	27.27	4.55	6.82	15.91	15.91	100	61.36	38.64
11. Educational equipment	2.27	2.27	9.09	11.36	22.73	52.27	100	13.64	<b>86.36</b>
<b>Non-academic facilities:</b>									
1. Furniture	2.27	4.55	4.55	13.64	22.73	52.27	100	11.36	<b>88.64</b>
2. Administrative staff	2.27	4.55	4.55	13.64	22.73	52.27	100	11.36	<b>88.64</b>
3. Facilities for Co-curricular activities	42.86	4.76	26.19	14.29	9.52	2.38	100	73.81	26.19
4. Hostel facilities	48.78	7.32	4.88	14.63	9.76	14.63	100	60.98	39.02
5. Cafeteria	32.50	30.00	10.00	5.00	12.50	10.00	100	72.50	27.50
6. Auditoriums/seminar rooms	26.32	31.58	13.16	5.26	10.53	13.16	100	71.05	28.95

**TABLE 3.31  
INFRASTRUCTURE: ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS OF PUBLIC SECTOR**

Survey Question:	How much improvement do you suggest in the following?								
<b>Academic facilities:</b>									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	Total	suggesting 40% or less improvement (1+2+3)	suggesting more than 40% improvement (4+5+6)
1. Faculty	0.00	14.17	20.00	20.00	29.17	16.67	100	34.17	<b>65.83</b>
2. Library: books and print resources	14.56	13.59	29.13	25.24	15.53	1.94	100	57.28	42.72
3. Library: Electronic /digital resources	1.47	12.50	16.91	32.35	24.26	12.50	100	30.88	<b>69.12</b>
4. Computer laboratories	2.24	14.18	24.63	32.09	15.67	11.19	100	41.04	<b>58.96</b>
5. Internet facility	10.07	20.13	24.16	22.82	16.78	6.04	100	54.36	45.64
6. Research labs	0.00	7.04	30.99	28.87	21.83	11.27	100	38.03	<b>61.97</b>
7. Research staff	6.67	8.33	20.00	25.00	28.33	11.67	100	35.00	<b>65.00</b>
8. Multimedia	0.00	4.67	29.91	23.36	19.63	22.43	100	34.58	<b>65.42</b>
9. Overhead projectors	0.00	9.65	38.60	32.46	10.53	8.77	100	48.25	<b>51.75</b>
10. Class rooms	0.00	10.62	33.63	31.86	12.39	11.50	100	44.25	<b>55.75</b>
11. Educational equipment	4.08	12.24	30.61	32.65	15.31	5.10	100	46.94	<b>53.06</b>
<b>Non-academic facilities:</b>									
1. Furniture	12.24	4.08	30.61	32.65	15.31	5.10	100	46.94	<b>53.06</b>
2. Administrative staff	15.38	3.85	46.15	17.95	0.00	16.67	100	65.38	34.62
3. Facilities for Co-curricular activities	9.82	0.00	33.93	32.14	12.50	11.61	100	43.75	<b>56.25</b>
4. Hostel facilities	14.56	13.59	29.13	25.24	15.53	1.94	100	57.28	42.72
5. Cafeteria	14.29	30.61	26.53	2.04	11.22	15.31	100	71.43	28.57
6. Auditoriums/seminar rooms	30.00	22.00	24.00	16.00	4.00	4.00	100	76.00	24.00

## **CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

In view of mounting public policy, the governance situation in the country and alarmingly low access to university education in, there exists an ample scope of training for students as well as faculty in the discipline of governance and public policy in Pakistan. Poor infrastructure, shortage of trained faculty especially at senior level due to poor incentive system in public sector and financial constraints are apparently the possible factors hindering the supply of these disciplines. But demand side factors indicate a neglect of public policy disciplines on the part of government. Despite of having a long history of bad governance and public policy issues, Government of Pakistan meets its human resource requirements for governance and public policy through Federal Public Service Commission which holds competitive examination for selection in which candidates can participate with a bachelor degree without imposing any restriction on discipline. Government of Pakistan has failed to recognize and therefore has never floated demand for graduates with an expertise in public policy and governance. Therefore, the student body has always preferred to choose the disciplines with higher demand like business administration, engineering, medical etc. and academic institutions have accordingly responded to the situation.

But success of the program of governance and public policy at masters level rests with a special focus on inducement from demand side apart from supply side measures. In current scenario, there is a need for graduates with competence and expertise in governance and public policy in public sector. However, this realization needs to be instigated in the public sector. The conventional hiring process in public sector for selection and induction of civil savants through competitive examination or direct placements through political influence is flawed and we need to devise and introduce new hiring process based on knowledge, skills, competence and expertise in governance and public policy acquired through well structured curriculum and training. Students with two year bachelor degree apparently seem not prepared for training in governing and public policy at masters' level. Since the people join public service after completing their bachelors therefore we as a research team strongly recommend that bachelor level is the most appropriate entry point for governance and public policy courses to create a desired social impact on governance situation. A curriculum of introductory and intermediate level should be introduced as minor or elective courses in

four years bachelor degree and students should be trained for governance and public policy issues through well structured advanced curriculum and training at masters level. The candidates for public service with knowledge and expertise of governance should be given an extra benefit in the selection process of public servants.

Based on identified strengths of faculty from survey results namely relatively more senior faculty, number of PhDs, and foreign qualified at senior and even at junior level in private sector academic institutions, we can conclude and comfortably recommend that private sector is suitable for launching the master level program in governance and public policy. On the other hand, public sector strongly needs to enrich its faculty through carefully planned training on governance and public policy issues before it takes initiative to start such a program.

Most of the faculty has clear and significant predisposition towards fully funded training at Ph.D level as first priority and then at Master/M.Phil level in governance and public policy preferably from some foreign academic institutions. Later part of this finding in itself is also a strong indication for poor teaching capacity and incapability to deliver required standard knowledge and training of Pakistani Universities. Faculty also needs training in modern teaching and student assessment methods.

#### References:

1. Economic Advisory Wing, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Affairs, Government of Pakistan (various issues). Economic Survey, Islamabad.
2. Statistics Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Statistics, Federal Bureau of Statistics, [Government of Pakistan](#) (various issues). Pakistan Statistical Year Book (Various Issues), Karachi.
3. Statistics Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Statistics, Federal Bureau of Statistics, [Government of Pakistan](#) (various issues). Pakistan Demographic Survey, Karachi.
4. World Bank Group, Governance Matters 2009: Worldwide Governance Indicators 1996-2008
5. [http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc\\_countries.asp](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc_countries.asp)
6. Transparency International, Global Corruption Barometer (various issues).
7. Transparency International Pakistan, National Corruption Survey (Various years)
8. World Development Indicators, CR-Rom version 2008. World Bank



## ANNEXURE 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATION

INSTITUTION:-----

### 1.1: Program Assessment: (Extensive Browsing and Interviews)

(Information for selected universities will be collected through extensive browsing of websites and prospectus. If information is not available interviews can be arranged with respective heads/deans, directors, principals, registrars, administrative staff and controller examination depending on the nature of information required)

		Economics	Political Science	Public Administration	Civics
<b>Student Information:</b>					
Admission criteria: Please write or tick in space	Past academic record only				
	Test : GMAT/GRE/Own test				
	Interview				
	Combination of the three				
No. of candidates applied for admission					
No. of candidates selected and admitted					
No. of students who joined the program					
No of existing students					
Average class size (in terms of no. of students)					
Graduating students					
No of students admitted on Merit Scholarship					
% of students getting scholarship					

	Economics		Political Science		Public Administration		Civics	
<b>Program Structure:</b>	<b>(C)= No. of courses (CH)=Credit hours</b>							
<b>Course Categories and Course Contents:</b>	(C)	(CH)	(C)	(CH)	(C)	(CH)	(C)	(CH)
Duration of the program (years)								
No. of the semesters in the program								
Total no. of courses (C) and credit hours (CH)								
No. of courses with theoretical content								
No. of courses with applied content								
No. of courses with research content								
No. of courses with practical training content like internship, on the job training etc.								
Compulsory thesis and its credit hours								
Compulsory internship and its credit hours								
No. of compulsory courses and their credit hours								
No. of elective/interdisciplinary courses and their credit hours								
No. of core/major courses and their credit hours								

<b>output indicators: (Interviews)</b>		<b>Economics</b>	<b>Political Science</b>	<b>Public Administration</b>	<b>Civics</b>
No. of publications by faculty of the department in last 5 years					
No. of publications by students of the department in last 5 years					
No. of published journal/s					
No. of research projects: completed in last 5 years					
No. of research projects: ongoing					
No. of International Educational Linkages					
No. of Linkages with Industry					
Alumni club/Society: Yes/No.					
Placement center : Yes/No.					
No. of students employed within three months or before graduating					
Results: (from controller examination)					
No of students with 3.00+ CGPA	2009				
	2008				
	2007				
	2006				
	2005				
	2004				
Average CGPA					

## 1.2: Faculty: (from prospectus/web and interviews)

▪ Economics							
Designations	TA's / RA's / Student coordinators	Lecturers	Assistant Professors	Associate Professors	Professors	Visiting Faculty	Foreign Faculty from HEC
Total Number							
No. of PhDs							
Teaching Load: No. of courses per							
Foreign Qualified							

▪ Political Science							
Designations	TA's / RA's / Student coordinators	Lecturers	Assistant Professors	Associate Professors	Professors	Visiting Faculty	Foreign Faculty from HEC
Total Number							
No. of PhDs							
Teaching Load: No. of courses per semester							
Foreign Qualified							

▪ Public Administration							
Designations	TA's / RA's / Student coordinators	Lecturers	Assistant Professors	Associate Professors	Professors	Visiting Faculty	Foreign Faculty from HEC
Total Number							
No. of PhDs							
Teaching Load: No. of courses per semester							
Foreign Qualified							

▪ Civics							
Designations	TA's / RA's / Student coordinators	Lecturers	Assistant Professors	Associate Professors	Professors	Visiting Faculty	Foreign Faculty from HEC
Total Number							
No. of PhDs							
Teaching Load: No. of courses per semester							
Foreign							

### 1.3: Infrastructure

Information will be collected interviews can be arranged with respective heads, deans, directors, principals and administrative staff.				
	Economics	Political Science	Public Administration	Civics
Total area of dedicated to department (%)				
Covered area				
Uncovered area				
Estimated Spare Capacity (%) of Covered Area for Class				
Estimated Spare Capacity (%) of Covered Area for Class				
No. of Shared Computer Labs				
Total Seating Capacity of Computer Labs: Shared				
No. of Computer Labs: Independent				
Total Seating Capacity of Computer Labs: Independent				
No. of Auditoriums/Seminar Rooms: Shared				
Total Seating Capacity of Auditoriums/Seminar Rooms:				
No. of Auditoriums/Seminar Rooms: Independent				
Total Seating Capacity of Auditoriums/Seminar Rooms:				
Multimedia (No.)				
Overhead projectors (No.)				
No. of hostels for girls and boys				
Accommodation Capacity of hostels for girls and boys				
No. of Shared Computer Labs				
Total Seating Capacity of Computer Labs: Shared				
No. of Computer Labs: Independent				
Total Seating Capacity of Computer Labs: Independent				
No. of Auditoriums/Seminar Rooms: Shared				

**ANNEXURE 2: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTY**

INSTITUTION: -----

DEPARTMENT: -----

**2.1 Assessment of Teaching Capacity: Self Assessment by Faculty**

Research team of Institute of Public Policy at Beaconhouse National University, Lahore is conducting a research on Training Needs Assessment for 2 Year and Four Year Bachelors' Level Programs in Public Policy linked disciplines. The objective of the survey is to identify the training needs for public policy and governance. Your cooperation and support will be highly appreciated if you may please spare some time from your busy schedule and fill in the following questionnaire.

**1. Your Personal Information:**

Your Name and Designation: -----

Your Contact No. and E-mail address: -----

Your College/University and Department: -----

**2. Your Specialized Teaching Area of Interest:** -----

**3. Your Specialized Research Area of Interest:** -----

**4. Your Research Contribution:**

Total No. of Publications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ In International Journal</li><li>▪ HEC Recognized National Journals</li></ul>	
No. of Theses Supervised	
No. of administration supported trainings attended	
Research Projects you participated in	
Consultancy services provided	

**5. Your Qualifications:** (Please encircle that applies to you)

	<b>Graduation/Masters (16 years of education)</b>	<b>Masters (18 years of education)</b>	<b>MS /M. Phil (17-18 years of education)</b>	<b>PhD</b>	<b>Professional Degree (Please Specify)</b>
Specialization (Subject)					

**6. Your Teaching Experience and Research:** (Please encircle that applies to you)

Experience	Level	Institutions	Years of Experience					
			<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
Teaching	PhD		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
	MS/M Phil (17-18 years of education)		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
	Masters (18 Years of education)		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
	Bachelor/Master (16 years of education)		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
	Bachelor (14 years of education)		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
	Intermediate		<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10
Research			<2	> 2	<5	>5	<10	>10

**7. What percentage of time you spend on the following (Estimated):**

Teaching -----%      Administration -----%      Research -----%

### **8. Your Teaching Skills:**

Teaching Skills	Please rate your teaching skills				
	Not satisfied	Rarely satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Much satisfied	Fully satisfied
	0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
1. Knowledge of the subject	1	2	3	4	5
2. Organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5
3. Clarity in communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
4. Effective delivery of concepts	1	2	3	4	5
5. Satisfactory response to questions of the students	1	2	3	4	5
6. Fair student assessment/evaluation and timely feedback	1	2	3	4	5
7. Class discipline	1	2	3	4	5
8. Relevance of course contents	1	2	3	4	5
9. Timely course coverage	1	2	3	4	5
10. Focus on defined learning outcomes and objectives	1	2	3	4	5



**9. Your Teaching Methods:**

S.No.	Teaching Methods	How frequently you use the teaching method. Please encircle that applies to you					Please encircle that applies to you	
		Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Where do you feel training can help you?	
1	Conventional Lectures	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
2	Case Studies Method	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
3	Directed Reading	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
4	Research Seminars/	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
5	Interactive Group	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
6	Problem Solving	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No

**10. Your Student Evaluation/Assessment Methods:**

S.No.	Assessment Methods	How frequently you use the assessment method. Please encircle that applies to you					Please encircle that applies to you	
		Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	Where do you feel training can help you?	
1	Conventional Examination	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
2	Research Assignments/Projects	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
3	Quizzes	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
4	Class Participation	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
5	Group Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
6	Individual Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No

**10. Your Over All Self Assessment: Training Needs**

Please encircle that applies to you

S. No.	Please evaluate the following	Not	Rarely	Moderately	Much	Fully
		satisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied	satisfied
		0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
1	Your research work	1	2	3	4	5
2	Your existing qualifications	1	2	3	4	5
3	Your teaching methods	1	2	3	4	5
4	Your teaching skills	1	2	3	4	5
5	Existing academic infrastructure available	1	2	3	4	5
6	Existing non-academic infrastructure available	1	2	3	4	5
7	Teachers trainings arranged by your own	1	2	3	4	5
12	Your salary	1	2	3	4	5
13	Your promotion	1	2	3	4	5
14	Research facilitation by your institution	1	2	3	4	5
15	Recognition for your work/contribution	1	2	3	4	5

S.No.	Academic Programs	In which of the academic programs offered purely in public policy and governance <b>did you ever participate?</b>		In which of the academic programs if offered purely in public policy and governance do you <b>like to participate in future?</b>	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Short Training Course	Yes	No	Yes	No
2	MS/M. Phil	Yes	No	Yes	No
3	PhD	Yes	No	Yes	No
4	Post Doctoral Program	Yes	No	Yes	No

**11. Where would you like to participate in fully funded academic programs offered purely in public policy and governance to address issues in public policy and governance in Pakistan? (Please encircle that applies to you)**

- At some foreign institution
- At some home country institution
- At some home country institution offered with full support of invited foreign faculty
- Partly at home institution and partly at some foreign institution Or
- You would like to participate at some foreign or home institution on self finance basis

**11. Your Course Outline:**

Does your course outline include the following?

	<b>Please encircle that applies to you</b>	
<b>1. Clearly defined course objectives</b>	Yes	No
<b>2. Clearly defined learning</b>	Yes	No
<b>3. Course description</b>	Yes	No
<b>4. Reading list</b>	Yes	No
<b>5. Teaching methods</b>	Yes	No
<b>6. Class room requirements</b>	Yes	No
<b>7. Student evaluation/assessment</b>	Yes	No
<b>8. Your contact/consulting hours</b>	Yes	No
<b>9. Lesson plan for the semester</b>	Yes	No
<b>Is your course outline distributed at start of the semester?</b>	Yes	No

## 2.2: Student Preparedness: Assessment by Faculty

S. No.	Skills or learning Outcomes of Graduates	Please encircle that applies to you at a scale from 1-5. 1=low 5= high										Your Remarks or Suggestions for
		How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>relevant to your academic</b>					How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>delivered by your academic</b>					
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Knowledge of Current Issues in the	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	Knowledge of relevant Institutions	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	Problem-Solving	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	Resource Management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	Leadership & Responsible	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6.	Decision-Making	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
7.	Research and Analytical	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
8.	Critical Thinking	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
9.	Creative Thinking & Visioning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
10	Teamwork & Interpersonal	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
11	Communicating through Evolving	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
12	Quantitative Skills (Mathematical	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
13	Computer Applications	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
14	Effective Communication	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
15	Reading	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
16	Writing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
17	Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
18	Listening	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
19	Preparedness for higher studies	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
20	Employability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	

### **2.3: Program Assessment: Assessment by Faculty**

S. No.	How much improvement do you	Need for improvement in perceived percentage						Your Remarks or Suggestions
		Please encircle that applies to you						
		0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
1	Clarity in predefined objectives of the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
2	Clarity in predefined learning outcomes and	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
3	Program structure	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
4	Content of courses	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
5	Need to add more courses to the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
6	Need to drop some courses from program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
7	Quality of student intake	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
8	Quality of graduates	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
9	Employability of graduates of the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
10	Achievement of defined learning outcomes	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
11	Practical application of knowledge to real world	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
12	Critical thinking among students	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
13	Learning of ethical and professional values	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
14	Supportive Administration	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
15	Focus on English language skills							

## 2.4: Infrastructure: Assessment by Faculty

Please encircle that applies to you

How much improvement do you suggest in the following?	Need for improvement in perceived percentage						Please indicate whether improvement is required in quantity or quality or in both			Your Remarks or Suggestions for Improvement
<b>Academic facilities:</b>							<b>Quanti</b>	<b>Qualit</b>	<b>Bot</b>	
1. Faculty	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
2. Library: books and	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
3. Library: Electronic	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
4. Computer	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
5. Internet facility	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
6. Research labs	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
7. Research staff	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
8. Multimedia	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
9. Overhead	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
10. Class rooms	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
11. Educational	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
<b>Non-academic facilities:</b>										
1. Furniture	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
2. Administrative staff	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
3. Facilities for Co-	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
4. Hostel facilities	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
5. Cafeteria	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
6. Auditoriums/semin	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	

**ANNEXURE 3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS**

INSTITUTION: .....

DEPARTMENT: .....

**3.1: Teaching Capacity: Assessment by Students**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Male/Female: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Current CGPA: \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Teaching Skills:**

Teaching Skills	Please rate your teaching skills				
	Not satisfied	Rarely satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Much satisfied	Fully satisfied
	0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
1. Knowledge of the subject	1	2	3	4	5
2. Organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5
3. Clarity in communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
4. Effective delivery of concepts	1	2	3	4	5
5. Satisfactory response to questions of the	1	2	3	4	5
6. Fair student assessment/evaluation and timely	1	2	3	4	5
7. Class discipline	1	2	3	4	5
8. Relevance of course contents	1	2	3	4	5
9. Timely course coverage	1	2	3	4	5
10. Focus on defined learning outcomes and	1	2	3	4	5

**Faculty Teaching Methods:**

S.No.	Teaching Methods	How frequently the teaching method is used. Please encircle that applies to you					Please encircle that applies to you				
		Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	How satisfied you are with Teaching Method? 1=low and 5=high				
1	Conventional Lectures	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2	Case Studies Method	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3	Directed Reading Method	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4	Seminars/Research Workshops	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5	Interactive Group Discussion	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6	Problem Solving Method	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

**Student Evaluation/Assessment Methods:**

S.No.	Assessment Methods	How frequently the assessment method is used. Please encircle that applies to you					Please encircle that applies to you				
		Never	Rarely	Often	Most Frequently	Only This method	How satisfied you are with Assessment Method? 1=low and 5=high				
1	Conventional Examination	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2	Research	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3	Quizzes	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4	Class Participation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5	Group Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6	Individual Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5



### 3.2: Student Preparedness: Assessment by Students

S. No.	Skills or learning Outcomes of Graduates	Please encircle that applies to you at a scale from 1-5. 1=low 5= high										Your Remarks or Suggestions for Improvement
		How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>relevant to your academic</b>					How much do you feel is the skill/learning outcome <b>delivered by your academic</b>					
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Knowledge of Current	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	Knowledge of relevant	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	Problem-Solving	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	Resource Management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	Leadership &	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6.	Decision-Making	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
7.	Research and Analytical	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
8.	Critical Thinking	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
9.	Creative Thinking &	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
10.	Teamwork &	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
11.	Communicating through	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
12.	Quantitative Skills	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
13.	Computer Applications	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
14.	Effective Communication	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
15.	Reading	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
16.	Writing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
17.	Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
18.	Listening	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
19.	Preparedness for higher	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
20.	Employability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	

### 3.3: Program Assessment: Assessment by Students

S.No.	How much improvement do you suggest in the	Need for improvement in perceived percentage Please encircle that applies to you						Your Remarks or Suggestions for Improvement
		0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
1	Clarity in predefined objectives of the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
2	Clarity in predefined learning outcomes and	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
3	Program structure	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
4	Content of courses	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
5	Need to add more courses to the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
6	Need to drop some courses from program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
7	Quality of student intake	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
8	Quality of graduates	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
9	Employability of graduates of the program	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
10	Achievement of defined learning outcomes	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
11	Practical application of knowledge to real world	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
12	Critical thinking among students	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
13	Learning of ethical and professional values	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
14	Supportive Administration	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	
15	Focus on English language skills	0%	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	

### 3.4 Infrastructure: Assessment by Students

Please encircle that applies to you

How much improvement do you suggest in the following?	Need for improvement in perceived percentage						Please indicate whether improvement is required in quantity or quality or in both			Your remarks or suggestions for improvement
	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	Quanti	Qualit	Bot	
<b>Academic facilities:</b>										
1. Faculty	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
2. Library: books and	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
3. Library: Electronic	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
4. Computer	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
5. Internet facility	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
6. Research labs	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
7. Research staff	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
8. Multimedia	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
9. Overhead	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
10. Class rooms	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
11. Educational	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
<b>Non-academic facilities:</b>										
1. Furniture	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
2. Administrative staff	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
3. Facilities for Co-	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
4. Hostel facilities	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
5. Cafeteria	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	
6. Auditoriums/semin	0	1-	21-	41-	61-	81-	1	2	3	

## **Annexure 4**

### **THE RESEARCH TEAM**

The research team consists of the Institute of Policy Policy (IPP) research staff and faculty of Department of Economics of Beaconhouse National University, Lahore. The team from BNU/IPP will consist of the following:

**Mr. Ijaz Hussain:** Mr. Hussain is Assistant Professor of Economics in BNU. He is officiating Head of Department of Economics His area of expertise is financial economics.

**Mr. Tahir Sadiq:** Mr. Tahir Sadiq is Lecturer of Economics in BNU and also works as a Researcher at IPP. His area of expertise is Economics of Education and Industrial Organization.

**Ms. Smbal Rana:** Ms. Smbal Rana is currently working as Assistant Lecturer of Economics at BNU and has recently qualified her MS in Public Policy.

**Research Assistant (Ayesha Khalid):**