

DRAFT FINAL REPORT (21-03-2002)

**TASK FORCE ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF
HIGHER EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN**
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Ministry of Education
Government of Pakistan

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements	3
Preface	6
Executive Summary	8
Section1: INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Economic Importance of Higher Education	14
2.0 Effectiveness of Higher Education in Pakistan	14
3.0 Past Educational Policies and Plans	15
4.0 Outcome of the Policies and Five-Year Plans	16
5.0 Conclusion	17
6.0 Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise	18
7.0 Establishment of the Task Force	19
8.0 Work of the Task Force	20
9.0 Vision Statement	20
10.0 Meetings	20
Section 2: SITUATION ANALYSIS	
1.0 System of Higher Education	22
2.0 Higher Education in the Private Sector	24
3.0 The Continuum of Education	25
4.0 Problems in Higher Education	26
5.0 Politicization	26
6.0 Inadequate Funding	27
7.0 Performance of Higher Education	28
8.0 Conclusion	29
9.0 Organizational Structure of Public Universities	29
Section 3: RECOMMENDATIONS	
1.0 Principles Underlying Recommendations of the Task Force	33
2.0 Governance of Universities	34
3.0 Functions of the Governing Board	34
4.0 Membership of the Governing Board	35
5.0 Management of Universities	36
6.0 Executive Council	37
7.0 Management of Academic Functions	37
8.0 Academic Council	39
9.0 Faculty and Staff Appointments and Conditions of Service	40
10.0 Central Co-ordination and Support for Quality	40
11.0 Higher Education Commission (HEC)	42
12.0 Governance of the HEC	42
13.0 Board of Governors of the HEC	44

14.0 Management of the HEC	45
15.0 National Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance	46
16.0 Funding and Financial Management	46
17.0 Tuition Fees	48
18.0 Research	49
19.0 Colleges	50
20.0 Curriculum Related Matters	51
21.0 National Education Testing Service	52
22.0 Conditions for a Charter to Award Degrees	52
Section 4: THE WAY AHEAD	
1.0 Implementation Process	56
2.0 Matters Requiring Further Work	56
3.0 Conclusion	56
Section 5: APPENDICES	
1. Sources of Reference	58
2. Task Force Meetings	59
3. Committees of the Task Force	60
4. Subjects Discussed in Seminars	62
5. Profile of Seminar Participants	64
6. Educational Institutions Represented at the Seminars	65
7. Development Expenditure on Education in Five Year Plans	67
8. Past Education Policies	68
9. Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan: (World Bank Report, 1990)	74
10. Key Principles of Financial Management (Boston Group)	75

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledging individually all of the many contributors to the discussions of the Task Force is a difficult undertaking, as there is the danger of unwitting oversight. With that caveat, acknowledgements are first and foremost due to all members of the Task Force for the time and effort that they devoted to the task at hand. Everyone actively contributed to the deliberations and enriched the final output.

We thank the seminar participants from across the country who provided valuable insights, and their inputs worked as a guide to the Task Force in remaining focused on the issues of concern and keeping the ground realities in mind.

We are very grateful to the Federal Minister for Education, Ms. Zobaida Jalal, whose initiative resulted in the formation of the Task Force. The Minister participated in several meetings and provided support and valuable guidance throughout. We also acknowledge the participation, encouragement and advice provided by the Governors of Sindh and Balochistan, the Federal Minister for Science and Technology, the Governor, State Bank of Pakistan, the Sindh Minister for Finance, Planning, and Development, the Punjab Minister for Education, and numerous other officials.

The convenors and members of the Task Force Committees (Appendix 3) put in many additional hours deliberating on issues of central importance, especially those deliberating on governance and management of higher education. Their outputs served as working documents that provided grist for the Task Force deliberations. Captain (R) U.A. G. Isani and Dr. Latif Virk provided useful information and analysis on higher education in Pakistan. The latter also carefully recorded the proceedings of the meetings. Dr. A.Q. Mughal and his colleagues at the University Grants Commission were generous in providing institutional support.

The Task Force appreciates the contributions and the extensive work done by The Boston Group and presented in its report “*Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards a Reform Agenda*”. This was an important input, and we expect this to be a precursor of future collaborations between expatriate Pakistanis and local efforts.

The Task Force secretariats at the Aga Khan University and the Lahore University of Management Sciences facilitated the work of the Task Force. Thanks are especially due to Dr. Arif Ali Zaidi and Dr. Imran Anwar Ali who co-ordinated the functions of the Task Force at these two Secretariats.

The World Bank provided funds for the work of the Task Force¹. Its report (co-sponsored with UNESCO) on ‘Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise’ triggered the process that led to the establishment of this Task Force, and often served as a guide to its deliberations. The encouragement and inputs of Drs. Henry Rosovsky and David Bloom, who participated in the initial deliberations on higher education in developing countries at Lahore and Karachi in February 2001, are deeply appreciated.

¹ Task Force on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan, notified by the Minister of Education, Government of Pakistan in April 2001.

Acknowledgement

The Task Force acknowledges the many others who have played a critical supportive role in facilitating its work.

Mr. Adil Ahmad's contributions for putting together the ingredients of this report need special mention. And finally, Drs. Camer Vellani, Tariq Banuri, S. Zulfiqar Gilani and Khalid Hamid Sheikh gave words to the rich and complex output of the Task Force and attempted to encapsulate all of that into the coherent whole that is before you.

Syed Babar Ali
Co-chair

Dr. Shams Kassim-Lakha
Co-chair

Composition of the Task Force

Co-Chairs

Syed Babar Ali, *Pro-Chancellor, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore*

Dr. Shams Kassim-Lakha, *President, The Aga Khan University, Karachi*

Members

Dr. Imran Anwar Ali, *Dean, Research & Publications, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore*

Mr. Tariq Farooq, *Secretary, Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad*

Dr. S. Zulfiqar Hussain Gilani, *Vice Chancellor, University of Peshawar, Peshawar*

Captain (R) Usman A. G. Isani, *Vice Chancellor, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad*

Mr. Mohammad Ibrahim Khan, *Joint Educational Adviser (Higher Education Wing), Ministry of Education, Islamabad*

Mr. Hunaid Hussain Lakhani, *Chancellor, Iqra University, Karachi*

Lt. Gen. (R) Arshad Mahmood, *Vice Chancellor, University of the Punjab, Lahore*

Dr. S. Qasim Mehdi, *Representative of the Ministry of Science & Technology, Islamabad (Director General Biomedical & Genetic Engineering Division, A. Q. Khan Research Laboratories)*

Dr. A. Q. Mughal, *Acting Chairman, University Grants Commission, Islamabad*

Dr. Najma Najam, *Vice Chancellor, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi*

Justice (R) M. A. Rashid, *Vice Chancellor, University of Balochistan, Quetta*

Dr. Zafar Saied Saifee, *Vice Chancellor, University of Karachi, Karachi*

Dr. Khalid Hamid Sheikh, *Chief Executive Officer, Babar Ali Foundation, & former Vice Chancellor, University of the Punjab, Lahore*

Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haq Siddiqui, *Vice Chancellor, University of Sindh, Jamshoro. [Before July 2001, Dr. R.A. Shah, the then Vice Chancellor of the University of Sindh, was a member of the Task Force]*

Dr. Camer Vellani, *Rector, The Aga Khan University, Karachi*

Acknowledgement

The Task Force has been ably and amply assisted in its deliberations by the Boston Group.

The Boston Group is an informal think tank of Pakistanis abroad, comprising scholars, educationists, researchers, professionals and activists interested in contributing to policy discussions on Pakistan's development, particularly improvement of higher education. The following contributed to the report: Dr. Khurram Khan Afridi, Dr. Anila Asghar, Dr. Tariq Banuri, Irfan Ullah Chaudhary, Duriya Farooqui, Prof. Asim Ijaz Khwaja, Dr. Salal Humair, Prof. Adil Najam, Farhan Rana, Hasan Usmani and Bilal Zuberi. The following participated in discussion and analysis that strengthened the report: Roohi Abdullah, Barry Hoffman, Masood Ahmed Khan, Dr. Malik M.A. Khan, Bilal Musharraf, Shahid Ahmed Khan, Dr. Musadik Malik, Prof. Atif Mian, Prof. Khalid Saeed, Mahjabeen Quadri, Rizwan Tufail, Dr. Naheed Usmani, and Shundana Yusaf.

PREFACE

No society has prospered without significant and sustained investment in higher education. Today, as the world becomes increasingly interconnected, higher education is considered critical for the achievement of economic progress, political stability and peace. However, in Pakistan, higher education ill-prepares the students for the challenges that lie ahead. Of course, it must be acknowledged that the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of higher education cannot be determined independently of the state of education as a whole.

Thus, it is heartening to witness a firm commitment on the part of the Government to improve education generally; the plan for Education Sector Reform (ESR) 2001, of which higher education is a component, is a signal of worthy intent. Unfortunately, realisation of the intent is troubled with uncertainty.

Uncertainty results not only from doubt about the availability of funds for investment in so vital a purpose as development of human resources for the country but also about the willingness of the play-actors, consisting of professionals and administrators, to effect change, even when fortified with knowledge that improvement will bring about better conditions for society.

Perhaps, seemingly unreasonable resistance to change is a natural phenomenon and ours can be classified as a normal experience. Or, is there another reality; that the phenomenon is a natural expression of lack of conviction based on limited reasoning and consequently stunted adaptability? If this is true, then we may expect different behaviors in the future through appropriate education at every level for all.

In response to the academic community's request, which was stimulated by the World Bank publication of an International Task Force report on Higher Education in Developing Countries, the Federal Minister for Education constituted a Task Force, in April 2001, to review higher education in Pakistan and recommend ways of improving its quality. This move, notwithstanding the real threat of potential redundancy due to insurmountable hurdles resisting change, is entirely consistent with the Government's strategic plan for development of society.

The Task Force has been privileged to undertake this assignment. Its recommendations are essentially generic, the principles being applicable to institutions in both public and private sectors. However, of necessity the Task Force had to consider in greater detail the conditions and operations of institutions in the public sector since they enroll more than 85% of the students in higher education. This report has been prepared for the Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, after extensive consultation within the country, involving academicians, students, parents, employers, administrators, Ministers and Governors, and deliberation over seven months. Its recommendations were presented to the President of Pakistan on January 11, 2002, which, it is gratifying to note, resulted in the decision to constitute the Steering Committee on Higher Education to develop modalities for implementing these recommendations, as well as the creation of the Higher Education Commission proposed by the Task Force.

The report records our understanding of the diverse interdependent courses of the current hapless state of higher education and the interventions required for improvement. These have been

presented in four sections, as follows: Section 1 indicates the need for restructuring higher education for the future of Pakistan; Section 2 analyses the situation of higher education in Pakistan; Section 3 presents the recommendations of the Task Force; and Section 4 suggests a way of moving forward with implementation.

Respectfully submitted by the Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Government of Pakistan has demonstrated a heightened sense of commitment to improving the effectiveness of education through its programme of Education Sector Reform (2001) that includes higher education, and this is further evidenced by the establishment of the Task Force.
- 1.2 While universal literacy and primary education have been in the forefront of development priorities in the past, the pressing need to benefit from the new knowledge-based economy has placed an unprecedented premium on higher education.
- 1.3 Pakistan's higher education system, encompassing all levels above grade 12, is proving unable to provide the skills necessary, in the quantities necessary, to achieve the dual objectives of nation building and global competitiveness.

2.0 THE TASK FORCE ON IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- 2.1 Stimulated by the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force Report, titled '*Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*' (2000), the academic community assembled in Lahore and Karachi in February 2001 to consider its recommendations and felt the need for a task force for improvement of higher education in Pakistan.
- 2.2 The Task Force was notified by the Federal Minister for Education on April 29, 2001. The membership of the Task Force is a private-public partnership comprising 17 leaders of higher education, Co-Chaired by Syed Babar Ali (Pro-Chancellor of the Lahore University of Management Sciences) and Dr. Shamsh Kassim-Lakha (President of the Aga Khan University, Karachi).
- 2.3 The terms of reference required an in-depth study of higher education and recommendations for improvement, with special reference to systems of quality assurance and accreditation, funding and financial sustainability, effective governance and management.
- 2.4 The Task Force reviewed the recommendations of seven past education commissions and policies and followed a consultative process through seminars across the country, extending over seven months, and involving more than 400 stakeholders including teachers, students, parents, alumni, employers, and government officials.

3.0 KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 The stakeholders have identified a list of longstanding maladies afflicting higher education in Pakistan. The most prominent amongst the issues identified are:
 - a) Ineffective governance and management structures and practices
 - b) Inefficient use of available resources

- c) Inadequate funding
- d) Poor recruitment practices and inadequate development of faculty and staff
- e) Inadequate attention to research and support for it
- f) Politicisation of faculty, staff and students
- g) Strong scepticism about the realisation of reform

4.0 VISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- 4.1 Based on the observations of the participants of the seminars, and the vision expressed in the programme for Education Sector Reform (2001), the following vision statement has emerged:

Transformation of our institutions of higher education into world class seats of learning, equipped to foster high quality education, scholarship and research, to produce enlightened citizens with strong moral and ethical values that build a tolerant and pluralistic society rooted in the culture of Pakistan.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

In the limited time available for this major exercise, the Task Force has identified for immediate attention of policy makers the following crucial strategic recommendations that apply principally to universities and can bring about significant change, providing a solid platform for introducing additional reforms. The recommendations are based on principles that apply to both public and private sector institutions.

5.1 *University Governance and Management*

- 5.1.1 Universities are the pillars of the higher education system. They must have autonomy from all extraneous influences in order to govern and manage their academic, administrative, and financial functions. In particular, universities must have autonomy to develop their academic programmes; recruit, assess, and develop their faculty; and select, train and educate their students. The present organisational structure, including the Senates and Syndicates, has too many weaknesses of which the principal one is an inadequate separation of governance from the functions and responsibilities of management.
- 5.1.2 In order to ensure accountability for institutional performance, each university must have a strong and independent governing or policy making body that may be called a Governing Board (GB) appointed by the Chancellor from candidates nominated by a nominating committee of the Board, and an independent system of management that is accountable to it. The Chief Executive Officer of the university (Vice Chancellor or Rector or President) must be identified through a formal and open search process, and appointed by the Chancellor from a selection of candidates recommended by the GB.

5.2 *Central Coordination and Support for Quality*

The University Grants Commission (UGC) was established in 1974 by an Act of Parliament for maintaining standards of education and uniform policy aimed at bringing about national unity and cohesion. Assessment of financial needs of universities, disbursement of grants, and building institutional capacity are also amongst its functions. With no control on funding the UGC nevertheless serves as a transmitter of the universities' annual budgetary requests to the Ministry of Education and distributor of Federal government's grants to the universities, generally less than requested and not always delivered on time. This has contributed to the erosion of its credibility with universities.

5.2.2 The Task Force recommends that a central body is needed for facilitating quality assurance of higher education in both the public and private sectors, and linking funding by the Federal Government for public universities to the quality of performance, akin to the principle used by the Higher Education Funding Council for England.

5.2.3 The central body is conceptualised as the focal component of a network of independently governed institutions that provides diversity of expertise and promotes synergy and efficient utilisation of the country's resources for higher education and research. It is conceptually different from the UGC and would replace it, and would be called the Higher Education Commission (HEC), with the following salient features:

To plan, develop and accredit public and private sector institutions of higher education.

- b) To raise funds for itself and for higher education.
- c) The HEC would be governed and managed independently as an autonomous body linked to the Ministry of Education.
- d) HEC should have the capability of receiving, managing and being accountable for block grants provided by the Ministry of Finance.
- e) In order to ensure accountability for institutional performance, the HEC must have a strong and independent Board of Governors appointed by the President from candidates nominated by a nominating committee of the Board, and an independent system of management that is accountable to it.
- f) The Chairman of the Board, functioning in an honorary capacity, should have the rank of a Minister of State.
- j)
 - g) The appointment of the Chairman and members of the Board, as well as the Chief Executive Officer, should be based on merit, free from political, bureaucratic or other extraneous influence.
 - h) The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the only full-time Board member, must be identified through a formal search process, and appointed by the President from a selection of candidates recommended by the Board of Governors.

5.3 *Funding*

- 5.3.1 Universities in Pakistan require significantly more financial resources than the current allocations. In the proposed higher education system, with improved financial management, provision for funding should be made through an annual review of a three year rolling budget, and the development of permanent sources of support such as endowments.
- 5.3.2 Further study is required to determine the financial requirements for improving the quality of higher education in colleges.
- 5.3.3 Funding from the Federal Government to all public sector universities for recurrent costs in 2001-2002 is Rs 2.9 billion (salaries, 75%; utilities, 8%); in addition, the developmental grant is Rs. 0.4 billion. The allocation for research is Rs 0.04 billion, 1.2% of the total grant. The self-generated income of universities is approximately Rs 3.2 billion. Thus, the total funds available are about Rs 6.5 billion. The Task Force recommends an enhancement of the Government grant by Rs. 5 billion annually in order to improve recruitment and retention of competent and qualified faculty and staff; develop infrastructure for research; provide adequate libraries, electronic access to information and communication, equipment and maintenance; and refurbish the dilapidated physical facilities.
- 5.3.4 The Task Force recommends that the Provincial Governments should also contribute to the funding of universities.
- 5.3.5 Creation of a national endowment of Rs. 20 billion will provide about Rs. 1.6 billion annually to support research, faculty and staff development, and facilitate financial assistance to deserving students.
- 5.3.6 Tuition and fees, which currently cover a rather small portion of costs, should reflect the real cost of an educational programme, but should neither be the main source of institutional funding nor an impediment to access for those who cannot afford the cost of education and subsistence. The full cost of the academic programmes should be stated in the student's bill, with institutional subsidies clearly indicated, so that students and parents are made aware of the extensive support they are receiving.
- 5.3.7 Fund-raising by individual universities must take place, and the Government should provide matching grants as an incentive, as is the case in most parts of the world.
- 5.3.8 Government should provide greater incentives for philanthropy, including tax exemptions and other fiscal concessions for donations and creation of endowments.

5.4 *Faculty and Staff*

- 5.4.1 Current emoluments are grossly inadequate to recruit and retain good quality faculty and staff. Emoluments should be de-linked from the Government's Basic Pay Scales, and should be appropriate for recruitment and retention of quality teachers and staff. Provision for in-service training is a critical requirement for improved performance.

5.5 *Research*

5.5.1 Research is conspicuous by its absence in our seats of higher learning. Research is a critical activity and must be assigned a high priority by making a major annual allocation of funds, creation of endowments for long term sustainability and, above all, an enabling environment. The capacity of faculty and students for research should be enhanced.

5.5.2 Linkages with business and industry are almost non-existent. They are essential not only for employment of graduates but also for relevance of curricula and research, and should be accorded a high priority. In addition, synergy should be sought through financial incentives provided by the government to encourage funding of higher education.

5.6 *Curriculum*

5.6.1 Serious reconsideration should be given to the current practice of early specialisation in schools (starting in grade 8), and the inclusion of general education in programmes in order to prepare candidates for critical and moral reasoning, effective communication, and self-directed life-long learning. Such enrichment of curricula will encourage good citizenship, adaptability, and innovation, thereby facilitating the continuous renewal of economic and social structures relevant to a fast-changing world.

5.6.2 There is a felt need to develop a long term strategy for higher education if Pakistan, a nation of 140 million people, is to become competitive in the rapidly emerging global economy, and occupy its rightful leadership role in the Muslim *Ummah*. For international comparability, universities should aim for awarding a Bachelor's degree after 16 years of education instead of the current requirement of 14 years. Initially, a 4-year Honours Bachelor's degree should be an essential requirement for admission to a Master's programme.

6.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS ON ADDITIONAL ASSIGNMENTS**

In addition to its formal Terms of Reference, the Task Force was asked to consider the following issues by the Chief Executive's Secretariat.

6.1 *National Education Testing Service (NETS)*

6.1.1 The Task Force does not favour the establishment of NETS. It feels that the long term and sustainable solution lies in reliable assessment of school education. The current Senior Secondary Certificate (SSC) and Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) examinations test for memorisation and recall, thereby promoting rote learning, which is detrimental for understanding and application of knowledge, and poor preparation for higher education.

It would be more appropriate to provide a reliable alternative examination system at the SSC and HSC levels that can significantly improve education in general rather than to establish a national testing service for the purpose of selecting candidates for higher education. Such an

initiative to promote improvement of school education could be accomplished through a private-public endeavour.

To screen the student stream entering universities, the universities should develop and implement their own entrance examinations.

6.2 *National Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance (NCAQA)*

6.2.1 The Task Force does not favour the establishment of the Council and recommends that the HEC undertake the role of accreditation as a component of its quality assurance function.

6.3 *Ministerial Responsibility for Higher Education*

6.3.1 The Task Force is of the view that education must remain with a single ministry, the Ministry of Education, while drawing resources from across the board. Education is a continuum across primary, secondary, higher secondary, and tertiary levels. Its generic purposes are not discipline specific. The support and accountability for educational functions, whether in the domains of knowledge concerning natural, biological, numerical, and social sciences, and humanities, are logically the responsibilities of the Ministry of Education.

6.4 *Conditions for Degree-Awarding Institutions in the Private Sector*

6.4.1 Considering the importance of the long-term viability of institutions of higher education and their impact on society and nation building, the Task Force recommends close scrutiny of the credentials of sponsors of new institutions in the private sector, effective provisions for accountability, transparency of governance and management, and maintenance of their quality. Although the recommendations of the Task Force were requested for institutions in the private sector, the principles are also valid and recommended for application to degree-awarding institutions in the public sector.

7.0 **ISSUES REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP**

7.1 In the limited time available the Task Force also discussed the following important issues, but considers that they need to be studied further:

Curricula

Review of colleges with regard to their functions, funding, governance, and management

Professional education and its relationship to universities, and quality assurance by the HEC and professional councils

Funding requirements of institutions of higher education in the light of the restructured system

Requirements for supporting research in universities

Assessment of academic achievement, and its use for the selection of students for higher education

Development of a reliable database on higher education

8.0 IMPLEMENTATION

- 8.1 The Task Force recommends the appointment of a Steering Committee in order to develop a plan for implementation in accordance with the recommendations, to oversee the drafting of necessary legislation and establish the HEC.
- 8.2 The implementation should be phased, beginning with the establishment of the HEC. While this activity is in progress, and the universities Act amended to accommodate the structural reforms recommended by the Task Force, universities should be made the focal point of reforms, and encouraged to improve the efficiency of their management, and review the membership of their structures under the current universities Acts, and be provided appropriate guidance.
- 8.3 The search for identifying appropriate candidates for the Boards of Governors of the HEC and universities should begin.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The Task Force firmly believes that implementation of the recommended changes, the principles of which apply to both public and private institutions, will result in significant improvement in the quality of higher education in Pakistan.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Economic Importance of Higher Education

- 1.1 Of all the economic growth initiatives available to the Government of Pakistan, perhaps none holds more promise and the possibility of large scale and sustainable returns than the effectiveness and expansion of the Higher Education infrastructure in Pakistan. This does not mean that the value of education is limited only to economic development. Its value extends -- and is universally viewed as extending -- well beyond its impact on economic performance, to encompass greater social impact contributing to a just, democratic, and enlightened society.
- 1.2 In considering the case for investment in higher education, the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force on *Higher Education in Developing Countries* emphasised economic growth and better living standards; development of enlightened leaders; expansion of choices, enabling social mobility and helping the talented to fulfil their potential; and the capacity to address local problems with appropriate solutions, in such vital areas as environmental protection, prevention and management of illness, industrial expansion and development of infrastructure. The report observed further: *“These benefits are not automatic. They are linked to the character of higher education systems and institutions as well as to the broader social, political, and economic systems within which they are situated. Even a well-functioning higher education system, operating under the most favourable of circumstances, is not sufficient for social and economic development, but better higher education will certainly be necessary in most countries, if more vibrant development is to take place.”*²
- 1.3 The report advocates that developing countries need to invest in good education that prepares graduates for versatility and skills of life-long learning, rather than narrowly in specific disciplines, to enable them to both identify and capitalise on trends in development as they emerge during their lives.
- 1.4 This advice is consistent with the other non-economic goals of higher education: the inculcation of the values of tolerance, responsibility, enterprise, creativity, and public duty. These require an open and non-hierarchical learning environment, a common base in core subjects and curriculum, and an emphasis on practicality and relevance.

2.0 Effectiveness of Higher Education in Pakistan

- 2.1 The operating conditions of universities in Pakistan are summarised well by Dr. M. Latif Virk, as follows:

“The universities in their present form are not geared to create new knowledge, nor do their graduate-study programmes measure up to international standards..... Rapid expansion of the system (of higher education), limited financial input, and periodic student unrest have

² *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*; Report of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force On Higher Education and Society; World Bank Publication, 2000; page 92.

eroded the teaching and learning process despite the modernisation of curricula. The supply of funds to the universities is limited and coupled with inefficient use of public funds. The autonomy of the universities provided under their Acts is not only inadequate but also distorted. The research base in the universities is weak, and inadequately equipped libraries and laboratories and a shortage of qualified teachers continue to hinder the progress of higher education towards excellence.”³

- 2.2 The litany of problems outlined above by Dr. Virk and many other observers, as the Task Force discovered in its consultations with the academic community, is both long and depressing. It is not surprising therefore that students in publicly funded institutions get an education of mediocre quality, which does not prepare them to participate effectively in the economic, political, and social life of the country, leave alone the competitive global economy. Furthermore, of the population of 140 million, only 2.6 per cent of the age cohort of 17-23 years (less than 500,000) were enrolled in the colleges and universities of Pakistan (1996 figure). This is one of the lowest ratios anywhere in the world.⁴
- 2.3 Thus, the country needs very significant improvement in the quality of higher education and considerable enhancement of its capacity.

3.0 Past Educational Policies and Plans

- 3.1 *“We must recognize that Government has never provided adequate financial support for education either in absolute terms or in comparison with the effort being made in other countries. It is frequently argued that the level of support for education in Pakistan is related to the general economic position of the country and if our effort is to be judged in this light it is as much as can be managed. It is stated that because we are poor we cannot afford an extensive educational programme. There is, of course, some truth in this.... But to argue that we are too poor to support education is to argue that we must always be poor. This goes against the whole concept of economic planning.... We are spending a smaller percentage of our national income ... on education than many countries whose resources are more or less equal to our own.”⁵*
- 3.2 Ever since independence, the Government of the time has emphasised the central role of education in the social development of the country. Thus, the record is replete with policy documents on the subject. Besides the constitutional provisions on education and the relevant sections in the Five-Year Plans, the Government has developed the following major policy documents, which are outlined in Appendix 8 of this report:

Pakistan Education Conference 1947
Commission on National Education 1959
New Education Policy 1970

³ *Universities of Pakistan*; Dr. Muhammad Latif Virk; University Grants Commission publication; 1998, Page .9.

⁴ *Problems of Higher Education*; paper prepared by Capt. U.A.G. Isani and Dr. Latif Virk for the Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan, 2001.

⁵ Report of the Commission on National Education, Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, 1959, P. 340 - 341.

New Education Policy 1972
National Education Policy 1979
National Education Policy 1992
National Education Policy 1998-2010

- 3.3 In addition to this list, two other reports are significant. These are the World Bank report (1990), titled *Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan* (outlined in Appendix 9), and the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force report (2000) on *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*.

4.0 Outcome of the Policies and Five-Year Plans

- 4.1 The Task Force reviewed the impact of the past policies and plans for higher education, based on the analysis prepared by Capt. (R) U.A.G. Isani for the Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan, 2001. Analysis is given in the following paragraphs:
- 4.2 The Education Policies clearly indicate the need to reform education. However, implementation has not matched the many significant recommendations. While financial allocations have been inadequate, several recommendations that were not dependent on finance were also not implemented. For example, simplification and strengthening of administrative and academic functions through a revision of the University Act was recommended by the Commission on National Education in 1959; this matter is being presented again at length in the report of the Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan in 2002. In another example, the recommendation of the second Five-Year Plan (1960-1965) to extend the Bachelor's degree programmes in Arts, Science and Commerce from two to three years, was implemented and withdrawn because of opposition by the academic community. This change required the determination and support of political leaders. The support was not given. No mechanism for implementation was specified. The failure cannot be assigned to inadequate funds.
- 4.3 The issue of raising the quality of education has been highlighted in all of the Five-Year Plans. The authors of the Fourth Plan (1970-1975) noted that it was necessary not only to spend more money on education, training and research but also to spend it effectively. Although this need was expressed in each plan, the lack of adherence to the stated discipline was not questioned. Sadly, whatever funds were available to the Education Sector were used for quantitative expansion and not for qualitative improvement. Consequently, standards of education deteriorated. Expansion in the field of education should have been guided and planned in relation to the needs of the country for skilled human resource. However, since the planners have never been able to estimate the country's needs, the institutions of higher education have had no guidance for defining goals.
- 4.4 Regarding enhancement of financial resources, the Five-Year Plans have envisaged increasing tuition fees. Unfortunately, appropriate political support was never provided; even an increase of Rs 10 per month led to agitation on campuses by various groups supported by their related political parties.

- 4.5 The need for admission tests at the universities and colleges has been highlighted in almost every Five-Year Plan. The public universities have not adopted this policy although funding was not an issue; inability to implement the policy was due to lack of appropriate support from the leadership at higher levels.
- 4.6 It can be said, therefore, that although there has been a shortage of funds, alongside there has also been a lack of political will and a failure to realise the importance of the Education Sector as a vital instrument for national development.
- 4.7 The New Education Policy 1972, introduced a radical reform package, of which the centrepiece was nationalisation of private educational institutions. While the ostensible intent was to narrow inequities in access to education, the actual result was the commitment of the government to a role for which it was ill-prepared, adversely affecting the standards of education and raising non-development expenditure six folds. In the Higher Education Sector, six new universities were established, increasing the number from 6 to 12. The enrolment in universities rose by 56%, from 15,500 to 24,000. During 1971-1978, enrolment at all levels of education increased but the goals of universal basic education, shift towards agro-technical studies, and ideological orientation were not met due to unrest in educational institutions and unprecedented political activities in them.
- 4.8 The National Education Policy of 1979 introduced the use of the national language, Urdu, as a medium of instruction, partly as a way of strengthening the ideological foundations of the nation, and partly in order to reduce the handicap faced by those from modest backgrounds. Yet, while the handicap may have been mitigated as far as the examination system is concerned, it has been reinforced in terms of the opportunities for professional success. At the same time, the policy of nationalisation was reversed and the private sector was encouraged to open schools. Private schools were permitted to use English as the language of instruction, since they intended to prepare students for foreign examinations. This policy in effect led to the operation of two different systems of education in the country, one for the elite and another for the rest of the country.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 If some of the reasonable policy recommendations had been implemented with the requisite earnestness, the situation of higher education in Pakistan would have improved and evolved over time. Instead, the quality of higher education has declined. The reasons for the chronic poor funding for the Social Sector are known. The reasons for the inability to improve the management and performance of universities are surely multiple, interdependent and complex. The end result is relentless gravitation of institutions to the minimal functional state of operation that can be sustained with current financial and human resources; policies and procedures that serve bureaucratic rather than functional ends; and the collective effect of variously motivated attitudes and behaviours of faculty, staff, students, society, politicians, and the Federal and Provincial Governments of the day.

6.0 Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise

- 6.1 The Report of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* analyses the influence of studies on the rate of return of investment in education that led to the World Bank's lending strategy to emphasise primary education. Evidently, higher education required higher investment but social returns and public interest were higher in primary education. This decision influenced many other donors. An important outcome of the report is the recognition of the broader impact of higher education on the economic and social well-being of countries, enabling good governance, strong institutions, developed infrastructure and research among other conditions for supporting economic development.
- 6.2 In its analysis of the lower than expected contribution of higher education to social and economic development in developing countries, the report notes particularly the absence of vision of the social and economic importance of higher education systems, lack of financial commitment in the face of pressing problems and severe resource constraints, and highly competitive political settings that consider higher education to be of benefit for the elite. The report draws attention to the severe disadvantage to higher education due to the lack of a critical mass of scholars and teachers; higher education cannot thrive without correction of this condition. The report points out that "*Escaping this low-level trap necessarily requires substantial and wide-ranging improvements, rather than the all too frequent patchy and incremental steps.*" In general, its recommendations for improving higher education concern increasing the resource base and utilising the resources efficiently, particularly emphasising the importance of good management and the importance of implementation. The report argues that strengthening higher education is a rational and feasible way for many countries to stem further deterioration in the relative incomes of developing and developed countries.
- 6.3 The publication stimulated a review of higher education in Pakistan by the academic community at a seminar held at the Lahore University of Management Science (LUMS) in February 2001, arranged by Syed Babar Ali, Pro-chancellor of LUMS, who was a member of the World Bank – UNESCO International Task Force. Senior policy makers in education, science and technology, and commerce, the heads of leading universities in the public and private sectors, leading educationists of the country, and representatives of international development agencies participated in the seminar. The interest and anticipation of the academic community generated at LUMS was evident also at the follow-up seminar in Karachi, arranged by Dr. Shamsh-Kassim Lakha, President of the AKU, and presided over by the Governor of Sindh Mohammadmian Soomro. The principal authors of the report, Dr. Henry Rosovsky and Dr. David Bloom participated in both seminars and elaborated on various aspects of the views expressed in the report.
- 6.4 The meetings generated considerable discussion on factors contributing to the ills of the system of higher education in Pakistan. The outcome was an appreciation of the complexity of implementing significant changes that had been recommended in the past and were clearly important for addressing the widely pervasive, constraining and wasteful issue of poor quality. The first step towards improvement would require extensive study. A national Task Force was necessary to recommend ways of improving the quality of higher education.

7.0 Establishment of the Task Force

- 7.1 The Minister for Education accepted the recommendations of the meetings, and notified the formulation of the Task force on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan on April 29, 2001 with the following Terms of Reference:

Recommend ways of improvement of higher education in Pakistan in the light of national and international reports, studies and recommendations, and consultation with the leadership, faculty, staff, and students of institutions of higher education and the Ministry of Education.

Identify ways and means of funding higher education in Pakistan, including new approaches for financial sustainability.

Recommend methods of effective governance of higher education, including their implementation.

Recommend the role of Federal and Provincial governments, and their departments and agencies in improving the quality and functioning of higher education institutions.

Recommend improved systems of higher education management, including development of faculty and support for student performance.

Recommend methods of improving the quality of higher education, including systems of quality assurance, academic audit, and accreditation.

Specify a prioritised plan for implementation of the recommendations for improvement of higher education.

Submit a final report to the Government of Pakistan by December 2001.

The Task Force was Co-Chaired by Syed Babar Ali, Pro-Chancellor, LUMS and Dr. Shams Kassim-Lakha, President, AKU. This was in keeping with the example of the good quality of higher education established by the two private sector universities.

- 7.3 The membership of the Task Force was drawn from the top leadership of major public and private universities in Pakistan, in addition to key policy makers in government. It included the Vice Chancellors of seven leading public sector universities, representatives of three leading private sector universities, the Secretary and a senior official of the Ministry of Education, the heads of a leading research institute and a philanthropic foundation, and the Acting Chairman of the University Grants Commission.
- 7.4 The constitution of the Task Force was in line with the Government's policy to benefit from public-private partnerships for solutions of national problems and complementary to the Government's evolving plan for Education Sector Reform (ESR), 2001.
- 7.5 In addition to the Terms of Reference, the Ministry of Education, acting upon a request from the Chief Executive's Secretariat, Islamabad, requested the recommendations of the Task Force on the following matters:

Re-definition of the role and "re-structuring/right sizing" of the UGC and, if necessary, amendment of the UGC Act.

“Establishment of National Education Services and [a] body for Accreditation and Quality under the UGC”.

“In recognition of the fact that the Government’s priority focus is on scientific and technical education, [consider] the possibility of combining scientific and humanities education under one umbrella and its placement under one ministry”.

To review and make recommendations on the requirements to grant a charter for awarding degrees in private sector universities and institutes.

- 7.6 The Task Force considered these matters in conjunction with related issues in the Terms of Reference. The opinions were communicated separately to the Ministry of Education and are included in this report.

8.0 Work of the Task Force

- 8.1 During its deliberations (May 2001 – December 2002) the Task Force organised consultative seminars at Karachi, Quetta, Islamabad, Peshawar, and Lahore, and received input from over 400 higher education stakeholders involving the leadership and faculty of the school and higher education system, government functionaries, parents, students, employers and alumni. The institutions that participated in the consultative seminars, and the profile of the participants, is given in the two tables listed in Appendices 5 and 6. Amongst the alumni, The Boston Group (see footnote in Acknowledgements) made a significant contribution to the Task Force with its report ‘Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards a Reform Agenda’.

- 8.2 The seminars focused on the following five sets of activities that affect the higher education system: *Vision, Governance and Management; Financial and Physical Resources; Efficiency and Quality Assurance; Research; and Students and Alumni*. For each set, participants of the group discussions were asked to identify plausible solutions for impediments in the performance of their institutions. These seminars were followed by meetings of the Task Force and its committees (Appendix 2).

9.0 Vision Statement

- 9.1 Based on the observations of the participants and the vision expressed in the programme for Education Sector Reform (2001), the following vision statement for higher education has emerged:

- 9.2 *The transformation of our institutions of higher education into world-class seats of learning, equipped to foster high quality education, scholarship and research, to produce enlightened citizens with strong moral and ethical values that build a tolerant and pluralistic society rooted in the culture of Pakistan.*

10.0 Meetings

- 10.1 From the formality of its earlier meetings, the Task Force transformed over the months into a well-knit group fully seized with the importance and urgency of its task, and spurred on by

the expectation that the current state of higher education could be improved. The Task Force met 10 times. Its meetings were characterised by open discussions and a free flow of ideas that addressed both the micro-management detail of the higher education system as well as the macro socio-political issues that have inhibited the flourishing of academia.

- 10.2 Senior Government functionaries participated in Task Force meetings and took a keen interest in the deliberations. The Federal Minister for Science and Technology, the Governors of Sindh and Balochistan, the Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan, the Sindh Minister for Finance, Planning and Development, the Punjab Minister for Education, and the Federal Minister for Education rendered invaluable encouragement and advice.
- 10.3 The President of Pakistan met the Task Force on January 11, 2002 and received a presentation on its findings and recommendations. He agreed with the appointment of a Steering Committee which should work out modalities for the implementation of the recommendations, including the establishment of the proposed Higher Education Commission, along with draft legislation for amendments in the relevant laws, wherever required.

SECTION 2: SITUATION ANALYSIS

1.0 The System of Higher Education

- 1.1 In Pakistan, higher education refers to all levels of education above grade 12, generally corresponding with the age bracket of 17 to 23 years. It is estimated that Pakistan presently has a population of 18 million in this category, and the number is expected to increase to 25 million by 2010. Of this segment of the population, 2.6% or approximately 475,000, are enrolled in institutions of higher education (1996 data). This proportion is one of the lowest in the world; for India (1990 data) and Iran (1994 data) the figures are 6.2% and 12.7% per cent, respectively (UNESCO Statistical Yearbook 1996).
- 1.2 The higher education system comprises universities and colleges. A broad functional classification, number and distribution of the institutions, obtained from data provided by the University Grants Commission, is given in Tables 1 and 2. The Tables show that the public sector institutions provide education in a wide array of disciplines whereas the private sector caters mainly for professional education and training in business and law. Although the figures in Table-2 may not be applicable today, nevertheless, they provide a broad classification and distribution of colleges, and essentially show that most of the higher education is provided through colleges. Accuracy of all data pertinent to higher education, related to the population and requirements of an area, is essential, if the information is to be used meaningfully for the support, planning and development of capacity in relation to need.

Table 1: Categories and Distribution of Universities and Other Degree-Awarding Institutions⁶

Area	Sector	General*	Agriculture	Engineering	Medicine	Degree-Awarding Institutions**	<u>Total</u>
Azad Jammu and Kashmir	Public	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Private	2	-	-	-	-	2
Balochistan	Public	1	-	1	-	-	2
	Private	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Territory	Public	6	-	-	-	2	8
	Private	1	-	-	-	-	1
NWFP	Public	4	1	1	-	2	8
	Private	4	-	-	-	1	5
Punjab	Public	5	2	2	-	3	12
	Private	1	-	-	-	1	2
Sindh	Public	3	1	3	1	2	10
	Private	7	-	1	2	7	17
Sub-Total	Public	20	4	7	1	9	41
	Private	15	0	1	2	9	27
<u>Total</u>		35	4	8	3	18	68

* A general university has more than one Faculty.

** Degree-Awarding Institutes may have more than one Faculty.

⁶ Data obtained from the University Grants Commission, February 2002.

Table 2: Categories and Distribution of Colleges⁷

	Sector	General	Professional									Total
			Ag	Bz	FA	Ed	HE	Law	Med	PE	Tec	
Azad Jammu and Kashmir	Public	22	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	26
	Private	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	3
Balochistan	Public	11	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	16
	Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Territory	Public	11	-	5	-	1	-	-	4	1	-	22
	Private	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
NWFP	Public	79	2	11	-	1	1	2	4	-	-	100
	Private	4	-	3	1	-	-	6	-	-	-	14
Punjab	Public	239	1	15	-	8	1	2	16	2	12	296
	Private	21	-	30	-	2	-	19	-	-	1	73
Sindh	Public	132	-	3	-	6	2	9	12	2	9	175
	Private	20	-	2	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	27
Sub-Total	Public	494	5	35	-	18	4	14	37	5	23	635
	Private	47	-	36	1	6	-	26	2	-	1	119
Total		541	5	71	1	24	4	40	39	5	24	754

Legend: Ag – Agriculture; Bz – Business Administration and Commerce; F.A – Fine Arts; Ed – Education; HE – Home Economics; Med – Medicine; PE – Physical Education; Tec – Technical Education.

Note: These figures have been classified according to the data given in the UGC publication *Colleges of Pakistan*, published in 1999. Degree-awarding colleges have been included in degree-awarding institutions listed in Table 1.

Table 3: Enrolment in Universities and Degree-Awarding Institutions (UGC data for 1999-2000)

Public Universities	Enrolment and Percent
General (Excluding Allama Iqbal Open University)	79,940 (57%)
Engineering	23,680 (17%)
Agriculture	14,210 (10%)
Sub-Total for Public Universities	117,830 (85%)
Sub-Total for Private Universities	21,490 (15%)
Total Enrolment in Universities	139,320 (100%)

Table 4: Enrolment in Colleges⁸

Type	Public Colleges	Private Colleges	Total
General	217,670 (65%)	11,370 (3%)	229,040 (68%)
Professional	78,690 (23%)	27,770 (8%)	106,460 (32%)
Total	296,360 (88%)	39,140 (12%)	335,500 (100)

⁷ Data obtained from *Colleges of Pakistan 1999*, the UGC Handbook, and tabulated by Mr. Adil Ahmad

⁸ Data obtained from *Colleges of Pakistan 1999*, the UGC Handbook, tabulated by Dr. Tariq Banuri.

- 1.3 Tables 3 and 4 show that some 88% of the students in colleges, and 85% of those in universities are enrolled in public sector institutions. The presence of degree-awarding institutions in the private sector is a recent phenomenon and is growing rapidly.
- 1.4 Colleges take 71% of all students in higher education. The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of education in colleges deserve serious attention, given that they provide facilities for the majority of youth seeking higher education. Included under the head of colleges are institutions of professional development such as medicine, law, agriculture and engineering. The Provincial Governments fund the colleges of the public sector.
- 1.5 Most general universities, by which is meant those with more than one Faculty, extend their capacity for certification considerably through the system of affiliating colleges that prepare candidates for the universities' degree examinations, ensuring the availability of higher education even in remote and less developed areas.
- 1.6 Thus, the public sector universities control the quality of higher education provided for a very large proportion of the students. The Provincial universities of the public sector are chartered by the Provincial Governments and are accountable to the respective Governors but are funded by the Federal Government.
- 1.7 The universities are required to inspect and ensure that adequate facilities of staff, buildings, libraries and laboratories are provided and maintained in the degree colleges. The system of affiliation of colleges places an unmanageable burden upon universities for assurance of academic quality in colleges, and requires careful review.
- 1.8 The matter of educational objectives of universities and colleges is crucial for the guidance of educators, administrators and planners of education at all levels and requires careful review. Responding to a dearth of expertise in science and technology, the Government's Education Sector Reform (2001-2004) Action Plan envisages a shift in the enrolment ratio of students in Arts and Science from the present 70:30 to 50:50 by the year 2004.

2.0 Higher Education in the Private Sector

- 2.1 With the creation of Pakistan, the passion for developing the new homeland saw many worthwhile community efforts and quality education flourished in the private sector, mainly schools but also some colleges. The Education Policy in 1972, and its crucial emphasis on nationalisation, resulted in loss of the distinctive character of the private sector institutions.
- 2.2 In 1983, The Aga Khan University became the first private sector university to be established in Pakistan, followed two years later by the Lahore University of Management Sciences. Both of these pioneering not-for-profit institutions have been supported by donors and income from their own operations.
- 2.3 In the last two decades, higher education in the private sector has been facilitated to a variable extent in the Provinces by the grant of charters to award degrees, as a consequence of both Government policy and the requirements of society.

- 2.4 At present there are 18 universities and 9 degree awarding institutes in the private sector that have received charters and are providing professional education in engineering, medicine, and business. Their distribution in the Provinces is given in Table 1.
- 2.5 The total enrolment in public sector universities was 118,800 in 2000-2001. In the same period the private universities enrolled 21,500 students. The Education Sector Reforms Action Plan for 2001-2004 of the present Government envisages an enhancement of the proportional enrolment in private sector universities from the current 15% to 40% by the year 2004, through the pursuit of a liberal policy to encourage the establishment of new institutions of higher education in the private sector.
- 2.6 The preponderance of the private sector in Business Administration, Commerce, and more recently in Information Technology suggests that its investment in higher education is generally driven by market demand, whether the institution operates on a for-profit basis or not. As is evident from the Tables, the Government shoulders the major responsibility for general education.
- 2.7 Although neither well developed nor sought after, general education serves a critical societal need by promoting flexibility and innovation, and permitting the continuous renewal of economic and social structures relevant to a fast-changing world⁹, and needs further consideration.
- 2.8 Universities in Pakistan can be categorised into General and Professional. While they do offer undergraduate programmes, their major emphasis is on post-graduate education and research.

3.0 The Continuum of Education

- 3.1 The product of our Secondary and Intermediate education systems is poorly prepared for the rigours and demands of Higher Education, and also ill-equipped for employment and career development through learning from experience and self-directed study.
- 3.2 Although primary, secondary and higher secondary education were not included in the Terms of Reference, prompted by the additional request to consider the separation of higher education in science and technology from the Ministry of Education, the Task Force emphasises the importance of viewing education as a continuum. A higher education system, irrespective of the disciplines involved, cannot operate in isolation. Hence, the quality of education in schools will affect significantly the preparation of students and the quality of higher education. The quality of higher education will also affect the quality of education in schools, by preparing teachers with clearer concepts of the subjects they teach and enhancing students' interests and guiding aspirations early in their development, leading to stronger foundations of knowledge as students compete for tertiary education places.

⁹ *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*, Report of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000, P.10.

3.3 The credibility of the Secondary and Higher Secondary School Certificates has been diluted to the extent that they are not considered adequate measures of a student's competence. The chief problem lies with the system of education that promotes rote learning rather than the spirit of inquiry; the system requires and examines for memorisation rather than understanding and application of knowledge. However, the more obvious problems of public examinations that are publicised in newspapers and receive government attention relate to dishonest practices and unreliability of results. Consequently, since 1979 the Government has given serious consideration to the institution of a National Education Testing Service (NETS) but had not implemented it, and sought the views of the Task Force on the need for it. It should be noted, however, that by 1999 some 35 reports had been generated on the subject of problems related to the public examination system, for the guidance of the Federal and Provincial Governments, generally resulting in legislative provisions for law and order and deterrence of malpractice.

4.0 Problems in Higher Education

4.1 The Task Force deliberated on the observations of the academic community, students and alumni obtained from the seminars, and concluded that the following conditions were among the most important reasons for the declining standards of higher education in Pakistan:

- a) Inefficient use of available resources.
- b) Inadequate funding.
- c) Ineffective governance, management and recruitment practices.
- d) Politicisation of the educational system, faculty and students.
- e) Inadequate provisions for research.
- f) Inadequate incentives for performance and development of faculty.

4.2 Based largely on the lack of implementation of previous recommendations on improvement of higher education, the academic community in each province expressed strong scepticism about the realisation of change and improvement in the quality of higher education provided in the public universities and colleges.

4.3 Through the consultative process and review of the overall education system it was evident to the Task Force that significant changes were required within universities and in their supportive environment to address the following problems of first-order importance:

- a) Inability to attract and retain high quality faculty.
- b) Inefficient distribution of funds within the universities.
- c) Lack of research and growth of knowledge.

4.4 Among the many causes of these problems were the following fatal flaws:

- Absence of accountability and transparency.
- Incongruity of responsibility and authority.
- Inadequate financial systems.
- Inadequate systems for supporting the quality of academic programmes and research.

5.0 Politicisation

5.1 To compound the poor conditions of learning and academic productivity, the faculty and student body have been subjected to external political influences that have sought to deploy the energies of youth and their role models for their own purposes. Such subversion displaces the faculty's and students' development and preparation for useful roles in society as conscientious and productive citizens. As a result our seats of higher learning have lost their focus on academic excellence, disabling the spirit of meritocracy and promoting a culture of dishonesty and nepotism.

6.0 Inadequate Funding

6.1 The Federal Government's grants to 41 public sector universities and degree-awarding institutions, and 20 other Centres of Excellence, Area and Pakistan Study Centres in 2001-2002 amount to Rs 3.3 billion (recurrent Rs 2.9 billion and developmental Rs 0.4 billion) or US\$ 55 million.

6.2 The total allocation for research is Rs 0.04 billion (US\$ 670,000). The allocation for research represents 1.2% of the total grant from the Federal Government.

6.3 The universities' self-generated income amounts to approximately Rs 3.2 billion.

6.4 Thus, the total funds available for the support of 41 degree awarding institutions are Rs 6.5 billion (US\$ 108 million). A windfall allocation by the government of Rs 5 billion to the Ministry of Science and Technology in the Financial Year 2000-2001 has indeed benefited the higher education system, even though its impact has been felt exclusively by Science faculties all over Pakistan, much to the dismay of the Social Sciences and Humanities faculties.

6.5 The average expenditure per student in a public university is Rs 55,000 (US\$ 920), assuming the total enrolment of 117,830 in the sector. Of the expenditure, salaries and utilities account for 75% and 8%, respectively.

6.6 The government's Five-Year Plans show that the proportional expenditure on development of education was reduced from 7.5% of all development in 1960-65 to 3.5-4.0% during 1983-98. Although the absolute expenditure education increased, its impact should be considered alongside the considerable growth of the population. The allocation to development of higher education was at its peak, 19% of developmental expenditure on education, in 1972-77, but by the decade 1988-98 was reduced to 10-11%; about that time (1995) the average for South Asia was 13% (*Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*; World Bank-UNESCO publication, 2000). The impact of the reduction should be considered alongside significant increase in the number of public sector institutions of higher education.

- 6.7 The total public sector expenditure on education rose from 1.7% of GNP in 1970 to around 2.3% in the 1990s and 2.1% in 2000-01; this is well behind the 4.0% of GNP recommended by UNSECO (*Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2001*), and the average for the South Asia region, 3.4% of GNP in 1995 (*Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*; World Bank-UNESCO publication, 2000).
- 6.8 The universities' budgetary requests for funding are channelled through the UGC to the Ministry of Education for processing with the Ministry of Finance. The resulting grants approved by the Ministry of Finance are generally well below the requirements, released in unequal instalments quarterly through a cumbersome process that may require over 45 days for the transfer.¹⁰ Often, on account of unexpected last minute financial exigencies, the recommended allocations are reduced significantly by the Ministry of Finance. Because all funds are allocated on an annual basis there is much uncertainty about the prospect for funding certain multi year research programmes. This is truly debilitating for serious academics.
- 6.9 Low salaries, frequently compared with institutions in the private sector, and the poorly supported operating conditions, poor rewards for achievement lead to disaffection and lack of motivation.
- 6.10 Since the state is unable to support higher education, the universities have been forced to raise their own funds through increase in user charges and tuition fee. Consequently, the proportion of self-generated funds covering the total expenditure has risen from 26% in 1992-93 to 49% in 2000-2001. However, the overall fund available for higher education remains entirely inadequate and requires considerable enhancement in both the levels of Government financing and independent fund raising by individual universities.
- 6.11 A fundamental structural problem with the current system is that even if fiscal resources are made available, they cannot be utilised properly because financial management is archaic and non-transparent. For example, despite their sizeable budgets and complexity of operations, most public universities practice single-entry bookkeeping maintained manually, with limited obligations of disclosure and information management. The Boston Group's observations on key principles of financial management are given in Appendix 10.

7.0 Performance of Higher Education

- 7.1 The outcome of the inadequacies is evident in the following observations of employers, parents, and students whom the Task Force met in Lahore and Peshawar.

(A) *Employers' and Parents' Observations at Lahore*

They were asked to comment on the quality of the graduates being produced by the universities. The Task Force thought that the following comments were important markers of less than adequate intellectual development and socialisation:

- a) Poor communication skills of the average graduate.

¹⁰ Report of the Task Force Committee on Financial Procedures and Management.

- b) Absence of reading habits. No culture of continuous up-gradation of skills.
- c) Links between the teacher and the taught had become increasingly tenuous.
- d) Narrow vision, lack of free thinking ability and spirit of inquiry, limited world view, and dismal application ability were some more weaknesses of graduates applying for jobs.

(B) *Students' Observations at Peshawar*

Graduate students at the University of Peshawar were asked for their observations on their educational programmes and the support provided for their work. Their responses are summarised below:

a) Research and Graduate Studies:

- Course-work is needed for M.Phil and Ph.D programmes, which should include research methods.
- There is a shortage of qualified teachers.
- There should be a broader selection of topics for the research component of graduate studies.
- Opportunities for work should be provided to graduate students for both financial assistance and work experience.
- Research scholars should have free access to the Internet.
- There is no practical application of research work in the absence of industry-academia interaction.
- Research projects of the Government are not entrusted to universities but given instead to foreign consultants or NGOs.
- Information concerning the duration and processes of M.Phil. programmes should be provided, along with an adequate number of supervisors.

b) On Curriculum:

- Curricula are outdated and need to be revised more frequently.
- Teachers are using out-dated notes and data.
- A change in attitudes of the faculty is needed; there should be provisions for lectures by professionals from the world of work.
- Requirements for rote learning should be stopped.
- The teaching process should involve students' participation in Seminars.
- There should be more provisions for community based work and co-curricular activity.

c) On Libraries:

- There should be a qualitative and quantitative improvement in library facilities.
- The reference books are under lock and key.
- Course books date back to 1945.
- The computer centre is under-utilised because of administrative issues that affect access and insufficient guidance on efficient use of the equipment.

d) On Students' Support:

- There should be a provision for students' loans.
- Promising students should be given scholarships for further studies overseas.
- Students should assess their teachers.
- There should be a platform for collective discussion of student issues with faculty.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 Sadly, the endpoint of investment of the country in human resource development and the students' time is that the existing system of higher education neither educates learners to participate adequately in the economic, social or political life of the country nor creates the basis for the good society envisaged in the vision statement derived by the Task Force.

8.2 Given the status of higher education today and the fact that many of the generic faults had been identified more than 40 years ago, it is evident that attempts within universities to improve the quality of education have been ineffective. While acknowledging the importance of less than adequate financial resources from the State, the question arises as to why the processes of governance and management of higher education have not been made effective instruments for guiding change, including the search for funds.

8.3 The Task Force reviewed the current processes for governance and management of universities and concluded that they do not provide the required direction and support to universities, nor protect universities from political, governmental, and bureaucratic or other extraneous influences that may adversely affect the institutions from within or outside. Therefore the processes do not adequately support the independence required for management of the complex institutions that universities are or enable appropriate accountability for their performance.

8.4 The structures of governance and management, the Senate and Syndicate, enshrined in the universities' Acts, are inefficient and do not distinguish between the two sets of functions. Too much of the decision-making is centralised on the Vice Chancellor who is appointed by and serves "at the pleasure of" the Chancellor.

8.5 The following text lists the key functionaries of public sector universities in Pakistan. This information and the preceding observations show good reasons for the plight of higher education. The net thrust of the conclusion is the need to make each university an independent institution so that it can undertake its academic mission without extraneous influences and be wholly and continuously accountable for all aspects of its performance.

9.0 Organizational Structure of Public Universities

[Brief comments are given in italics].

Chancellor: The Governor of a Province or the President of Pakistan in case of Federal universities, as the Chancellor, approves amendments to statutes, and appoints the Vice Chancellor, most Syndicate members, the Deans, and the Treasurer.

The Chancellor is essentially required to perform the functions that are ordinarily performed by a governing board.

Pro-Chancellor: In some universities, the Federal or Provincial Minister for Education is ex-officio the Pro-Chancellor and may discharge the Chancellor's responsibilities in the latter's absence.

Federal Ministry of Education is the Chancellor's Secretariat for Federal universities but has little direct interaction with universities in provinces.

University Grants Commission, a component of the Ministry of Education, was established to promote common educational standards. However, it has become mainly a funding channel.

A central supporting body is needed to help define and promote quality standards.

Provincial Departments of Education serve as the secretariat for the Chancellor, and as the administrative oversight agencies for colleges.

Viewed as lacking in expertise and vision on higher education.

Vice-Chancellor (VC) is the chief executive and chief academic officer of the university, appointed by and accountable to the Chancellor. The VC chairs the Syndicate, the Academic Council and some other bodies. All senior university officials are appointed by the syndicate on the recommendations of the Selection Board, which is Chaired by the Vice Chancellor.

- a) *Accountability to a single person creates irresponsibility and dependency rather than autonomy and accountability.*
- b) *Although the VC has extensive powers of appointment, there is little consideration of the expertise and experience needed to carry out the responsibilities. The appointments are almost always from within the system, and based on non-professional considerations. Also, the top management is weighted heavily towards administrative functions rather than academic and research related responsibilities.*

The Senate: Where it exists, the Senate may have more than 100 members, including all Syndicate members, department heads, Deans, Directors of programs, representatives of faculty and alumni, a representative of the Provincial Assembly and appointees of the Chancellor. Its powers include voting on the budget and recommending changes to Statutes. *Although it has a broad-based membership, the Senate is too large to discharge any executive oversight responsibilities.*

Syndicate: The Syndicate is the executive body of the university, responsible for all matters except for changes in statutes. It has 15-20 members, one third are ex-officio, the others are either elected by faculty members or appointed by the Chancellor. The membership includes a representative of the Provincial Assembly

Although a management team, it is often viewed as a means of achieving independent governance. However, since the VC chairs the Syndicate, it is not an independent body.

Academic Council (AC): A council of over 100 members, the AC considers all curricular matters. Chaired by the VC, it comprises some senior management staff, Deans, department heads, full professors, Librarian, elected faculty representatives, Chancellor's nominees, and representatives of colleges.

It is too cumbersome a body to make timely decisions on academic matters.

Selection Board: The Selection Board is convened whenever needed to consider appointments, and other personnel matters. Chaired by the VC, it comprises a representative of the Public Service Commission, nominees of the Chancellor, nominee of the Syndicate, department chairs and Deans concerned. Relevant subject experts are usually included.

Pro Vice-Chancellor: where present, is appointed by the Chancellor and assists the VC in his/her duties.

Treasurer: The chief financial officer of the university is appointed by the Chancellor and is responsible for ensuring that all financial rules are followed.

Controller of Examinations: Manages the examination system.

Registrar: The Registrar enforces administrative policies and prepares institutional reports. *As the secretary of all executive committees, the Registrar often wields considerable power.*

Deans: are appointed by the Chancellor, and have mainly academic responsibilities. *The roles and appointment procedures for Deans need to be defined more clearly.*

Heads of Department: are appointed by the Syndicate, and have both academic and administrative powers.

SECTION 3: RECOMMENDATIONS

1.0 Principles Underlying Recommendations of the Task Force

- 1.1 While considering strategic changes that would improve higher education, the Task Force noted that the various components of education are interdependent, although each is generally understood in terms of a specific level with defined limits of time and content.
- 1.2 The Task Force focused primarily on the functions of the universities because they are the chief determinants of the quality of higher education. The universities must improve in order to achieve and sustain improvement of quality, each institution from within itself, supported by enabling external operating conditions.
- 1.3 The most critical determinant of competent graduates is the quality of education, which is dependent on the quality of the faculty as well as financial and other resources and their management.
- 1.4 The universities must have control of the operating conditions within their institutions, a state that can only be achieved by autonomy for efficient management, coupled inseparably with accountability for performance. The functional achievement of these conditions is the crucial goal of the reform effort. However, the Task Force was fully cognisant of the fact that no reform process will be successful unless it is espoused, led and driven by members of the universities' faculty and staff, with appropriate guidance, governance and continuity of each institution's vision and values.
- 1.5 The Task Force noted that autonomy for academic and non-academic functions as well as growth and utilisation of resources involves adoption of the following hitherto unfamiliar characteristics of the working environment:
 - a) Accountability for functions at all levels in the institution.
 - b) Decentralised responsibility and authority.
 - c) Selection of leadership, faculty and staff on merit, based on evidence of competence, with relevance to the functional requirements of a position.
 - d) Regular performance evaluation for faculty and staff, which is transparent and fair, from a constructive viewpoint.
 - e) The critical need for faculty and staff development.
 - f) Term appointments; continuity based on performance; and tenure, if a provision exists, earned through achievements.
- 1.6 Consideration of the functions of a university and its role in development of society, led to understanding of accountability and the need for separate systems of governance and management.
- 1.7 Provision for performance-based attraction of faculty, staff and students to a university as well as Government grants and financial support by society will enhance the quality of education.

- 1.8 Strategic changes should be implemented as a whole, not as options.
- 1.9 In order to improve the performance of universities substantially, having considered the evidence of impediments from the consultative seminars (summarised in section 2.4.1), the Task Force concentrated its attention on systems that would enable efficient governance, management, support for quality of education, and funding of universities, thereby laying the grounds for additional reforms that would address long term objectives of enhancing the quality and relevance of the curriculum.

2.0 Governance of Universities

- 2.1 The Task Force recommends that each university should be governed and managed as an independent institution, associated with the Ministry of Education or Provincial Department of Education, as appropriate, but not controlled by the Ministry or Department or any other sources of funds. The Governing Board (GB) of a university must function separately from management although the two together provide accountability for the functions of the university.
- 2.2 The Governing Board of a university must be accountable to society for the utilisation of the institution's resources and the resulting performance. It should achieve this purpose by assuring itself that the performance of the university is consistent with its mission, and ensuring that the institution has the appropriate human, physical and financial resources to achieve the relevance and requisite quality of the end product.
- 2.3 Effective policy making requires an enlightened Governing Board that has a broad view of the impact of higher education on society and is cognisant of the strategic directions and resources for achieving the university's mission with quality that is worthy of recognition nationally and internationally.
- 2.4 The Governing Board may be called the Senate or Syndicate or Board of Governors or Board of Trustees. The first two names are likely to be associated with the familiar performance of the current Senate and Syndicate; for this reason, the Task Force did not recommend a name. For the purposes of this Report, the generic form *Governing Board* (GB) has been used.

3.0 Functions of the Governing Board

- 3.1 The functions of the GB include the following:
- a) Nominating candidates for membership of the Board.
 - b) Appraisal of the Board's performance.
 - c) Recommending candidates to the Chancellor for the appointment of the Vice Chancellor, identified by a search committee appointed by the Board; Approval of the quality and relevance of the university's programmes.
 - d) Approval of the policies of the university.

- e) Approval of appointments of senior faculty (Associate Professors and Professors) and senior administrators to be selected in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Governing Board.
- f) Approval of the budget.
- g) Approval of strategic plans and development.
- h) Approval of financial resource development.

3.2 The Board shall decide how it wishes to organise its functions

3.3 The functions will require the Board to convene at least quarterly.

4.0 Membership of the Governing Board

4.1 The members of the GB should be selected carefully to ensure significant commitment to the purpose of the university and meaningful engagement in the activities of the Board. Therefore, the membership should not be large. The Task Force recommends that the number should not exceed 15, including the Chair; at least two of the members should be women.

4.2 Candidates for membership of the GB should be independent thinkers who are ethical, broad-minded and constructive. Evidence for these attributes should be obtained from the developmental nature of their accomplishments and significant engagement in the development of human resources or knowledge or service. The Chairperson and members, except for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the university, should serve in a voluntary capacity.

4.3 Members of the GB should be appointed by the Chancellor from at least two candidates identified for a position. The profile of the membership and the mode of nominating the candidates for each position are given below:

- a) The Chairperson: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.
- b) One member from the academic community of the province in which the university is located, other than the university concerned, at the level of Professor or Principal of a College: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.
- c) Two members from the academic community in other provinces, at the level of Professor or Principal of a College: candidates nominated by the Higher Education Commission.
- d) Five members from society, in order to ensure wide representation of public interest in the contribution of universities to society through the effectiveness of the graduates, service, and research. Such persons should be selected on the basis of their accomplishments, independent and broad-based thinking, commitment, and respect in society. Candidates should be identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board based on the recommendations of public and professional bodies, such as the Federation of Pakistan Chambers of Commerce and Industries, Overseas Chamber of Commerce, Engineering Council, Council of Architects and Town Planners, Pakistan Medical and Dental Council, and Bar Association.

- e) One member from the alumni: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.
 - f) Two members from the Provincial or Federal Government, as appropriate, not below the rank of Joint Secretary: candidates nominated by the Ministries or Departments of Education and Finance.
 - g) The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the university (Vice Chancellor or Rector or President): candidates recommended by a Search Committee appointed by the GB.
 - h) Two members from the university's faculty at the rank of Professor, the senior most Dean and senior most Professor, identified by the CEO.
- 4.4 The term of office of the Chairperson should be five years and of the members three years. The term may be renewed consecutively once, except that the two members of the university's faculty may serve only for one term. The CEO is an ex-officio member. One third of the other members appointed initially should retire every year for the first three years.
- 4.5 The term of office of the CEO should be five years, subject to performance, and may be renewed. The CEO shall be accountable to the Board for all the functions of the university.
- 4.6 For the initial appointments, the Chancellor should constitute a Nominating Committee consisting of three members who will nominate candidates for all positions except the CEO. Thereafter, replacements for retiring members should be determined as indicated above.

5.0 Management of Universities

- 5.1 The best of intentions, plans, policies and procedures can come to naught due to faulty application. Effective application is the responsibility of management, the functions of which are distinct from governance. Synergy of the two will result in the efficiency and support that is crucial to learning and productivity. Functioning in a culture of efficiency and productivity will enable the faculty and young learners in their turn to contribute effectively to societal development, with consequential multiplier effect.
- 5.2 Acknowledging the crucial and complex nature of the human elements that constitute institutions of education, the Task Force derived the principal organisation of management at the highest level from consideration of the essential support for the functions of a university. The Task Force recommended that structures and processes at lower levels should be determined by the management in accordance with institutional needs, with the guidance and approval of the Governing Board.
- 5.3 Currently, at the highest level, decision-making is rendered inefficient by organisational structures that are responsible for matters of both governance and management of academic and non-academic functions. Having identified the functions of governance, the Task Force recommends that separate structures should be responsible for the senior management of academic and non-academic functions, while ensuring that the requisite critical co-ordination between them is achieved.

5.4 In general, a co-ordinating and executive body (Executive Council or Vice Chancellor's, Rector's or President's Council) is needed for non-academic functions and an Academic Council for academic functions. The CEO should chair both Councils and be accountable to the GB for the respective functions.

5.5 The Task Force strongly recommends that the structures of academic and non-academic management at all levels should be determined carefully, guided by the need to support clearly defined functions of the institution, keeping in view the fact that the functions are usually multidisciplinary in nature and will change from time to time.

6.0 Executive Council or the Vice Chancellor's or Rector's or President's Council
[For this Report the generic term Executive Council (EC) has been used.]

6.1 The responsibilities of the EC include development of policies and oversight of the following functions:

Preparation of the budget.

- b) Management of fund raising.
- c) Development and maintenance of physical facilities.
- d) Management of human resources.
- e) Management of finance and physical resources.
- f) Development of strategic plans and implementation of approved plans.
- g) Provision of learning resources, including the library, and information and communications technology.
- h) Support for co-curricular activities.

6.2 Each is a major function and will require further levels of organisation. The authority and accountability of each level should be defined in order to sustain de-centralised management. Since each function will be related to academic activities, appropriate co-ordination is critical at various levels, not only in the EC.

6.3 Membership of the EC

The Task Force recommends that the Executive Council should have approximately 15 members, and include the following:

- a) The CEO (Chairperson);
- b) The heads of the non-academic functions;
- c) All Deans;
- d) Three senior most Professors who are not members of the GB, from different departments, nominated by the Vice Chancellor and approved by the Governing Body, for a non-consecutive period of two years;
- e) Principals of the constituent colleges.

7.0 Management of Academic Functions

- 7.1 Academic activity comprises diverse functions that are specific for learning and growth of knowledge and skills. Each function requires management at several levels. Each function also requires the support of non-academic functions. Thus, in order to ensure optimal utilisation of human and physical resources it is necessary to conceptualise a matrix of management, in which the effectiveness of both academic and non-academic activities is critical. The academic functions relate primarily to quality assurance of academic programmes and research as well as accountability for these activities, and include:
- a) Selection, development and management of faculty.
 - b) Selection, support and development of students.
 - c) Planning, implementation, monitoring, and review of educational programmes and research.
- 7.2 The responsibility for the academic functions rests with the academic staff (faculty). The faculty is organised in clusters of affinity based on function, knowledge and expertise. Such clusters are usually organised as Departments, each led by a Chairperson.
- 7.3 At a higher level, Departments concerned with a broad area of knowledge or function are organised as a Faculty, Institute or College, led by a Dean, Director or Principal, respectively. The leaders should be accountable for the nature and performance of the academic programmes, research and the resources required to support them.
- 7.4 Thus, the Chairs of Departments, Deans of Faculties, Directors of Institutes and Principals of Colleges are positions of significant leadership and are important elements in the management of a university. Their authorities and accountability should be commensurate with their responsibilities and must be defined clearly.
- 7.5 Therefore, the leadership should be selected with great care, based on merit in respect of the specific needs of the academic unit and university, realising the leader's influence on the development of faculty through the role model effect.
- 7.6 Since leaders are selected for their achievements in some functions and potential for effectiveness in others, for which they may have no expertise or experience, it is essential to provide for in-service education and training for various functions, particularly management and education in the case of faculty. The provision of appropriate in-service programmes is needed expeditiously not only for the development of the institution's leadership but also more generally of the faculty and staff.
- 7.7 Decentralisation of authority is advocated, utilising the Heads of Departments, the Deans of Faculties, Directors of Institutes, or Principals of Colleges who should be responsible and accountable for the selection, development and functions of the faculty. The faculty must be competent for upon them depend critically the functions of education and research.

- 7.8 Appropriate authority will be necessary for the structures of management that will be required for recruitment of faculty and staff, involving formal search and careful assessment of candidates; appraisal, development and promotion of faculty and staff; and management as well as guidance and supervision of the academic programmes.
- 7.9 In consideration of the management of academic functions, it is important to recognise that all are multidisciplinary and require academic and non-academic administrative support.
- 7.10 With regard to the working of universities with the Education department in the provinces, and the Ministry of Education in the Federal Territory, the Vice Chancellor should deal directly with the Chancellor (Governor or President respectively for the provincial and federal governments), and the Chancellor may designate a person in his office for dealing exclusively with the universities.
- 7.11 The matter of ensuring that the views of the faculty are obtained on matters of policy is generally presented as the justification for increasing the representation of faculty in the various committee structures of the university. While appropriate representation is essential for effective functioning of the university, the plea for greater opportunity for hearing of the faculty's voice is an indication of insufficient two-way communication between policy makers and the faculty involving the leadership.
- 7.12 The Task Force recommends that the leadership of academic units should facilitate the participation of faculty in discussions concerning the university's policies within the Departments or other initial functional levels of the organisation, enabling the entire faculty to be engaged in dialogue.
- 7.13 The Task Force recommends that a Council should be constituted to oversee the academic affairs of a university.

8.0 Academic Council (AC)

- 8.1 The functions of the Academic Council include the following:
- a) Approval of the policies and procedures pertaining to the quality of academic programmes.
 - b) Approval of academic programmes.
 - c) Approval of the policies and procedures pertaining to the quality of student affairs, including admissions, examinations, and certification.
 - d) Approval of the policies and procedures pertaining to the quality of research.
 - e) Recommendation of the policies and procedures for affiliation of other educational institutions.
 - f) Recommendation of tuition and examination fees.
 - g) Recommendation of the policies and procedures for financial assistance for students.
- 8.2 Membership of the Academic Council

The Task Force recommends that the Academic Council should have approximately 18 to 25 members and include the following:

- a) The CEO (Chairperson).
 - b) All Deans.
 - c) Heads of the Departments of Finance and Administration.
 - d) Five members representing the heads of Departments (not below the rank of Professor), Institutes and constituent Colleges.
 - e) Two Principals of affiliated Colleges.
 - f) Five Professors.
 - g) The Registrar.
 - h) The Controller of Examinations.
 - i) The Librarian.
- 8.3 The Governing Board should appoint the members of the Academic Council. Other than the ex-officio members, the CEO should recommend candidates to the Board for appointment.
- 9.0 Faculty and Staff Appointments and Conditions of Service**
- 9.1 The Task Force recommends strongly that all appointments of faculty and staff of universities should be made based on merit and relevance for the specific requirements of a position, and involve appropriate searches for the best candidates through processes to be defined by the management and approved by the GB.
- 9.2 All appointments should be made for a specified period, renewable based on appraisal of performance, and may be eligible for tenure in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the GB.
- 9.3 The management, with the approval of the GB, should determine the emoluments and terms and conditions of service.
- 9.4 In order to recruit, develop and retain quality teachers and staff, emoluments should be de-linked from the Government's Basic Pay Scale and based upon performance and market forces. The definition of such a system is not easy and will require considerable thought and consultation.
- 9.5 Provisions must be made for in-service education and training for all faculty and staff in order to maximise the capacity of faculty and staff for enhancement of their effectiveness at work. Provisions must be made for development of faculty in respect of education, research and professional and technical competence as well as management and leadership.
- 9.6 The annual performance appraisal system should be structured so that it identifies the need for an individual's development, in respect of the needs of the academic unit and the university, and is transparent, constructive, and supportive of career growth, with a view to make human resources more effective contributors to the institution's mission.

10.0 Central Co-ordination and Support for Quality

- 10.1 Many countries have felt the need for a central body to support various functions of the universities. In Pakistan, the University Grants Commission (UGC) was established in 1974 under an Act of Parliament for maintaining standards of education and uniform policy aimed at bringing about national unity and cohesion. The UGC is a unit of the Ministry of Education, chaired by either a senior academician or a senior officer of the civil service. The appointment is generally the result of political considerations.
- 10.2 The functions of the UGC given in the Act are summarised as follows:
- a) Maintenance of the quality of higher education, chiefly the universities.
 - b) Finance of universities, including scholarships and fellowships.
 - c) Planning, including advice on the establishment of new universities.
 - d) Uniformity of policies among universities.
 - e) Support and co-ordination of research.
 - f) Support and promotion of extra-mural and extra-curricular activities at inter-university level.
 - g) Promotion of national unity and solidarity.
- 10.3 The current functions of the UGC are:
- a) Co-ordination of academic, research and development programmes of universities for greater national development.
 - b) Maintenance of a permanent liaison with the universities, provincial governments and the federal government.
 - c) Maintenance of standards of education and uniformity of curricula aimed at bringing about national unity and cohesion.
 - d) Development, review and revision of curricula beyond class 12.
 - e) Arrangement of in-service training for teachers of degree colleges and universities.
 - f) Service as an effective link between the government and the universities to make an objective assessment of universities' requirements and secure adequate funds for their speedy development.
- 10.4 The support for academic quality given by the UGC consists primarily of reviews of curricula, co-ordinated through meetings of the relevant academic units at the UGC offices, and publication of the recommendations for implementation in universities and colleges. In another activity supporting quality, dictated by the Acts establishing universities, the senior staff of the UGC attend meetings of the Syndicates and Selection Boards as members, in which capacity they draw attention to the procedural requirements of the universities' Acts and Statutes.
- 10.5 Regarding other functions, the UGC has very limited funds for research projects, for which faculty of public and private universities may apply, and little ability, if any, to enhance the universities' capacity for research. It arranges inter-university sports for students. It assists the Government in accreditation of new institutions and determining the equivalence of degrees granted abroad in relation to the degrees awarded by institutions in Pakistan.

- 10.6 In respect of assessment of the financial needs of the universities, disbursement of grants, and building institutional capacity, in practice the UGC serves as a transmitter of the universities' annual budgetary requests to the Ministry of Education and distributor of the Federal Government's grants to the universities, generally less than requested and not always delivered on time. It has no control on either request from the universities for funding or distribution of recurring and non-recurring grants. A confounding factor is the arrangement whereby the authority for granting the charter of a university, appointing its Vice Chancellor or CEO, and enabling development of programmes rests with the Province while the Federal Government provides the funds to support the university's programmes. These conditions have contributed to the erosion of the UGC's credentials, being regarded by academia more as an organ of the Government rather than a representative of universities, on the one hand, and considered as possibly an unnecessary institution by the Federal Government, on the other.
- 10.7 Conclusion: Careful review of the functions of the UGC and the status of higher education led the Task Force to the conclusion that a central body is needed primarily for supporting improvement of the quality of academic programmes in both public and private sector institutions. The Task Force conceptualised the central body as a component of a network of independently governed and managed institutions that provides diversity of expertise, and promotes synergy and efficient utilisation of the country's resources for education and research.

11.0 Higher Education Commission (HEC)

- 11.1 The Task Force recommends that there should be a central body known as the Higher Education Commission (HEC). The HEC is conceptually different from the current University Grants Commission and should replace it. Its chief functions would differ significantly from those of the UGC while addressing similar concerns, as follows:
- a) In respect of the quality of education, the mandate of the HEC should encompass all degree-granting institutions, public and private, including professional colleges.
 - b) It would support the attainment of quality education in institutions by facilitating and co-ordinating self-assessment of academic programmes and their external review by national and international experts. The recommendations would be reported to the Chief Executive Officers and Governing Boards of the institutions and the HEC.
 - c) The HEC would serve the purpose of planning, development and accreditation of public and private sector institutions of higher education.
 - d) For universities in the public sector, the HEC would link Federal Government funding with the quality of performance (akin to the principle used by the Higher Education Funding Councils in the U.K.) and the need and justification for institutional development. It would have the capacity for raising funds for itself and for higher education.
 - e) The HEC would serve as a national resource for higher education, based on its comprehensive nation-wide information and data on experience in other countries.

- f) The HEC would support planning, development and fund raising for universities and other institutions of higher education.

11.2 Functions of the HEC

The purposes of the HEC lead to the following list of functions:

- a) Provide support for enhancement of the quality of higher education and research.
- b) Facilitate funding for higher education based on the quality of performance and needs.
- c) Serve as a national resource for higher education, based on its comprehensive nationwide information, and data on experience in other countries.
- d) Participate in the formulation of Federal Government policy on matters of higher education.
- e) Advise institutions, the Provincial Governments and the Federal Government on planning and development of higher education.
- f) Advise the Federal and Provincial Governments on all proposals for granting a charter to award degrees, in both public and private sectors.
- g) Co-ordinate the initial and subsequent periodic assessment of the quality of academic programmes in established and new institutions of higher education, in order to support accreditation and maintenance of academic standards.
- h) Guide the public, the Provincial Governments and the Federal Government, on the legal status and functional value of degrees and other certification of academic achievement given by public and private institutions of higher education, and recommend appropriate action.
- i) Support the cause of national integration and cohesion through co-curricular activities.
- j) Perform such other functions incidental or consequential to the discharge of the aforesaid functions.

12.0 Governance of the HEC

- 12.1 In order to achieve these functions, the HEC should be governed and managed independently, associated with the Ministry of Education but not controlled by it. The HEC should be overseen by its Board of Governors, with the capability of receiving and managing block grants provided by the Ministry of Finance and being accountable for them.
- 12.2 The HEC must have autonomy to undertake its functions in co-operation with institutions of higher education; organise its management; select its Chief Executive Officer and staff; and develop its programmes and recommendations in consultation with the institutions of higher education, the Provincial and Federal Governments, and any other agencies in the country or abroad.
- 12.3 In order to ensure accountability to the institutions of higher education, society, the Federal and Provincial Governments for its performance, the HEC must have a strong and independent Board of Governors (BOG) appointed by the President of Pakistan from candidates nominated by a nominating committee of the Board, and an independent system of management that is accountable to it.

- 12.4 The Chairman of the Board should have the rank of a Minister of State.
- 12.5 The appointment of the Chairman and members of the Board, as well as the Chief Executive Officer, should be based on merit, free from Governmental, political, bureaucratic or other extraneous influence.
- 12.6 The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) must be identified through a formal search process, and appointed by the President from a selection of candidates recommended by the Board of Governors.
- 12.7 The HEC must have a fund in addition to a Government grant, developed from contributions by the Federal Government and its own fund raising efforts, in order to support its activities and enable the support of institutions for specific purposes, such as development of the faculty's capacity for education and research, and expert consultation.
- 12.8 The HEC must have strong financial systems to control the allocation of funds for the institutions of higher education, based on performance.

13.0 Board of Governors of the Higher Education Commission (HEC)

- 13.1 The scope of the Board's deliberations should extend beyond the operation of the HEC to quality assurance of higher education through the network of universities and other institutions of higher education, of which the HEC should be seen as an essential component.
- 13.2 The members of the BOG should be selected carefully to ensure significant commitment to the provision of quality education and meaningful engagement in the activities of the Board. Therefore, the membership should not be large. The Task Force recommends that the number should not exceed 14, including the Chair; at least two of the members should be women. It is anticipated that the Board will meet at least quarterly.
- 13.3 Candidates for membership of the BOG should be independent thinkers who are ethical, broad-minded and constructive. Evidence for these attributes should be obtained from the developmental nature of their accomplishments and significant engagement in the development of human resources or knowledge or service. The Chairperson and members, except for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the HEC, should serve voluntarily.
- 13.4 The Task Force recommends that all members of the BOG should be appointed by the President of Pakistan from at least two candidates identified for a position, in order to minimise the possibility of politically motivated appointments. The profile of the membership and the mode of nominating the candidates for each position are given below:
 - a) The Chairperson: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.
 - b) Three members from the academic community other than universities, at the level of Professor or Principal of a College*: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.

- c) Three members from the society*, consisting of accomplished, independent, broad-based, committed and respected persons: candidates identified by the Nominating Committee of the Board.
- d) Two members from the Federal Government, not below the rank of Joint Secretary: candidates nominated by the Ministries of Education and Finance.
- e) Four Chief Executive Officers (Vice Chancellor or Rector or President) of universities: candidates nominated by the Chancellors of universities.
- f) The Chief Executive Officer of the Higher Education Commission: candidates recommended by a Search Committee appointed by the Board.

* Membership in these categories should include representation from the provinces, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and Federally Administered Northern Areas.

- 13.5 For the initial appointments, the President should constitute a Nominating Committee consisting of three members who will nominate candidates for all positions except the CEO. For the CEO, the Board shall appoint a Search Committee to identify suitable candidates for the Board's recommendation to the President. The Search Committee should consist of at least six members, no more than one should be a member of the BoG.
- 13.6 The term of office of the Chairperson should be five years and of the members three years, both renewable for one consecutive term. One third of the members appointed initially should retire every year for the first three years.
- 13.7 The Board may appoint committees from amongst its members and may seek information from the management in order to undertake its work of governance.
- 13.8 The Board shall be accountable for the functions of the HEC and the support required for undertaking them as well as the management and utilisation of the institution's financial resources.

14.0 Management of the Higher Education Commission

- 14.1 It is essential for the management of the HEC to act as a facilitator of a system of higher education characterised by diversity, and ensure the efficient deployment of the country's resources for attaining optimum standards of education and research within each institution, rather than achieving uniformity of academic offerings and performance.
- 14.2 The CEO shall be accountable to the Board of Governors for the functions of the Commission and responsible for the management of the HEC. The duration of the appointment should be five years, subject to performance, and may be renewed.
- 14.3 The Commission should be organised in a manner that enables the management of its functions, including: quality assurance and accreditation; finance; resource development; planning; information and communications technology; and two-way communication with the institutions and academic community engaged in higher education for both input and

feedback. It will be necessary to establish and manage a very large and versatile database for diverse applications.

- 14.4 It is envisaged that each set of the functions of management will require a head and managerial staff. In addition, technical staff will be required for supporting the infrastructure for information and communications technology. Non-technical staff will be necessary also, in accordance with the support required for space, equipment, supplies, utilities, and maintenance including buildings and grounds. Detailed consideration of the support needed for providing the functions will determine the human resources required for the HEC. This will emerge from further planning. It is also envisaged that the institution will evolve over time. Provision for the evolution, which will occur under the supervision and guidance of the BOG, should be made in the formulation of any legislative instrument that may be necessary to establish the HEC.
- 14.5 All appointments should be based on merit in respect of the work required and subjected to regular review of performance. It is recommended that appointments should be valid for a period of contract, subject to performance, and may be renewed. The management with the approval of the Board of Governors shall determine the terms and conditions of service. Tenure, if granted, should be offered after the successful completion of several contracts.
- 14.6 The management, with the approval of the BoG should determine the emoluments and terms and conditions of service in order to recruit and retain personnel with high levels of competence. Terms and conditions of service should be de-linked from the Government's Basic Pay Scales because they are neither adequate nor often equitable.
- 14.7 The CEO and heads of the various functions should be guided by consultative committees involving the staff of the Commission. The Commission must function in co-operation with the universities and other institutions of higher education, facilitated by appropriately constituted consultative committees, to ensure communication and integration of effort. It is envisaged that such co-operative effort will strengthen the universities' capacity for developmental activities such as establishing linkages with other institutions, enabling visiting scholars to enhance the expertise of the faculty, and facilitating development of faculty for education, research, management and leadership, and service.

15.0 National Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance (NCAQA)

- 15.1 The Ministry of Education requested the recommendation of the Task Force on a proposal to establish a National Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance. The Task Force did not favour the establishment of the Council, since its purpose would be subsumed by the HEC, the functions of which include planning, development and accreditation of public and private sector institutions of higher education, support for attainment of quality education, and performance linked funding of public universities.

16.0 Funding and Financial Management

- 16.1 While it is clear that institutions of higher education need more funds and must generate income and manage their assets, it is also clear that the current methods of financial management must be improved in order to increase the capacity for absorption of financial resources and decrease wastage. Financial management requires enlightened policies for supporting institutional growth and performance; skilled persons supported by electronic information and communications systems to ensure accuracy, efficiency and transparency of the service; and accountability for receipt and utilisation of resources. Assurance of sound financial management, subject to professional external audit, is essential for the confidence of donors; receipt of grants from the Government, development agencies and sources of research funds; and investment management of endowments.
- 16.2 A revised higher education system, with improved financial management and accountability, provision for funding should be planned and considered over several years in order to ensure the continuous financial support required by institutions to sustain their academic programmes. The current practice of annual provisions subject to prevailing Government priorities has demoralising consequences on the faculty and staff and disrupts programmes. The Task Force recommends annual review of a 3-year rolling projection of each institution's requirements and sources of funding.
- 16.3 Each institution should strive for development of permanent sources of support, such as endowments, for its core activities and programmes, in addition to revenue from tuition and grants. Quality of performance and need for institutional development will become the critical considerations for Government grants, research grants and donor support from society, on the one hand, and applications for admission to quality education, on the other.
- 16.4 Public philanthropy for higher education was a tradition in Pakistan and could be revived by establishing trust in the performance and relevance of the institutions. Funding from this source is particularly useful for building endowments, expanding on physical infrastructure, and creating scholarships.
- 16.5 Financial support by alumni is an important source of long-term funding but will require cultivation through generation of justifiable pride in the performance of the institution and the value of the education. Alumni support will also require demonstration of the institution's interest in the future evolution of graduates and their participation in the development and life of the institution. Achievement of these conditions will need the services of permanent professional staff, an Office of Alumni Relations, and definition of the objectives for philanthropic fund generation.¹¹
- 16.6 The creation and growth of endowments for higher education, and education generally, requires enabling conditions, in the form of enhanced relief from taxation for the support of institutions and their programmes and economic opportunities for investment as well as protection from depreciation of currency.

¹¹ *Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards a Reform Agenda*, The Boston Group Report

- 16.7 In the prevailing conditions of international relations, international development agencies may consider supporting improvement of public sector higher education although the main emphasis for support hitherto has been at the primary level.
- 16.8 A full study is required to establish realistically the requirements for funding higher education that includes the future status of colleges. Nevertheless, the Task Force estimated the gross financial requirements for improvement of higher education over a period of 5 years, based upon current funding in the public and private sector institutions.
- 16.9 Presently (2001-2002), the universities generate 50% of their total expenditure of Rs 6.5 billion mainly from tuition and fees; the remainder is covered by grants from the Federal Government (Rs 2.9 billion for recurrent expenditure, Rs 0.4 billion for development, and Rs 0.04 billion for research). Salaries and utilities account for 75 per cent and 8 per cent of the expenditure, respectively.
- 16.10 In order to support improvement, the Task Force recommends an enhancement by Rs. 5 billion annually of the Government's grant to universities, in order to support recruitment and retention of quality faculty and staff, development of the infrastructure for research, provision of libraries, electronic access to information and communication, equipment and maintenance, and refurbishment of physical facilities.
- 16.11 The Task Force also recommends the creation of an endowment of Rs. 20 billion, which will provide Rs. 1.6 billion annually (anticipated rate of return of 8%) that would be used for supporting financial assistance for deserving students in need, research, and development of faculty and staff.
- 16.12 In order to encourage the fund-raising effort of universities, the Task Force recommends that for non-recurring or development related funds the Government should provide a matching grant based upon the funds raised in a ratio of 4:1.
- 16.13 The Task Force recommends the following proportional allocation of incremental non-recurring funds for initial improvement of the support for higher education.

Component	Universities	Colleges
Research	20	5
Human Resource Development	20	30
Information & communications technology	20	20
Modernisation of facilities for students	15	20
Modernisation of facilities for education and research, including development of libraries and electronic access to information.	15	20
Linkages and interaction	10	5
Total allocation	100	100

- 16.14 However, in order to determine the appropriateness and expected impact of the allocations, proportions alone will not suffice without consideration of the number of universities and

colleges as well as analysis of needs for each category of activity. In addition, it is important to note that non-recurring development funds will increase recurring expenditure in order to sustain the improvement of facilities and services that will result from the investment.

17.0 Tuition Fees

- 17.1 Tuition fees in public sector institutions have been low for decades, while the cost of imparting education has risen steadily. An upward revision of tuition fees has long been overdue, and has been delayed because of a fear of political repercussions. Even though tuition fees can never recover the full cost of university operations, it is inevitable that they must increasingly reflect the cost of education.
- 17.2 Currently, the public universities have two sets of students; those selected on the basis of their academic achievements, with or without an admission test, and those who pay full tuition amount, referred to as “self-financed students”. The tuition fees for the latter varies from 5 to 10 times of the former. Although tuition fees and a variety of other levies from both sets of students, as well as other income generating schemes, provides approximately half of the operating budget of the public universities, this seemingly high proportion is largely a reflection of the low allocation of the Government’s grants for the support of universities.
- 17.3 The Task Force recommends that the institutional cost of providing an academic programme or research or other service should be known. The proportional recovery of the cost of education through a tuition fee should be determined and the mode of funding for the residual cost identified.
- 17.4 Tuition and fees should reflect significantly the high cost of education but should neither be the main source of funding institutions nor an impediment to access for those who cannot afford the cost of education and subsistence. Every candidate selected for admission on merit should have access to financial assistance based on need, in accordance with transparent systems of assessment and allocation, but pay what they can afford. However, there are difficulties inherent in assessment of students’ needs when sources of income are poorly documented.
- 17.5 A student’s bill should state the full cost of his or her academic programme and the institutional subsidy that is provided, so that students and parents are made aware of the extensive support they are receiving and the proportion of their contribution. Experience in private institutions has shown that students value the education for which they have paid.

18.0 Research

- 18.1 There is an immediate and urgent need for training our people in the scientific and technical education in order to build up our future economic life, and we should ensure that our people undertake scientific research, commerce, trade, and particularly well

planned industry. But do not forget that we have to compete with the world which is moving very fast in this direction.¹²

- 18.2 The paucity of research activity in the universities of Pakistan is evident from the low financial allocation (Rs 40 million, 1.2% of the total Government grant for universities in 2001-2002) and the low output of research publications. In addition to sources of funds to support research studies, it is necessary to develop the capacity of faculty and students for research and develop the infrastructure to support research, not only in science and technology but also in social sciences and humanities.
- 18.3 Along with the provisions pertaining directly to the conduct of research, it is also necessary for every university to establish a system of managing research, including multidisciplinary access to laboratories and provision of assistance for contract administration, financial management, and legal issues. This has direct implications for the ability of the university to attract good faculty and retain them as well as to attract external research funding.
- 18.4 Clearly, major change is necessary to create a significant capacity for research in Pakistan to enable the country to guide its development, understand its problems and find solutions for them. Growth in research will take time but should follow closely as an indicator of supportive operating conditions for motivated and effective faculty and students.

19.0 Colleges

- 19.1 Although the majority of the enrolment in higher education is found in colleges, due to insufficient time the Task Force has not considered the various categories, functions and organisations of these widely distributed institutions. However, consultation with the leadership and faculty of colleges indicated the need for careful review of the definition and systems for quality assurance, accountability, governance, management and funding. Of particular importance is the need to understand the complexity of organisation and provisions for quality assurance of professional education.
- 19.2 The following is an indication of commonly expressed ills by college educators and managers in the seminars:
- a) Arbitrary transfer of faculty.
 - b) Lack of control over recruitment and release of staff.
 - c) Admission of students based on district-wise quotas.
 - d) Lack of empathy and support for the functions and development of colleges.
 - e) Bureaucratic hurdles for accomplishment of routine matters imposed by the provincial government.
 - f) Lack of control over funds generated by the colleges.

¹² Quaid-e-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah in his message to the All Pakistan Education Conference in Karachi on the 27th of November 1947.

- g) Disbursement of budgets late in the academic year, leaving insufficient time for utilisation and resulting in lapse of the budgetary provisions.

19.3 From the discussion of the Task Force on the subject of Colleges, the following broad directions were obtained, based on general principles:

- a) Colleges should have autonomy for the provision of quality education, requiring control of recruitment, development and promotion of faculty, selection and promotion of students, and management of the institutions' financial and administrative affairs.
- b) The management and governance of colleges should be separated and organised in a manner that ensures accountability of performance to the users of the services and society.
- c) Learning should be based on understanding and application of knowledge, utilising libraries, information and communications technology, laboratories and other learning resources.
- d) Provisions must be made for educational development of teachers. Teachers' performance and development should be considered in the criteria for promotion.
- e) Colleges that perform the functions of universities should be considered for appropriate development, resources and reclassification.

19.4 The Task Force recommended that since most of the students in "degree-colleges" follow courses at the levels of Grade 11 and 12, consideration should be given to the most appropriate organisation of education at these levels, probably as high schools and preferably providing broader education than the current practice of specialisation only.

19.5 The Task Force observed that virtually all technical industrial, agricultural and commercial functions require skilled human resources. The skills acquired in such activities also provide the basis for self-employment. Whereas the skills are acquired generally through apprenticeship, they should be supported by formal education and training in colleges. A large proportion of the population that seeks access to higher education would benefit from development in colleges appropriate for specific applications, rather than the fundamental, specialised or broad intellectual development offered in universities.

19.6 Taking these observations into consideration, the Task Force recommends that in respect of enhancing the number of institutions of higher education, the private sector should consider investment in the establishment of colleges.

20.0 Curriculum Related Matters

20.1 Curricula should be the constant concerns of the faculty in all institutions of higher education. However, two matters surfaced repeatedly in discussions of the Task Force and consultative seminars concerned the poor quality of education, one related to early specialisation and the other to the duration of education required for a Bachelor's degree.

20.2 In addition to the importance of poor quality of instruction, outdated curricula and unreliable examinations, the Task Force considered that early specialisation through

segregation of students into Arts and Science streams from Grade 8 in schools was detrimental to general education and limited choices for career development at a later stage. The Task Force recommended that the Ministry of Education should give this matter serious consideration. General education was recommended not only for secondary and higher secondary levels but also for Baccalaureate programmes in order to prepare students for critical and moral reasoning, effective communication, and self directed life-long learning. Such enrichment of the curriculum will encourage good citizenship, adaptability, and innovation, facilitating the continuous renewal of economic and social structures relevant to a fast-changing world.

20.3 The Task Force considered that an important element contributing to the poor quality of education is the fact that a Bachelor's degree is awarded after 14 years of education (two years after Grade 12 or Higher Secondary Certificate) compared with 16 years internationally. One consequence of this variance from the international norm is that Pakistan's Master's degree is taken as the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree abroad.

20.4 After much discussion on the consequences of past attempts to increase the duration of undergraduate education and the financial burden of effecting the change as well as the implementation of 4-year Bachelor's programmes in some public universities, the Task Force recommends the institution of a 4-year Honours Bachelor's degree that would be a pre-requisite for admission to a Master's programme. For the time being the existing 2-years Bachelor's degree will have to continue, per force, due to the paucity of physical resources and faculty to institute a 16 years degree requirement for all students. Hence the Task Force recommends the 16 years Graduation for that small percentage of students wishing to pursue postgraduate studies. The Task Force recommends increased attention and effort to improving education standards through in-service training of teachers, updating curricula, improving facilities and finances.

21.0 National Education Testing Service (NETS)

21.1 The Secretariat of the Chief Executive of Pakistan requested the Task Force (Appendix 11) to advise on a long standing proposal to establish a national education testing service (NETS) for selection of candidates for institutions of higher education and improvement of education.

21.2 The argument for NETS was that the public examination boards are not standardised; there is considerable variation in the scores for a given level of performance. Consequently, admission to institutions of higher education, on the basis of scores, would be facilitated for some and rendered difficult for others. The results of the current public examinations are not reliable; this observation relates to deficiency in administration of the examinations and its systems of security.

21.3 From the viewpoint of improvement of education, the current Secondary School Certificate (SSC) and Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) examinations test for memorisation and recall, thereby promoting rote learning, which is detrimental for understanding and application of knowledge at all levels, and poor preparation for higher education.

- 21.4 If NETS provided curriculum-based examinations and tested understanding and application of knowledge, it would conflict with the requirements of the SSC and HSC examinations, inasmuch as teachers prepare their students so that they can obtain the high scores in the Board examinations that are required for access to the next level of education.
- 21.5 If NETS provided tests of logical reasoning and English not based on a curriculum, emulating the SAT I and GRE of the Education Testing Service, Princeton, USA, such tests would be unfamiliar in Pakistan and place students from underprivileged education at a disadvantage.
- 21.6 The Task Force concluded that the purpose of standardisation could be served if entrance tests were given by colleges and universities that select their students from a pool of applicants who present scores given by several Boards. The establishment of NETS is not recommended for selection of students for higher education because it would replicate the existing model of examination. It will not serve as a significant instrument for improvement of education unless it replaces the examination boards and tests understanding and application of knowledge. Examinations that test for understanding of knowledge could be developed through a private-public endeavour.

22.0 Conditions for a Charter to Award Degrees

- 22.1 The Ministry of Education requested the Task Force to review the criteria proposed by the UGC for awarding a charter to private universities and institutes for granting degrees, which were under consideration by a Cabinet Sub-Committee.
- 22.2 Notwithstanding the complexity of the issues involved, and after much discussion on matters of principle and purpose that should be considered while defining the criteria, the Task Force made the following observations.
- 22.3 The Task Force acknowledged that there exists a need to facilitate the creation of private degree-awarding institutions adhering to a specified basic level of acceptable quality. This is necessary in order to provide access to higher education for a burgeoning population of youth. The Task Force approached the matter of defining the criteria from the viewpoint of assurance that the physical and financial foundations for supporting effective education must be in place so that quality is not compromised in the compelling interests of quantity.
- 22.4 The Task Force noted that a growing private sector does not necessarily lead to increased diversity, as new universities may simply respond to market demand for professional development or follow the curricular offerings of the public universities. However, new private institutions have the potential to be innovative, because they do not have an institutional history to overcome. The ability to respond to the market and recruit faculty with greater emoluments than is possible for public universities may also condition their performance and market value.
- 22.5 The Task Force concluded that the criteria for the award of degrees should apply equally to institutions in both the public and private sectors. All sponsors, whether Government, NGO, individual or corporation, should demonstrate the capacity for governance,

management, and financial support in order to sustain independent functioning of degree-awarding institutions.

22.6 In arriving at its recommendations, the Task Force has considered the following factors:

- a) The need to facilitate the creation of degree-awarding institutions with at least a basic level of acceptable quality.
- b) The need to ensure that the sponsors have the physical and financial foundations for supporting effective education and training from the very beginning, demonstrating a commitment to investments over the first 3-4 years of development, as a minimum requirement.

22.7 Considering the long-term sustenance of the institutions and the importance of their contribution to societal development, the Task Force recommended close scrutiny of the credentials and purposes of the sponsors of new institutions, and the provisions for accountability, transparency of governance and management, and maintenance of quality education.

22.8 Although the UGC’s proposal specified different levels of support for degree awarding institutes and universities, there was no definition of these institutions. Nevertheless, having been informed about the gross estimates of initial investments in three private universities (Iqra University, Hamdard University, and Lahore University of Management Sciences), the Task Force recommended the requirements for initial funding given in the following Table.

	University Rupees in million	Degree Awarding Institute Rupees in millions
Endowment	50	15
Tangible Assets (Space and Facilities)	100	25
Working Capital	50	10
Total initial	200	50
Total over 3-4 Years	400	100

22.9 Concerns were expressed about the feasibility of a single sponsor achieving the quantum of funds and the resulting discouragement of individual investors, on the one hand, and the realistic financial support required for sustenance of effective higher education, on the other. In respect of the quantum of funds, the Task Force suggested that multiple sponsors should be encouraged to join forces and form consortia instead of attempting the establishment of institutions as lone ventures. In respect of the sustenance of effective higher education, specification of the adequacy of funds was not possible without some understanding of the proposed institution’s functions.

22.10 Regarding the number of “faculties” that should be present in new institutions, the Task Force noted that the term was not defined in the proposal; the text suggested that ‘departments’ was meant. Use of the terms *faculties*, *departments*, *disciplines*, *fields of study*, *college*, *university* and *degree awarding institute*, without clear meaning, led to

confusion and the realisation that definitions are necessary if criteria are to be meaningful rather than arbitrary. That having said, the Task Force recommended that charters for colleges or degree awarding institutes could be given for those specialising in any one field of study. For universities, there could be one or more fields of study; however it would be difficult to specify a minimum number, especially where such capital intensive disciplines as medicine were involved.

22.11 The Task Force noted that some matters related to the conditions for a charter to award degrees overlapped considerations of quality assurance and accreditation; these matters will come under the purview of the Higher Education Commission.

22.12 Keeping in view the considerations for a diversified Board of Governors and accountability to the sponsors as well as the Government and society, the Task Force recommended the following composition of the Board of Governors for a private university. Half of the Members should be nominated by the Trust or Society; the other half should be professionals outside the composition of the Trust or Society.

- a) Chancellor (Chairman).
- b) Chief Executive Officer (Vice Chancellor or Rector or President) appointed by the Board.
- c) One serving or retired judge of the Supreme Court or High Court, to be nominated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court or Provincial High Court. Nominee of the Chairperson of the Higher Education Commission, not below the rank of Professor.
- d) Education Secretary of the Federal Government or of the province concerned or his nominee not below the rank of Joint Secretary.
- e) One Vice Chancellor of a public university. Three eminent educationists or scientists in the relevant discipline, to be nominated by the Chancellor.
- h) Three eminent businessmen or professionals selected by the Board of Governors.
- i) The duration of an appointment should not continue beyond two terms.

22.13 The Task Force reviewed the proposed “safeguards” to be provided in the Acts of private universities and degree-awarding institutes and recommended the following:

- a) The President of Pakistan or Governor of the province as the case may be should be Patron of the University.
- b) The Patron shall have the powers to cause a visitation to be made on the request of the Higher Education Commission (HEC) in respect of any matter connected with the affairs of the University and shall, from time to time, direct any person or persons to inquire into or carry out inspection of the university.
- c) The new university or institute shall have no power to grant affiliation to any institution for the first ten years of its existence, and that too after evaluation of its performance.
- d) In the case of a separate sub-campus or branch of the university or institute, it will be treated as a new institution and the same criteria will be applicable.
- e) The Higher Education Commission (HEC) shall be the competent authority for accreditation and standards of academic quality.
- f) The university or institute shall be liable to provide facilities to the representatives of the HEC, the Pakistan Engineering Council, Pakistan Medical and Dental Council or similar

relevant organisations for visitation to enable them to verify that the university or institute is maintaining appropriate academic standards.

- g) The HEC shall be competent to carry out periodic inspection and monitoring of the institution.
- h) The university or institute shall work within the frame-work of the Education Policy and other law or policy framed or amended by the Government of Pakistan or the Provincial Government from time to time.
- i) The university or institute shall be required to strictly comply with the constitutional provisions and law and abide by the social, ethical and cultural ethos and values.
- j) The programmes of the university or institute shall be restricted to teaching, research and services only.
- k) Double entry system of accounts conforming to international standards of accounting shall be maintained by the university or institute.
- l) Each university or institute shall have its annual accounts audited by competent external auditors.

SECTION 4: THE WAY AHEAD

1.0 Implementation Process

- 1.1 The Task Force recommends the appointment of a Steering Committee in order to develop a plan for implementation in accordance with the recommendations, to oversee the drafting of necessary legislation, and establish the HEC.

The implementation should be phased, beginning with the establishment of the Higher Education Commission (HEC).

- 1.3 While the HEC is being established, universities should be encouraged to improve the efficiency of their management, and review the membership of their structures under the current universities Acts, and be provided appropriate guidance.
- 1.4 The search for identifying appropriate candidates for the Boards of Governors of the HEC and universities should begin.
- 1.5 The universities' Acts will require changes in order to establish them as independently governed institutions.

2.0 Matters Requiring Further Work

- 2.1 The Task Force considers the following to be critical items for follow-up study and recommendations.
- a) Categorisation, funding, governance, and management of colleges.
 - b) Curricular reform.
 - c) Professional education and its relationship to universities, and quality assurance by the proposed Higher Education Commission and professional councils.
 - d) Requirements for funding of universities.
 - e) Requirements for supporting research in universities.
 - f) Assessment of academic achievement, and its use for the selection of students for higher education.
 - g) Accuracy of data on higher education.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 The Task Force firmly believes that implementation of its recommendations, the principles of which apply to both public and private institutions, will result in significant improvement in the quality of higher education in Pakistan.
- 3.2 While nothing can change unless the faculty, staff and students subscribe to the vision of an effective system of education, and therefore much of the initiative must come from within the institutions, the role of the proposed Higher Education Commission will be crucial as pacemaker, stimulant, guide, critical appraiser, supporter, and collective conscience of the

network of universities and other institutions of higher education. It must however avoid assuming a controlling role and work always towards creating an enabling environment in universities.

- 3.3 There remains an important final matter for consideration. While the early history of Pakistan is replete with inspiring examples of people who selflessly devoted themselves to the act of nation building asking only what they could do for the country, not what the country should do for them, by 1959 the Commission on National Education considered that prevailing attitudes of society would impede change. The Commission observed as follows:

- a) *“Education ... can meet its responsibilities only if a revision of attitudes on the part of the professional educator is accompanied by a change in the view point of Government and the public... In education the prevailing attitude of the public and those responsible to Government was that it warranted low priority. Among those outside the educational system there was little recognition of the fact that at independence the nation was thrown into competition with the rest of the world and that its future status depended upon how well it met this competition with the skills of its own manpower. Although our leaders were now the architects of policy rather than the implementers of the policy of others, education was neither in fact nor theory give the importance that would enable it to meet the needs of a people who controlled their own destiny. Those within the educational system failed to develop new attitudes, habits and skills consistent with the needs of a people who controlled their own destiny. Our curricula, teaching methods, administrative structure, and system of examinations continued to reflect the old ways.*
- b) *This, in broad outline, was the state of mind that had come to pervade all areas of our national life. They are the attitudes of a subject people rather than of free men. Yet it is the outlook that motivates each segment of our society that will determine ultimately our future achievements. We cannot escape the conclusion that our fundamental need is for a revolution in attitudes through which the cynicism, lethargy, opportunism, suspicion, dishonesty and indifference that have characterised the outlook of so many of our people and officials in the past will give way to a spirit of individual initiative, personal integrity, pride in accomplishment, trust in one’s fellow men, and a ‘private sense of public duty’. We have no illusion that this reorientation of values can be brought about quickly or completely, or that it can be realised only through fiat, yet come it must if we are to achieve any substantial improvement in our education system or any other sphere of national endeavour.”¹³ [The emphasis has been added by the editors of the current report]*

- 3.4 Notwithstanding the encouraging expectations expressed at the end of the quotation, it must be said that many of the attitudes mentioned above are strongly manifest today. If the status of higher education is to change, the strategies for implementing the recommendations of the Task Force should take into consideration the central importance of attitudes that condition the performance of individuals and in aggregate their institutions.

¹³ Report of the Commission on National Education, Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, 1959, P8 and 9.

SECTION 5: APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Sources of Reference

Original material emanating from the Seminars and Task Force meetings.
Papers submitted by the Committees of the Task Force.

Reports submitted to the Task Force by the Consultant and members:

by Dr. Mohammad Latif Virk (Consultant)

Policies and procedures for the accreditation of universities

A Review of the National Education Policy 1998-2010, and Education Sector Reforms: Strategic Plan 2001-2004 (Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan)

Review of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force Report 'Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise', and areas of importance and relevance for the Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan

Common recommendations of past education policies

The current status of technical education

by Capt. (R) U. A. G. Isani (Member)

Constitutional provisions for education

A review and analysis of education policies and commissions

Higher education and Five Year Plans: A critical review

Assessment of Plan performance in education

The problems of quality

Recommendations of education policies on higher education

The problems of higher education

Higher Education through distance learning

The University Grants Commission

The National Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance

The role of the private sector

Plan for the future – challenges and opportunities

A Review of the World Bank Report on Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan

Financing the universities

Self-finance in universities in Pakistan

by Mohammad Ibrahim Khan (Member)

Salient features of a Charter as recommended by the Government of the Punjab

by Dr. A. Q. Mughal (Member)

Draft proposal on the Vice Chancellor's appointment process

Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan (World Bank Report, 1990).

Higher Education In Developing Countries: 'Peril & Promise', 2000 (Report of the World Bank & UNESCO International Task Force on Higher Education and Society).

Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards a Reform Agenda (The Boston Group Report 2001)

Task Force Meetings

1 st	Islamabad: Ministry of Education	May 24 th , 2001
2 nd	Karachi: The Aga Khan University	June 20 th , 2001
3 rd	Quetta: University of Balochistan	July 18 th , 2001
4 th	Islamabad: UGC	August 23 rd , 2001
5 th	Karachi: The Aga Khan University	September 5 th & 6 th , 2001
6 th	Karachi: The Aga Khan University	October 31 st & November 1 st , 2001
7 th	Lahore: University of the Punjab	November 13 th & 14 th , 2001
8 th	Peshawar: University of Peshawar	November 19 th & 20 th , 2001
9 th	Lahore: LUMS	December 27 th & 28 th , 2001
10 th	Karachi: The Aga Khan University	January 7 th , 2002

* Extraordinary meeting at the UGC to brief ministers: Islamabad	September 13 th , 2001
--	-----------------------------------

* Presentation to the President of Pakistan: Islamabad	January 11 th , 2002
--	---------------------------------

Committees of the Task Force

The following is a record of the composition of the Committees and the matters deliberated by them for recommendations to the Task Force.

Vice Chancellor's Appointment Process

Dr. A. Q. Mughal (Convenor)
Dr. Shamsh Kassim-Lakha
Justice (R) M. A. Rashid.

Financial Procedure and Management

Dr. Zafar S. Saifee (Convenor)
Mr. M. Ashraf (General Manager Finance, LUMS)
Justice (R) M. A. Rashid
Mr. M. Yaqoob (Director-General Finance, UGC).

As per the Task Force suggestion a seminar on financial systems for higher education institutions was organised by the UGC with Dr. A. Q. Mughal as the Co-ordinator and assisted by M/s Ferguson Associates (Pvt) Ltd.

Administrative Procedures and Rules

Dr. Najma Najam (Convenor)
Dr. Zulfiqar H. Gillani
Dr. A. Q. Mughal
Mr. Ibrahim Khan

Educational Fees

Capt. U. A. G. Isani (Convenor)
Dr. Arif Ali Zaidi (AKU)
Mr. M. Ashraf (General Manager Finance, LUMS)

Governance & Management of Universities

Dr. Najma Najam (Convenor)
Dr. A. Q. Mughal
Lt. Gen. (R) Arshad Mehmood
Dr. Zulfiqar Gilani
Dr. Camer Vellani

Governance and Management of University Grants Commission and the Universities

Dr. Zulfiqar H. Gilani (Convenor)
Dr. A. Q. Mughal
Dr. Camer Vellani
Dr. Khalid Hamid Sheikh
Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haq Siddiqui
Dr. Arif Ali Zaidi
Dr. Mohammad Latif Virk

Research Productivity Grants

Dr. Qasim Mehdi (Convenor)

Dr. A. Q. Mughal

College Affairs

Mr. M. Ibrahim Khan (Convenor)

Dr. Najma Najam

Dr. A. Q. Mughal

Capt. U. A. G. Isani

Subjects Discussed in Seminars

Vision and purpose of higher education

Mission of higher education for society

Utilisation of the mission for institutional support, academic programmes, research, recruitment of faculty, staff and students

Enhanced resources

Improved infrastructure: faculty, students, space, equipment and supplies, library, information technology and communication, recreational and cultural facilities

Enhancing financial resources

Long-term support for programmes: by society, government, alumni, endowments, commerce and industry

Support for operations: tuition and fees, grants and earnings from endowments and infrastructures

Accountability

Improved efficiency

Recruitment, selection, retention, motivation, development and performance of faculty and staff

Design, review, implementation accountability and management of academic programmes and research

Administrative support for academic functions

Collegial, co-operative effort

Research

Faculty and staff development for research

Quality and relevance of research and utilisation of outcomes in economic growth and development of society

Multidisciplinary national and international linkages for collaborative work

Funding for research capacity and studies

Students and alumni

Selection

Improved quality of school and higher secondary education

Improved preparation for higher education

Support for students from economically and socially disadvantaged populations

Financial and geographical access to programmes

Rational evaluation of students in respect of curricular objectives

Extracurricular activities

Quality assurance

Relevance of academic programmes to the needs of society, general education, and application in the country

Systems for review, evolution and change of programmes

Systems for assurance of quality of academic programmes

Accreditation

Governance and management

Organization structures to support the functions of higher education

Accountability to the beneficiaries and users of higher education, society, supporters, and provincial and federal government

Profile of Seminar Participants

Vice Chancellors, Rectors, Presidents	25
Deans	17
Academic Directors	21
Principals	32
Faculty	232
Students	56
Federal Government officials	5
Provincial Government officials	14
Employers	10
TOTAL	412

Educational Institutions Represented at the Seminars

SINDH	<p>KARACHI: University of Karachi, The Aga Khan University, Sir Syed University, Ziauddin Medical University, Baqai Medical College, Jinnah University for Women, Iqra University, Isra University, Indus Valley School of Art & Architecture, SZAB Institute of Science & Technology, St. Patricks Govt. College, DJ Science College, Govt. College of Commerce, Delhi Govt. College, Textile Institute of Pakistan, The Aga Khan Educational Services, The Aga Khan Sultan Mohammed Shah School.</p> <p>HYDERABAD: Liaqat University of Medical & Health Sciences, Shah Abdul Latif University.</p> <p>JAMSHORO: University of Sindh.</p> <p>TANDOJAM: Sindh Agricultural University.</p> <p>NAWABSHAH: Quaid-e-Awam University.</p>
BALUCHISTAN	<p>QUETTA: University of Balochistan, Agricultural College, Govt. Girls Inter College, Federal Govt. College, Govt. Girls College, Govt. Science College, Technical Education Project, Govt. Degree College, Bahria Foundation College, Science Education Project, Balochistan Education Foundation, Bolan Medical College, Tameer-e-Nau Public College, University Law College.</p> <p>SIBI: Girls College, Govt. College.</p>
ISLAMABAD CAPITAL TERRITORY, FATA, FANA, AJ&K	<p>ISLAMABAD CAPITAL TERRITORY: Quaid-e-Azam University, Allama Iqbal Open University, International Islamic University, National University of Modern Languages, Bahria University, Al-Khair University, COMSAT Institute of Information Technology, Pakistan Institute of Engineering & Applied Sciences (Nilore), National Institute of Historical & Cultural Research, National University of Computer & Emerging Sciences, Preston University, Federal Govt. Margala College for Women, Federal Govt. College for Men, Islamabad College for Girls, Federal Govt. College for Women, Federal Govt. College, Islamabad Model College for Boys, OPF Girls College, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), National Institute of Science & Technical Education (NISTE).</p> <p>AZAD JAMMU & KASHMIR: Post-graduate College for Women (Bagh), Mohiuddin Islamic University (Nerian Sharif), Govt. Post-graduate College (Mirpur), Azad Jammu & Kashmir University (Muzaffarabad), Govt. Post-graduate College (Bagh), Govt. Girls Degree College (Kotli).</p> <p>GILGIT: Federal Govt. Post-graduate College, Degree College for Women</p> <p>SWABI: Ghulam Ishaq Khan Institute of Engineering Sciences & Technology (Topi).</p> <p>KOHAT: Government College (Darra Adam Khel).</p> <p>PARACHINAR: Govt. College, Govt. Girls College.</p> <p>JAMRUD: Govt. College of Education for Elementary Teachers (Female).</p>

<p>PUNJAB</p>	<p>LAHORE: University of the Punjab, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), Government College, University of Engineering & Technology, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore College for Women, Government Forman Christian College, Home Economics College for Women, Fatima Jinnah Medical College, King Edward Medical College, Govt. APWA College, M.A.O. College, Islamia College, College of Business Administration & Engineering Technology, Centre of Excellence in Molecular Biology.</p> <p>RAWALPINDI: Fatima Jinnah Women University, University of Arid Agriculture, National University of Science & Technology (NUST), Govt. College for Women, Federal Govt. Sir Syed College, Govt. College, Govt. Post-graduate College.</p> <p>MULTAN: Bahauddin Zakariya University.</p> <p>SARGODA: Govt. College.</p> <p>FAISALABAD: University of Agriculture.</p> <p>TAXILA: University of Engineering & Technology.</p>
<p>THE NORTH WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE</p>	<p>PESHAWAR: University of Peshawar, CEWCOS University, City University of Information Technology, Eduardes College, NWFP Agricultural University, Peshawar Engineering University, Govt. Frontier College, Hazara University, College of Home Economics, Jinnah College, Islamia College, Pashto Academy, JCW, LIMS, Govt. College, Islamia Collegiate School.</p> <p>ABBOTTABAD: Govt. Post-graduate College (Kakul), Pakistan Military Academy (Kakul), Burn Hall College for Boys.</p> <p>DERA ISMAIL KHAN: Gomal University.</p> <p>MARDAN: Govt. Post-graduate College.</p>

Development Expenditure on Education in Five Year Plans
(Rupees in billions)

Five Year Plans	Total development outlay	Development outlay for education	Education as %age of total development outlay	Development outlay for higher education	Higher education as %age of total development outlay	Higher education as %age of education outlay
1 st (1955-60)	9.3052	0.581	6.2%	0.175	1.88%	30%
2 nd (1960-65)	19.0	1.423	7.5%	0.190	1.0%	13%
3 rd (1965-70)	52.0	2.674	5.14%	0.395	0.76%	15%
4 th (1972-77)	75.0	3.665	4.9%	0.705	0.94%	19%
5 th (1977-83)	215.0	10.255	4.8%	1.457	0.68%	14%
6 th (1983-88)	490.0	19.830	4.0%	3.400	0.70%	17%
7 th (1988-93)	642.4	22.680	3.5%	2.415	0.37%	11%
8 th (1993-98)	1700.5	69.032	4.0%	6.607	0.39%	10%

*Sources: Obtained from the Five Year Plans

PAST EDUCATION POLICIES

Pakistan Education Conference, 1947

Convened between the 27th November and 1st December 1947 for the purpose of assisting the Education Division in determining the future educational policy and programme of action, the Conference was energised by the Quaid-e-Azam's message which called for scientific and technical education in order to build the future economic life of the country, and to instil in the people the highest sense of honour, integrity, responsibility and selfless service to the nation. The Conference recommended the following:

- Aptitude based selection and admission of students.
- Initiation of mass literacy programmes.
- Free and compulsory primary education for a period of five years.

Commission on National Education, 1959

The Commission was appointed by a resolution adopted by the Government of Pakistan on the 30th of December 1959, with the mandate of evolving a national system of education which would reflect the spiritual, moral, and cultural values of independent Pakistan, and enable the system to meet the growing needs of the nation in the fields of agricultural, scientific and technological development.

The Commission recognised that civilised societies have for many centuries looked to their institutions of higher learning for the training of leaders in government and the professions. It emphasised that higher education must be concerned with the formation and development of character along with the acquisition of knowledge.

Celebrated for its exhaustive analysis and recommendations, the 'Shareef Report', as it came to be popularly known, was not supported sufficiently by funds and political will.

Its following highlights warrant recollection:

- Recognition of Higher Education as a distinct stage, and the separation and transfer of intermediate classes from the jurisdiction of universities to the Boards of Secondary Education.
- Increase in the duration of the course of study for Bachelor's Degree in Arts and Science from the prevailing two to three years.
- Simplification and strengthening of administrative and academic functions through a revision of the University Acts.
- Establishment of the University Grants Commission to develop higher education and co-ordinate university and college programmes.
- Prohibition of students to participate in politics, or serve the interests of groups outside the academic community.
- Development of community service programmes by each university on the basis of an intensive survey of the community and its needs.
- Definition and enforcement of strict rules governing the affiliation of colleges.
- Four years minimum duration of degree courses in all engineering colleges.
- Institution of postgraduate courses in engineering colleges.
- Five years duration of courses for award of degree in agriculture. Minimum duration of two years thereafter for Master degree, and a further minimum two years duration for PhD.
- High priority to agricultural research, and the establishment of the Council of Agricultural Research.
- Establishment of a full fledged agriculture university in each province.
- Extension of the post-graduate LLB course from two to three years.

An allocation of only Rs.1323 million was made in the corresponding Second Five Year Plan. Its following recommendations were, however, implemented:

Curricula for primary and secondary education were revised, and new syllabi were introduced in 1961. Islamic studies and religious education were made compulsory subjects for classes 1 to 8, and optional subjects in classes 9 and 10.

Greater emphasis was laid on technical education, and short term evening classes were started in Polytechnics and other technical institutions.

A number of engineering colleges were established in the country, and two engineering colleges were raised to the status of universities.

Intermediate education was separated from universities, and Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education were established.

New Education Policy, 1970

This policy was announced on the 28th of November 1969, the same day that the then President of Pakistan announced the dissolution of the One Unit in West Pakistan.

The policy regarded educational development as a dynamic and continuous process, which implied an evolutionary exercise and periodic appraisals of policy and programmes on the part of the state, the community, and all others concerned with it.

It was a forward looking and well-intentioned policy which was allocated a sum of Rs. 892 crores (Rs. 8920 million) in the Fourth Five Year Plan period. Unfortunately it suffered a premature demise as a consequence of political disturbances and change of government. Its salient features were as follows:

Great emphasis on universal enrolment up to class 5.

Decentralisation of educational institutions to allow greater community participation.

Secondary and tertiary education institutions to have their own governing/advisory bodies with representation from government, parents, teachers, and founders.

National Research Fellowships and National Professorships Schemes to be financed by the central government.

Establishment of two National Institutes of Modern Languages.

Higher pay scales for faculty members tied to qualifications and research output.

System of sabbatical leave for faculty members.

Education Policy, 1972

This policy made recommendations similar to the New Education Policy of 1970.

What made it radical with far reaching consequences was its recommendation for nationalisation of all privately managed institutions. The implementation of the nationalisation programme put the national exchequer squarely on the back foot, raising non-development expenditure six folds.

It contained the following recommendations specific to higher education:

Limit enrolment in arts to 5% per annum, and increase enrolment in sciences at 10% per annum.

Establish new universities at Multan, Saidu Sharif, and Sukkur.

Convert Jamia Islamia Bahawalpur into a full fledged university.

Raise the Agricultural College Tandojam, NED Engineering College Karachi, and Engineering College Jamshoro to the status of a university.

Add new faculties to the Agriculture University Faisalabad.

Add a medical College to the Balochistan University.

Add under-graduate faculties to the University of Islamabad.
Develop a collaborative programme between PINSTECH and the University of Islamabad.
Establish the University Grants Commission to act as a buffer between Government bureaucracy and university administration.
Establish Area Study Centres for research in general universities.

The achievements of this policy included:

Raising the total expenditure on education from Rs. 70 crores (Rs. 700 million) in 1971-72 to Rs. 120 crores (Rs. 1200 million) in 1972-73.

Nationalisation of privately managed institutions.

Expansion of enrolments at all levels without achieving the goals set for universal basic education, shift towards agro-technical studies, and ideological orientation.

Six new universities were established, raising the number from six to twelve.

Campus colleges of engineering at Nawabshah and Taxila were established.

Enrolment in universities increased by 56%.

National Education Policy, 1979

Presented in February 1979, the stated aim of this policy was the harmonisation of education with the concepts of Islam and the ideology of Pakistan.

The major change introduced through this policy was the use of the national language as the medium of instruction with a view to strengthening the ideological foundations of the nation, and to foster unity of thought, brotherhood and sense of patriotism.

Its other recommendations were as follows:

No new universities would be established for the next five years except for women's universities.

A national testing system for admission to higher education would be developed and launched.

Pre-service and in-service teachers training programmes would be organised by the National Academy of Higher Education at the UGC.

University teachers would be allowed to render consultative services to other organisations and agencies.

On-the-job training would be necessary for engineering and agriculture graduates.

The financial implications of this policy were estimated at Rs:28,898 million within the context of the 5th Five Year Plan (1978-83). In addition a sum of Rs:256 million would be required to give education the desired ideological direction.

The following milestones were achieved by this policy:

The medium of instruction was switched over to Urdu in government schools.

Private schools were allowed to have English as the medium of instruction. This led to the operation of two different systems of education within the country, one for those who could afford private education, and one for the rest of the nation. This two tier system contributed to a widening socio-economic inequity with the consequent feeling of injustice and resentment.

The policy of nationalisation was reversed.

The private sector was encouraged to open schools.

The funding of universities was made through the Federal government.

National Education Policy, 1992

This policy was initiated in December 1992 with the objective of restructuring the existing educational system on modern lines, and to bring a social change as dictated by the teachings of Islam. It envisaged a qualitative shift for higher education from supply to demand oriented study programmes, and placed a heavy premium upon Research, Community Participation, and Student Discipline.

Unfortunately, this policy too fell victim to the vagaries of political expediency and instability. It started out realistically enough by recognising the need to create an operational framework which would improve quality by ensuring effective translation of policy principles into concrete action at the level of educational institutions. It was prepared for a period of ten years (1992-2002), and like its predecessors aimed at universal primary education. Some of the highlights unique to this policy are as under:

Professional associations in various disciplines shall be encouraged and given substantial financial support for holding professional conferences and publication of research journals.

Competitive grants shall be provided to research institutions doing high quality basic and applied research.

The research fund placed by the government at the disposal of the National Scientific Research and Development Board (NSRDB) shall be gainfully used for promoting research related to economic development of the country. For this purpose a higher education research policy will be formulated. An Information Retrieval System will be set up at the UGC for facilitating the flow of information to researchers.

Teachers shall be subjected to a strict regimen of accountability through performance evaluation, on the basis of which rewards and punishments will be awarded by review boards established for the purpose. Degree level education will be restructured and diversified by introducing such courses in a three years Honour's degree programme which may enhance employability of the students.

A National Council of Academic Awards and Accreditation may be established to regulate the academic affairs of such institutions in the private and public sectors which are given degree awarding status. Special programmes to promote the entrepreneurial role of the university through enhanced industry-academia interaction should be launched.

National Awards will be instituted for creative research in social sciences.

A Dean of Students Affairs will be appointed in each educational campus for promoting and regulating the co-curricular activities of students. He will also act as an Ombudsman to deal with the complaints of the students.

Placement services will be established on each campus for providing information and guidance related to job opportunities and career planning.

A campus security force will be established at each campus.

Teachers will be vested with powers to deal with acts of hooliganism, and impose penalties on culprits, without recourse to the discipline committee.

Such student clubs will be encouraged which could enhance academic excellence, sharpen intellectual activities and promote creativity.

Parents Bodies and Alumni Associations will be organised on each campus for seeking periodical advice about maintaining discipline on the campus.

The Vice Chancellor will be vested with full authority to expel a student if he is not satisfied with his conduct and behavior. No appeal will lie against the decision of the Vice Chancellor.

The rule of 80% attendance of classes will be strictly enforced.

Interaction between the university and community will be encouraged to identify common problems and seek assistance from the academic community for solutions.

College and university students will be assigned, individually or in groups, to community service.

The restriction of No Objection Certificate will be lifted for the participation of teachers in international conferences.

National Education Policy, 1998-2010

Announced in March 1998, the policy acknowledged that there was an unprecedented demand for higher education, as well as the fact that higher education in Pakistan was beset with problems of a most pressing nature. These problems were identified as limited access to higher education, and a tilt towards arts education, low investment, politicisation and polarisation of the faculty and student body, outdated curricula and system of assessment, lack of merit, low quality of students and education, inadequate student support services and deficient physical infrastructure, unresponsiveness, inefficiency, and mal-administration; altogether a very strong indictment of the system.

Four general policy objectives were defined. These were: a) to achieve universal primary education, b) diversify, with a view to transforming the system from supply oriented to demand oriented, c) prepare students for the pursuit of professional and specialised education, d) achieve comparability with international standards by upgrading the teaching, learning and research processes.

The structural changes identified as being necessary to achieve the policy objectives were: a) private provision of higher education, b) autonomy to increasing number of institutions, c) decentralisation of higher education, d) amendments in the acts of the Universities and the UGC, e) development of an efficient system of cost effectiveness and responsiveness, f) public accountability, g) liaison with industry, and h) a system of accreditation for quality control.

The functional changes required included a) faculty development, b) revision of curricula, c) academic audit, d) corruption free system of examination, e) selectivity of higher education, and, f) diversity of higher education institutions.

The policy picked up the three years bachelor degree programme recommendation of the 1959 Shareef Commission report, but skirted the issue due to high financial costs and possible political repercussions.

The policy recommendations are listed as under:

Allocation to universities to be non-lapsable.

Funding of education to be raised from 2.2% to 4% of GNP.

Access to higher education to be expanded by at least 5% of the relevant age group.

Introduction of 3 years bachelor (honours) degree, with honours students given preference in university admission and government recruitment.

Provision of special funds for research.

Strengthening of laboratories and libraries.

Establishment of foreign linkages, and linkages with industry.

Up-gradation of good departments to Advanced Centres.

Modernisation of curricula.

Faculty development and incentives to teachers.

Introduction of two track system for appointment of university teachers.

Internal and external academic audit of universities.

Revision of universities Acts.

Introduction of zero based budgeting in universities.

Universities to generate their own funds.

Provision of guidance and counselling and career development services to students.

Student support services to be enhanced.

Scholarships to be increased.

National testing service to be established.
Exemption from tax on import of educational equipment.
All quotas to be abolished.

The policy lays down a detailed implementation strategy for carrying out the recommendations.

Education Sector Reforms, Strategic Plan 2001-2004

The constitution of the Education Advisory Board by the present government, and the formulation of the 'Education Sector Reforms: Strategic Plan 2001-2004' points in the direction of a critical continuity in policy. As per the policy recommendations, the Liaquat University of Medical and Health Science has been established in Hyderabad, and a liberal policy in respect of private and public sectors to enhance access to higher education is being pursued. Also, since the policy announcement, 16 universities and degree awarding institutions have been established.

The reform package realises that Pakistan needs a vibrant higher education sector for socio-economic development and technological advancement, and lists on the following as top development priorities:

- Improve the accessibility and enlarge the enrolment.
- Improve the quality of higher education.
- Major shift of emphasis to science and technology.

The document has identified that inadequate admission standards, less duration of our general bachelor degree, lack of resources, shortage of qualified teachers, poor textbooks, dilapidated facilities, and an unreliable evaluation mechanism have eroded the quality of education.

The recommendations propose the introduction of a one year Honour course for the general bachelor degree, the raising of funding for higher education from the present 0.39% of GNP to 2% of GNP by the year 2010, the creation of endowment funds for research in universities, an academy for university teachers, a revised service structure for university teachers, strengthening of libraries and laboratories, and linkage with the world of work.

In order to effect the shift to science and technology, the enrolment ratio of arts to science is to be improved from the present 70:30 to 50:50, with the introduction of science subjects in colleges and provision of physical infrastructure along with the introduction of new emerging disciplines.

The cost of implementing these recommendations has been estimated at Rs:10.582 billion.

Higher Education And Scientific Research For Development In Pakistan (World Bank 1990)

In February 1990 the World Bank published an exhaustive study titled '*Higher Education And Scientific Research For Development In Pakistan*', calling for a complete overhaul of systems and attitudes, and suggesting that transformation of higher education and research in Pakistan to become a significant contributor to development will require a long term, multifaceted, and carefully sequenced effort. The reform package had been linked to two indispensable preconditions: (a) commitment from Pakistan's political and administrative leadership to correcting the institutional efficiency and service delivery weaknesses (educational process) of the sector, and (b) the creation of a policy environment conducive to change in higher education and research.

The Report recommended the following strategy for improvement and reform:

Strengthening and adaptation of existing institutions rather than creating new ones, unless their retention will inhibit reforms or perpetuate bad practice.

Decentralisation of responsibility and accountability.

Careful preparation and phased implementation, planning, and prioritisation of higher education and research by an apex body taking into consideration the issues of institutional framework, quality control and assurance, resourcing, efficiency, financial and academic autonomy, private sector provision, incentives for improved performance.

Revitalising the policy making function for higher education and research.

Creation of an overall operational framework which stimulates improvement.

Increase in the overall resources available to the sector.

Ensure the efficient use of all available resources.

Improve the development and delivery of services at the institutional level.

The Report was regarded by many as an oversimplified renunciation of the positive category of events prevailing in our higher education.

The implementation of the Report required a strong commitment of the politicians and bureaucracy, and massive funding outlay for the reform strategy, both of which were not available. Neither was the Government support to execute the major institutional transformation that the Report required¹⁴.

¹⁴ A Review of the World Bank Report on Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan by Dr. Mohammad Latif Virk

Key Principles of Financial Management¹⁵

Three key principles should guide a university's management of its financial resources. First, recurrent revenues must cover recurrent costs; second, that this must be true for all comprising units of the institution (e.g. departments, libraries, examinations, commercial activities); and third, that information about revenues and expenditures are public property and should be placed in the public domain. These may appear to be simple (even simplistic) and fairly uncontroversial propositions, but their implications are far from simple.

For purposes of this discussion, costs as well as revenues can be divided into two categories: core and ancillary. The purpose of this distinction is to separate essential activities from auxiliary ones, permanent activities from those that might take place occasionally, and predictable activities from exigencies. Given this, the fundamental principle of financial discipline should be the same as in most not-for-profit organizations, namely that core costs should be funded exclusively from (predictable) recurrent revenues. Recurrent expenditures are the direct and indirect costs associated with normal teaching functions of a university. The costs associated with the normal teaching functions include faculty salaries and benefits, salaries and benefits of non-teaching staff (administration, library, security, lab technicians, buildings and grounds maintenance, student counselling, teacher training, alumni and donor relations, and the like), maintenance and operation of infrastructure (rent, utilities, repair, replacement of classrooms, offices, dorms, sports facilities), communications equipment and recurrent costs, library equipment and publications, teaching materials, and laboratory materials.

These should be distinguished from developmental or ancillary activities, which may cover short term or ad hoc initiatives as well as expansion or revamping of the structure, funds for new buildings, new programs, new commercial ventures, and new equipment.

Recurrent revenue sources are mainly tuition, earnings from endowments, and predictable government grants. Other sources, including alumni contributions, funding by philanthropic foundations or technical assistance sources, ad hoc government grants, and surpluses and overheads from commercial activities (including consultancies by faculty members, rental of real estate, summer programs, rental of equipment or conference facilities, and others), should be characterized as non-recurrent in nature, and therefore as developmental or ad hoc revenues. Further details on each of these items are provided below. In the ideal case, these additional sources of revenue, which are unpredictable and ad hoc in nature, should not be used to fund recurring activities. Of course, it is possible that some of these might generate predictable incomes. Still, the principle ought to be that the surpluses, if any should be ploughed into an endowment fund, and thus the inherently unpredictable form of revenues be converted explicitly into a predictable form.

If this principle is followed, it has implications for a number of related issues. First, it implies a more stringent and transparent financial management. Each element within the university structure should operate as a separate cost centre, with clearly defined budgets and reliably reported activities. Ideally, all the revenues and expenditures of the university should be placed on the web in order that the exercise will be useful in other ways as well. It will help the university communicate to its students the true costs of a university education, provided it forms the basis of the (nominal) tuition fees to be charged to them. It will also provide the basis of information to the

¹⁵ *Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards a Reform Agenda*, The Boston Group Report, 2001.

government and other donors in order to generate predictable revenue streams. Finally, it will permit the comparison of different universities and colleges by estimating their unit operating costs, thus indirectly placing them in a financial discipline grid. The second point in the imposition of financial discipline is to ensure that not only the entire university, but also each and every cost centre is financially solvent. This means that the aggregate budget needs to be allocated to every cost centre and fiscal discipline introduced at that level.