

Problems in the Implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs) at Elementary level



**Muhammad Aslam Bhatti
Shaista Bano
Fahmeeda Khanam
Asif Hussain**

**Edited by
Dr. Shahnaaz A. Riaz
Khawaja Sabir Hussain**

**Academy of Educational Planning and Management
Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan
Taleemi Chowk, G-8/1, Islamabad**

2011

AEPAM, Islamabad, 2010

Research Team

Muhammad Aslam Bhatti, Joint Director
Asif Hussain, Research Officer
Abdul Rehman, P.S/Researcher
Muhammad Sohail Ajmal, Research Assistant

Data Analysis

Yasir Irfan, Senior Programmer

Data Entry

Tahir Shahzad , (Steno Typist)

Report Writing

Muhammad Aslam Bhatti, Joint Director
Shaista Bano, Deputy Director
Fehmeeda Khanum, Research Officer

Typing, Composing, and Technical Assistance

Zulfiqar Ali Joya, Stenographer
Tahir Shahzad (Stenotypist)
Zahoor Hussain Shah (Stenotypist)

Main Entry under Authors

Main entry under Authors:

Dr. Shahnaaz A. Riaz and M. Aslam Bhatti

Problems in the Implementation of National Education Policies
at Elementary Level: - (AEPAM Research Study No. 237).

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Educational Policies</i> | 2. <i>Educational Problems</i> |
| 3. <i>Elementary Education</i> | 4. <i>Research Study</i> |

379.154

999-444-

PREFACE

Knowledge is the special gift of Allah Subhana-ho-wa Taala for mankind and it is the base for human distinction and pride in the universe. Knowledge is essentially a product of education. Societies that emphasize education have historically prospered. Ever since societies developed into states education has been the responsibility of the independent. States to recognize education as a right of the citizen. Therefore, right from the existence of Pakistan, the founding father Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah realized that the future of our nation depended on a productive pursuit of knowledge through education.

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2009 is the latest in a series of education policies dating back to the very inception of the country in 1947. The review process for the National Education Policy 1998-2010 was initiated in 2005 and the first public document, the White Paper was finalized in March 2007. The White Paper, as designed, became the basis for development of the Policy document. Though four years have elapsed between beginning and finalization of the exercise, the lag is due to a number of factors including the process of consultations adopted and significant political changes that took place in the country.

Two main reasons prompted the Ministry of Education (MoE) to launch the review in 2005 well before the time horizon of the existing Policy (1998 - 2010) firstly, the Policy did not produce the desired educational results and performance remained deficient in several key aspects including access, quality and equity of educational opportunities and secondly, Pakistan's new international commitments to Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Dakar Framework of Action for Education for All (EFA). Also the challenges triggered by globalization and nation's quest for becoming a knowledge society in the wake of compelling domestic pressures like devolution and

demographic transformations have necessitated a renewed commitment to proliferate quality education for all.

The success of the Policy will depend on the national commitment to this cause. Already there has been a marked improvement in this sector, as all provinces and areas, as well as the federal government have raised the priority of education. This will now have to be matched with availability of resources and capacity enhancement for absorption of these resources to improve education outcomes for the children of Pakistan. It is a long journey that has already begun. It is hoped that the policy document will help to give a clearer direction and institutionalize the efforts within a national paradigm.

I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Muhammad Aslam Bhatti, Joint Director, Ms. Shaista Bano, Deputy Director and Ms. Fahmeeda Khanam, Research Officer for their efforts for managing, analysis and reporting the study. I admire the services of Mr. Yasir Irfan, Senior Programmer for providing technical assistance of computer for data analysis. The services of Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Joya, Stenographer and Mr. Tahir Shahzad, Stenotypist are also appreciated for typing & composing the report.

(SHAIGAN SHAREEF MALIK)
DIRECTOR GENERAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>S. #</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page #</u>
	Preface	ii
	Executive Summary	vi
Ch. I	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Rationale Justification	2
1.2	Statement of the Problem	2
1.3	Objectives of the Study	3
1.4	Significance of the Study	3
1.5	Delimitations of the Study	3
1.6	Limitations of the Study	3
Ch. II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
2.1	Frequent Development of Education Policies	6
2.2	Over ambitious Targets	6
2.3	Financial Constraints	7
2.4	Insufficient Provisions in the ADP	7
2.5	Cuts imposed without any prior planning	7
2.6	Unequal distribution of Funds	7
2.7	Different priorities in different provinces	8
2.8	Non-availability of reliable and up to date statistical data	8
2.9	Lack of appropriate implementing machinery	8
Ch. III	METHODOLOGY	9
3.1	Population	9
3.2	Sample of the Study	9
3.3	Research Instruments	10

3.4	Pilot Testing of Research Instruments	11
3.5	Procedure for Data Collection	11
3.6	Procedure of Data Analysis	12
3.7	Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	12
Ch. IV	DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	13
4.1	Analysis of Questionnaire for Provincial Educational Managers	13
	Questionnaire II	25
Ch. V	OBSERVATIONS/FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS	43
5.1	Observations and Findings Questionnaire-I	43
5.2	Suggestions/Recommendations for Questionnaire-I	47
5.3	Suggestions/Recommendations for Questionnaire-II	48
	Conclusions	48
	Recommendations	49
	Bibliography	50
	Annexures	53

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study was designed to investigate the problems in the implementation gap of National Education Policies (1992-2002, 1998-2010) and Education Sector Reforms Program (2001-06). The study was descriptive in nature. The sample of the study consisted on 11 districts from all over the country were selected. Two questionnaires were designed for data collection. One Questionnaire was designed for Provincial Educational Managers and responded by 88 provincial educational managers. The second questionnaire was designed for District Educational Managers and responded by 655 District Educational Managers.

Research team of AEPAM consisting of two researchers personally visited each sample district to collect data. Data collection from the respondents through questionnaire 1 and 3 were coded and entered into database. On the basis of the data analysis findings of the study were drafted. The major findings of both the questionnaires are separately given below:

Findings of the Study

1. It was found that the majority of the respondents (total 53 percent, male 52 percent and 1 percent female) were involved in the policy formulation stage.
2. It was also found that 93 percent provincial educational managers (male 88 percent and female 5 percent) said that economic condition is the major factor influencing in the implementation of NEPs.
3. As far as the implementation status of National Education Policies 1992, 1998 and ESR Program (2001-06) is concerned, it was found that:
 - i. The majority of the respondents were of the view that recommendations of the National Education Policy 1992 were partially implemented.
 - ii. Majority of the respondents thought that the recommendations of National Education Policy 1998-2010 were implemented at the range of 25% to 50%
 - iii. Majority of respondents thought that the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms Program were partially implemented.
4. It was further found that majority of the respondents (total 93 percent, male 87 percent and female 6 percent) mentioned that political instability and absence of

effective monitoring and evaluation system were the main factors for the non-implementation of NEPs.

5. Majority of the respondents (total 85 percent, male 80 percent and female 5 percent) indicated that financial problem was not the main reason for non-implementation of NEPs.
6. Majority of the respondents (total 39 percent male 38 percent and female 1 percent) suggested that education budget should be increased, it should be released in time and strict check and balance should be applied on utilization of allocated funds for education.
7. It was found that majority of the respondents (total 91 percent) considered that there should be provision of financial resources in time and maintaining proper coordination were important steps for better implementation of National Education Policies.
8. It was found that 24 percent responded suggested that special monitoring team should be constituted at provincial and district level for the improvement of monitoring mechanism.
9. It was found that majority of the respondents (Total 78, Male 47% and Female 31%) were not involved in the policy formulation process.
10. Data indicated that majority of the respondents had no access to the hard copies of education policies and ESR documents. It was observed that only 10% respondents (Male 5% and Female 5%). That access to the hard copies of the NEPs and ESR documents.
11. The reasons for non-availability of the policy document were sought. Majority of the respondents (Total-20%: Male 13% – Female 7%) indicated that circulation problems of policy document and lack of coordination with federal ministry are the main reasons in this connection.
12. Majority of the respondents (Total-15%, Male 7% and Female 8%) viewed that economic condition was an important factor which influenced the policy implementation.
13. As far as the implementation status of NEP 1992, 1998 and ESR (2001-06) program was concerned, it was observed:
 - i) Majority of the respondents were of the opinion the recommendations of the policy NEP 1992 were partially implemented.

- ii) Majority of the respondents thought that the recommendations of the NEP 1998-2010 were implemented at the range of 25-50%.
 - iii) Majority of the respondents were of the view that the thrust areas of education sector reforms were partially implemented.
14. The majority of the respondents (Total 35%; Male 21% and Female 14%) thought that improvement in quality education should be the first priority area of educational program. Moreover, 2% respondents (Male 1% and Female 1%) viewed that achieving universal primary education (UPE) upto 2015 should be the fifth priority area of education.
 15. There were many factors which were affecting implementation of NEPs. According to 74% respondents (Male 43% and Female 31%) policy targets are too ambitious. In the opinion of 90% respondents (Male 50% and Female 40%) lack of timely releases of funds was the factor. In the view of 88% respondents (Male 50% and Female 38%) lack of infrastructure was the factor. In the opinion of 87% respondents (Male 50% and Female 37%) the lack of accountability was the factor.
 16. it was found that 49% respondents (Male 30% and Female 19%) financial problem was the main reason for non implementation of National Education Policies. To solve those problems majority of the respondents viewed that budget might be released in time and allocated funds might be utilized.
 17. It was also found that 57% respondents (Male 32% and Female 24%) lack of coordination among implementing agencies was a major hurdle in implementation of National Education Policies.
 18. it was further found that 64% respondents (Male 36% and Female 27%) pointed that proper monitoring mechanism should be adopted for effective implementation of National Education Policies.
 19. There were so many issues and challenges that were still facing at elementary level of education. According to 74% respondents (Male 42% and Female 32%) weak instructional supervision was an important issue. According to 16% respondents (Male 9% and Female 7%) poor quality of education was another challenge still facing at elementary level. In the views of 15% respondents (Male 8% and Female 7%) lack of physical facilities was another issue.

CONCLUSIONS

1. It was concluded that majority of the Provincial and District Education Managers were not involved in policy formulation stage.
2. There are many factors which were adversely affected the implementation of national education policies. Among these factors poor economic condition lack of political commitment, non involvement of stakeholders, discouraging attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries were important as far as implementation of NEPs was concerned.
3. As far as the implementation status of national education policies, 1992, 1998 and ESR (2001-06) program was concerned, it was reported by the majority of the respondents that the recommendations of those national education policies and ESR program were partially implemented.
4. There were many factors which were badly affecting implementation of national education policies. Some of the major factors were, policy targets are too ambitious lack of technical and trained educational managers, financial resources constraints and political instability.
5. It was reported that financial problems was the main reason for non implementation of NEPs. Therefore, budget might be released in time and funds might be properly utilized.
6. There were so many issues and challenges that were still facing at elementary level. Some of the main issues were teachers, absenteeism, weak instructional supervision, poor quality of education and lack of physical facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations/ suggestions are proposed:

1. All the district and provincial education managers may be involved from the initial stage of policy formulation and preparation.
2. Economic condition of the country may be improved as it was identified as major influencing factor for the implementation of NEPs.
3. There may be strong coordination amongst various departments and stakeholders.

4. Primary education may be made compulsory and free to achieve UPE targets through fully implementation of NEPs.
5. Integration of primary and middle level of education into elementary education may be fully implemented as mentioned in NEPs.
6. Accountability as one of the factors which was adversely effected the implementation of NEPs which may be considered seriously.
7. Technical stream at secondary level of education may be fully implemented as one of the thrust areas of ESR.
8. Steps may be taken for proper planning and utilization of available funds to overcome financial constraints.
9. Monitoring system may be strictly be followed for achieving the targets of NEPs.
10. Public private partnership may be encouraged to overcome the financial constraints.
11. Steps may be taken to eliminate gender and rural urban disparity for fully implementation of NEPs.

INTRODUCTION

Education is extensively regarded as a route to economic prosperity being the key to scientific and technological advancement. Hence, it plays a vital role in human capital formation and a necessary tool for sustainable socio-economic growth. Education also combats unemployment, confirms sound foundation of social equity, awareness, tolerance, self esteem and spread of political socialization and cultural vitality. It raises the productivity and efficiency of individuals and thus produces skilled manpower capable for leading the economy towards the path of economic development.

Since the creation of Pakistan every successive government has made efforts to provide quality education to the masses. In this context the following National Education Policies have been designed and implemented, so far.

1. The National Education Conference 1947.
2. The Report of the Commission on National Education 1959.
3. The National Education Policy 1970.
4. The National Education Policy 1972.
5. The National Education Policy 1979.
6. The National Education Policy 1992.
7. The National Education Policy 1998-2010.
8. The National Education Policy 2001-2006.

In spite of implementation of above National Education Policies the system is still facing numerous challenges such as, "more than 5.5 million primary school age (5-9) children are left outs, 45% drop out rate at primary level. Teacher absenteeism and weak supervisory mechanism, inadequate learning material etc" National Education Policy (1998-2010,p.23). Whereas, Ministry of Education, EFA (2008,pp. 91-92) states that GER for ECCE is 91% GER in primary education is 84% and NER is 66% at primary level in year 2005-06 Hence, NER in secondary Education is only 31%" The report further highlights that UPE by 2015 can only be assured by consolidating and accelerating efforts for increasing enrolments, improvement of NERs and GERs, reaching the un-reached and disadvantaged groups, enhancing survival and transition rates and minimizing drop-outs and repetition rates" EFA (2008,p.xxvii).

It is pertinent to mention that education system is facing these challenges due to not properly implemented and monitoring of the National Education policies. National Education Policy (1998-2010) describes that weak performance is due to lack of

commitment to education implementation gap which leads to poor implementation. The implementation gap, though not well documented, is believed to be more pervasive as it affects various aspects of governance as well as allocation and use of resources. For instance the amount of developmental funds allocated in education sector remains unspent to the tune of 10% to 30% of allocated funds.

The implementation gap needs to be addressed on the basis of empirical evidences, so that policy formulation can be developed by avoiding all those factors which may create hurdles while implementing the policy. This study was designed to investigate problems of implementation gap of National Education Policy 1998-2010 and Education sector reforms (2001-06) program.

1.1 Rationale/Justification

In the past every possible effort was made to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education For All targets (EFA) through implementing a number of policies and plans. Despite all of these efforts the goals could not be achieved. The existing situation regarding education access and completion of children at primary level is such that according to NEMIS report, the apparent dropout of children of age (5-9) year at primary level is about 45% thereby the system could retain 55% children. The international report indicated that about 6 million children of the same age group are out of school. The participation of children at secondary level of education is about 32%. Also the government's commitments capture the un-reached and disadvantaged groups to enhance the access and retention thereby minimizing the dropouts which could also not be successfully achieved.

The government is making on possible efforts to achieve the targets at national and international levels. In spite of policy's statements since independence the goals/targets could not be achieved. It is therefore, pertinent to identify the gaps of current situation and the targets laid down in the new educational policy 2009. This situation alarms towards whether the weak implementation or the over ambitious targets.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The National Education Policy 1998-2010 and Education Sector Reforms (2001-06) program was introduced to address critical issues. The focus of this program was UPE, Adult literacy, Early Childhood Education, introduction of technical stream at secondary level revamping of science Education, Rehabilitation of schools. Establishment of teacher training resource centers, Teacher training, and public private partnership. All these thrust areas originate from National Education Policy 1998-2010 and much still needs to be done for the development of education in the country. The present study was undertaken to investigate the problems in the implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010 and ESR program.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were as following:

- To investigate sector-wise implementation status with identification of broad gap between policy formulation and implementation;
- To analyze the existing operational strategies to gather with suggestions for improvement.
- To identify the problems in implementation of National Education Policies in Pakistan and development of mechanism.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study was launched to investigate the problems in implementation of National Education policies in the country. Consequently the study is as immense importance for educational stakeholders, planners, managers, policy makers and policy implementers in developing insight in understanding implementation implications of education policies. Moreover, the findings of the study may be helpful for education managers and other stakeholders who are having direct interaction with students.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

Keeping in view the limited time and resources, the study was limited to only 11 districts of Pakistan including Islamabad FANA and AJK. The study was further delimited to elementary level.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The coverage of the study was limited to Provincial Education Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Section Officers, Director Public Institution (DPI), Executive District Officers (EDO), District Officers (DO) and Deputy District Officers (DDO) and principals/head teachers due to time and financial constraints.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is important to recognize that all the National Education Policies were developed for the improvement of education. All those were goal-oriented and guided by philosophical, epistemological and ideological underpinnings. The main areas of emphasis in all these reports and policies are: (a) the ideological basis; (b) national unity; (c) individual development; (d) social development (e) economic progress; (f) equality of opportunity for education; (g) universalization of Primary Education; (h) emphasizing Technical and Vocational Education; (i) stress to Adult Literacy and (j), above all, improving the spread and quality of education at different levels.

In spite of many efforts, the education system is not coming up to the aspirations of nation. Since 1947, a number of efforts were made for the implementation of National Education Policies. Some significant improvements have been made, but the targets could not be achieved in totality, so far.

Literature on policy studies suggests that over-simplification of policy-making process will hardly be able to capture the complexity of policy formulation and implementation what *Bowe et al. (1992)* call 'messiness'.

Ball (1994) reinforces the need for seeing policy as both process and product. This does not only include the statement of strategic direction, organizational and operational values but also help operationalize values in its context. Recognizing the messiness and complexity of policy-making the process should be a non-linear and dialectical by engaging stakeholders at all levels.

Study of education policies, particularly in developing countries has seldom been considered as priority of their respective governments until recently. Even, policy-making had been taken for granted in developed countries (*Bell and Stevenson, 2006*).

Bengali (1999) observed that the sincerity of purpose did not produce results. The striking common features of all the policies, plans and programs are the philosophical pronouncements about the importance of education, lament about past failures and glowing optimism about impending success. Differences in the hues, and shades of various governments; be it civilian or military, elected or otherwise; socialist or Islamic; has made little difference to the manner. The results in all cases have been the same. Obviously, there has been lack of political commitment to literacy or education.

secondary education. This also results in partial or non-implementation of education policies.

2.7 Different Priorities in Different Provinces

Education is a provincial subject. The resources available to the provinces vary a lot. Consequently the priorities fixed at federal level differ widely in each province. The results in meagre provisions for education as compared to other sectors. It results in non-implementation or partial implementation of policy recommendations.

2.8 Non-Availability of Reliable and up to Date Statistical Data

Availability of valid, reliable and up to date educational statistics are essential for planning various programs and projects very few authentic studies are available for the planners. This is also one of the most important factors which affects timely and complete implementation of the policy recommendations.

2.9 Lack of Appropriate Implementing Machinery

Lack of appropriate machinery for undertaking timely action for implementing development programs is another drawback. The intended line of action is not followed. The executor of the reforms at grassroots levels does not know the policy decision/guidelines. They do not get hold of the copies of the education policies. Without training the actual spirit of the reforms measures, they can not do their best to achieve the targets.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes methods and procedures adopted for conducting this study. The study was descriptive in nature and essentially a survey type of research. The study was designed to investigate the problems in the implementation gap of National Education Policies 1992-2002, 1998-2010 and Education Sector Reforms (2001-06) program. The following methods and procedures were adopted to carry out this study.

3.1 Population

All the educational administrators from four Provinces (Sindh, Punjab, Khyber Pakhtoon Khwa and Balochistan), Gilgit Baltistan, ICT and AJK were included in the population. Therefore, all the Provincial Education Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Section Officers, Director Public Institutions (DPI), Directors, Executive District Officers (Education), Assistant Education Officers, District Officers, Deputy District Officers and Head Teachers/principals (male/female) of secondary schools working in the educational institutions of these districts were also selected as population.

3.2 Sample of the Study

The major task of this study was to select the sample districts which may be true representative sample at national level. For selection of districts criteria was developed on the basis of available human and financial resources. Convenient sampling technique was used to select the sample from each district. In order to get true representative sample two districts from each province and one district from each region were selected. 11 districts from all over the country were selected as sample for data collection. District-wise sample distribution and number of study sample for each district are given in the following tables.

Table 3.1
Province/Region/District-wise Sample Selection

S. #	Province/Region	Districts
1	Punjab	Lahore, Shaikhupura, Multan
2	Sindh	Karachi, Sukhar
3	Balochistan	Quetta, Sibi
4	KPK	Peshawar, Abbottabad
5	Gilgit Baltistan	Gilgit
6	AJK	Muzaffarbad
7	ICT	Islamabad

** Islamabad includes respondents of AEPAM Workshops.*

3.3 Research Instruments

The main research instrument for the study was questionnaire. Two questionnaires, one for provincial educational managers and the other for the district educational managers were designed to collect data. The items of the questionnaires were consisted of the following important aspects regarding the implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs).

1. Period of involvement of the respondents in the policy preparation process.
2. Factors influencing the objectives of National Education Policies (NEPs).
3. Implementation status of National Education Policies 1992, 1998-2010 and Education Sector Reforms (ESR 2001-06) program.
4. Thrust areas of Education Policies and ESR (2001-06).
5. Priority areas of National Education Policies (NEPs) and Education Sector Reforms (ESRs)
6. Factors adversely affecting the implementation of National Education Policies.
7. Suggestions about financial problems, coordination, monitoring mechanism and improvement of National Education Policy.

From the Provincial Governments side, the Education Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Section Officers, Director Public Institutions (DPI), Directors, Deputy Directors were the respondents of the Questionnaire one, which were consisted of 18 items and detail of respondents of provincial educational management is given below.

Table 3.2
Respondents from Provincial/Regional Education Management (Q-1)

S. #	Designation	Numbers
1.	Education Secretary	02
2.	Additional Secretary	05
3.	Deputy Secretary	12
4.	Director/ DPI/Dy Director/Asstt. Director/Additional Director	25
5.	Section Officer	27
6.	Others Education Officers	17
	Total	88

From the District Government side, Executive District Officers (EDOs), District Officers (DO), Deputy District Officer (DDO) Assistant Education Officers (AEOs) Head Teachers (male/female) of secondary schools are important stakeholders and play a vital role in the implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs). Therefore, their opinions about problems in implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs) were solicited through a comprehensive Questionnaire two consisted of 24 items and detail of respondents of district educational management is given below.

Table 3.3
Respondents from District Education Management (Q-2)

S. #	Designation	Numbers
1.	Executive District Officers	06
2.	District Officers	16
3.	Deputy District Officers	172
4.	Heads of Secondary Schools/ Principals	307
5.	Others Education Officers	154
Total		655

3.4 Pilot Testing of Research Instruments

Instruments of the study were tested and were finalized in the light of the feedback received as a result of pilot testing. Pilot testing was conducted in district Rawalpindi. Necessary changes were incorporated in the research instruments, however, instruments were found valid for conducting the study. Each and every question included in the research instrument was discussed with AEPAM's Faculty meeting under the guidance of Chief Investigator. Instruments of the study were tested and were finalized in the light of the feedback received as a result of pilot testing.

3.5 Procedure for Data Collection

Research Team of AEPAM consisting on two researchers personally visited each sample district to collect data. The team also conducted interviews with the provincial and district educational managers. Every effort was made by the research team to collect valid and reliable data.

3.6 Procedure of Data Analysis

Data collected from the respondents through questionnaires one and two were coded, entered into computer and fed into database. Key for data coding, data entry and tabulation plan were prepared. Frequencies, percentages and other indicators were calculated considering the objectives of the study for the generation of the report.

3.7 Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

On the basis of data analysis, findings of the study were drafted. Conclusions were drawn from the findings/observations with the consideration of the objectives of the study. Finally recommendations/suggestions were formulated for the solutions of the problems in the implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs) at elementary level.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. Two questionnaires were designed for data collection. One questionnaire was designed for Provincial Educational Managers, which was consisted of 18 items and responded by 88 Provincial Educational Managers. Another separate questionnaire was developed for District Educational Managers. It was consisted of 24 items and numbers of respondents were 655. Item-wise analysis of data of both questionnaires is given below.

4.1 Analysis of Questionnaire for Provincial Educational Managers

Table 4.1
Involvement of Provincial Educational Managers in
Policy Formulation and Preparation

S #	Stages	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Initial Stage	10	3	13
2	Formulation Stage	52	1	53
3	Final Stage	8	0	8
4	Overall Process	4	1	5
5	No response	19	0	19

Table 4.1 indicated that involvement of Provincial Educational Managers in the formulation and preparation of education policy. It was revealed that 53 percent Provincial Educational Managers were involved in policy formulation stage out of which 52 percent male and only 1 percent female. Only 13 percent Provincial Educational Managers were involved at the initial stage in the formulation of education policy, among them 10 percent male and 3 percent were female.

The involvement of Provincial Educational Managers in overall process varies from 4 percent to 1 percent. 19 percent respondents have not given any response.

Table 4.3 shows the implementation status of the various recommendations for National Education Policy 1992-2002. The policy statement *primary education shall be recognized as a fundamental right of every Pakistani child* it was noted that 26 percent respondents said that. It was fully implemented, 66 percent respondents viewed that it was partially implemented. Majority of the respondents (66 percent) viewed that it was partially implemented. The second variable "primary education made compulsory and free so as to achieve universal enrolment by the end of the decade" most of the respondents 59 percent out of which 56 percent male and 3 percent female viewed that it was partially implemented.

As far as the policy statement "*implementation of the medium of instruction to be determined by the provinces*" total 53 percent respondents were in favor out of which 50 percent male and 3 percent were female. Responding the factor for "provision of two rooms primary school with five teachers as minimum norm during the transitory period" the overall responses were 44 percent indicated that it was partially implemented out of which 41 percent male and 3 percent female.

Regarding the policy statement of "development of primary education in private sector will be encouraged" it was noted that 49 percent respondents indicated that the recommendation was partially implemented out of which 47 percent male and 2 percent female. As regard the "primary education will be transformed into basic education (Elementary extending to class VIII)", it was revealed that 48 percent respondents viewed that it was partially implemented, 46 percent male and 2 percent were female.

In short according to data showed in Table 4.3 all the recommendations of Education Policy 1992 described here, were partially implemented.

Table 4.4
Implementation status of National Education Policy 1998-2010

S#	Objectives of NEP 1998-2010	Male (%)				Female (%)				Total (%)			
		25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R	25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R	25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R
1.	To integrate primary and middle level education into elementary education (I-VIII).	55	21	10	9	2	0	2	1	57	21	13	10
2.	To increase participation rate at middle level from 46% to 65% by 2002-03 and 85% by 2010.	48	33	6	10	0	1	2	2	46	34	8	13
3.	To enhance retention and completion of primary education cycle up to 90% students (both boys and girls) by the year 2010.	41	36	7	10	2	1	2	0	43	38	9	10
4.	To ensure achievement of minimum level of learning up to 90% primary education students by the year 2010.	40	38	7	10	2	1	2	0	42	39	9	10
5.	To expand and strengthen the base for secondary education.	34	41	7	13	3	0	1	1	38	41	8	14
6.	To meet the basic learning needs of the child in terms of essential learning tools as well as the basic learning contents.	42	34	7	11	0	3	2	0	42	38	9	11
7.	To reduce the existing disparities to half by the year 2010.	47	30	3	15	3	0	0	2	50	30	3	17

Table 4.4 showed the implementation status of different recommendations of National Education Policy 1998-2010. Responding the first variable, "*Integration of primary and middle level education into elementary education*", majority of respondents (total 57 percent; 55 percent male and 2 percent female) indicated that the implementation status of the policy statement was between 25% to 50% and 10 percent had given no response. Responding the second variable; "*increasing the participation rate at middle level from 46% to 65% by 2002-03 and 85% by 2010*", majority of the respondents 46 percent indicated that the implementation status of this statement was between 25%-50% and 13 percent had not responded.

In response to the third variable, "enhancing retention and completion of primary education cycle up to 90% students (both boys and girls) by the year 2010", majority of the respondents (43 percent) viewed that the implementation status was between 25% to 50%. The fifth variable, *expanding and strengthening the base for secondary education* majority of the respondents (41 percent) viewed that the implementation status of this statement was between 50%-75%. As far as, the implementation status of fourth, sixth and seventh variables were concerned majority of the respondents viewed that those were implemented 25%-50%.

Table 4.5
Implementation status of Thrust Areas of Education Sector Reforms
(ESR 2001-2006)

S #	Policy Statements	Male (%)				Female (%)				Total (%)			
		FI	PI	NI	N/R	FI	PI	NI	N/R	FI	PI	NI	N/R
1.	Universal Primary/ Elementary Education	9	69	10	6	2	2	0	1	11	72	10	7
2.	National Literacy Campaign – Integrated Approach to Poverty Reduction	7	64	18	6	0	2	3	0	7	66	22	6
3.	Technical Stream at Secondary Level	2	47	41	5	2	2	1	0	5	49	42	5
4.	Improving the Quality of Education: Curriculum Reform, Teacher Education and Training, Exam Reform and Assessment	13	61	15	6	2	3	0	0	15	65	15	6
5.	Mainstreaming Madrassahs	2	38	48	7	2	1	1	1	5	39	49	7
6.	Higher Education Sector	3	68	16	7	1	2	0	2	5	71	16	9
7.	Public Private Partnership	7	65	16	7	2	3	0	0	9	68	16	7

FI = Fully Implemented, PI = Partially Implemented, NI = Non Implemented, N/R = No Response

Table 4.5 mentioned that the implementation status of the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms (ESR) program. Data showed that majority of the respondents, 72 percent viewed that the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms UPE were partially implemented followed by 71 percent higher education sector and 66 percent national literacy campaign integrated approach to poverty reduction. For the variable mainstreaming Madrassah Education majority respondents (49%) were of the view that the variable was not implemented. The responses for the variable "Technical Stream at secondary level as the same as (42 percent) responded that it was not implemented.

Table 4.6
Factors Adversely Affecting the Implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010

S #	Factors Affecting the implementation of NEP	Male (%)			Female (%)			Total (%)		
		A	DA	N/R	A	DA	N/R	A	DA	N/R
1	Policy targets are too ambitious	69	13	13	3	0	2	73	13	15
2	Lack of technical, trained educational managers	86	5	3	4	0	2	90	5	6
3	Human Resources constrains for implementation of policy	84	7	3	3	0	2	88	7	6
4	Financial Resources constrains for implementation of policy	83	7	5	6	0	0	89	7	5
5	Political instability.	87	3	3	6	0	0	93	3	3
6	Lack of capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district levels.	78	13	3	6	0	0	84	13	3
7	Lack of releases of funds in time	81	10	3	6	0	0	86	10	3
8	Lack of infrastructure.	80	11	3	5	0	1	84	11	5
9	Lack of accountability.	84	6	5	6	0	0	90	6	5
10	Absence of effective/proper Monitoring and evaluation system	87	3	3	6	0	0	93	3	3

A = Agree

DA = Disagree,

N/R = No Response

Table 4.6 indicates the factors adversely affecting the implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010. Majority of the respondents total 93 percent; (87 percent male and 6 percent female) mentioned that political instability and absence of effective/proper monitoring and evaluation system are the main factors for the non-implementation of National Education Policy, 1998-2010. However, a number of respondents (total 90 percent) indicated that lack of technically trained educational managers and lack of accountability were also important factors that were hindrance for non-implementation of the National Education Policy. A significant number of respondents (88 percent) identified those human and financial resources constraints were also important factors effecting the non-implementation of National Education Policy.

Majority of respondents agreed with the statements that these were the main factors which influence the implementation of policy. It was noted that none female respondents disagreed with the statements.

Table 4.7
Policy Implementation could not be made due to Financial Problem

S #	Responses	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	1	0	1
2	No	80	5	85
3	No Response	13	1	14

Table 4.7 shows that majority of the respondents (total 85 percent; 80 percent male and 5 percent female) indicated that the financial problem was not the main reason for non-implementation of National Education Policies. 14 percent respondents had not responded the question.

Table 4.8
Suggestion to Overcome Financial Constraints

S #	Suggestions	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Budget should be released on time/Strict check on utilization of allocated funds properly.	38	1	39
2	More percentage of GDP may be allocated for education at national level.	6	1	7
3	Effective monitoring and evaluations system to achieve the desired results.	1	0	1
4	Public Private Partnership shall be encouraged/participation of community.	5	2	7
5	Planning should be made to make education department self sufficient economically	5	0	5
6.	No response	40	1	41

In Table 4.8 suggestions of the respondents to overcome the financial constraints were sought. Majority of the respondents (total 39 percent) suggested that education budget should be increased, it should be released on time and strict checks should be applied on utilization of allocated funds for education. Allocation of more percentage of GDP on education and Public Private Partnership were also emphasized. Majority of respondents 41 percent had not responded the question.

Table 4.9
Lack of Coordination among Implementation Agencies

S #	Responses	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	1	0	1
2	No	80	5	85
3	No Response	13	1	14

Table 4.9 showed that majority of the respondents viewed that lack of coordination among implementation agencies was not the major hurdle in the

Table 4.12
Mechanism designed for Monitoring of National Education Policies

S #	Suggestions	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	A committee may be made to overlook the matter sincerely/ Coordination and Accountability.	7	0	7
2	Establishment of cells for implementation of M&E system in all Provinces/There should be monitoring system among the federal provisional and district level.	19	2	21
3	In provinces continuous monitoring through education officers/Special monitoring teams is made at provincial, district levels and federal levels.	24	0	24
4	Provinces shall be independent to allocate resources according to their needs	10	1	11
5	Monitoring system should be improved by considering the real situations.	7	1	8
6	Increase sense of responsibility in all levels either he/she is a headteacher or educational managers.	4	1	5
7	No Response	25	0	25

Table 4.12 indicated the suggestions regarding the improvement of monitoring mechanism. Overall (24 percent) respondents suggested that special monitoring team should be constituted at provincial and district level. Therefore, it is essential that these recommendations must be considered for monitoring mechanism designed for effective implementation of National Education Policies. 21 percent respondents were of the view that monitoring system of policy may be at Federal, Provincial and District Levels. 11 percent respondents were of the view that provinces may be independent to allocate resources according to their needs. One fourth respondents (25 percent) had not responded the question.

QUESTIONNAIRE-II

Table 4.13
Involvement in Policy formulation/Preparation Process

S #	Response	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	1	0	1
2	No	47	31	78
3	No Response	8	13	21
4	Total	55	45	100

Table 4.13 indicates that 78 percent respondents were not involved in the policy formulation process, whereas, only 1 percent respondents were involved and 21 percent have not given the response. The above table also shows that the gender wise ratios i.e. 47 percent male and 31 percent female respondents were not involved in the policy formulation. It was noted that out of total respondents (655), 55 percent male and 45 percent female.

Table 4.14
Factors Influencing on implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs)

S #	Factors influencing the objectives of NEPs	Male (%)			Female (%)			Total (%)		
		Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R
1	Economic condition	7	45	4	9	30	6	15	75	10
2	Lack of Socio-culture needs	5	42	8	8	31	5	13	74	13
3	Partially inclusion of Ideology of Pakistan	4	39	13	8	30	7	12	69	20
4	Partially inclusion of Islamic Principles and fundamentals	6	35	14	7	31	7	13	66	21
5	Political Commitment	7	31	17	9	30	6	16	61	23
6	Non involvement of stake holders	8	48	19	8	31	6	16	79	24
7	Extent of donor agencies/international development partners	7	49	29	6	32	6	13	81	35

8	Attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries:									
	<i>A Bureaucrats</i>	34	16	5	25	19	2	59	35	6
	<i>B Technocrats</i>	36	15	4	26	17	2	62	32	7
	<i>C Economists</i>	6	30	19	8	28	8	15	58	28
	<i>D Planners</i>	6	34	15	7	32	6	14	65	21
	<i>E Politicians</i>	8	34	13	8	31	6	15	65	20
	<i>F Stakeholders</i>	7	30	18	8	32	6	15	62	23
9.	Lack of coordination of various departments									
	<i>Ministry of Education and P & D, Departments</i>	8	34	14	8	31	5	16	66	19
	<i>Ministry of Education and district governments</i>	8	31	17	8	35	2	15	67	18

Table 4.14 indicates the responses regarding the factors influencing the implementation of National Education Policies. The overall responses indicated that 15 percent responded that economic condition was the factor out of which, 7 percent male and 8 percent female. As regard the factor lack of socio-cultural needs, 15 percent indicated in favor of it, among them 5 percent male and 8 percent female.

One of the factors influencing the objectives was "partially inclusion of ideology of Pakistan". For this overall responses were 12 percent out of which 4 percent male and 8 percent were female. It was observed that 13 percent responses relates to partially inclusion of Islamic principles and fundamentals out of which 6 percent male and 7 percent female, whereas, 21 percent mentioned no response.

For political commitment, the overall percentage was 16 percent out of them 7 percent male and 9 percent were female. For non-involvement of stakeholders responses were 16 percent. Out of which 8 percent each male and female. As concerned the factor relating to the extent of donor agencies. The responses indicated 13 percent out of which 7 percent male and 6 percent were female.

For the factor attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries. Respondents were of the view that bureaucrats 59 percent, technocrats 62 percent economists 15 percent planners 14 percent politicians 15 percent and stakeholders 15 percent influence the objective of National Education Policies.

As concerned the factor relating to lack of coordination of various departments opinion of the respondents was sought, 16 respondents had observed that coordination between Ministry of Education and Planning & Development (P & D) was the influencing factor and 15percent were of the view that coordination between Ministry of Education and District Government was factor.

Table 4.15
Access to the hard copy of Education Policies and ESR Documents

S #	Access to the hard copy	Male (%)			Female (%)			Total (%)		
		Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R
1	National Education Policy 1992-2002	5	40	10	4	32	9	9	72	19
2	National Education Policy 1998-2010	8	38	10	5	31	9	13	69	18
3	Education Sector Reforms (ESR) Program	8	38	9	7	30	8	15	68	17

Table 4.15 indicates that only 9 percent respondents had access to the hard copy of National Education Policy 1992-2002 out of which 5 percent male and 4 percent were female. Only 13 percent respondents indicated that they possessed the National Education Policy 1998-2010 document out of which 8 percent male and 5 percent were female. 15 percent respondents possessed hard copy of Education Sector Reforms (ESR) out of which 8 percent male and 7 percent were female.

No response regarding the access of National Education Policy 1992-2002 was 19 percent of which 10 percent male and 9 percent were female. Similar pattern was noticed in case of 1998-2010 Policy and Education Sector Reforms (ESR) respectively. 72 percent had no access of National Education Policy 1992-2002 out of which 40 percent male and 32 percent were female. Almost the same pattern was observed in case of 1998-2010 Policy and Education Sector Reforms. The situation was very embarrassing toward "No access" to the hard copy of education policy documents.

Table 4.16
Reasons of Non availability of Policy documents

S #	Reasons	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1.	Lack of time to find out Policy document.	2	2	4
2.	Circulation problems of Policy documents/non-availability of Policy Documents in institutions.	13	7	20
3	Lack of coordination with Federal Ministry of Education, Provincial and District governments.	12	9	21
4	Non awareness on Policy documents and its importance.	7	5	12
5	Non involvement of stakeholders of education department for policy formulation.	3	3	6
6	Irresponsible behavior for policy circulation and sharing.	2	2	4
7	ESR program was not shared with the stakeholders at the early stage.	1	0	1
8	Hard copy of NEPs was not provided to the stakeholders.	2	1	3
9	No response	15	14	29

Table 4.16 indicates the reasons of non-availability of policy documents given by the respondents. 21 percent respondents responded that lack of coordination with Federal Ministry of Education, Provincial and District Education Departments. Further the same percentage (20) indicated the circulation problems of policy document which were not available in libraries.

The maximum responses 29 percent related to no response. As regard the gender-wise responses the same pattern was observed. 12 percent male respondents mentioned that lack of coordination at Federal, Provincial and District Government, whereas 9 percent females showed the same views. Similarly 13 percent male and 7 percent female indicated circulation problems and non-availability of policy documents in their institutions.

Table 4.17
Implementation Status of NEP, 1992-2002

S #	Policy Statements	Male (%)				Female (%)				Total (%)			
		FI	PI	NI	N/R	FI	PI	NI	N/R	FI	PI	NI	N/R
1.	Primary education shall be recognized as a fundamental right of the every Pakistani child	13	37	4	1	11	27	5	2	24	64	9	3
2.	Primary education shall be made compulsory and free so as to achieve universal enrolment by the end of the decade.	16	31	7	1	16	21	5	3	32	52	12	4
3.	The medium of instruction as may be determined by the provinces, shall be either the approved provincial language, the national language, or English.	11	26	17	2	10	23	9	4	21	49	25	5
4.	For this transitory period the minimum norm will be a two-room primary school with 5 teachers.	4	22	27	1	5	21	17	2	9	44	44	3
5.	Development of primary education in the private sector will be encouraged.	12	36	7	1	13	25	5	2	25	61	12	2
6.	In due course of time, primary education will be transformed into basic education (elementary education extending to class VIII).	13	23	18	1	9	24	10	2	22	47	28	3

FI = Fully Implemented, PI = Partially Implemented, NI = Non Implemented, N/R = No Response

The policy statement "provision of primary education shall be made compulsory and free so as to achieve UPE by the end of the decade" was fully implemented as indicated by 32 percent respondents (16 percent each male female). 52 percent responded partially implemented (31 percent male and 21 percent female) and 12 percent said not implemented. 24 percent respondents indicated that "primary education shall be recognized as a fundamental right of every child" was fully implemented. However, 64 percent (37 percent male and 27 percent female) were of the view that it was partially implemented, whereas, 9 percent said that it was not implemented.

The statement "medium of instruction as may be determined by the provinces shall be either the approved provincial language, the national language or English" as indicated by 21 percent respondents (11 percent male and 10 percent female) was fully

Table 4.19

Implementation status of thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms (ESR)

S #	Policy Statements	Male (%)				Female (%)				Total (%)			
		25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R	25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R	25-50	50-75	75-100	N/R
1.	Universal Primary/Elementary Education	10	37.8	5.5	1.9	6.9	28.1	4.1	5.6	17.2	65.8	9.5	7.5
2.	National Literacy Campaign - Integrated Approach to Poverty Reduction	8	33.7	12.0	1.6	3.9	27.0	8.7	5.0	12.0	60.7	20.7	6.6
3.	Technical Stream at Secondary Level	7	25.3	21.8	1.7	5.1	22.9	12.2	4.4	11.7	48.2	34.0	6.1
4.	Improving the Quality of Education: Curriculum Reform, Teacher Education and Training, Exam Reform and Assessment	10	33.5	10.5	1.7	7.0	27.9	4.8	4.8	16.7	61.5	15.3	6.6
5.	Mainstreaming Madrassahs	3	27	22.9	1.4	4.4	21.8	13.6	4.8	8.3	49.0	36.5	6.2
6.	Higher Education Sector	6	32.9	15.1	1.7	4.2	26.8	8.1	5.5	9.8	59.8	23.2	7.2
7.	Public Private Partnership	6	33.9	12.8	3.1	5.5	24.3	8.1	6.7	11.1	58.2	20.9	9.8

Regarding the universal primary/elementary Education of policy statement of Education Sector Reforms (ESR), 17 percent responses indicated that Primary/Elementary education shall be made universalizes in between 25-50 percent followed by 66 percent in between the range of 50-75 percent. 10 percent responses were between 75-100 percent, however, 7 percent no response received out of which 2 percent male and 5 percent were female. As gender wise situation, it was revealed that (10 percent male and 7 percent female) were responded that the same policy statement was implemented within the range 25-50. 38 percent males and 28 percent female's responses were between the range 50-75 percent and 6 percent males, 4 percent females respectively responded within the range 75-100 percent.

17 percent responses were within the range 25-50 in respect of the policy statement of ESR to improve the quality education, Teacher Education etc of which 10 percent males and 7 percent were females of the same range. However, 6 percent no responses received of which 2 percent were males and 4 percent females. About 62 percent said that it was implemented within the range 50-75 in respect of the policy statement of which 34 percent males and 28 percent were females. As regard the overall situation, 15 percent respondents indicates that the policy statement was implemented

within range 75-100 percent out of which 10 percent male and 5 percent were female of the same range.

11 percent responses were within the range 25-50 in respect of the policy statement of public private partnership of which 5 percent males and females respectively of the same range. However, about 10 percent no responses received out of which 3 percent were males and 7 percent were females. 58 percent responses were in the range 50-75 percent according the Education Sector Reforms (ESR) policy statement of which 34 percent males and 24 percent were female. As regard the overall situation, 21 percent respondents indicates that the policy statement was implemented within the range 75-100 percent out of which 13 percent were male and 8 percent female of the same range.

Table 4.20
Mode of Opinion for Priority Areas in Educational Planning

Priority Areas	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	N/R
Literacy Enhancement	Male (%)	15.3	17.2	7.3	3.9	3.9	7.8
	Female (%)	10.8	10.3	8.6	3.1	3.6	8.3
Achieving Universal primary Education by 2015	Male (%)	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.9	53.4
	Female (%)	1.9	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.5	40.7
Improvement in Quality Education	Male (%)	21.4	15.0	5.0	3.9	1.7	8.4
	Female (%)	14.2	12.8	3.0	3.9	3.0	7.8
More emphasis on Technical and Vocational Education	Male (%)	4.7	5.9	11.7	10.3	14.0	8.7
	Female (%)	4.4	4.7	5.6	8.7	13.1	8.1
Improvement in Infrastructure of school education	Male (%)	4.1	3.3	6.6	19.5	13.4	8.6
	Female (%)	2.8	2.8	4.4	14.8	12.0	7.8

The above table was prepared in view of responses for the priority areas. Achieving UPE by 2015 was taken as first priority area. In this regard zero percent was indicated by males and 2 percent by female. The second priority was shown by 1 percent male and female. The third priority was mentioned by zero percent male and 1 percent female. The fourth priority was supported by zero percent male and female, 53 percent male and 41 percent female mentioned no response in this connection.

Improvement in quality education was taken as first priority areas by 21 percent male and 14 percent female. The second priority area was mentioned by 15 percent male and 13 percent female. The third priority was indicated by 5 percent male and 3 percent female. The fourth priority was responded by 10 percent male and 9 percent female. The

the most important factor resulted in the non-implementation of NEP; and not responded by 5 percent respondents.

The factors; lack of capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district level, "lack of infrastructure, and lack of accountability" are important factor that was agreed by 87 percent respondents (48 percent male and 39 percent female), 88 percent respondents (49 percent male and 39 percent female), and 87 percent respondents (51 percent male and 36 percent female) respectively, while disagreed by 7 percent (5 percent male and 2 percent female), 7 percent respondents (4 percent male and 3 percent female) and 6 percent respondents (3 percent each male female) respectively, whereas no response was given by 6 percent respondents (2 percent male and 4 percent female), 5 percent respondents (2 percent male and 3 percent female), and 7 percent respondents (2 percent male and 5 percent female) respectively.

Therefore, it is concluded from the above table that releasing of funds in time, capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district levels, provision of infrastructure and accountability are the crucial factors for the effective implementation of National Educational Policies.

Table 4.22
Financial Problems for the Implementation of NEPs

S #	Response	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	30	19	49
2	No	18	19	37
3	No Response	7	7	14

It was indicated from the table 4.22 that 49 percent respondents (30 percent male and 19 percent female) viewed financial problems were the reasons for non-implementation of National Education Policies. Moreover, 37 percent respondents (18 percent male and 19 percent female) rejected this response, while 14 percent respondents (7 percent male and 7 percent female) gave no response in this connection. The majority of the respondents (49 percent) viewed financial problems were the main hurdles for non-implementation of National Education Policies.

Table 4.23
Suggestions to Overcome the Financial Constraint for the better
Implementation of NEPs

S #	Suggestions	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Budget should be released on time and utilization of allocated funds properly.	17.9	13.6	31.5
2	More percentage of GDP may be allocated for education.	3.6	0.6	4.2
3	Proper training and facilitation to manpower for implementation of NEP.	0.6	0.5	1.1
4	Effective monitoring and evaluations system to achieve the desired results.	0.9	0.3	1.2
5	Proper planning is required to utilize available funds.	1.7	1.2	3.0
6	Public Private Partnership shall be encouraged/ participation of community may be ensured.	1.9	0.8	2.7
7	Planning should be made to make education department on fraud reality.	1.4	0.6	2.0
8	Monitor system of NEP may be from Federal-Provincial and District.	0.9	0.6	1.6
9.	No response	26.4	26.4	52.7

Table 4.23 indicates the suggestions to overcome the financial constraints for the better implementation of National Education Policies. It is observed that majority of respondents 32 percent (18 percent male and 14 percent female) suggested that Education Budget should be increased, it should be released on time and strict checks should be applied on utilization of allocated funds for education. 52 percent (26 percent each male female) gave no response in this connection.

Table 4.24
Lack of Coordination among Implementation Agencies

S. No	Response	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	32.6	24.0	56.6
2	No	17.9	15.6	33.5
3	No Response	4.8	5.0	9.8

Table 4.24 revealed that majority of the respondents viewed that lack of coordination among implementation agencies was the major hurdle in the implementation of National Education Policies (NEPs). 57 percent respondents (33 percent male and 24 percent female) favored that item, while 34 percent respondents (18 percent male and 16 percent female) not in favored, whereas, 10 percent respondents (5 percent each male and female) gave no response in this connection.

Table 4.28
Major Issues and Challenges Facing At Elementary Level

S #	Policy Issues and Challenges	Male (%)			Female (%)			Total (%)		
		Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R	Yes	No	N/R
1	Access to education	6.2	36.5	12.6	6.2	27.9	10.5	12.5	64.4	23.1
2	Teacher absenteeism.	9.2	34.2	12.0	9.2	25.6	9.8	18.4	59.8	21.8
3	Weak instructional supervision at elementary level.	42.4	12.3	0.6	31.5	11.9	1.2	73.9	24.2	1.9
4	Untrained teachers.	5.8	36.8	12.8	5.5	28.5	10.6	11.2	65.4	23.4
5	Poor quality of education.	8.6	34.6	12.2	7.5	27.0	10.1	16.1	61.6	22.3
6	Lack of physical facilities	7.6	35.4	12.3	7.6	26.8	10.1	15.3	62.2	22.5
7	High drop out rate	7.0	35.9	12.5	6.7	27.6	10.3	13.7	63.5	22.8
8	Gender disparity	7.5	35.6	12.3	5.8	28.2	10.6	13.3	63.8	22.9
9	Rural urban disparity	7.2	35.7	12.5	7.0	27.3	10.3	14.2	63.0	22.8
10	Low survival rate	5.3	37.1	12.9	5.0	28.9	10.8	10.3	66.0	23.7

Table 4.28 indicates the responses in respect of issues and challenges being faced at elementary education. Majority of the respondents 74 percent (42 percent male and 32 percent female) indicated that weak instructional supervision is the major issue that was still facing. Another important issue was teacher absenteeism that was mentioned by 18 percent respondents (9 percent each male and female).

Table 4.29
Suggestions for the Improvement of Implementation of National Education Policy

S. No	Suggestions	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	Proper allocation of budget and timely releases to meet targets	6.9	3.4	10.3
2	Proper training and provision of physical infrastructure/ Effective M&E system for these activities	5.9	6.4	12.3
3	All stakeholder may be involved in the process of policy formulation and implementation	13.6	6.6	20.1
4	Copies of new education policy may be provided to all stakeholders for proper implementation	5.8	6.9	12.6
5	Coordination between policy developers and implementations at national, provincial and district levels	7.6	7.5	15.1
6	Gender and rural urban disparity may be considered.	0.8	0.5	1.2
7	Policies may not change if government changed	1.6	1.7	3.3
8	Universalization of primary and elementary education may be given importance.	2.3	1.1	3.4

Table 4.29 describes the suggestions for the improvement of implementation of National Education Policies. Majority of the respondents 20 percent (14 percent male and 6 percent female) indicated that all stakeholders might be involved in the policy formulation process. A good number of respondents 15 percent; (8 percent male and 7 percent female) mentioned that there should be coordination between policy developers and implementers at national, provincial and district levels. Some respondents also gave suggestions for consideration of gender and rural urban disparities.

OBSERVATIONS/FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS/ SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Observations and Findings Questionnaire-I

On the basis of data analysis, the following findings of the study were drawn.

5.1.1 Findings

1. It was found that majority of the respondents (total 53 percent; 52 percent male and 1 percent female) were involved in implementation stage. Only 10 percent respondents (8 percent male and 2 percent female) were involved in initial stage of policy formulation process.
2. There are many factors influencing on implementation of National Education Policies. Some of main factors were;
 - i. According to 93 percent respondents (88 percent male and 5 percent female) economic condition are an important factor.
 - ii. In the opinion of 84 percent respondents (78 percent male and 6 percent female) political commitment was an influencing factor for implementation of National Education Policies.
 - iii. 73 percent respondents (68 percent male and 5 percent female) thought non-involvement of stakeholders was a significant factor in this connection.
 - iv. 69 percent respondents (64 percent male and 5 percent female) indicated that attitude are perception of politician was an influencing factor.
 - v. 67 percent respondents (65 percent male and 2 percent female) reported that attitude of bureaucrats was an important factor.
 - vi. 67 percent respondents (64 percent male and 3 percent) considered that lack of coordination between Ministry of Education and District Government influenced on implementation of National Education Policies.
 - vii. 66 percent respondents (61 percent male and 5 percent female) mentioned that attitude and perception of stakeholders played an important role in this connection.
3. As far as the implementation status of National Education Policies 1992, 1998 and ESR Program is concerned, it was reported:

- i. According to the majority of respondents, the recommendations of the National Education Policy 1992 were partially implemented.
 - ii. Majority of respondents thought that the recommendations of the National Education Policy 1998-2010 were implemented at the range of 25%-50%.
 - iii. According to the views of majority of the respondents the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms were partially implemented.
4. There are many factors which were adversely affected the implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010. Some of the main factors were:
5. It was found that majority of the respondents (total 78 percent; 47 percent male and 31 percent female) were not involved in the policy formulation process.
6. Data indicated that majority of the respondents had no access to the hard copies of Education Policies and ESR documents. It was observed that only 10 Percent respondents (5 percent male and 5 percent female) had access to the hard copies of the National Education Policies and ESR documents.
7. The reasons for non-availability of the policy document were sought. Majority of the respondents (total 20 percent; 13 percent male and 7 percent female) told that circulation problems of policy document and lack of coordination with federal ministry are the main reasons in this connection, which are causing hurdles in policy implementation.
8. There were many factors influencing on implementation of National Education Policies. Some of the main factors were:
 - i. In the opinion of 15 percent (7 percent male and 8 percent female) economic condition was an important factor which influences the policy implementation.
 - ii. According to 16 percent respondents (7 percent male and 9 percent female) political commitment was the reason for implementation of National Education Policies.
 - iii. 16 percent respondents (8 percent male and 8 percent female) thought non-involvement of stakeholders was an influencing factor.
 - iv. 59 percent respondents (34 percent male and 25 percent female) reported that attitude and perception of government functionaries was an important factor.
 - v. 62 percent respondents (36 percent male and 26 percent female) considered that attitude perceptions of government functionaries were an important influencing factor.

- vi. 16 percent respondents (8 percent male and 8 percent female) thought that lack of coordination between Ministry of Education and P & D, Departments, Provincial and District governments influenced on implementation of National Education Policies.
9. As far as the implementation status of National Education Policies 1992, 1998 and ESR Programs was concerned, it was found that:
- i. Majority of the respondents were of the view that National Education Policies 1992 were partially implemented.
 - ii. Majority of the respondents thought that the recommendations of the National Education Policy 1998-2010 were implemented at the range of 25%-50%.
 - iii. Majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms were implemented at the range of 25%-50%.
10. Priority areas in educational program were:
- i. 36 percent respondents (21 percent male and 14 percent female) improvement in quality education is the first priority area of educational program.
 - ii. 28 percent respondents (17 percent male and 10 percent female) reported that literacy enhancement should be the second priority area of education.
 - iii. 18 percent (12 percent male and 6 percent female) thought that more emphasis should be given on technical and vocational education and it should be third priority area of education.
 - iv. 44 percent respondents (20 percent male and 14 percent female) indicated that improvement in infrastructure of school education may be the fourth priority area of educational program.
 - v. Only 2 percent respondents (1 percent male and 1 percent female) achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) upto 2015 was the fifth priority area of educational program.
11. There were many factors which were affecting implementation of National Education Policy. Some of the main factors were:
- i. It was found that 74 percent respondents (43 percent male and 31 percent female) policy targets are too ambitious.
 - ii. In the opinion of 85 percent respondents (48 percent male and 37 percent female), lack of technical and trained educational managers was the factor affecting the implementation of policy.

- iii. 81 percent respondents (45 percent male and 36 percent female) thought that human resources constraints were the factors implementation of policy.
 - iv. 82 percent respondents (46 percent male and 36 percent female) reported financial resources constraints for implementation of policy.
 - v. 69 percent respondents (49 percent male and 20 percent female) considered political instability was the factor.
 - vi. According to 87 percent respondents (48 percent male and 39 percent female), lack of capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district level was the factor.
 - vii. Majority of the respondents (total 90 percent; 50 percent male and 40 percent female) considered lack of timely releases of funds was the factor.
 - viii. 88 percent respondents (49 percent male and 39 percent female) thought lack of infrastructure was the factor.
 - ix. 87 percent respondents (50 percent male and 37 percent female) mentioned that the lack of accountability was the factor.
 - x. In the opinion of 83 percent respondents (47 percent male and 36 percent female) absence of effective/proper monitoring and evaluation system.
12. It was further found that 49 percent respondents (30 percent male and 19 percent female) financial problem was the main reason for non-implementation of National Education Policies.
13. 57 percent respondents (32 percent male and 24 percent female) were of the opinion that lack of coordination among implementing agencies was a major hurdle in implemented of National Education Policies. Majority of the respondents (total 22 percent; 14 percent male and 8 percent female) mentioned that there should be proper coordination and cooperation in all concerned institutions.
14. 64 percent respondents (36 percent male and 27 percent female) pointed that proper monitoring mechanism should be adopted for effective implementation of National Education Policies. Majority of the respondents (total 22 percent; 14 percent male and 8 percent female) suggested that establishment of cells at federal, provincial and district levels are essential for implementation of National Education Policies.
15. There are so many issues and challenges that were still facing at elementary level of education. Some of the main issues and challenges were:
- i. According to 18 percent respondents (9 percent male and 9 percent female) teachers absenteeism was the issue.

- ii. 74 percent respondents (42 percent male and 32 percent female) thought weak instructional supervisor.
- iii. 11 percent respondents (6 percent male and 5 percent female) reported poor quality of education.
- iv. 16 percent respondents (9 percent male and 7 percent female) reported poor quality of education.
- v. 15 percent respondents (8 percent male and 7 percent female) mentioned lack of physical facilities.
- vi. 13 percent respondents (7 percent male and 6 percent female) described gender disparity.
- vii. 13 percent respondents (7 percent male and 6 percent female) though high dropout rate.
- viii. 14 percent respondents (7 percent male and 7 percent female) reported rural urban disparity.
- ix. 10 percent respondents (5 percent male and 5 percent female) mentioned low survival rate was the challenge for educational managers.

5.2 Suggestions/Recommendations for Questionnaire-I

On the basis of the above observations/findings the following recommendations / suggestions are proposed:

- i. The education secretaries should have been involved in the initial stage of policy formulation and preparation.
- ii. Economic condition has been identified as one of the major influencing factor for the implementation of NEPs.
- iii. There was a need of strong coordination amongst various departments and stakeholders.
- iv. Primary education shall be made compulsory and free to achieve UPE (2015) through fully implementation of NEPs.
- v. Integration of primary and middle level of education into elementary education shall be fully implemented as mentioned in NEPs.
- vi. Technical stream at secondary level of education shall be fully implemented as one of the thrust areas of ESR
- vii. Accountability is one of the factors which is adversely affecting the implementation of NEPs which shall be considered seriously.
- viii. Steps shall be taken for proper planning and utilization of available funds to overcome financial constraints.
- ix. Monitoring system shall strictly be followed for achieving the targets of NEPs

5.3 Suggestions/Recommendations for Questionnaire-II

Following were the main suggestions given for the improvement of implementation of National Education Policies.

- i. According to 20 percent respondents (13 percent male and 7 percent female) all stakeholders must be involved in the policy formulation and implementation process for effective implementation.
- ii. 15 percent respondents (8 percent male and 7 percent female) thought coordination between policy developers and implementers at National, Provincial and District Levels is very essential.
- iii. 12 percent respondents (6 percent male and 6 percent female) indicated proper training and provision of physical infrastructure was important factor.
- iv. 12 percent respondents (6 percent male and 6 percent female) mentioned copies of new education policy may be provided to all stakeholders for achieving the better result.
- v. 10 percent respondents (7 percent male and 3 percent female) indicated proper allocation of budget and timely releases to meet targets was essential.

CONCLUSIONS

1. It was concluded that majority of the Provincial and District Education Managers were not involved in policy formulation stage.
2. There are many factors which were adversely affected the implementation of national education policies. Among these factors poor economic condition, lack of political commitment, non involvement of stakeholders, discouraging attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries were important as far as implementation of NEPs was concerned.
3. As far as the implementation status of national education policies, 1992, 1998 and ESR (2001-06) program was concerned, it was concluded that the recommendations of these national education policies and ESR program were partially implemented.
4. There were many factors which were badly affecting implementation of national education policies. Some of the major factors were, policy targets were too ambitious lack of technical and trained educational managers, financial constraints and political instability.

5. It was reported that financial problems were the main reason for non-implementation of NEPs. Therefore, budget might be released in time and funds might be properly utilized.
6. There were so many issues and challenges that were still facing at elementary level. Some of the main issues were, teachers, absenteeism, weak instructional supervision, poor quality of education and lack of physical facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations/suggestions are proposed:

1. All the district and provincial education managers should be involved from the initial stage of policy formulation and preparation.
2. Economic condition of the country may be improved as it was identified as major influencing factor for the implementation of NEPs.
3. There may be strong coordination amongst various departments and stakeholders.
4. Primary education may be made compulsory and free to achieve UPE targets through fully implementation of NEPs.
5. Integration of primary and middle level of education into elementary education may be fully implemented as mentioned in NEPs.
6. Accountability as one of the factors which was adversely affecting the implementation of NEPs which may be considered seriously.
7. Technical stream at secondary level of education may be fully implemented as one of the thrust areas of ESR.
8. Steps may be taken for proper planning and utilization of available funds to overcome financial constraints.
9. Monitoring system may be strictly followed for achieving the targets of NEPs.
10. Public private partnership may be encouraged to overcome the financial constraints.
11. Steps may be taken to eliminate gender and rural urban disparity for fully implementation of NEPs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ball, S. (1994). *Education Reform: a critical and post structure approach*. – Buckingham: Open University.
- Bell, L. and Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education Policy Process Themes and Impact*. – London: Routledge,
- Bengali, K. (1999). *History of Educational Policy Making and Planning in Pakistan*, Islamabad, Sustainable Development Policy Institute.
- Government of Pakistan (1947). *Proceedings of Educational Conference*, Ministry of Interior Education Division, Karachi.
- Government of Pakistan (1959). *Report of the Commission on National Education 1959*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad .
- Government of Pakistan (1970). *The Education Policy 1970*, Ministry of Education Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1972). *The Education Policy 1972*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1979). *National Education Policy and Implementation Program, 1972*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1992). *The Education Policy 1992*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1994). *Eighth Five Year Plan 1993-98*, Planning Commission, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1998). *National Education Policy 1998-2010*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (2001). *Education Sector Reforms: Action Plan (2001-2004)*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (2008). *Education for All*, Ministry of Education Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (2009). *National Education Policy 2009*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Memon, M. (2010). *Pakistan's Education Policies Fail: Rhetoric or Reality*. www.currentsocial.com.pk.

- Shahid, P. (1985). Comparative Analysis of Education Policies, Academy of Educational Planning and Management, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Shahid, P. (1985). Implementation of National Education Policy, Academy of Educational Planning and Management, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Taylor, S., Rizvi, F. Lingard, B. and Henry, M. (1997). Education Policy and the Politics of Change., – London: Routledge.

PROBLEMS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICIES (NEP)
AT ELEMENTARY LEVEL

INTERVIEW OF
Annexures

POLICY IMPLEMENTERS

ROBERTS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY
AT SECONDARY LEVEL

INTERVIEW OF

POLICY IMPLEMENTERS

**ACADEMY OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN
TALEEMI CHOWK, G-8/1, ISLAMABAD**

2009

Official use only

**PROBLEMS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION
AT ELEMENTARY LEVEL**

*For Educational Secretaries/Additional Secretaries/Joint Secretaries/Deputy Secretaries/
Director Public Instructions/District Nazims*

Date

1. Name of Respondent:

2. Designation:

3. Official Address:

4. Sex: Male Female

5. Phone No. Fax No.
Cell No: E- Mail:

6. Highest Qualifications:

7. At what stage provincial Education Secretary is usually involved in Policy Formulation and Preparation?

8. In your opinion what are the factors influencing the implementation of NEP and its objectives? Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	Factors influencing the objectives of NEP	Yes	No
1.	Economic condition		
2.	Lack of Socio-culture needs		
3.	Partially inclusion of Ideology of Pakistan		
4.	Partially inclusion of Islamic Principles and fundamentals		
5.	Political Commitment		
6.	Non involvement of stake holders		
7.	Extent of donor agencies/international development partners		
8.	Attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries:		
	<i>A Bureaucrats</i>		
	<i>B Technocrats</i>		
	<i>C Economists</i>		
	<i>D Planners</i>		
	<i>E Politicians</i>		
	<i>F Stakeholders</i>		
9.	Lack of coordination of various departments		
	<i>A. Ministry of Education and P & D, Departments</i>		
	<i>B. Ministry of Education and district governments</i>		
10.	Any other (please specify)		

9. The following are the policy statements of NEP 1992 regarding elementary education. To what extent, these were implemented in your educational programs/activities? Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	Policy Statements	Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented
1.	Primary education shall be recognized as a fundamental right of the every Pakistani child			
2.	Primary education shall be made compulsory and free so as to achieve universal enrolment by the end of the decade.			
3.	The medium of instruction as may be determined by the provinces, shall be either the approved provincial language, the national language, or English.			
4.	For this transitory period the minimum norm will be a two-room primary school with 5 teachers.			
5.	Development of primary education in the private sector will be encouraged.			
6.	In due course of time, primary education will be transformed into basic education (elementary education extending to class VIII).			

10. The following were the objectives of National Education Policy 1998-2010 regarding elementary education. In your opinion, to what extent these were implemented in your educational programs/activities? Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	Objectives of NEP 1998-2010	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
1	To integrate primary and middle level education into elementary education (I-VIII).			
2	To increase participation rate at middle level from 46% to 65% by 2002-03 and 85% by 2010.			
3	To enhance retention and completion of primary education cycle up to 90% students (both boys and girls) by the year 2010.			
4	To ensure achievement of minimum level of learning up to 90% primary education students by the year 2010.			
5	To expand and strengthen the base for secondary education.			

6	To meet the basic learning needs of the child in terms of essential learning tools as well as the basic learning contents.			
7	To reduce the existing disparities to half by the year 2010.			

11. The following were the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms (ESR) Program, in your opinion; to what extent these were implemented? Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	ESR Program	Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented
1.	Universal Primary/Elementary Education			
2.	National Literacy Campaign – Integrated Approach to Poverty Reduction			
3.	Technical Stream at Secondary Level			
4.	Improving the Quality of Education: Curriculum Reform, Teacher Education and Training, Exam Reform and Assessment			
5.	Mainstreaming Madrassahs			
6.	Higher Education Sector			
7.	Public Private Partnership			

12. In your opinion, what are the factors adversely affecting the implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010. Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	Factors Affecting the implementation of NEP	Strongly Agreed	Agreed	Disagreed
1.	Policy targets are too ambitious.			
2.	Lack of technical, trained educational managers			
3.	Human Resources constrains for implementation of policy.			
4.	Financial Resources constrains for implementation of policy.			
5.	Political instability.			
6.	Lack of capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district levels.			
7.	Lack of releases of funds in time			
8.	Lack of infrastructure.			
9.	Lack of accountability.			
10.	Absence of effective/proper Monitoring and evaluation system			
11.	Any other (please specify)			

13. Do you think that Policy implementation could not be made due to financial problem?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

14. If yes, please give your suggestions how to overcome these financial constraints.

- i. _____
- ii. _____
- iii. _____

15. Do you think that lack of coordination among implementation agencies is a major hurdle in implementation of National Education Policy?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

16. If yes, please give your suggestions what mechanism can be adopted to increase the coordination among these implementation agencies.

- i. _____
- ii. _____
- iii. _____

17. Do you think that monitoring mechanism for implementation of NEP is essential for effective implementation?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

18. If yes, what type of mechanism can be designed for monitoring of NEP at Federal, provincial and district level?

- i. _____
- ii. _____
- iii. _____

Thanks for your cooperation

**PROBLEMS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
NATIONAL EDUCATION
AT ELEMENTARY LEVEL**

INTERVIEW OF

POLICY IMPLEMENTERS

**ACADEMY OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN
TALEEMI CHOWK, G-8/1, ISLAMABAD**

2009

--	--	--	--	--	--

Official use only

**PROBLEMS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION
AT ELEMENTARY LEVEL**

For Directors/EDOs/DOEs/DDOEs/UCs/Tehsil Nazims

Date

1. Name of Respondent:

2. Designation:

3. Official Address:

4. Sex: Male Female

5. Phone No. Fax No.
Cell# Email:

6. Highest Qualifications:

7. Have you ever been involved in policy formulation/preparation process?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

8. If yes, how long have you been involved in policy formulation process?

Less than 3 months

Less than 6 Months

Less than 3 Years

More than 3 Years

9. In your opinion what are the factors influencing the implementation of NEP and its objectives? Please tick (√) in the relevant box:

S #	Factors influencing the objectives of NEP	Yes	No
1.	Economic condition		
2.	Lack of Socio-culture needs		
3.	Partially inclusion of Ideology of Pakistan		
4.	Partially inclusion of Islamic Principles and fundamentals		
5.	Political Commitment		
6.	Non involvement of stake holders		
7.	Extent of donor agencies/international development partners		
8.	Attitudes and perceptions of government functionaries:		
	<i>A Bureaucrats</i>		
	<i>B Technocrats</i>		
	<i>C Economists</i>		
	<i>D Planners</i>		
	<i>E Politicians</i>		
	<i>F Stakeholders</i>		
9.	Lack of coordination of various departments		
	<i>C. Ministry of Education and P & D. Departments</i>		
	<i>D. Ministry of Education and district governments</i>		
	Any other (please specify)		

10. Do you have access to a hard copy of the following documents?

National Education Policy 1992-2002

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

National Education Policy 1998-2010

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

Education Sector Reforms (ESR) Program

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

11. If No, in your opinion what were the reasons?

12. The following are the policy statements of NEP 1992 regarding elementary education. To what extent, these were implemented in your educational programs/activities? Please tick (✓) in the relevant box:

S #	Policy Statements	Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented
1.	Primary education shall be recognized as a fundamental right of the every Pakistani child			
2.	Primary education shall be made compulsory and free so as to achieve universal enrolment by the end of the decade.			
3.	The medium of instruction as may be determined by the provinces, shall be either the approved provincial language, the national language, or English.			

4.	For this transitory period the minimum norm will be a two-room primary school with 5 teachers.			
5.	Development of primary education in the private sector will be encouraged.			
6.	In due course of time, primary education will be transformed into basic education (elementary education extending to class VIII).			

13. The following were the objectives of National Education Policy 1998-2010 regarding elementary education. In your opinion, to what extent these were implemented in your educational programs/activities? Please tick (✓) in the relevant box:

S #	Objectives of NEP 1998-2010	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
1	To integrate primary and middle level education into elementary education (I-VIII).			
2	To increase participation rate at middle level from 46% to 65% by 2002-03 and 85% by 2010.			
3	To enhance retention and completion of primary education cycle up to 90% students (both boys and girls) by the year 2010.			
4	To ensure achievement of minimum level of learning up to 90% primary education students by the year 2010.			
5	To expand and strengthen the base for secondary education.			
6	To meet the basic learning needs of the child in terms of essential learning tools as well as the basic learning contents.			
7	To reduce the existing disparities to half by the year 2010.			

14. The following were the thrust areas of Education Sector Reforms (ESR) Program, in your opinion; to what extent these were implemented? Please tick (✓) in the relevant box:

S #	ESR Program	Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented
1.	Universal Primary/Elementary Education			
2.	National Literacy Campaign - Integrated Approach to Poverty Reduction			
3.	Technical Stream at Secondary Level			
4.	Improving the Quality of Education: Curriculum Reform, Teacher Education and Training, Exam Reform and Assessment			
5.	Mainstreaming Madrassahs			
6.	Higher Education Sector			
7.	Public Private Partnership			

15. In your opinion, what are the priority areas in your educational programs/activities? Please insert the number of your priority in the box:

- i. Literacy Enhancement
- ii. Achieving Universal Primary Education by 2015
- iii. Improvement in Quality Education
- iv. More emphasis on Technical and Vocational education
- v. Improvement in Infrastructure of School Education
- vi. Any other, please specify:

16. In your opinion, what are the factors adversely affecting the implementation of National Education Policy 1998-2010. Please tick (✓) in the relevant box:

S #	Factors Affecting the implementation of NEP	Strongly Agreed	Agreed	Disagreed
1.	Policy targets are too ambitious			
2.	Lack of technical, trained educational managers			
3.	Human Resources constrains for implementation of policy			
4.	Financial Resources constrains for implementation of policy			
5.	Political instability.			
6.	Lack of capacity for operational strategies at provincial and district levels.			
7.	Lack of releases of funds in time			
8.	Lack of infrastructure.			
9.	Lack of accountability.			
10.	Absence of effective/proper Monitoring and evaluation system			
11.	Any other (please specify)			

17. Do you think that Policy implementation could not be made due to financial problem?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

18. If yes, please give your suggestions how to overcome these financial constraints.

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

19. Do you think that lack of coordination among implementation agencies is a major hurdle in implementation of National Education Policy?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

20. If yes, please give your suggestions what mechanism can be adopted to increase the coordination among these implementation agencies.

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

21. Do you think that monitoring mechanism for implementation of National Education Policy (NEP) is essential for effective implementation?

1	Yes	2	No
---	-----	---	----

22. If yes, what type of mechanism can be designed for monitoring of NEP at Federal, provincial and district level?

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

23. Previous National Education Policies have described the following major issues and challenges at elementary education. Do you think that we are still facing these challenges? Please tick (✓) in the relevant box:

S #	Policy Issues and Challenges	Yes	No
1.	Access to education		
2.	Teacher absenteeism.		
3.	Weak instructional supervision at elementary level.		
4.	Untrained teachers.		
5.	Poor quality of education.		
6.	Lack of physical facilities		
7.	High drop out rate		
8.	Gender disparity		
9.	Rural urban disparity		
10.	Low survival rate		
11.	Any other (please specify)		

24. Please give suggestions for the improvement of implementation of NEP.

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

iv. _____

Thanks for your cooperation