Vision 2025:

Discussion Document 2

Ministry of Education
Islamabad

Table of Contents

Table of Abbreviations

ADO	Assistant District Officer
DD1	Discussion Document 1
DD2	Discussion Document 2
DIPs	District Improvement Plans
DO	District Officer
ECE	Early Childhood Education
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information Systems
ESR	Education Sector Reforms
GDP	Gross Development Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate
MOE	Ministry of Education
NGOs	Non Government Organizations
NER	Net Enrolment Rate
RSU	Reform Support Units
SIPs	School Improvement Plans
UPE	Universal Primary Education

1. Executive Summary

The Federal Ministry of Education (MoE) is undertaking a visioning exercise designed to delineate a widely shared national understanding of what the education system will look like, and how it will function, in the year 2025, such that every child will become a responsible and highly productive citizen.

This visioning exercise is designed for completion in three major stages, each stage developing the vision document further, culminating in the third stage where the final vision, *Vision 2025,* is presented. *Vision 2025* is not an unattainable dream, for it will be the product of a number of rigorous cost and financial analyses: *Vision 2025* will be financially feasible.

With the finalization of this document, *Vision 2025: Discussion Document 2* (DD2), the second stage of this visioning exercise is completed. It reflects the feedback we elicited from many of you on *Vision 2025: Discussion Document 1* (DD1). Accordingly, it presents a more comprehensive vision than that which was presented in DD1. Specifically, if you will recall, a number of questions were raised in DD1, questions that were addressed in a series of Feedback Workshops that were conducted in late 2005. Basic format of the document has been retained while the responses and answers to the questions raised in DD1 have been reflected under relevant sections here in DD2.

Inasmuch as the vision presented here is more complete and comprehensive than the one presented in DD1, it still speaks in generalities: it does not present a number of the details that came out during the Feedback Workshops. There are two reasons for this. The first is that before we can settle on a particular detail, such as the number of teachers on a particular rung of a career ladder, we need to know what the cost implications might be. These cost implications will be examined during the next round of workshops scheduled to begin in March, 2006. The second reason is that many of the details need to be discerned through rigorous research. The sanctions of an accountability system for, say, a poor performing district, have to reflect the best knowledge world wide.

In addition to presenting you with a more complete and comprehensive vision of the education system in 2025, this document also reacquaints you with the rationale behind the entire vision exercise and an overview of the exercise itself. Basic format of DD1 has been retained while some additions have been made on the basis of the feedback received from various stakeholders. It also points to numerous factors that drive cost and how we will go about determining what we can, and cannot afford, in the way of *Vision 2025*.

2. Vision 2025 and its Rationale

"If you don't know where you are going, a step in any direction will get you there."

Our existing policy frameworks[1] contain a number of exceptional goals and objectives, including an improved quality of elementary education[2] and competence of teachers[3], the elimination of all types of disparities and imbalances in schooling[4], and significantly improved enrolment rates[5]. So why do we need a vision? They all contain elements of a vision. The visioning exercise is designed to flesh out those elements/aspects of the system to actually make it work. Without a vision, reform:

* tends to go off in multiple directions: "improved quality of elementary education" can mean many things to many people;
* tends not to be coordinated: if two donors understand "improved quality of elementary education" differently, they would be more inclined to compete than coordinate;
* tends not to be systemic: vision tells us how the elements of the "reformed" system relate to each other, and therefore, how best to go about systemic reform; and
* tends not to be demand-driven, without a widely shared understanding –widespread ownership – of where various reform efforts should be heading, reform becomes supply-driven (donor-driven).

A better-developed vision will allow us to examine, align, and unify our policies and plans. But to what end? Clearly, the answer to this question is high quality education for all; an education that allows every child in the country the opportunity to become

* a citizen who can contribute significantly to what will largely be an information-based global economy;
* a citizen who can act responsibly in civic society and a larger democracy;
* a citizen who is a lifelong learner and capable of moving about within a complex and ever-changing economic environment;
* a citizen who is morally upstanding; and
* a citizen who is an effective problem solver, one who can think laterally and so apply his knowledge to new situations to come up with creative solutions.

That every child has the opportunity to become such a model citizen requires (a) classrooms where high-quality teaching and learning takes place on a daily basis; (b) well-managed schools that can nurture these highly-effective classrooms; (c) engaged

---

[1] National Education Policy 1998-2010, Education Sector Reforms 2002-2006, Education For All-National Plan of Action 2001-2015, Perspective Plan 2001-2011, Accelerating Economic Growth and Reducing Poverty (PRSP), and the Local Government Devolution Plan 2000.

[2] NEP Elementary Education, Policy Provisions 5.3.1.

[3] NEP Elementary Education, Policy Provisions 5.3.4.

[4] NEP Elementary Education, Policy Provisions 5.3.7.

[5] NEP, ESR, EFA

communities that can champion theses schools, classrooms, and the high-quality teaching and learning that goes within them; (d) district, provincial, and national education apparatuses that ensure that these schools, classrooms, and communities are available for every child in the country; and (e) the resources necessary to pay for it all.

However, if we require all these things (a-e), we have to have some sense of what they all look like and what we can afford. What's needed, minimally, in every classroom in order to ensure that high-quality teaching and learning takes place there on a daily basis? What does high-quality teaching and learning look like? What's necessary to ensure that it takes place on a daily basis? What does a well managed school in which high-quality teaching and learning takes place look like? What do these well-managed schools do? How do they interact with the community? How do they interact with the districts? And how do we ensure that all schools are so well-managed? What does an engaged community look like? In what ways are they engaged such that they support the high-quality teaching and learning that goes in these schools? What district, provincial, and federal apparatuses need to be put in place in order to develop and support these schools and classrooms? What do they look like and how do they operate? Finally, what can we afford, *what must we afford at a minimum*, if we wish for every child to become such model citizens?

We need to know what an affordable high-quality education system for all looks like so that we can adjust our policy frameworks to ensure that they help us to move from where we are now to where we really want to go, and develop the strategic plans necessary to align, sequence, and otherwise orchestrate all development efforts such that they help us move in the direction we want to move: the realization of *Vision 2025*.

3. The Process of Developing the Vision 2025 for Education

3.1 Introduction

A widely owned and affordable national vision for education needs some time to develop. The process must ensure collection of input from a wide range of stakeholders and the consolidation of these inputs into a series of progressively refined vision documents. It must also ensure the evaluation of the vision emerging on the basis of these inputs in financial terms to ascertain its affordability.

In this section, the salient features of the process are highlighted. The section will describe the preliminary stages, followed by an elaboration of the overarching values that guide the development of vision in all these stages. A reflective reading of this document is important to further this process of visioning that the MoE has initiated. To this end, a set of suggestions is provided to the reader toward the end of this section.

3.2 The process

The visioning process consists of three stages. Each stage produces a document, and each successive document is an improved version of the earlier one, hence a step further towards a refined vision for education in Pakistan in the year 2025. Given below is a detailed description of the various stages along with the associated time frames:

Stage I	Initial Visioning Workshops resulting in Discussion Document 1.	April -July, 2005
Stage II	Feedback workshops on Discussion Document 1 resulting in Discussion Document 2 [The document in your hands].	August,2005- February, 2006
Stage III	Workshops to cost the vision resulting in the Final Vision Document	March-July, 2006

3.2.1 Stage I—April-July, 2005

The MOE, supported by the Education Sector Reforms Assistance Program (ESRA), conducted a number of visioning exercises (April-May, 2005) designed to (a) get people to understand and own the notion of a vision: what a vision is, what it is not, why a vision is important, and finally how to go about crafting one; and (b) get people to craft the beginnings of a vision. Specifically, the participants of these workshops were asked to describe a fully functional classroom/school/community, and highly efficient delivery apparatus at district, provincial, and national education levels with particular emphasis on planning, management, and professional development.

The active participation of stakeholders at the district, provincial, and national levels in these workshops[6] generated a wide range of ideas about the vision of system-wide efficiency and learning in Pakistan in the year 2025. The documents generated by these workshops were examined and consolidated into *Vision 2025: Discussion Document 1*(DD1), which was sent to every district office in the country, every provincial education department, federal level stakeholders, and a host of non-government, donor, public, and private sector stakeholders throughout Pakistan. These stakeholders were asked to submit comments to the MOE within a month's time of receiving DD1, and to prepare themselves to participate in the Feedback Workshops that took place September, 2005.

3.2.2 Stage 2 — September, 2005 – February, 2006

A second series of workshops, the Feedback Workshops, was conducted (September, 2005) to allow the stakeholders to comment on, and/or respond to *Vision 2025: Discussion Document (1)*. In so doing, they further elaborated the vision that was presented in DD1. The feedback from these visioning exercises was analyzed (October-November, 2005) and put into a second discussion document: *Vision 2025: Discussion Document (2)* (December 2005-February 2006). DD2, in turn, raises a number of questions. Some can only be addressed through rigorous research efforts that will be undertaken over the course of the year. Others, those having to do with cost and affordability, will be addressed in the upcoming Costing Workshops scheduled to begin in March, 2006.

3.2.3 Stage 3—March-June, 2006

The Costing Workshops (March-April, 2006) will be supported by a demographically driven enrolment, input, and cost projection policy options model to enable stakeholders from around the country to examine the cost implications of a variety of scenarios or

---

[6] These workshops were conducted at the district, provincial and national levels.

policy options regarding the emerging vision. For instance, can Pakistan afford a Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) of 110 per cent by the year 2025? If so, what will a well-supplied school look like? Will every child be sitting at a desk and chair or on a mat? Will every school have a boundary wall? How many children will, on average, be sitting in each class, 25 or 50? All of these policy options, and a number of others, have budgetary and cost implications. Given realistic assumptions about population growth, economic growth, and the share of educational expenditure in the GDP, the parameters of an affordable education system will be examined. The information gathered from these feedback and costing workshops will be used to prepare the final vision document (June 2006).

The computerized model that will be supporting these workshops will use the existing government data. This data has its shortcomings but it can still provide a very good sense of what we can and cannot afford over time. A nationwide sample survey of schools and a school census are currently underway. These complementary exercises will yield much better data that we can use in support of Vision 2025. [0]As better—more reliable and accurate—data becomes available from these exercises, our costing estimates will be further refined.

3.3 Visioning Discussion Document 2 (DD2)

The document in your hands is *Vision 2025: Discussion Document 2* (DD2), which is a culmination of both stage 1 and stage 2 of the visioning process. Therefore, while it is a more comprehensive account of *Vision 2025* than that which was presented in DD1, it is not, as yet, the final vision. This section describes some of the limitations of this document. It then depicts the values that underpin the entire visioning exercise. Finally, it provides the reader with some useful comments on how to read the document.

3.3.1 Limitations

DD2 reflects the views of district education officials from *every* district in the country, provincial education officers from every province, key stakeholders from every province (e.g., teacher trainers, university leaders, NGOs, curriculum specialists, etc.), and a wide range of national-level stakeholders including representatives from the MOE, GOP, NGOs, donor community, parliament, etc. All told, over 1200 stakeholders have participated in 24 stage-1 and 9 stage-2 visioning workshops. Inasmuch as this is proving to be one of the most participatory exercises carried out by the MOE, we feel that this document is not, as yet, as widely owned as it needs to be. Accordingly, the MOE is making it available for comment on our website: www.moe.gov.pk

DD2 is focusing on those aspects of the system that will render it more accountable, more efficient, and more equitable, all of which have immediate and direct bearing on every sector of the system. In order to keep it focused, tertiary education, pre-school education, technical and vocational schooling, and non-formal education have not been directly addressed in DD 2. However, the issues of professional development, SMCs, financial flows, accountability etc. have a direct bearing on every sector and thus relevant to them as well. Moreover, the cost of each sector of the system will factor into the costing workshops scheduled to begin in March, 2006.

Finally, we need to realize that a vision is never fully attained. Circumstances change over time[7] and new needs[8] arise that may force us to change the projected vision. The education system needs to grow and develop much like the people within it to respond to the changing circumstances for which there has to be visioning as an ongoing exercise. In addition visioning exercises are needed to be undertaken for the areas of education system which have not been directly addressed in the present exercise. To this end, *Vision 2025* will need to be supported by a mechanism that revisits it periodically in order to update it in accordance with the changes in circumstances, knowledge, needs and aspirations of the nation. This mechanism is the Reform Support Unit that is now being established in the MOE.

3.3.2 Overarching values guiding the visioning process

The entire visioning exercise is being guided by an overarching set of values. The first is that the entire education system needs to be oriented around learning, most critically, classroom learning. Everything that everyone does--the Federal Minister of Education, an Executive District Officer, or a Head Teacher--has to be geared to improve classroom learning for all students. If the education system wants more and more children to learn more and more, this kind of learning must take place within a system that is itself a learning organization.

The second overarching value is efficiency, in particular, the efficient use of valuable resources. There are never enough resources to do everything we may want to do, which tells us that resources have to be used wisely so that the system delivers the goods it was designed for.

The third is equity. Resources need to be channeled to those schools that are in the most need (they also have to be channeled to those areas of the country that are in dire need of schools). Given a certain index that represents some minimum standard of provision, many schools fall below it: systems need to be put in place to ensure that fewer and fewer schools fall below that index on an annual basis. We cannot continue to channel valuable resources to areas that are already above the index[9].

The last value is affordability. In order for the visioning process to be successful, the vision needs to be affordable. Indeed, the assumptions we make over population growth, economic growth, and education's share in various government budgets may butt up against the margins, but if we treat them as realistic assumptions, and adjust our vision over time to the emerging realities, the goals may be entirely achievable.

3.3.3 Instructions for the readers

DD2 is being sent to government officials in every district and provincial education office in the country: federal government officials, education experts and practitioners,

---

[7] Laptop computers could cost as little as 5000 rupees in 10 years time.
[8] For example, we may need to formalize ECE in 5 years time.
[9] In order to improve equity of provision, the Federal Government will extend grants through programs like President's Education Sector Reforms Program (PESRP).

and the donor community, all of whom are being asked to read through the discussion document paying particular attention to the next section, 'The Emerging Vision.'

Over the course of the next three to four weeks, you and your staff are requested to read and discuss DD2. A number of questions are raised. Some can only be answered through rigorous research; others will be addressed in the Costing Workshops. Your general reactions to the document should be sent in to the MOE. In preparation for the Costing Workshops, you are asked to think about how best our education budget should be spent if we want it to yield the most classroom learning. In your experience, what are the most important investments: textbooks, teachers, chairs, or boundary walls? And how much money needs to be spent on administration? These are complex issues for which we need your best thinking. Your ideas in this regard should be recorded.

You are requested to nominate relevant persons to attend the next round of workshops scheduled to begin in March-April, 2006. During these workshops, participants will share their recorded ideas as we begin to cost the emerging vision. The outcome will find its way into the final document, *Vision 2025*.

4. The Emerging Vision

4.1 What you should expect in this section

What follows is the emerging vision of classrooms, schools, and the district, provincial, and national education apparatuses that support them. Specifically, we present the very same vision that was put forth in DD1, together with the answers to the questions that were asked after each aspect of the emerging vision: answers that were gathered from both the Feedback Workshops and stakeholders' written responses to the MOE. We also delineate the fundamental aspects of the career ladders and accountability systems of our emerging vision. In doing so, we raise a number of additional questions, many of which can only be answered by a rigorous research exercise designed specifically for that purpose. These exercises will be initiated during the course of the year in an effort to implement *Vision 2025*.   Finally, we discuss the issue of costs, the factors that drive it, and the need to determine how best to spend it such that we get the most learning per child for every rupee we spend. All questions and issues concerning the cost of the emerging vision will be addressed in the Costing Workshops scheduled to take place in March-April, 2006.

4.2 Emphases of learning and system wide efficiency

Before the reader embarks on the descriptions, it is important to realize that the basic structure of the system is for the most part taken as a given: the Federal MOE, the Provincial DOEs, the District Education Offices, and the schools, are all still in place as per our existing policy frameworks. Our concern here is with making them all work as efficiently as possible in support of classrooms in which high-quality teaching and learning goes on for every child. And so we emphasize those aspects that drive system wide learning (with the aim of transforming our system into a learning organization) and the efficient and effective use of scarce resources. We want to maximize the return on the investment that we as a country are making in the education system. Every rupee spent should in some way help bring about high-quality teaching and learning for all. To the extent that there are some structural anomalies in our existing frameworks, anomalies that stand in the way of system-wide learning and the efficient and effective use of scarce resources, recommendations are made to effect a positive change.

4.3 The Emerging Vision of Classrooms

4.3.1 Classrooms in Pakistani public schools in the year 2025

By the year 2025, high-quality teaching and learning will be going on in every classroom. All classrooms will support genuine learning[10] and will, therefore, be sufficiently equipped according to a widely agreed upon minimum standards of provision. Pupil-class ratios will not be higher than 25:1. Repetition and drop out rates will be minimal largely because of the high-quality teaching and learning going on in every classroom.

---

[10] By genuine learning we mean the kind of learning that enables children to gain full knowledge of the subject, but also one that builds their capacity to use that knowledge in novel settings to solve problems. Learning has to be about children applying the material being taught who then own and incorporate it into their being.

The classroom will have a well-trained and highly motivated teacher, an academic well versed in the subject(s) s/he teaches; who is also a professional educationist skilled in a number of modern pedagogical techniques that foster inquiry, interaction, and problem solving among all students regardless of their learning styles. Teachers will assess their pupils on a continuous basis, helping them to reflect on what they did right, what they did wrong, and how they could best learn from their mistakes. The development needs of such a professional will be met on a regular basis through access to a needs-based professional development infrastructure.

4.3.2 Further delineation of the emerging vision of the classrooms

This emerging vision raises a number of questions. For example, you can see that it speaks of well-trained highly motivated teachers facilitating genuine learning. These well-trained highly motivated teachers are not readily available at the present. These teachers, as put forth in the emerging vision, are the product of the system as it would be by the year 2025. There are still some aspects of the emerging vision that need detailed working out, for instance, how to produce this quality of educationist.

- What aspects of the system, in your view, would ensure that teachers actively seek out the training they need in order to better perform their duties as a professional educator?

  Answer: The only way to ensure that teachers actively seek out the training they need is to tie professional development to career advancement. Teachers must take a certain battery of courses in order for them to advance through the system. Clearly, these courses[11] should address the content knowledge and pedagogical skills teachers need in order to carry out their duties, given the type of teacher they wish to become. To this end, the fundamental parameters of a career ladder for teachers were discussed in the Feedback Workshops, the general features of which are delineated below (Section 4.7.1).

- The emerging vision imagines teachers as maximizing children learning through a variety of modern teaching techniques. Only ongoing and need-based professional development can prepare teachers to do this. How would the system ensure that the training these teachers get through on-going professional development is the training that they actually need?

  Answer: Standards need to be established: learning standards (what every child needs to know), performance standards (what every child needs to be able to do), and behavioral/attitudinal standards (what every child needs to be able to demonstrate) for each grade in the system. Then, efforts need to be made to align the curriculum to the standards to ensure that the curriculum is such that the standards can be met. Then, professional development courses have to be created to impart the content knowledge and skills needed to ensure that teachers are able

---

[11] The actual courses were not discussed; they would flow from learning standards, the aligned curriculum, and the requirements of each teacher type.

to teach the curriculum such that the standards can be met for each and every child. Should someone wish to become a mentor teacher, that person would also have to take the courses needed to be an effective mentor. Everyone will be required to demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to assume the responsibilities and carry out the tasks of the type of teacher[12] they wish to be: one needs to do more than just participating in a professional development course, they need to pass it.

- Professional development makes sense only if it is applied in practice. How would the system ensure that the training these teachers receive is used in daily teaching-learning interactions?

    Answer: Everyone said that teachers have to be held accountable; they not only have to show up for class, they have to utilize the knowledge and skills they acquire from various professional development programs on behalf of children learning. The broad guidelines of a teacher accountability system are delineated below (Section 4.8).

The vision imagines the teachers to be highly motivated to eliminate the present dismal state of teacher absenteeism. The questions to be asked are:

- How do you think the system will ensure that teachers remain highly motivated? What means within the system can ensure that they are in school every day?

    Answer: Teachers will be highly motivated if (a) they are viewed as and act like professionals (most professionals are highly motivated), (b) if they are held accountable for results (if there is a definite reward for good performance and a definite sanction for continued poor performance), and (c) they are paid well enough and have the opportunity to take on more and more responsibility through career advancement. The feedback we received suggests that a career ladder and an accountability system can, if designed correctly, address these two questions adequately. Both are delineated below (Sections 4.7 and 4.8).

Comment: Finally, the emerging vision put forth here has a number of cost implications. It speaks of a well-equipped classroom, pupil-class ratios no lower than 25-to-1, drastically reduced drop out and repetition rates, and more qualified teachers who, presumably, will be paid more. These cost implications will be assessed in the upcoming Costing Workshops.

4.4 The Emerging Vision of Schools/Communities/SMCs

4.4.1 Schools/Communities/SMCs in the year 2025

These schools will be characterized by widespread learning, not just by the students, but also by the teachers, administrators, SMCs, and parents about their respective roles. All such learning will be directed toward improving student achievement. All schools will be

---

[12] The different types of teachers are presented in the Career Ladder that is described in Section 4.7.1.

adequately equipped to foster such widespread and continuous learning. There will be no schools without buildings, no one-teacher schools, no multi-grade teaching[13]. Every school in need of a boundary wall will have one, and there will be a sufficient number of toilets. Each school will have electricity and access to running water.

Teachers will interact with other teachers from within the school and from neighbouring schools in order to learn from each other's experiences and knowledge. Head Teachers will be trained professionals chosen from a cadre of professionals in educational administration and management. To become a Head Teacher (or any other higher-level education administrator), teachers will be required to pass a set number of accredited professional development courses that prepare them for the position being pursued (for example, Head Teacher, Learning Coordinator, ADO, etc.). Accordingly, professional development and career advancement as an education administrator will be interconnected. The changing needs of professional development for school administrators will be met by accessing a needs-based professional development infrastructure. All staff will be hired, promoted, and retained on the basis of qualifications and performance.

The overall well being of the school will be in the hands of the SMC, members of which will be well trained to carry out their particular roles and responsibilities. The Head Teacher will regularly report to the SMC.

Ongoing school improvement will be driven by the development and implementation of School Improvement Plans (SIP). Schools and school communities in an open, highly participatory, and well-informed manner will develop these plans regularly. This will ensure that the plans and the decisions leading up to them (e.g., setting priorities, weighing the relative importance of various needs, and assessing and making tradeoffs) are widely owned and reflect the best information and knowledge available. Feedback on school improvement, school performance, and school finance will be done on a regular basis before the SMC. This process will be institutionalized.

There will be sufficient funds to run the school and to drive a meaningful school improvement programme. The SIPs will be an essential part of a rational budgeting process that will trigger the resources needed to implement them. This does not mean that each school will get all the funds it needs all the time, but that every school can expect to get enough to run the school and achieve school improvement. All funds will flow in a timely manner.

Each school will be well managed with the mechanisms in place to ensure that all of the resources available to the school--teachers, administrators, materials and equipment, money, community support--are used efficiently and effectively toward improved student achievement.

---

[13] That there will be no one teacher schools and no multi-grade teaching was an aspect of the vision that was put forth in DD1. That some of our population lives in very remote rural areas, and continue to do so in the 2025, strongly suggests that a certain percentage of our schools will still have to be one-teacher schools where multi-grade teaching goes on. Needed are the mechanisms that ensure that high-quality teaching and learning takes place even under these circumstances. These will have to be examined.

Schools will have performance standards: a certain percentage of the students must pass standardized exams at the end of the academic year. Those schools that perform well will be acknowledged and those that don't will be targeted for higher-level support (coming from the Tehsil or District) that will facilitate the reflection and learning needed to improve overall school performance.

4.4.2 Further delineation of the emerging vision

You have just read a description of what schools/SMCs/communities will look like and how they will function in the year 2025. It is an emerging vision: it needs to be further elaborated. It is envisioned that all School Improvement Plans and the decisions leading up to their development (setting priorities and making tradeoffs) will be well informed and widely owned.

- Describe the mechanisms needed to ensure that these decisions and plans are well informed.

  Answer: We can safely assume that all schools will be electrified by the year 2025[14] and so we can safely say that each will have at least one computer. With that computer, we can say that all schools will be electronically linked to a robust National Education Management Information System, one that facilitates the multidirectional (vertical and lateral) flow of relevant information to and from various nodes within the system. This, however, does not address all of the informational needs of the school. To the extent that school-level stakeholders need to know of the successes and failures of other schools, and best practices from beyond, a cadre of professional change agents was proposed. These change agents would be education experts responsible for catalyzing the on-going improvement of a set number of schools (~10-20 depending in the size and distance between each school): they would help mobilize communities around school improvement, and support them in the preparation and implementation of school improvement plans. As education experts working with other schools, they could easily facilitate the lateral transfer of knowledge amongst the schools they support. Were these change agents to meet regularly amongst themselves, the lessons learned and best practices of schools beyond their own could easily be shared as well. And, with access to the internet, scholarly journals, research institutes, and various project documents, these change agents can facilitate the vertical transfer of knowledge and information, with best practices from afar finding their way down to the level of the school and various problems found at the school level finding their way up to relevant research institutes and/or consultants. Decision-making, however, is not just informed by numerical data and knowledge of lessons learned elsewhere, but also by the perspectives and opinions of each and every stakeholder at the local level. Teachers, Head Teachers, parents, and members of the community all have different interests in what goes on in the education sector; they also have different perspectives and opinions. In order to ensure that each group of stakeholders has a say and that

---

[14] The Government plans to provide electricity to all villages by year 2007.

each can hear what the other has to say vis-à-vis a particular issue at-hand, workshop participants came to realize that democratic forums were a viable mechanism for further informing various decision making processes. Generally speaking a democratic forum was viewed as an institutionalized means by which stakeholders have the opportunity to share their views and perspectives on a particular issue, to advocate for a particular action to be taken, to help further a particular idea, and to learn from others. Union Councils, associations of SMCs or other such democratically elected forums can be used for such consultation and decision making. Further research is required to delineate the framework and cost implications of such forums.

▪ Delineate a school/community-level mechanism that will ensure that SIPs and the decisions leading up to their development especially those regarding priorities and tradeoffs are widely owned. If the SIP development process took place in a community forum, would that ensure widespread ownership? If so, how would that community forum operate? Would it be institutionalized? How would the system ensure that all stakeholders have a say and that their say is given serious consideration?

> *Answer*: Because the democratic forums that were just described engage all stakeholders in, say, the development of a school improvement plan, they were seen by the workshop participants as an ideal mechanism for engendering widespread ownership of the plan, or whatever else may be discussed therein.

It is also envisioned that each school is well managed: the mechanisms will be in place to ensure that all of the resources available to the school—teachers, administrators, materials and equipment, money, community support—are used efficiently and effectively toward improved student outcomes.

▪ Describe the mechanisms needed to ensure that the school is well managed, where the resources are used efficiently and effectively toward improved student performance.

> *Answer*: All agreed that schools need to be held accountable for utilizing there resources in ways that bring about better and better learning for all of its students while at the same time improving the internal efficiency of the school (reducing the drop out and repetition rates[15]). The general parameters of an accountability system for schools are delineated below in Section 4.8.

Comment: Finally, the emerging vision put forth here has a number of cost implications. It speaks of a well-equipped school, no more shelter-less schools, no more single teacher schools, no more multi-grade teaching, and sufficient funds to achieve its learning objectives. It also speaks of a cadre of change agents who not only have to be paid a

---

[15] One can achieve better school-wide learning in percentage terms by forcing low-performing students to drop out. By holding schools accountable for student achievement *and* decreased repetition and drop out, we prevent this from happening.

salary but require an annual operating budget in order to do their job. These cost implications will be examined during the upcoming Costing Workshops.

4.5 The Emerging Vision of Education System

4.5.1 Vision of the Education Systems in the year 2025

A hierarchy of education systems (district, province, and national) will support the schools described in the previous section. Each of these levels will be characterized by knowledge-based institutions where all personnel will be trained to run an education system that supports and fosters genuine learning for all children in every classroom. Politically motivated transfers will be eliminated, and all personnel will be hired, promoted, and retained because of their qualification and performance. All personnel will have access to a needs-based professional development infrastructure. Career advancement will be linked, in part, to professional development: anyone wishing to move up in the system will be required to pass a series of professional development courses from an accredited institution.

Systemic improvement will be driven by the development and implementation of level-specific (i.e., district, province) Improvement Plans that are designed to improve the quality levels of schools, districts, and provinces that will receive resources based upon needs that are evident to maintain the minimum standards within given means and resources. There will be mechanisms to periodically upgrade these minimum standards. Accordingly, these Improvement Plans will also reflect relevant portions of lower level Improvement Plans (i.e., District Improvement Plans will, in large part, be a culmination of School Improvement Plans prepared by the schools in that district). These plans and the critical decisions leading up to them--priorities and tradeoffs--will be developed in a way that ensures that they are widely owned and well informed.

Comment: To the extent that local-level democratic forums were viewed as a viable means of ensuring that school improvement plans were well informed and widely owned, they were also viewed as a way of ensuring that higher level improvement plans were well informed and widely owned. Accordingly, all Feedback Workshop participants saw the merit of having democratic forums at the district, provincial and national level. That the views and opinions of "the local level," in particular, parents, need to be heard within these higher-level forums, the notion of an Associations of SMCs was discussed. A District Association of SMCs would be comprised of a number of elected representatives from the SMCs within the districts. They would have a seat at the District Forum. A Provincial Association of SMCs would be comprised of a number of representatives from its District Associations of SMCs. They would have a seat at the Provincial Forum. The same pattern would hold for at the national level. The by-laws of these institutions will have to be developed.

Each level within the larger education system will have a robust Education Management Information System (EMIS), one that supports information-based planning and the efficient management of the education system. All data will be reliable, accurate, relevant and available on a timely basis. Education officials will report back regularly to education

stakeholders on systemic improvement in performance and finance. In this regard, stakeholders will receive School, District, Provincial, and National Report Cards that describe how funds for each school, department and district have been spent, how well each school/system is performing, and how each school, department and level compares to each other across a number of relevant performance and expenditure indicators.

Each department and level of the education sector--schools, districts, provinces and federal levels and their sub-departments--will be well managed, ensuring that all resources--funds, materials, equipment, support services, personnel--are appropriately spent for earmarked activities in a timely manner. There will be sufficient funds to manage each system effectively (and meet its learning outcomes targets) and to drive meaningful system improvement.

The roles and responsibilities of the SMCs, the district education structures, the provincial education departments, and the national education system, will be clearly defined and the distribution of authority throughout the entire public education sector will promote value for money vis-à-vis learning and system-wide efficiency. If administrative efficiency requires that schools should hire their own support staff, then this will be the case. If districts need ready access to funds in order to finance the timely implementation of their improvement plans, then those funds will be in a district bank account. Responsibility and authority will go hand in hand, and all will be held accountable for performance.

4.5.2 Further delineation of the emerging vision

People throughout the system, including teachers, will be selected, promoted, and retained on the basis of qualifications and performance. If this is to be so, the emerging vision assumes the presence of career ladders and effective performance appraisal systems as an integral part of the system, since these elements ensure that the promotion of all staff is based upon qualification and merit.

In order for people to be promoted on the basis of qualification, there needs to be a career ladder where each higher position (Teacher, Head Teacher, ADO, DO, and others) require a better qualifications: skills acquired through the successful completion of certain professional development courses and, maybe, years of experience carrying out certain responsibilities.

- What would a career ladder look like for teachers?

    Answer: See Section 4.7.1 for a general description of the career ladder for teachers.

- What would a career ladder look like for educational managers and administrators?

    Answer: See Section 4.7.2 for a general description of the career ladder for managers and administrators.

For people to be promoted on the basis of performance, you need an appraisal system comprised of criteria for every job within the system and the ways and means of measuring or assessing people's performance.

- What would a performance appraisal system look like for teachers, Head Teachers, and various district officials? Should they be assessed for how well they teach, or how they run the school? Or should they be assessed for how well their students perform on end-of-grade exams?

    Answer: See Section 4.8 for a general description of an accountability system for teachers and administrators.

- What should happen if people don't perform?

    Answer: See Section 4.8 for s discussion on how to deal with poor performance.

It is easy to say that the required resources will be spent where they are needed and that they will be efficiently used to support system wide learning. Experience suggests that it is much harder to ensure that this actually happens, whether at the district, provincial, or national level.

- Delineate those aspects of the vision that ensure that much needed resources go where they need to go and are spent in accordance with the development plans.

    Answer: Workshop participants realized that resources will go where they are most needed and spent in accordance with development plans if and only if people are held accountable for doing so. Again, we ask you to examine the accountability systems delineated below (Section 4.8).

It is envisioned that all four major levels of the system school/community, district, province, and national will operate in a collaborative, mutually supporting, and highly effective manner.

- How will such a vision be achieved? What aspects of the present system need to be abolished to achieve the vision? What aspects of the future vision need to be put in place?

    Answer: The workshop discussions tended to focus primarily on two major issues: budgeting and finance, and political interference, in particular, as it pertains to the frequent transfer of personnel throughout the system.

    With regard to budgeting and finance, stakeholders realized that it makes little sense putting together a budget for, say, non-salary recurrent expenditures, if in the end, those potential resources are lumped together in a block grant that is fought over in the assembly, the outcome of which could be a zero allocation for non-salary recurrent expenditures in education. Education resources, recurrent and capital, have to be earmarked and transferred according to some formula or

mechanism that ensures that they go where they are supposed to go. They cannot be lumped into a social sector block grant which is open for debate and adjustments according to political expediency. The details of such an educational funding formula/mechanism will be examined during the Costing Workshops.

As for the frequent transfer of educational personnel throughout the system, workshop participants realized that this would be greatly curtailed if personnel were hired and removed *at the level at which they worked*. A district education officer would not be easily transferred to another district if that officer where hired by the district itself. A teacher could not be easily transferred to another school if s/he were hired at the school level. Personnel must, for the most part[16], be hired and removed at the level at which they work. In order to safeguard the chances of promotions for the teachers a tenure track system or possibility of a larger pool of positions can be worked out subsequently.

In 2025, there will be sufficient funds to drive system wide improvement. Various levels of the system (including schools) can expect to get much, if not all, of what they budget for.

- Elaborate upon those aspects of the vision that make this happen.

    Answer: The first aspect, which doesn't need much elaboration, is simply enough public sector resources to cover the costs of a quality education system for all. Pakistan must come up with a minimum standard of provision—one that offers all children the opportunity for a reasonable quality of education. This minimum standard of provision isn't just about the number of qualified teachers, textbooks, desks, chairs, and pedagogical materials. There has to be ample money to cover the operating costs of support staff. If change agents are needed to help achieve the goals set out in this vision, then they need the resources to carry out their tasks. Without this fiscal commitment, Pakistan education sector will wallow as it has done for the last thirty years. The second aspect was already mentioned: earmarked education funds distributed to lower levels of the system via a funding formula, driven largely by the number of students (and potential students; there are many out of school youth).

4.6 The Emerging Vision of Professional Development Infrastructure

4.6.1 Professional Development Infrastructure in the year 2025

The emerging vision of professional development is related to the visions already delineated in the previous sections. As mentioned earlier, if teachers and administrators are to be hired, promoted, and retained on the basis of qualifications and performance, then the system needs to implement both career ladders and effective and transparent performance appraisal, or accountability, systems. With these in place, there will be a significant demand in place for ongoing needs-based professional development where

---

[16] As per the accountability system delineated here, if a school or district performs poorly……..

teachers and administrators will want to attend professional development courses that help them perform better and gain the qualifications necessary to advance in the system.

4.6.2 Further delineation of the emerging vision

With this in mind, what would a professional development infrastructure look like?

▪ Reflect upon the following as you think about this aspect of the emerging vision. When people talk about the ways and means of addressing the professional development needs of teachers and administrators, they describe elaborate schemes that involve various institutions and professional support staff (i.e., universities, teacher training colleges, NGOs, master teachers, learning coordinators, mentors, etc.). Yet, when you look at the country's physicians, professors, engineers, and lawyers, no such schemes are needed: they obtain the professional development they need to do their jobs as best they can. Do teachers really need these elaborate schemes, or can they be more like physicians? If so, how is this possible?

> *Answer*: Most workshop participants realized that if the salary structure of the career ladder were set "right," and if teachers and administrators were held accountable for producing results, and therefore, treated as professionals, they would be willing to pay for professional development out of their own pockets (many professionals do this around the world). This being the case, a professional development infrastructure would be nothing more elaborate than (a) accredited institutions offering the certified courses, (b) a career ladder, and, (c) objective performance criteria (within an accountability system), all of which are discussed below in Sections 4.7 and 4.8.

4.7 Career Ladders

4.7.1 Basic Features and Conceptual Elements

A career ladder, be it for teachers or administrators, is described by a number of fundamental elements:

- The "types" of personnel that define each rung of the ladder with Type 1 as the lowest (i.e., an entry level or temporary teacher) and Type 5, 6, or N as the highest, depending on how many rungs of the ladder there are (with N being the highest rung). The more rungs on the ladder, the more opportunities there are to advance. Each type of personnel would be defined by a detailed terms of reference that describes what each person of that type is expected to do, how they are to relate to others, etc.
- The qualifications of each type, inclusive of such things as level of pre-service training, professional degrees, performance standards, minimum number of years of service, and performance on a requisite number of professional development courses.
- The number of each type the system needs/wants (and can afford). The system does not need 100% of its teachers to be, say, Master Teachers. In the first instance, the system could not afford it. In the second instance, there will always

be entry level teachers. The question, then, is what percentage of the teaching force can be Master Teachers, or any other type of professional on these ladders.

- The salary and benefits associated with each type. This has to be high enough (at some point) to attract the best people, encourage them to pay for their own professional development, and offer them enough status within society, as say, that of medical doctors and other professionals.

4.7.2 Career Ladder for Teachers

Six types of teachers were envisioned in the Feedback Workshops:

- Provisional Teachers,
- Teachers,
- Senior Teachers,
- Master Teachers,
- Mentor Teachers, and
- Master Mentor Teachers.

That they might all work at the Primary, Middle, Secondary, and Higher Secondary levels of education means that there could be upwards of 24 different types of teachers depending on how much, for example, the job requirements of, say, a middle school senior teacher differ from that of, say, a primary school senior teacher. Moreover, as one moves up into middle, secondary, and higher secondary education, subject matter specialization has to be considered as well: to what extent, if any, might a higher secondary physics master teacher "differ" from a higher secondary Urdu master teacher? If one (i.e., the physics teacher) is in short supply, their salaries could differ (although their basic pedagogical responsibilities could remain the same); this would further elaborate the career ladder. Finally, to the extent that we may want to entice more and more good teachers into the rural areas, the salaries of rural teachers (be they provisional, senior, or master) may have to differ; does this constitute yet another "type" of teacher; quite possibly so.

There are more issues to consider. Clearly, the career ladder has Provisional Teachers on the lowest rung of the ladder and Master Teachers on the highest rung of the ladder; likewise, Master Mentor Teachers are higher than Mentor Teachers. What has yet to be determined is the relative position of the mentors to the non-mentors: is, for example, a Master Mentor Teacher higher than a Master Teacher? Is a Mentor Teacher higher than a Senior Teacher? Then, there is the relative position of primary, middle, secondary, and higher secondary teachers: which if any should be higher? Many will argue that higher secondary school teachers should be on a higher rung of the ladder than primary school teachers (due to a perceived need for significantly higher qualifications), yet, common knowledge tells us that primary school teachers are the most important with regard to a student's intellectual development in that they are the ones who lay the foundation for such critical "skills" and "attitudes" as intellectual curiosity, love of learning, ability to work with others, reading comprehension, critical thinking, and basic intellection. If the career ladder forces all of our best teachers to the upper levels of the system, primary students will never develop the skills they need to succeed as students. An argument can

be made that our best primary school teachers need to remain at the primary level and the career ladder needs to be designed in a way that helps make this happen.

Then there is the issue of qualifications. How qualified need each teacher type be? How many years of post secondary education will it take to become a Provisional Teacher? Should we require all Master Teachers to have a Ph.D.? And how many years of service, with high quality performance, should a Teacher have in order to become a Senior Teacher? While there was a considerable amount of discussion around these and a host of other related questions during the Feedback Workshops, they cannot be adequately addressed without (a) rigorous research into career ladders around the world, and (b) the aid of a computerized model that can help us measure teacher demand over the course of the next 20 years, the relative proportion of the total teaching force for each teacher type (given their proposed salaries), the flow of new teachers into the system, teacher attrition, and the requirements of bringing the existing teaching force onto the proposed career ladder.

4.7.3 Career Ladder for Education Administrators

A career ladder of sorts already exists for teachers and administrators: our best teachers become Head Teachers, with the hope of possibly becoming a district administrator, be it a Learning Coordinator, Assistant District Officer Education, Executive District Officer (Education) etc. The problem here is that we lose our best teachers and gain some of our worst administrators. *Vision 2025* rectifies this situation with a cadre of local-level administrators. Teachers can chose to become a Head Teacher and/or a district officer of some sort, but when they make that choice, they must first take and pass a battery of courses aimed at giving them the skills, knowledge, and mindset necessary to carry out the tasks of the desired position. Moreover, these courses must be paid for by the individual. The career ladder for local level administrators is comprised of

- Head Teachers (Primary),
- Head Teachers (Middle),
- Head Teachers (Secondary and Higher Secondary),
- Learning Coordinators,
- Change Agents,
- Assistant District Officers (Education),
- Deputy District Officers (Education),
- District Officers (Education), and
- Executive District Officers (Education).

Many of the same kinds of questions raised about the teacher's career ladder have application here. The international research is overwhelming in support of what we all know from experience: great Head Teachers create great schools. They can raise funds, get the community involved, hold teachers accountable, forge a team that pursues a common goal, etc. Should they be the lowest rung on the career ladder for administrators? After all, the entire education system exists to support what goes on in the school; don't we want our best administrators there? And given what we said above about the importance of primary education, laying the intellectual foundations for each

and every child, should a Head Teacher for Primary be lower than a Head Teacher for Secondary? And what is the relative importance of a Learning Coordinator and a Deputy District Officer (Education)? Who needs more qualifications? Who deserves a higher salary? What should be the qualifications of an Executive District Officer (Education)? Need s/he have been a Deputy District Officer (Education) first? How many of each administrator type do we need? *Do we even want all of these positions; if we can't afford the operating costs that enable many to do their jobs, should we not reconsider their positions altogether?* Where do the Change Agents envisioned in this document fit in? What should be each administrator type's salary? And how might this career ladder mesh with Provincial and Federal level administrators, if at all? These questions can only be adequately addressed through a specific research undertaking (looking into the relative proportion of non-teachers in high-performing system elsewhere), and the help of a computerized model, one that can give us a sense of how many education administrators (non-teachers) we can afford over the course of the next 20 years.

4.8 Accountability Systems

4.8.1 Basic Features and Conceptual Elements

Fundamentally, everyone in the system needs to be held accountable for doing the job they are being paid to do: everyone must show up for work, teachers must teach, administrators must administer, support staff must support, etc. Moreover, everyone's work must be viewed as supporting constantly improving classroom learning. Accordingly, learning standards need to be established for each and every grade/class, and performance standards, in particular the percentage of students receiving a passing grade on an end-of-year/class exam that measures how much students learned vis-à-vis those learning standards need to be established for each teacher, Head Teacher, School, District Office, and Provincial Office in the country. Additional—job specific—performance standards also need to be worked out for every "type" of personnel envisioned on the teacher and administrator career ladders; only then can they be held accountable.

Of concern here is the level of the learning standard: what constitutes a passing grade on an end-of-year/class exam, and what percentage of students needs to achieve this passing grade in order for us to be sure that our system is producing quality education for all? Is 70% good enough for a passing grade, and should 90% of all students achieve this passing grade before we can say that a teacher has performed well? Should 90% of all the students in a school achieve a passing grade of 70% on all of its end-of-grade/class exams before we can say that that school performed well? What percentage of students needs to pass their end-of-grade/class exams in order for us to say that a district performed well? These and a host of related questions cannot be addressed without first establishing the standards, and then seeing where our students currently stand relative to those standards. If the learning standards that we establish for say, Grade 3, are X, and if on a pre-test that is given to all Grade 3-entering students 80% fall well below the standard we set for Grade 2, then we cannot expect 90% of those Grade 3 students to achieve a passing grade of 70% on their Grade 3 end-of-year exams.

Clearly, people cannot be held accountable for achieving specific performance standards if they are not given, or have, the wherewithal to do so. Learning Coordinators cannot be held accountable for supporting the teaching staff of 20 schools if they do not have the money to buy fuel for their cars. Teachers who know little more than their students cannot be held accountable for teaching them much more. And education personnel in poorly resourced areas (i.e., schools, districts) cannot be held accountable for the same performance standards as those who operate in well-resourced areas of the country: students in a shelter-less one-teacher school in rural Balochistan cannot be expected to perform as well as students in a model government school in the ICT.

That such gross inequity of provision exists speaks to the need also to hold people accountable for the rational distribution of resources. Making this happen requires some guidelines in the form of a <u>minimum standard of provision</u>: a blend of inputs that guarantees each and every student a quality education[17]. Questions abound, however: what level of "quality" can/should[18] the GOP guarantee for each and every student? What blend of inputs can bring about that level of quality? What can we afford for each and every student? The level of quality is tied up with standards: what do we as a country want each and every child to know and be able to do, at a minimum? The blend of inputs needed to bring about that level of quality depends in large part on what we can afford, but there are limits here. If all we can afford (as determined by past expenditures in education) is not enough to be able to purchase a blend of inputs that can guarantee even a minimum quality level, then we will have to determine what that blend is and find the money to pay for it.

Once a minimum standard of provision is determined, a numerical index can be created. Those schools that are relatively well-resourced vis-à-vis the minimum standard of provision will fall above the index, those that are poorly resourced vis-à-vis the minimum standard of provision will fall below the index. Districts can then be held accountable for channelling relatively more resources to those schools below the index (on the basis of need), and in so doing, move a certain percentage of those schools up to the index on a regular basis. A similar index can be created to ensure that provinces give more resources to those districts that are relatively under-resourced vis-à-vis the minimum standard of provision. Again, this forces needs based planning to take place, which is how it should take place.

To hold people and entities (i.e., schools and districts) accountable, requires that the authority to whom they are accountable reward those who do well (the reward could be as inexpensive as the lack of a sanction, but could take the form of a cash award), and in some way deal with those who don't perform well. With regard to the latter, initially, support of some sort has to be given to, say, the teacher in need or the school where many of its students are not achieving a passing grade. If, after a number of rounds of support performance is still sub-par, then sanctions have to be put in place.

---

[17] What we are guaranteeing is a minimum standard of quality for everyone. Should a school be able to provide a higher standard, fine.
[18] What it should be able to afford can be premised on international norms vis-à-vis spending (% of total public expenditure going to education, per capita spending, etc.).

It will take some time to develop and make these accountability systems operational. Questions have to be answered, issues resolved, and details worked out. The notion of takeover is vexing. Serious research has to be undertaken to work out the details. Nevertheless, we are committed to holding people and entities accountable. It is the only way to ensure that our resources are being used in such a way that every child in the country has the opportunity to become the kind of citizen we want them to be.

5 *Affordability and the Costing Model*

The cost implications of various aspects of the emerging vision have been raised throughout this document. The overall cost of education is driven by two things: demographics—the number of children being educated; and unit cost—the average amount of money that is spent per student. The number of students being educated is driven by how many enter the system (5 and 6 year-olds; and left-outs) and how many stay in the system. If we as a country wish to educate all of our children by the year 2025, then more and more children will enter and stay in the system, raising overall costs. If we want all of our children to have a quality education, then the unit cost will rise over the course of the next 20 years and so add to that increase in cost.

We are morally bound to educate all of our children: all children have that right, a right enshrined in our Constitution, the Universal Bill of Rights for Children to which we are a signatory. And so, we must look to two things: how much money we spend on education and what we spend it on. As we increase total public expenditure on education to 4% of GDP, then the question becomes one of what to spend it on.

We need to increase both access and quality. Access is relatively easy: we need to build more schools and classrooms (where they are most needed) and we need to rehabilitate much of our existing infrastructure: we need classrooms that are conducive to learning. Quality is a more vexing issue. What should we spend our money on to improve quality? How high can the pupil-classroom ratio be before quality starts to wane (higher pupil-class ratios mean that we need fewer teachers, all of whom have a cost associated with them)? How much can we expect out teachers to teach (a greater workload translates into fewer teachers needed)? How much should we spend on teachers (assuming they show up for class and utilize their skills on behalf of student achievement)? How much needs to be spent on textbooks, pedagogical materials, and other such items? Is a desk and chair a better investment than a mat and a writing tablet? How important are fans? What inputs yield the greatest amount of learning on a rupee-by-rupee basis? And what assumptions can we make about the economy? How will it grow over the course of the next 20 years? And, with a growing population and our moral commitment to provide all children a quality education, what will it cost to provide that education over the course of the next 20 years? These and a host of related questions will be the focus of the next round of workshops: the Costing Workshops.

6 *The Way Ahead*

This document describes the salient features of the emerging vision. A number of questions are raised here. Some require serious research; research that will be initiated

over the course of this year in an effort to begin implementing *Vision 2025*. Some will be addressed in the upcoming Costing Workshops. You are asked to share your general impressions of the emerging vision by sending them to the MOE. You are also asked to ready your selves for the Costing Workshops: how do we get value for money with regard to quality learning for all our children? We need your best thinking.

All submissions should be sent to Dr. S. Fayyaz Ahmad, Joint Education Advisor, Policy and Planning Wing, Ministry of Education, AEPAM Building, Taleemi Chowk, G-8/2, Islamabad.