

Training Needs Assessment
for
Master's Level Programs

Supervisor: Dr. Saeed Shafqat

Lead Researcher: Raheem ul Haque

Research Associate: Khurram Waqas Malik

Research Assistants: Adeel Riaz & Saboor Karamat

Centre for Public Policy & Governance,

FC College (A Chartered University)

Acknowledgement

The research team at the Centre for Public Policy and Governance (CPPG), Forman Christian College (A Chartered University) is grateful to the Governance Institute Network International (GINI) and its international partner Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR), Oslo for sanctioning this much needed research for Pakistan.

We are thankful to the various institutions and individuals who hosted us and shared their valuable time, and insights. Additionally we would like to thank GINI's TNA sub-committee especially Dr. Rifaat Hussain, Prof Najaf Yawar Khan, Mr. Daniyal Aziz, Brig. Mohammad Saleem, Dr. Arne Tesli and Mr. Stig Jarle Hansen for their support during the project and valuable feedback on the research report.

Terms of Reference

Title

Baseline research on TNA for Masters' level programs and courses in public training institutions in Pakistan

Scope of work:

1. To prepare a comprehensive report on the credentials/Curriculum Vitae (C.V.s) of the faculty currently teaching courses in governance related disciplines in Pakistani universities and public training institutions to assess the potential and training requirements for adopting a Masters' program in Governance. More importantly faculty qualification, experience, area concentration and research orientation will be assessed both to develop clear targets for capacity development as well as to define a road map for achieving these targets in comparison to world class programs offering multi-disciplinary Governance curriculum.
2. The evaluation will also include institutional infrastructure including library, faculty and student facilities to determine student induction and professional development capacity.

Foreword

Governance Institutes Network International (GINI) deserves credit for not only centre staging governance and public policy in the academic discourse but also for initiating base line research and empirical studies on the very fuzzy domains and disciplines of Public Policy, Governance and Public administration. This relatively short yet wide ranging report on Training Needs Assessment for Master's level programs clearly demonstrates that Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance are the emerging programs in Pakistan's higher education. The size of the clientele is not very clear at this point. The Report draws attention to the fact that disciplinary basis are still hazy and the curriculum at the Master's level, generally shows lack of consensus on the broad parameters of these programs. For example, the Report highlights how the Master's in Public Administration (MPA) programs are overwhelmingly influenced by Master's in Business Administration (MBA) and Information Technology (IT) and have yet to evolve their distinct identity. It also notes the inadequacy of trained faculty in the fields of public policy, public administration and governance. Therefore, the Report visualizes that there is great opportunity for not only streamlining the curriculum and faculty needs but also initiating a discourse on how to structure Master's level programs in the country.

The report strongly recommends that the Annual Conference and regional seminars of GINI could help in strategizing the scope and future orientation of programs in public policy, public administration and governance.

Dr. Saeed Shafqat
Professor & Director
Centre for Public Policy & Governance (CPPG)
Forman Christian College (A Chartered University)
Ferozpur Road, Lahore – 54600

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	6
Scope, Methodology & Structure	9
Objectives:	9
Scope of the study.....	9
Training Needs Assessment Report Structure.....	12
Conceptual Framework of the Policy Domain.....	13
Assessing World Class Programs	14
Graduate Level Policy Instruction	17
Current Status of Policy Programs in Pakistan:.....	20
Graduate Degree Programs	20
Curriculum and Academic Concentration.....	21
Institutional Capacity	24
Faculty & Students.....	24
Academic Research.....	26
Goals	27
Faculty and Institutional Needs	28
Faculty Training Aspects:.....	28
Subject Areas Requirements	28
Compensatory Mechanisms	30
Training Mechanisms.....	31
Linkages:.....	32
Other Initiatives:	34
Institutional Dynamics	34
Institutional Culture	34
Institutional Needs	35
Findings & Recommendations	37
Findings	37
Recommendations.....	38
Appendix A: University Abbreviations	41
Appendix B: Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	42
Appendix C: List of Foreign Universities Assessed	43
Appendix C: List of Interviewees.....	44
Appendix D: List of Tables	46
Appendix E: Survey Form.....	47

Executive Summary

History & Evolution

The history of policy programs in Pakistan goes back to the early 1960s when the Institute of Administrative Studies, Punjab University started a program in Public Administration (PA). Simultaneously, leading to the establishment of Pakistan Administrative Staff College and National Institutes of Public Administration for the training of public servants. Public Administration programs have since started at a number public universities but it is only recent that universities have started Public Policy and Governance programs.

Unlike the evolution of policy programs in the United States where school standards were maintained owing to policy school associations, no such association exists in Pakistan although recently HEC has played a small part in reformulating curriculums. An evaluation of international policy schools indicates that though some commonalities exist in the curriculum, each school tends to specialize in a particular area of Public Policy owing to its faculty, location or institutional strength.

But in spite of the history of policy programs in Pakistan, there hasn't been an academic discussion regarding the need, objective and adhering standards for the programs. It is thus important for academics to discuss and build a consensus on the definition of Governance, Public Policy and Public Administration, the standards for curriculum and graduation within the Pakistani context.

Academic Programs & Curriculum

Currently there are fifteen universities offering policy programs in the country divided into: First, Master's programs requiring 14 years of education which include 9 MPA, and 1 Governance and Public Policy program each. Second, there are Master's/MPhil programs requiring 16 years of education including 4 PA and 3 Public Policy of which 6 extend to a PhD program. Third, there are two degree awarding Executive Programs, 1 each in Public Administration and Public Policy.

In terms of curriculum, policy programs can be divided into three. First, the MPA programs which have evolved more towards management than policy with concentrations in Human Resource Management (HRM), Marketing, Finance and MIS with only a few schools offering Development. Second, Public Policy programs with heavy economic concentration producing economic analysis experts. Third, programs in Public Policy, Administration and Governance, which have a diverse curriculum and an eye for producing generalists.

Faculty & Institutional Status

Similarly diversity exists among policy programs in terms of institutional culture, faculty expertise and student intake. But the overall situation requires a lot of improvement as average Student to Full Time Faculty Ratio is 30 reaching as high as 75 for one university. The general dearth of full time faculty is further compounded when

relevant subject areas are taken into account. The faculty expertise is heavily tilted towards HRM with a total of 7 PhDs while there is only 1 PhD for Quantitative/Econometric Analysis. Though our analysis indicates 17 Economic PhDs, this number would be 5 if PIDE, an economic research organization is excluded from the analysis. Thus there is a critical need for faculty expertise in Economic Theory and Quantitative & Empirical Analysis among policy schools. Within Public Management, HRM expertise dominates while Structure and Process of Government, and Leadership and Administrative Theory are neglected. But the worst situation exists in the field of Political Economy, Globalization, Governance and Development, all core areas of Public Policy for which faculty expertise is non-existent in policy schools.

The reasons for the dearth of full time and additionally PhD faculty are numerous including a young discipline, institutional culture, student intake but one that stands out for public sector universities is the compensation mechanism. The Tenure Track System (TTS) introduced by the HEC improves compensation structure for public sector faculty if conditions for research output are met. But almost all public sector faculty interviewed were not part of the TTS and it is unlikely that they would become a part primarily because they are currently teaching up to 6 courses a semester to supplement their government grade based income, leaving them little time for research.

Faculty Development

In terms of faculty development, some public sector universities are availing opportunities to send their junior faculty for PhD through HEC scholarship and foreign university exchange programs. But an institutional strategic plan is missing among all interviewed institutions. All institutions had goals to improve academic quality, introduce new concentrations or start a new program but a detailed plan which encapsulates faculty skills requirements, budgetary requirements, projected student size, administrative and institutional needs was missing.

It is thus recommended that policy programs in the country bring themselves under the framework of an association, which is manned by academic experts and policy makers to evolve a consensus on definitional grounds and objectives of the various policy programs. Additionally the same association can facilitate policy programs both to devise a five year strategic plan and more importantly to execute and achieve it.

Recommendations

Based on the interviews and data gathered over the course of this research, it is recommended that a three tiered approach be taken

- For the Short Term, policy programs should develop linkages with their own university's social science departments to involve needed experts in teaching, while the association should kick start research activity by devising incentives for faculty research seminars. The association should create a pool of experts (both domestic and foreign faculty) to deliver intensive short-term courses in core policy subject areas at various cities in addition to exploring linkages and exchange program opportunities for domestic policy programs.

- For the Medium Term, the association should institutionalize the curriculum, program structure and logistics for short-term faculty training in select subject areas. Additionally association should facilitate foreign summer research sabbaticals where junior faculty can work under the supervision of an expert in the field while facilitating domestic PhD degree holders to get Post-Docs for exposure to foreign academic and research culture.
- For the Long Term, the association should institutionalize linkages and exchange programs with foreign universities for a long-term commitment towards faculty development and exchange; it should provide PhD scholarships in select subject areas for which experts do not exist in Pakistan. More importantly using its pool of experts, it should build a quality domestic PhD program by supporting it with faculty, library, lab and other institutional resources.

Further Study

The following areas of exploration were further suggested during the review process but time constraints have restricted their inclusion in the report.

- A detailed assessment of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance curriculums including texts of various universities would inform the scope, clarity, context (local or foreign) and datedness of what is being taught.
- An overview of market supply and demand of policy graduates should be undertaken to understand national level needs
- The Annual Review Reports of policy departments can shed more light on the needs and functioning of these departments.

Scope, Methodology & Structure

Objectives:

The objective of the baseline research is to assess degree awarding master's level Public Policy and Governance programs across the country in terms of faculty, curriculum, students, administration and infrastructure, and articulate institutional capacity building and faculty training needs for the program. All GINI partners as well as other schools with policy programs were included in the study.

Scope of the study

Though the study encompasses only educational institutions, which are or aspire to start Public Policy and Governance programs, it is important to identify the measuring criteria for these schools. Thus the scope of the study also includes conceptual notes on what can be termed Public Policy, Public Administration and Governance. Usually programs evolve their own area of expertise tailoring the curriculum according to their own program philosophy, faculty expertise, staff and institutional resources. Programs of some foreign universities will also be explored to get a better understanding of areas of focus in these disciplines.

Field Research Scope: The research covers degree awarding master's level programs in Public Policy, Public Administration and Governance for all network members of GINI. These programs include Masters, M.Phil and degree awarding Executive Education programs. Though thirteen degree awarding institutions are currently members of GINI, only nine have a policy relevant program. Our research thus covered an in depth survey of institutions with a policy program and was restricted to faculty interviews for institutions which are part of the GINI network but do not currently have a policy program.

Among GINI members, the following universities have the concerned program

- Public Policy
 - BeaconHouse National University (BNU)
 - National Defense University (NDU)
 - Centre for Public Policy & Governance, Forman Christian College (CPPG)
 - (Economics & Population Sciences Program) Pakistan Institution of Development Economics (PIDE)
 - National School of Public Policy, Lahore (NSPP)
- Public Administration
 - Quaid-e-Azam University (QAU)
 - University of Karachi (UK)
 - Institute of Administrative Sciences, Punjab University (IAS)
 - Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi (FJWU)

- Governance
 - National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad (NUML)

Other universities that have a Public Administration program include

- Peshawar University (PeshU)
- University of Baluchistan, Quetta (UB)
- University of Sindh, Jamshoro (US)
- Gomal University (GU)
- Government College University Faisalabad (GCUF)
- Institute of Business Administration (IBA)

GINI members who do not have a policy relevant program

- Lahore University of Management & Sciences (LUMS)
- Government College University Lahore (GCUL)
- International Islamic University (IIU)
- Kinnaird College, Lahore
- Aga Khan University, Karachi (AKU)

Research Areas: Though this report is meant to concentrate on faculty training needs assessment, the institutional dynamics play an important part in influencing the faculty and thus the following functional areas were taken into account to formulate findings and recommendations:

1. **Program Philosophy & Structure:** The broad field of Public Policy and Governance requires that a program has a philosophy on which its program structure, curriculum, faculty expertise and student intake are designed. The Program Philosophy articulates a program's conception of Governance in terms of the importance it attaches to the theoretical versus the practical, the international versus the domestic, the state vs the non-state, the core versus the electives and the structured versus the tailored. The program's mission instead defines milestones such as adding a concentration, increasing student body size, and building partnerships with other programs.

The Program Structure devises the academic process by defining the number of course credits and field research/project/internship credits required for graduation, the categorization of courses and the process in which courses will be offered.

2. **Infrastructure & Administration:** The service delivery of every program requires an infrastructure including lecture rooms, discussion oriented classes, a computer laboratory with statistical and office management software, a library providing accessibility to newspapers, books, academic journals, government statistical data & reports, and reference texts. Space availability for group discussions and project work areas are also an important part of the infrastructure.

Within the realm of Administration, the day to day management of the program includes admissions, orientation, course registration, grades management, course and teacher evaluation, student advising, placement and alumni relations. The student experience at the university is greatly dependent on the administrative efficiency of the program, which can either facilitate the learning experience or obstruct it. The strength of the program can also be judged by designation of resources for Advising students, and a Placement center with links in the industry.

3. Curriculum & Academic Experience: The program curriculum is structured along the lines of Program Philosophy but its fulfillment of program objectives needs to be evaluated. Particularly, the curriculum may have a mixture of theoretical and practical, quantitative and qualitative, seminar lecture or discussion based courses. For each of the specific courses, a clearly defined and detailed curriculum articulating what is expected of students, what will be taught and what will be the learning outcome will be evaluated. In addition, the detailed curriculum will be used to judge if different opinions, methodologies and ideologies are being discussed for a specific topic.

The Academic Experience also includes faculty availability for office hours and for advising students. A program may or may not have an assigned faculty advisor. If it does, then advisor student ratio would indicate the importance provided to the advisory role. Research and Teaching opportunities for students also improve learning experience. Additionally student's learning experience is also based on institutional culture, which may or may not provide extracurricular opportunities outside the classroom for personal, academic and professional growth.

4. Faculty: The strength of the faculty can be judged based on the philosophy and objectives of the program. Program strength is partly based on the number of full time versus part time faculty to assess the faculty student ratio. In addition, the qualification of the faculty, its teaching experience, practical work/consultancy experience, research experience specifically in their area of expertise will be evaluated. It is also important to judge the relationship between a faculty's area of expertise and the course they teach. In addition, program's human resources management needs to be assessed for faculty development, research facilitation, remuneration and promotion policy.
5. Student Body: The student body can be judged by its diversity in terms of undergraduate degree and GPA, age group, gender, geographical (urban/rural and district), ethnicity and religion. Programs will be evaluated based on their Admissions' criteria, Acceptance Ratio, Graduation Ratio, Average Graduation GPA, Placement Ratio within 3 months after graduation. In addition, funding opportunities for students in terms of loans, stipends, scholarships and work opportunities would also be included. The student experience is also influenced by class size, accessibility of faculty, books and other needed resources, student clubs, incorporation of student feedback in to the program and timely redressal of complaints.

Methodology: The methodology differed depending on the areas being researched. It included review of literature, survey of program websites, designing and administration of a questionnaire, and focused group discussions and interviews:

- To devise a conceptual framework of Public Policy, Administration and Governance, brief review of literature was conducted.
- An assessment of foreign university programs was done based on the institution's website.
- To explore the conception of Public Policy, Administration & Governance in Pakistan, focused interviews were conducted of select Academics, Bureaucrats and Policy Makers.
- While initial assessment of domestic programs in our research universe was based on the websites, it also included
 - A set of survey questionnaires was used to gather quantifiable information regarding the listed areas including faculty (qualification, experience, area concentration, research interest), institutional capacity (administration, library, laboratory, facilities), curriculum and student indicators.
 - Focused interviews were conducted with the dean of the school, director of the program and faculty members.
 - Phone interviews were conducted in case the university was not visited.

Training Needs Assessment Report Structure

The research report aims to understand faculty training needs within the academic and institutional domain. It begins by exploring the definitional context of policy relevant terms, followed an analysis of international world class programs and Pakistani academics elaboration of policy instruction's objectives and vision. Following an exploration of policy relevant programs across the country, the report gets deeper into faculty training needs issues and concludes with the findings and recommendations of the study.

- The first section explores the conceptual framework of Public Policy, Public Administration and Governance. It provides a definitional context to the terms.
- The second section analyzes the philosophy, program structure and curriculum of world class universities to get a better understanding of the educational practices of these disciplines.
- The third section presents a brief discussion on Public Policy, Administration and Governance Instruction. It highlights the issues and debate among academics regarding policy relevant instruction in Pakistan.
- The fourth section explores the current status of policy programs in Pakistan. It explores the philosophy, program structure, curriculum, faculty and administrative capacity of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance programs in the country.
- Based on the information and analysis of earlier sections, the fifth section further explores in detail the Faculty Training and Institutional Capacity Building Needs.
- The last section provides in brief the Findings and Recommendations of the research.
- The Appendices include the Abbreviations used, the list of Tables and the Survey Questionnaire.

Conceptual Framework of the Policy Domain

To assess programs in Public Policy, Public Administration and Governance, it is important to conceptually define and differentiate the terms. The World Bank's definition of Governance is "*Governance consists of the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. This includes the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.*" Linking this definition with the Douglas North's analogy of the Game- Governance defines the 'Rules of the Game, How the game is played'. Public Administration is the 'Interaction of the Players of the Game' while the Public Policy becomes the 'Outcome of the Game'. Thus Governance can be termed the framework within which institutions of the State interact with themselves as well as with citizens and non-governmental institutions. It is an outcome of the consensus built around socio-cultural and political traditions formalized in a Constitution. Within this framework, the intra and interaction of government institutions in addition to interaction between government institutions and the citizenry impacts both efficiency and effectiveness of government. Thus Public Administration is broadly defined as the science of these interactions, which allows effective running of the government as well as administration and efficient execution of public policies. While Public Policy is a specific set of actions formulated within the Governance Framework through the interplay of various governmental and non-governmental institutions. Policy is dependent upon but may impact both the Framework as well as the institutions responsible for its implementation.

In terms of education and structured programs within the policy domain, Public Administration came first in line with the evolution of the modern administrative State with its bureaucratic structures, while Public Policy was an outcome of the post second world war behaviorist influences attracting policy makers rather than functionaries of the civil services¹. Governance programs were the last to begin in the policy domain but only a few exist because a number of Public Administration or Public Policy programs already cover the area as a concentration or as select courses.

¹ De Soto, Opheim, Tajalli. "*Apples and Oranges? Comparing the Attitudes of Public Policy Versus Public Administration Students*". *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol 29 No. 1, March 1999. pp 77 - 91

Assessing World Class Programs

In earlier literature assessing Public Policy and Public Administration programs in the United States, analytical skills, economic sophistication and methodological training are considered common to both sets of students. In another study comparing American and International Policy Programs, Organizational Theory, Personnel, Policy Analysis and Microeconomics were considered common, while Research Methods and Budget Management was considered an American forte at the expense of the non-American institution's inclusion of Public Law and Management Information Systems². Thus differences in the curriculum existed both within the discipline of Public Policy and Public Administration as well as according to location. Another element of difference is between the school's association with the National Association of Schools in Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) or with the Association of Public Policy and Management (APPAM). Though initially APPAM had a more economic emphasis at the expense of public law and personnel, research indicated that difference have diminished over time³. Still a stereotype persisted that Public Administration students did not have the skills to evaluate public programs objectively while Public Policy students had a narrow technical proficiency of problem analysis without the interpersonal skills and human dimension of the problem.⁴ The stereotypical differences that Public Policy students remain skeptical of politics as a criteria for decision making because of their socializing through Neoclassical Economics placing added burden of proof on benefits of government while Public Administration students consider value of government more accepting because of their grounding in management of a policy, organizational behavior and politics of bureaucracy were rejected⁵. The only difference between Policy and Administration students was the lack of sensitization of feeling and emotions found in Public Policy students as compared to Public Administration students.

In our analysis of twenty one programs of fifteen well renowned universities⁶ of the world teaching Public Policy, Public Administration, Public Management and Governance, the difference in the curriculum stems less from the kind of program (PP, PM, PA) and more from the philosophy of the university. Thus a PP and PA program from the same university would have more in common than a PA program of two different universities. University programs range from academic with a concentration on theoretical courses to a professional program primarily concerned with skills impartation. Our analysis of these programs provides the following results.

The following features are an integral part of most of the analyzed policy programs:

- Economics is by far the most dominant subject in the core courses of the analyzed policy programs. Economics courses though can be divided into three areas: First the **Basic Economic Grounding** includes

² Averch and Dluhy. "Teaching Public Administration, Public Management and Policy Analysis: Some International Comparisons". International Journal of Public Administration., 20(2), (1997), pp497-511

³ *ibid*

⁴ De Soto, Opheim, Tajalli. "Apples and Oranges? Comparing the Attitudes of Public Policy Versus Public Administration Students". American Review of Public Administration, Vol 29 No. 1, March 1999. pp 77-91

⁵ *ibid*

⁶ The list of universities is provided in Appendix C.

courses in Microeconomics & Macroeconomics meant to provide a theoretical base in economics. The second *Economic Analysis and Application* courses builds on the basics to provide skills in analyzing a policy or a project. The third *Quantitative & Empirical Skills* is meant to instill statistical analysis skills. The concentration on Economics is not limited to just Public Policy Programs but also includes Public Administration (PA) and Public Management (PM) programs. But there is a measurable difference such that PA and PM programs concentrate more on Economic Application rather than in depth theoretical courses in Micro & Macro Economics. Though Economics and Quantitative Analysis dominated core curriculums, a few schools instead or in addition also had a more generic course in *Research and Evaluation Methods*.

- *Financial Management*: For Public Administration and Public Management programs, Financial Management (including Budgeting) seems to be a key component of the core curriculum while few Public Policy programs include it.
- Similarly *Public Management* is also a key component of the Public Administration though depending on the university philosophy, the program can range from a theoretical to an application course. From the theoretical stand point, universities offer a course in 'Leadership & Management', some concentrate on the 'Theory of Administration' while on the opposite side of the spectrum, specifically European and Japanese universities concentrates on 'Structure and Process of Government'. While some universities offer an analytical course in 'Organizational Analysis'.
- *Political Economy* is also an important part of the core curriculum especially of the Public Policy programs though few schools also include it in their Public Administration core curriculum. Schools with a theoretical focus term the course as the relationship between 'State and Market', others term it as 'Political Economy of Development' while schools with an international focus term it as 'World Economy & Globalization'. Some schools go further and concentrate specifically on the political realm with core courses such as 'Politics of Policy and Governance'.
- The other areas such as *Ethics* was part of the core curriculum of only one program, *Law* was required in six programs, while skills oriented courses such as *Communication & Proposal Writing* was required in three and *Information Technology* only at the Indian Institute of Public Administration.

Seminars, workshops and simulation exercises are a key component of the academic experience of international universities. Some programs also have a *1-2 week workshop* or exercise, which is a part of student evaluation. An important part of the two year programs was an *internship* though was not required at all universities as some also allowed the flexibility for language study programs. The program completion requirement for most programs was either a *Research Thesis* or a *Policy Research* (applied research project) document. Averch and Dluhy in their analysis of policy schools stated that Critical Thinking, Memo Writing, Program Evaluation, Professional Writing

and Speaking are some of the other skills emphasized.⁷ In the next section we will briefly review to what degree the experience of international universities was operative in Pakistani universities.

⁷ Averch and Dluhy. "Teaching Public Administration, Public Management and Policy Analysis: Some International Comparisons". International Journal of Public Administration., 20(2), (1997), pp497-511

Graduate Level Policy Instruction

As is clear from our research of foreign schools, program objectives are important in defining both the philosophy and methodology of policy instruction at the graduate level. Thus as part of our research, we explored the meaning of Public Policy, Public Administration and Governance with academics belonging to various universities of the country.

There was a general consensus among all participants that policy remained under-emphasized in Pakistan and thus the conception of national interest remained constrained to a tunnel vision. One reason was that the vision & philosophy of governance had yet to be properly articulated by the political class while the current owners of Governance vision, the bureaucracy still had restricted engagement with the public and other stake holders. For academics, the current reality of processes and institutional breakdown, and various regional and class imbalances required rethinking and evidence based formulation of policies, followed by efficient implementation. A few academics additionally stressed good university governance as key to inculcating the value system articulated in governance literature as it provided an opportunity where students could get first hand experience in both theory and practice.

Though opinions varied in nuances, most academics understood Governance as an over all ability of the political system to address public needs and aspirations. Most considered it as a broader notion that encompassed Public Policy, a formulation of policy related to public interest and Public Administration, the management of public sphere during the policy implementation process. Some academics instead considered Governance closer to Public Administration only including Public Policy if Governance was broadly defined. Shafqat defines Good Governance as a two dimensional phenomena including the Political and the Technical. In the Political, he includes Rule of Law, consensus building and conflict resolution through bargaining and negotiations. This requires parliamentary, judiciary and press independence. The Technical includes efficient, honest and professionally trained civil services as part of effective public institutions, which ensures continuity of policies, political stability and cultural cohesion. The understanding of Public Administration as a discipline also differed with some academics considering it as management of public institutions and thus encompassing only the technical issues of administration while others defining it as an art of policy implementation including the management of political, socio-cultural and administrative issues around the policy. For Public Policy though, academics agreed that it was a complex interface of economics, political science and management aspects, an interdisciplinary field, which tried to incorporate a holistic approach towards policy analysis. Few academics suggested that Development Studies should also be included in the broader policy domain because of its interdisciplinary social sciences makeup, which complements a professional policy degree with academic theory.

Though, a heated debate exists on the influence and use of economics in the policy arena. Shafqat as a political scientist argues that Good Governance rather than economic development alone is a function of political will and

leaderships' commitment, affected by the cultural, historical and institutional setting of the country.⁸ Burki, a senior economist instead argues that though policy is a mixture of economics, sociology and political science, it has to build on the basis of Economics because quantification and statistics is now required for social scientists to strengthen their argument. Thus concentration in Economics is a must in the policy arena and a solid background in master's level economics, including micro, macro and econometrics is necessary. But even economists agree that Neo-classical Economics restricted to Rational Choice Theory should be a thing of the past primarily supported by the argument that Public Policy instrumentation and choice of tools should not be treated as evidence with an autonomous meaning, which Neo-classical economics has been for the last few decades.⁹ Pasha argued instead for heavy concentration on Political Economy while Burki argued for Institutional Economics because both explain the formulation and implementation process better than Neo-classical Economics.

This discussion is extremely important because "Instruments" are not neutral devices and include power relations. They can further legitimize certain relations by their politicization or de-politicization, thus constructing a framework for categorizing a situation.¹⁰ Hussain agreed that there is no neutral study of public policy, considering governance as a value driven phenomena and arguing for a people centred policy and ethics based governance. But even with a consensus on values for overall policy evaluation, its instrumentalization would still be a challenge. Moving beyond the so called 'natural' phenomena articulated by Neo-classical Economics, both Burki and Pasha specifically mentioned Game Theory as an important constituent of the policy domain because it analyzes and tries to model interactions among people, groups and institutions. But this consensus on required changes in policy instrumentation does not extend to the level of quantification of social sciences, which is still a debate able area. Some academics whole heartedly support quantification, while others through agreeing with the strength of empirical evidence argue for case study treatment with emphasis on qualitative analysis instead.

Another difference of opinion exists in the debate between Generalists and Experts. Most academics argued that the modern system of government could not be handled by the generalist bureaucrat alone and requires experts in specific policy arena. Rais alone extended this line of argument taking a position against a generalist policy analyst instead suggesting that master's graduates with a thorough grounding in social sciences would be better placed in the policy arena than a generalist masters level policy graduate. Hussain though differing from this position did argue that the intake of interdisciplinary masters level policy programs should be restricted to social science and at most literature students. Most other academics were open to the idea of an interdisciplinary program with a diverse student intake.

⁸ Saeed Shafqat, "*Pakistani Bureaucracy: Crises of Governance and Prospects of Reform.*" The Pakistan Development Review 38:4 Part II, (Winter 1999), pp995–1017.

⁹ Lasoumes and Gales, "*Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments – From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instruments.*" Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, Vol 20, No.1,(2007), pp1–21.

¹⁰ *ibid*

Regarding the Market for policy graduates, Rais did not see a market for the generalist policy graduate arguing that policy was the preserve of bureaucrat in Pakistan and any market required a change in this reality while Think Tanks were better served by trained social scientists than generalists. Other academics though saw an opportunity but pinned it on the degree of competence of the graduates. Lack of a structured market was itself an outcome of a lack of a graduate program while Development and Social Science graduates had an existing market in the State Bank, Housing sector, Financial Consulting research departments and NGOs. Hussain saw a huge opportunity in Chambers of Commerce, professional organizations and legislative bodies which though employed full time policy analysts across the world including India, were not ready to invest in policy professionals in Pakistan because of a lack of awareness of benefits. Thus market awareness raising will be an important factor in the overall success of policy programs in Pakistan.

Interestingly language was another subject mentioned multiple times in the interview process. Haider approached it as a single most important factor in equalizing knowledge among the various groups of students. Shah argued that had their students been able to write their thesis and research reports in Urdu, the substance of the report would be much better because their level of articulation differed drastically between English and Urdu. Extending this argument further Ansari argued that the non-consonance of persons and government was at the root of the problem of Governance and could not be resolved without indigenous orientation of problem definition and solution. This included means of communication - language.

Another difference of opinion was on the method and structure of executive programs. Some interviewees suggested a short term 6 weeks in-house program, which involves facilitated sessions of a group of around 60 executives, representing armed forces, national assembly, nazims and the private sector. A similar suggestion was instead a 3-6 month in house program with both class room instruction as well as seminars, providing an in depth grounding in relevant policy areas and catering to a diverse background. Those disagreeing argued that there was a difference between training and education and Executive Education could only be imparted through structured university oriented program.

The issues highlighted above require further discussion among academics to fully debate their arguments either to build a consensus or to at least fully articulate the pros and cons of the stated positions. The curriculum, direction and maturity of policy programs greatly depend on such academic discourses. It is not necessary for universities to follow the same pedagogical approach as earlier highlighted in the analysis of foreign universities but it is important that the selected approach has been carefully thought through based on university philosophy, faculty expertise and student intake.

Current Status of Policy Programs in Pakistan:

Graduate Degree Programs

There is quite a diversity of graduate level programs in the policy domain in Pakistan primarily because the term graduate itself needs a definition. Since the introduction of HEC requirements where universities were asked to start a BA Honors – 4 year bachelor degree rather than the earlier 2-year degree, most university programs are still in transition. With most public colleges in the country still offering a 2-year Bachelors degree, most public universities offer MPA/MA/MSc to students with 14-years of education. The same universities instead call their graduate degree requiring 16 years of education as an MS/Mphil. Some schools allow students to receive an MS degree in one year while requiring another year of research thesis to earn an Mphil. Most private universities though have a Master’s program, which requires 16 years of education to enroll while providing an MA, MBA or MS degree.

Table 1: Policy & Governance Programs in Pakistan

University	Program			Degrees Offered			
	Public Admin	Public Policy	Governance	Masters aft. 14 yrs	Masters/ Mphil aft. 16 yrs	PhD	Exec/ Exec MBA/ Exec MA
BNU							
CPPG, FCC							
FJWU							
GU							
GCUF							
IAS, PU							
IBA							
NDU							
NSPP							**
NUML							
PIDE		*					
PeshU							
QAU							
SALU							
UB							
UK							
US							
* Does not have an exact Public Policy Program but one similar to it							
** Does not have a degree awarding Policy program							

The HEC has not been successful in standardizing the names of degrees such that though a four year after 12th grade is named Bachelors Honors in public universities, most private universities call their four year Bachelors degree a simple BA/BS or Baccalaureate. As stated, the situation for Masters is even for confusing. This lack of clarity and vision by the HEC does not contribute towards broader goals of the emerging disciplines which at least require some standardization to build a minimum consensus on curriculum and program structure. Though the analysis of graduate programs in this study include all Master's programs, it is important for the network to standardize the name and meaning of a Graduate Degree as it currently corresponds to all programs post 14 years of education.

As indicated from the table above, there are fifteen universities currently offering policy programs in the country though most of the universities concentrate on Public Administration, only one university has a Governance program, and three have Public Policy programs.

Curriculum and Academic Concentration

We have analyzed the curriculum of 15 domestic schools¹¹ offering programs in the policy domain to gain a better understanding if curriculum differences exist among the Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance programs in the country. Additionally this analysis has been followed up with comparison of the international school curriculum. For analysis, we have divided the programs in the following categories

- MSc programs after 14 years of education
- MS/Mphil programs after 16 years of education
- Executive programs

Among MSc programs requiring 14 years of education, Public Administration programs dominate the landscape as no Public Policy program exists in traditional public universities. Both Governance (NUML) and Public Policy programs (NDU) at the MSc level have been started by universities, which have recently received a charter. Among MS/Mphil programs, which require 16 years of education, traditional public universities again concentrate on Public Administration while new universities (NDU, BNU) offer programs in Public Policy. But BNU's Public Policy program is very similar to its MS in Economics program. Thus to improve our analysis, we have also considered the curriculum of Economics programs at LUMS & PIDE.

Public Administration Programs

As can be ascertained by the table below, Public Administration programs concentrate mainly on Administration and Management issues with little concentration on Policy. All MPA programs have 1 course each in Theory of Public Policy, Economic Analysis and Research Methods while some also include Managerial Economics in the curriculum. Still in comparison with foreign programs, concentration on economic and development theory is limited while too much concentration is paid to Human Resource Management (HRM). Within the policy domain, HEC has only worked on Public Administration developing a 3-year Bachelors, 1 year Masters and a 2 year

¹¹ BNU, PIDE, CPPG, IAS, PeshU, UB, KU, GCUF, GU, US, NUML, NDU, IBA, SALU, FJWU

Master's curriculum in 2002. The HEC recommended curriculum for the 2 year MPA is slightly different from existing programs as it includes Economic Analysis, Research Methods & Techniques and Quantitative Analysis for Management as part of the core curriculum¹², but existing programs analyzed may include at most two of these courses.

Table 2: Public Administration Program Concentrations

Schools	MPA Concentrations	Sector Specific Masters
FJWU	HRM, Marketing, Finance, Public Policy, Management	
GCUF	HRM, Marketing, Law	
GU	HRM, Marketing, MIS, Development Admin	Public Health
IAS	HRM, Marketing, Finance	HRM, Health Admin, Mgmt
PeshU	HRM, Marketing, Finance, Development	
QAU	HRM, Management, Finance, MIS	
SALU	HRM	
UB	HRM, Health Admin, Development	
UK	HRM, Marketing, Finance, MIS, Legal Dimesions, Development Strategies	HRM
US	HRM, Marketing, Finance, MIS	

MPA programs are very much influenced by the market with high demand for all subjects related to an MBA & IT. Thus one also observes concentrations in Marketing and MIS in most programs. HRM is one concentration which dominates MPA programs and as indicated in later sections also the faculty. It is though encouraging to see few schools also providing concentrations in Development and Legal Dimensions while only 1 PA program has a concentration in Public Policy. Other than classroom education, almost all MPA programs require an internship though few have the infrastructure capacity to fully support students in finding an internship. Additionally most MPA programs concentrate on a project report rather than on a research thesis and only 1 program (FJWU) has one full semester set aside for research thesis.

To understand the evolution of traditional policy programs, a case in point is IAS, Punjab University, the oldest policy program in the country. IAS currently has five types of degrees including BA Honors (a 4 year Bachelors degree), a Post Graduate Diploma, Master's programs (a 2 year degree for students with 14-years of education), an MS degree (a 30 CR degree for graduates with 16 years of education) and PhD. For BA Honors and Master's level, IAS offers a Public Administration, Human Resource Management and Health Administration programs but for MS/Mphil and PhD, the only program offered is Management. This indicates the weakness of the policy domain in

¹² Revised curriculum of Public Administration,
http://www.hec.gov.pk/InsideHEC/Divisions/AECA/CurriculumRevision/Documents/567_PUBLIC_ADMINISTRATION.pdf

the country as even the oldest and one of the largest programs of the country does not really offer a PhD in the policy domain in a strict sense.

Table 3: Program Curriculum in the Policy Domain

Subject Area	MSc after 14 Years of Education			MS after 16 Years		Executive	
	PA	Governance	PP	Mgmt	Econ/PP	PA	PP
Politics & Society, Globalization							
Math, Statistics & Accounting							
Public Administration/Mgmt							
Theory ¹³							
Application ¹⁴							
Human Resource Mgmt							
Management Theory							
Administration – Sector Specific ¹⁵							
Public Policy							
Theory							
Policy - Sector Specific							
Economics							
Theory							
Analysis							
Sector Specific	(M)	(T)		(D)		(P,M)	
Research							
Methods							
Quantitative Techniques							
Finance							
Marketing							
Communications		Media					
Ethics							
Law							
MIS							
Project Mgmt & Evaluation							
Course taught in program:		Some		All		Multiple in All	
M managerial, T trade, D development, P public							

¹³ Includes Public Administration – Concept & Theory, Introduction to Public Administration, Organizational Behavior, Intro To Behavioral Sciences

¹⁴ Includes Comparative Public Administration, Public Administration & Society in Pakistan

¹⁵ Includes P&D Administration, Tax Administration, Health Administration

In Public Administration, all foreign programs do not carry the kind of attention to HRM as Public Administration schools do in Pakistan. Additionally the concentration on political aspects is minimal especially in the Public Administration programs among Pakistani programs. In foreign schools, all Public Administration programs include theoretical courses such as Globalization, Political Economy or Politics of Policy Making. But these courses are completely missing from the Public Administration curriculum in domestic schools.

Public Policy & Governance Programs

While Public Policy & Governance curriculums include both courses in economics as well as in the political domain, analysis indicates that Political Economy and Institutional Economics are both absent as theoretical subject areas. Instead they are only part of the domestic Economics programs and also the Public Policy program of BNU. The debate between Generalists and Experts is very much alive in the curriculum of schools. BNU's Public Policy curriculum is much closer to its own and MS in Economic programs of PIDE and LUMS thus developing Experts, while other Public Policy & Governance programs are much more diverse in their curriculum producing Generalists. Within the Experts domain, it is also important to mention that postgraduate degrees are also being offered in Health Administration, Population Sciences and Human Resources Management.

Among other subjects mentioned as important for policy by academics interviewed, the MPA programs did not include theoretical courses in economic, only concentrating on economic application. Only one school offers a course in 'Role of Media' while only two have courses on 'Ethics/Accountability'.

Executive Programs

Currently two types of executive policy programs run in the country. First, a one year (12-15 months) Executive Program structured similar to a regular university program and second, a seminar oriented specialized program for serving public officials (military or civilian) with a duration of 3 – 9 months, which serves as a requirement for promotion to a higher grade. The curriculum of the structured 1 year programs were analyzed indicating that IBA's program falls in the Public Administration domain while CPPG offers a Public Policy program with a concentration in "Governance, Democracy & Institutional Building" and "Environment, Demography & Urban Change". Both programs require a research project as an integral part of their degree requirement.

Institutional Capacity

Faculty & Students

As far as interest of students in policy programs is concerned, the acceptance percentage varies according to public versus private sector universities and additionally on the maturity of the program. For an MA (after 14 years of education), the acceptance ratio varies from 5% - 60%, though the average for traditional public sector universities is less than 20% except for University of Sindh – Jamshoro where more than necessary students are inducted because

of political reasons. For MS/Mphil (after 16 years of education), although the range is similar, still the average acceptance rate is higher, while for executive programs, the acceptance percentage range from 25% - 50%.

Scholarships are limited in public sector universities where few students get around Rs. 5000 merit scholarship though exceptions exist with multinational companies sponsoring 6 full MPA scholarships at the University of Karachi and at PIDE, the first three students are given full tuition waiver. Private universities also claim that they provide 25% merit scholarship to students with higher than 3.5 GPA.

Table 4: Full Time Faculty Strength

University	Faculty						Student Strength	Ratio
	Full Time (FT)	# PhD	Foreign	Masters/ Mphil	Foreign	Teaching Load/Sem		
BNU	11	3	3	8	3	2	125	11
CPPG	4	2	2	2	2	2	11	3
FJWU	9	0	0	9	5	2	250	28
GU	12	3	0	9	2	2	185	15
IAS	22	4	4	18	4	2	700	32
NDU	3	2	2	1	1	2	100	33
NUML	8	0		8	**	2	35	4
PIDE	50	14	12	36	10	1	311	6
PeshU	20	5	*	15	*	2	1600	80
QAU	4	3	1	1	0	4	300	75
SALU	4	1	0	3	0	2	400	100
UK	9	5	0	4	1	2	475	53
US	16	3	0	13	1	3	1000	63
** Faculty has participated in 6mth-1yr courses in a foreign country						* Figures not available		

The table above provides a clear assessment of faculty qualifications of the various policy programs in the country. In addition, especially the traditional public sector universities seem to be working towards improving their faculty capacity. In IAS, seven faculty members are currently doing PhD through a foreign university exchange program, which provides flexibility for Part Time or Full Time programs. Similarly in University of Sindh, Jamshoro, four faculty members are currently doing their PhD from a foreign university while three are completing it from Sindh University itself. At PIDE, five faculty members have also recently been sent for PhD through the support of the Planning Commission. At Peshawar University, one faculty member is currently doing PhD in Public Policy through the Fulbright Program while five are doing PhDs in Business Administration through HEC university program. At

Gomal University, five faculty members are enrolled in the PhD program of the same department. No other information of faculty capacity building was received from other universities.

As can be observed from the table above, the faculty student ratio is low for most universities, requiring them to hire Part Time Faculty to deliver most of their courses. In some universities, the part time faculty makes up more than 75% of teaching hours. Though class room lecture needs are fulfilled through this mechanism, still this does not allow for a strong academic institution as other parts of the academic experience such as program administration, extracurricular activities and student guidance suffer. The universities with better ratio are either new programs, with goals to start new or extend their programs (NUML, CPPG) or have associated think tanks with the core purpose to generate research (PIDE, BNU, CPPG).

Regarding the required number of courses to be taught every semester, the usual requirement is 1 for the Director whose time is also spent on administration issues, 2 for most professors and associate professors and usually 3 for assistant professors/lecturers. Though this is mostly the case on paper, faculty not linked to the Tenure Track System (TTS) in public sector universities teach a lot more courses than the usual two because their grade based pay scale is not enough for their quality of life requirements. Thus faculty may actually be teaching up to 6 courses in a semester, 2-3 in the morning session to fulfill university requirement and 2-3 in the evening session to supplement their income. PIDE is the only institutions where faculty members are required to only teach 1 course a semester, but again teaching a course is a means of compensation in addition to the salary structure.

Academic Research

On average, around 50% of the faculty's time is spent on Teaching, 20-25% on administration and about 20% on research. But this number differs widely among universities. Research culture is practically non-existent in Public Sector universities especially where the faculty is not part of the TTS. At PIDE, the premiere research institute of the country, faculty additionally takes on teaching and external research to supplement their income. This would work well if external research is academic in nature but instead these researches are usually consultancies and the subject matter is externally dictated.

Few institutions are working to evolve a different model, which combines a Think Tank and an Academic Institution. Here the senior faculty only teaches 1 course a semester, is supported by a teaching assistant while also involving students or junior faculty as research assistants. But for this model to evolve, a different institutional culture is needed where faculty time is structured and administrative, teaching and research support is provided. Among all the universities researched, only three mentioned of keeping faculty office hours while all others even if they had listed office hours practically had a walk in culture. Interestingly the same universities that had instituted faculty office hours also had Research Assistantships and Teaching Assistantships as a component of their program.

Goals

Most programs evaluated did not have a thought out five year strategic plan in place, but all had certain goals. The traditional public sector universities including IAS, PU and US-Jamshoro were preparing to start a Master's program in Public Policy in the near future while others such as KU were preparing to consolidate the programs they were currently running. Within the Public Sector, a few Public Administration departments had the goal of upgrading their departments to become "Institutes" which would give them more autonomy in terms of faculty hiring, student intake and institutional development.

More recent programs instead were either thinking of adding concentrations to their programs (NDU), extending their existing programs to Mphil (NUML), adding a 2-year MA degree program (CPPG) or consolidate their existing program (BNU) to concentrate on improving the quality of their graduates. Those with restricted space such as PIDE are currently in the process of extending the building infrastructure. While both Executive programs wanted to increase their student strength from the existing lower teens to 30 (IBA) or 20 (CPPG).

Thus the goals varied depending on the evolutionary stage of the programs. But it was only in the case of few programs that curriculum restructuring or quality improvement of graduates was articulated as a goal.

Faculty and Institutional Needs

Faculty Training Aspects:

As understood from the current status of policy programs in the country, both faculty training needs go hand in hand with institutional capacity and culture. This section discusses faculty training needs later consolidating them to recommend a Training process.

Subject Areas Requirements

Table 5: Full Time PhD Faculty Academic Expertise

Subject Area	PIDE	US	QAU	NDU	BNU	KU	IAS	CPPG	SALU	PeshU	GU	Total
Economic	12			1	3				1			17
Quantitative Analysis/Econometrics	1											1
Public Finance/ Financial Mgmt			1			1	1			1		4
Public Management & Administration				1		1	1					3
Human Resource Management		3	2			1	1			4		11
Organizational Behavior						1						1
Demography	2											2
Sociology & Culture	2											2
Public Policy							1	1				2
Development Administration											2	2
Political Science & International Relations				1		1			1			3
MIS											1	1

According to an interviewee, there should be at least 8-10 PhDs before starting a Master's program. Driven by this argument, no university other than PIDE is in a position to start a post graduate program. But even if this stringent requirement is not adhered to, still the capacity based on the number of PhDs in the table above is a clear indication that there is a general lack of expertise in the policy arena with two universities with no PhD scholars. More importantly if specific subject areas are evaluated, the lack of expertise in the policy arena becomes quite clear.

- ***Economics:*** If PIDE, an economic research institute is excluded from the list, then only 5 economic PhDs are associated with all policy institutions in the country. Additionally for ***Quantitative & Empirical Skills*** including Econometrics, one of the most important areas of Public Policy, there is only 1 PhD expert in the country. The concentration on Economics does not improve even if we incorporate the Master's level faculty in our analysis as only 2 faculty members concentrate on Econometrics and another 3 teach Math and Statistics. In terms of junior faculty, Marketing (4) has higher strength than Econometrics faculty (2).

Table 6: Full Time Master's Level Faculty Expertise

Subject Area	PIDE	US	QAU	NDU	NUML	BNU	KU	IAS	CPPG	SALU	FJWU	Total
Economic	9				1	4		1				15
Quantitative Analysis/Econometrics	1						1					2
Mathematics & Statistics							2	1				3
Public Finance/ Financial Mgmt	2	1	1					2		1	1	6
Public Management & Administration					2			1				3
Human Resource Management		6			1		1	6		2	1	17
Organizational Behavior								5				5
Marketing							1	3				4
Management & Entrepreneurship								1			3	1
Political Economy	1											1
Development	1						1					2
Governance					1			2				3
Population	3											3
Public Policy				1					2		2	3
Political Science											2	
Law					1							1
Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation	1											1
Project Management & BPR					1							1
Information Technology		1					1	1				3
Communication & Writing					1							1

- Expertise in policy programs is concentrated in **Human Resource Management** with 11 PhDs, **Financial Management** with 4 and **Public Management** with 3 PhDs. It's a clear indication that Public Administration programs make up the majority of policy programs in the country but additionally that PA programs are dominated by management particularly HRM, with little concentration on policy issues. The ratio is similar for junior faculty as compared to 14 HRM faculty, general PA faculty comprises of only 3 in number.
- Among all of full time faculty, there is no PhD in **Political Economy**, **Governance** or **Globalization**. Though two faculty members list their expertise as **Public Policy**, their academic training has been in Political Science. Closest to the subject, there are 2 PhDs in Development Administration in the same university. Among all faculty, only one person lists Political Economy as their prime interest and expertise

while Governance and Public Policy is being listed by 2-3 faculty members each. This clearly indicates a lack of policy expertise among policy programs in the country.

- The other areas such as *Ethics, Law, Communication & Proposal Writing* and *IT* are supported either by junior or Part Time faculty.

Comparative Analysis

After analyzing both the curriculum and faculty of various policy programs, it seems quite clear that truly interdisciplinary policy programs are not yet a norm. The current programs can be categorized into three. First, the Economic/Public Policy programs (PIDE, LUMS and BNU) which concentrate primarily on Economics with little concentration on the political or social dimension. The faculty in these programs and additionally curriculum is dominated by Economics and Quantitative Analysis. With a strong Economics faculty, these programs can become interdisciplinary policy programs by including other social sciences faculty. Second, the PA programs, which do not have Economic and Public Policy faculty, are instead highly influenced by MBA programs. Their faculty is dominated by Public Administration degrees with expertise in HRM, Organizational Behavior, Finance, and Marketing. These programs would need to improve their Economic, Quantitative Analysis, Political Economy and Public Policy faculty to develop into strong policy programs. Third, though the existing Public Policy programs may have a more interdisciplinary, analysis oriented curriculum, their faculty does not yet support expertise in core constituents of public policy including Economic Analysis, Political Economy and Governance.

It is thus important to consider the differences among these programs before devising a strategy for faculty training. While in the short term, the programs may involve faculty experts from other departments of the university, a long term strategy requires both a vision for the program as well as a faculty development plan to fulfill the vision.

Compensatory Mechanisms

As one of the interviewee put it succinctly, finance is the biggest hook in faculty training right now. For Public Sector universities, funds for further faculty education come from the HEC, which are then routed through the university. But for private and especially the newly instituted universities, there is no university funding for further studies. In few private universities (Hamdard), the university provides basic salary to the junior faculty for further studies but it is only a part of the whole salary and is not enough.

The Tenure Track System (TTS) has not yet been instituted in all Public Sector universities because either the university as a whole has not opted for it or because existing faculty does not meet the requirements of the system, as it requires 4 publications in the last five years for Associate Professors.¹⁶ In the absence of TTS, it is impossible

¹⁶ Criteria for Associate Professor includes either 6-years post-Ph.D./Relevant terminal degree or minimum of 4-years of post-PhD experience with at least 6 years of experience prior to the PhD. Additionally 10 research publications (with at least 4 publications in the past 5 years) in Internationally Abstracted Journals are required. Model Tenure Track Process Statues, DV 2.0, (Jan 1, 2008), http://www.hec.gov.pk/InsideHEC/Divisions/QALI/QualityAssurance/QADivision/Documents/2279_model-tts-ver-2-0-new.pdf.

for Policy departments in these universities to attract Full Time Faculty who require market-based incentives. Quaid-e-Azam University's Administrative Sciences department is an example where 10 advertised positions lie vacant and additionally there is no Associated or Full Professor because non can meet the TTS requirements. In the last 35 years, 24 have been without an associate professor. A chicken and egg situation prevails where by public sector faculty which does not fulfill the TTS criteria instead takes on more teaching responsibilities in order to improve their financial situation. Thus number of courses taught by faculty range from 1 to 6 (3 courses in the morning and an additional 3 in the evening). With such teaching load, it is not possible to conduct research and thus leaves no chance to fulfill TTS requirements. It is thus important that institutions and faculty find a way out of this problem in negotiations with the HEC else a research culture can never be instituted in the department. Without market based compensation packages, the Part Time Faculty supports the program because most part timers do not teach for a financial incentive but instead for an association with the best public sector university in the city.

The same situation of a lack of resources also permeates research and conference funding. Though Public Sector universities facilitate research conference participation, they usually provide only the TADA for a conference while the Registration fee (if applicable) has to be paid by the faculty leading to their lack of participation even if their paper has been accepted. In most private sector universities, there is no research allowance or an incentive to research as faculty is asked to concentrate primarily on teaching.

Training Mechanisms

The most common articulated methodology for faculty training and institutional capacity building was induction of fresh PhDs. More importantly the opinion was shared across the board by public sector as well as private universities including LUMS, which boasts the highest number of PhDs in social sciences. The argument as articulated by Burki was that some fields such as macro-economics have changed so rapidly and to such degree that someone who completed their PhD even fifteen years ago in the same field can not teach new macro economics. Thus keeping a set of core faculty, either PhD faculty should be hired or junior faculty be sent abroad to complete their PhDs according to a long term (7-10 years) strategic plan. As an alternative, a private university is moving ahead with a plan where by senior faculty would take on the responsibility of offering specific courses to junior faculty for completing their PhD course work as budget and human resource capacity does not allow sending junior faculty to an foreign university. But for most domestic PhDs, it was still suggested that a year long Post Doc or a short term training / research collaboration with a foreign university was necessary.

Other methodological suggestions concentrated on Short Term courses with a difference in opinion regarding their location. More faculty members suggested short term courses within Pakistan though away from their university as an external environment was necessary for concentration. Short term trainings within Pakistan were supported both in terms of existing social and family responsibilities which constraints some to leave the country for a significant period of time as well as in terms of cost. A few examples included short term 'Research Methodology & Teaching

Training' exercise conducted by HEC recently where by assessment of teachers' presentation skills was conducted and more importantly personalized feedback was provided. Additionally Multinational Corporations provide communication & presentation trainings while various NGO's provide research trainings in their specific area of expertise. Though on the academic front, a similar mechanism can be devised where foreign faculty is invited to provide short term or a complete semester training to participating faculty, familiarizing them with latest literature, research or techniques. Academics only reservation was the HEC's foreign faculty program, which mostly attracted Pakistani academics residing outside the country rather than foreign faculty with most recent experience. An domestic alternative to this suggestion was to create a pool of experts in specific fields to deliver short term trainings to faculty members of own and other universities. This would work for subject areas, which required hands on knowledge of the Pakistani surroundings. Few academics were optimistic that out the box thinking could help cajole the senior faculty to take on this role but it required devising an incentive structure tied to measurable success factors for accountability.

The other opinion on Short Term courses involved foreign exposure and was argued primarily from the perspective of inculcating academic and research culture, which exists in foreign universities as compared to the domestic ones, in addition to learning the best practices. It was suggested that summer was the best time to schedule these short term foreign programs as otherwise teaching could suffer at the university. For senior faculty, instead 3-4 month sabbaticals at foreign universities were suggested to interact with foreign faculty as well as to use library and academic resources of the foreign university to improve their knowledge base.

But most importantly, each institution needs to devise it faculty training and capacity building plan which projects required experts (PhDs) in specific policy fields a decade down the road. A few universities especially Public Sector universities have started executing such a plan where part of the junior faculty is working towards PhDs at their home university, few faculty members are currently doing their PhD at a foreign university while few are waiting for their colleagues to come back before starting their own foreign PhD program. A core outcome of this study should provide the needed information for devising a targeted faculty training program based on the needs of researched universities.

Linkages:

As specified earlier, all academics accepted that faculty training and capacity building required the involvement of foreign universities and faculty, either in terms of new PhDs, post Doc, short term trainings and sabbaticals at foreign universities, or inviting foreign faculty to conduct short term trainings in domestic universities. Thus most academics stressed on developing linkages in terms of faculty and student exchange programs with foreign schools and additionally they did not want to limit it to the United States, Western or Northern Europe instead also putting stress on Asian schools in Singapore, China, Malaysia, Japan and India.

A number of schools and research institutions had been setup in collaboration with foreign countries and universities but over the years these links were not institutionalized and slowly tapered off. IBA is one example. It was setup with the help of Wharton School of Business, (University of Pennsylvania) still considered among the best business schools of the world while the Hyderabad School in India was setup in collaboration with MIT. In comparison, the institutional exchanges have continued between MIT and Hyderabad to the mutual benefit of both while IBA's link with Wharton broke off a long time ago.

The Institute of Administrative Sciences (IAS), Punjab University's example can be followed in this regard which has an exchange program with Sterling University, UK. This has allowed both in sending their junior faculty for PhD at Sterling (where Part Time degree takes about 5 years while a Full Time degree takes 3-4 years) as well as providing opportunities to the senior faculty to conduct post Doc or sabbaticals at the foreign university. The National School of Public Policy is also in the process of establishing linkages with civil services training schools in other countries.

But the reality on the ground dictates a different priority in developing linkages. All departments in Public Sector universities are currently islands with little or no faculty or student exchange even among university departments. Most interviewees when asked about Part Time faculty also included faculty of other university departments who taught mostly evening courses. Thus for Public Sector universities, it is first important that faculty and student exchange is established within the university as a normal practice such that policy department students have access to experts in economics, other social sciences and management beyond the faculty of their own department. Establishing this exchange, which is only possible by establishing a centralized university registration and scheduling process would give elective options to students in other departments and resolve part of the capacity problem of policy departments. Most importantly universities need a bridge between a specific area of study and public policy, which is only possible if various university departments are invited to contribute in the policy program. Most private sector universities are already following a university wide registration mechanism but because of their short history, most do not have an established exchange program with other domestic or foreign universities.

Beyond the university, the next level of linkages should be at the city level and then at the provincial level. Also important is the inter-provincial exchange and linkages because only with interaction among students and faculty of different provinces can one truly grasp the spatial differences in policy priorities. Beyond the national level, only CPPG lists the greater South Asia as its regional policy domain. With porous borders and cross country movement of goods, services and people, it is necessary that academic linkages are made between the policy community in the region to educate as well as collaborate on regional policy issues. GINI is thus a good step forward both in creating a network of policy schools of domestic universities and policy institutes. It is recommended that this domestic network is further institutionalized through promotion of collaborative initiatives followed by establishment of exchange programs with regional and world class universities allowing their faculty and students to have the option

of visiting all universities in the network. This would both promote healthy academic competition among universities in the network to attract foreign faculty as well as allow all universities to take advantage from the exchange programs.

Other Initiatives:

The quality of education is not limited to classrooms and thus various recommendations were provided to improve the overall academic experience of the students. Though most schools visited mentioned at most 1-2 seminars during the semester, the quality and their aptness to policy is debate able. What could be judged was students' lack of interest in them and faculty's lack of giving extracurricular activities enough importance. At PIDE, the last Director had instituted a weekly seminar series for the faculty linking it with the incentive structure, but the program has discontinued since the departure of the director. At CPPG, the director considers seminars and workshops as an integral part of the academic curriculum but has had a tough time in improving faculty attendance from across the university.

Thus to institute an academic culture, the network should collaborate in research, seminars, workshops and conferences. This includes both logistical as well as financial help including social science research grants of Rs. 200 – 500 thousand, establishing a journal or supporting an existing journal, publishing and distributing a policy newsletter among students, facilitating internship programs in policy think tanks and establishing merit scholarships for outstanding students. These initiatives would attract better quality student body, develop academic culture and create incentives for faculty research.

Institutional Dynamics

Institutional Culture

Though the HEC has been playing the role of an accreditation body, it did revise and develop the Public Administration curriculum in 2002 but its vast purview that includes all institutions of higher education in Pakistan, limits its capacity to focus on specific programs or specific issues in institutions. Articulated differently, the issue stems from the fact that though HEC has facilitated universities to start a 4 year Bachelors, it has introduced the option of TTS system, yet it does not have the charter or resources to micromanage and thus has not been able to standardize these systems across the university system.

Thus it is required to develop an association of policy programs, which concentrates on defining standards for the collective, improving institutional capacity of specific program areas through facilitating collaboration among universities, collective faculty training and curriculum analysis. While the HEC has defined the TTS, it is more important to facilitate the existing faculty in public institutions to try to meet the requirements of the TTS. The alternative as one of the interviewees suggested was that while the younger faculty (with recent PhD degrees)

wanted to establish the TTS system, the older faculty was against it because it they could not fulfill the TTS requirements.

It is generally accepted that social science departments especially in public sector universities have deteriorated because of the political involvement of faculty and staff leading to a culture, which does not support academic excellence and research. Though the HEC has made some impact through the provision of funds, again funds alone cannot change the institutional culture while at times can enhance the culture of corruption. In terms of resources among Public Sector Universities, the situation is drastically different between Departments and Institutes. Programs offered by institutes had more resources, an ability to hire more faculty, more flexibility than those offered by departments who have little institutional independence.

In most universities, teaching is dominated by part time faculty leading to a lack of institutional capacity for collaborative research as well as little time for student advising. Though part time faculty is also an integral part of world class programs, it is rare that core subjects of program such as economics, statistics, political science are also taught by part time faculty. Additionally universities usually move qualified faculty to administrative positions such as departmental heads without providing them qualified administrative help. This further aggravates the problem as departmental heads drop their teaching load for administrative responsibilities.

Additionally, the research time available to the faculty is not enough to support research culture in the institution. The compensation structure requires the faculty to teach additional courses to supplement their income, thus relegating research to a low priority. The compensatory structure, academic culture in addition to the quality of student intake influences faculty hiring. Thus to attract good faculty, all of these conditions need to be met. But in some public sector universities with heavy political involvement in student induction, it would be hard to attract good faculty.

Institutional Needs

Among specific institutional needs, the most talked about and common were the Library and Lab. Other than public universities, no private university had access to JSTOR. (IBA did have access though may come under the domain of Karachi University). Still policy related books were non-existent or in short supply at all universities. Other than one interviewee who argued that if electronic access to journals was provided, there was not a necessity for a physical library, all others argued for a better library collection. For some public universities, reference texts were only available in the main library rather than the department's seminar library. The main reason for this situation was a lack of funds as with the devaluation of the rupee, foreign books have become too expensive. To say the least, the situation of libraries barring just a couple of universities does not allow for proper research. It is thus recommended that a shared library network be established such that rather than duplicating resources, each institution builds a collection on select topics and thus accessibility of latest literature can be sufficed through the

network. The National School of Public Policy (NSPP) has a good collection of government documents in their library which if digitized can also be accessible by all universities in the network.

Regarding a lab, other than two universities which require physical space or computer workstations, the rest would like support to install expensive but needed software such as Graphical Information Systems (GIS) or statistical software (Stata/SPSS) whose pirated copies may currently be used privately by the faculty.

Findings & Recommendations

Findings

- In world class programs, there is less difference between policy programs (PA, PP) than between same programs of different universities. Specialization is thus dependent on the university than the program.
- Differences regarding policy instruction exist among the academia in Pakistan
 - o It is important to have a consensus on the definition of Governance, Public Policy and Public Administration to provide direction to the various policy programs in the country
 - o There is a consensus on moving beyond Neo-classical economics, and instead including Political Economy and Institutional Economics but it is not reflected in the curriculum.
 - o The policy program vision differs between academics, who prefer Generalists or Experts.
- Reservations still exist regarding the market for policy graduates. Although there is a lot of room, it will be necessary to inform and educate prospective clients about the benefits of policy research including the legislation, commerce and professional associations.
- English Language as the sole medium of instruction and academic production was identified as a contributing factor in limiting comprehension and articulation of students.
- Graduate degree is a confusing term as Master's level programs could require 14 or 16 years of education.
- Policy programs in the country are dominated by Master's programs requiring 14 years of education: MPA programs (9), Governance (1), Public Policy (1); Master's/MPhil programs require 16 years of education: Public Administration (4), Public Policy (3); PhD (6); Executive Programs also require 16 years of education: Public Administration (1), Public Policy (1).
- MPA programs are more in line with management than policy. They are highly influenced by the market demand for MBA and IT. Thus the domineering aspect of the MPA curriculum and faculty expertise is Human Resource Management (HRM). Concentrations usually offered in MPA programs are HRM, Marketing, Finance, MIS with few schools also offering Development. Additionally theoretical courses in Globalization, Political Economy or Politics of Policy Making are completely missing from most Public Administration curriculums.
- Based on curriculum, policy schools in Pakistan can be categorized into three different types
 - o MPA program which are heavily influence by management rather than policy
 - o Policy programs, which are a slight modification of economics programs. They aim to produce policy professionals with an economic expertise.
 - o A diverse governance/policy program with the aim of producing a generalist.
- Though the HEC has introduced a TTS system to improve faculty compensation, its requirements can not be met by existing faculty in most public sector universities and thus a dual system is expected to continue which does not auger well for the institutions.
- The Student Faculty Ratio varies though an average of 38 students for one full time faculty member is high for graduate level instruction. Some school's ratio is as high as 100.

- Research culture does not exist in the universities because
 - o In the absence of Tenure Track System (TTS), compensation package is not enough to attract good faculty
 - o Faculty which is not part of TTS, teaches multiple courses other than the required number to supplement their income, leaving no time for research.
 - o Few universities have a culture adhering to Faculty Office Hours, Teaching Assistants to support the faculty and Research Assistants to both support faculty research as well as to promote a culture of research among the student body.
 - o Financial support for research is limited such that even faculty in research oriented institutions are taking on consultancies to supplement their income.
- There is a dearth of faculty expertise in most areas of the public domain.
 - o Need is critical in Economic Theory and Quantitative & Empirical Analysis, both considered required subjects in the policy domain. Some PA programs don't even offer courses in these areas.
 - o Though a need exists in Financial Management, it is not critical.
 - o The Public Management area seems to have transformed into HRM where enough faculty expertise exists. But within Public Management, areas such as Organizational Analysis, Structure and Process of Government, and Leadership and Administrative Theory have been neglected.
 - o There is absolutely no faculty expertise in Political Economy, Globalization, Governance and Development, the most important aspects of Public Policy.
 - o Policy program also do not have expertise in peripheral but important areas of Ethics and Law.
 - o Among skills oriented areas such as MIS, Communication & Proposal Writing, the faculty situation is better.
- Few public universities have been supporting their junior faculty to complete a foreign PhD degree in addition to producing their own PhDs, but for most universities, a faculty development plan or institutional strategic plan does not exist.
- Historically linkages with foreign universities existed such as between IBA and Wharton School of Business, but these were not institutionalized and slowly tapered off due to the disregard of university administration.
- Library resources are limited in the policy domain. There is a general lack of books and little university funding to buy new books. Additionally other than Public Sector universities, JSTOR , a electronic journal archive is not accessible.
- Similarly lab facilities are also needed especially analytical and statistical software which are both expensive and additionally have limited in house faculty expertise.

Recommendations

- GINI should use the Annual Conference Regional Seminars to develop a minimal consensus on instructional issues highlighted in this report including the role of economics especially Neo-classical Economics versus

Political Economy & Institutional Economics, the suggested level of quantification in policy analysis, language use and the Expert vs Generalist option.

- The policy programs across the country should form an association, which devises standards for the programs. HEC is fulfilling part of these responsibilities but has yet to develop a curriculum and faculty standards for policy programs. An association should suggest and ask schools to
 - o Develop a 5 year strategic plan which includes both faculty and institutional capacity enhancement
 - o Devise standards for faculty time to be spent on Teaching, Administration and Research. Change walk-in policy and institute Teaching & Research Assistantships to further research culture.
 - o Devise a transition plan of existing faculty from the current system to the TTS system.
- The network/association should create linkages with foreign universities, formulate and institutionalize an exchange program of both faculty and students.
- The network/association should create a pool of experts encompassing various domains of public policy.
- For faculty capacity building, a three tiered plan needs to be developed
 - o Short Term:
 - All policy programs should develop linkages with social science departments of their university to use social science faculty expertise to train their students in areas they currently lack expertise in: Economic Analysis, Political Economy etc.
 - Devise incentives for faculty to deliver research seminars to promote a culture of research.
 - Using its pool of experts or foreign faculty, short term (weeks or months) courses should be devised during the semester (accessible to city wide faculty) or summer (accessible to all faculty) to improve overall faculty capacity. If physical presence is hard to manage, then at least a distant learning program can be devised to enhance the knowledge base of the faculty.
 - o Medium Term:
 - Institutionalize the curriculum and program structure for junior faculty in select subject areas to be delivered by the pool of experts. Develop collaboration among schools such that junior faculty from Public Administration program take an intensive course in economics with an Economics/Public Policy expert and vice versa.
 - Encourage exchange and collaboration between programs between different provincial public/private universities. Both an intra-provincial network as well as multiple inter-provincial networks can help learning opportunities for all participants.
 - Provide 3-4 month summer research sabbaticals in select subject areas in foreign universities where the faculty can work under the supervision of an expert in the field.
 - Facilitate Post-Docs and provide short term grants or scholarships to faculty with domestic PhDs to provide exposure to foreign academic and research culture.
 - o Long Term:
 - Institutionalize linkages and exchange programs with foreign universities such that a long term commitment is made by the foreign university to support a domestic program. The

association can play a significant role in facilitating and managing the exchange program between the universities.

- Provide PhD scholarships to faculty in select subject areas for which experts do not exist in Pakistan.
 - Build select PhD programs with resources including faculty, library and lab. Create incentive structures for all participating expert faculty to give part of their time to the PhD program so as to pool subject area expertise from across the country.
- In terms of supporting an academic and research culture
 - Policy research grants should be instituted for competitive bidding by institutions or faculty.
 - Linkages between domestic think tanks and university departments should be facilitated through collaborative research as well as internship programs for students.
 - A network newsletter comprising of policy issues should be distributed among students.
 - Institute a peer reviewed policy journal or support an existing journal
 - Establish merit scholarships to improve student body intake in policy programs and devise paper or thesis competition to encourage student research.
 - In terms of institutional capacity, Library and Lab resources are a need across all policy programs.
 - Rather than investing in one library, all universities should be provided electronic access to select policy journals and JSTOR.
 - Specialized resources should be built up in every library such that a complete collection of the policy domain is available in the country. This can be done based on the program concentrations offered by different schools.
 - For lab resources, a large initiative should be to build a centralized data centre, which hosts primary research data from all government and non-government institutions. On a smaller scale, it is important to equip labs in all schools with basic quantitative analysis software and a trained faculty member.

Appendix A: University Abbreviations

University	Abbreviation
Aga Khan University, Karachi	AKU
Bahauddin Zikria University, Multan	BZU
BeaconHouse National University, Lahore	BNU
Centre for Public Policy & Governance, Forman Christian College, Lahore	CPPG
Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi	FJWU
Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan	GU
Government College University, Faisalabad	GCUF
Government College University, Lahore	GCUL
Hamdard University, Karachi	HU
Institute of Administrative Sciences, Punjab University, Lahore	IAS
Institute of Business Administration, Karachi	IBA
International Islamic University, Islamabad	IIU
Islamia Univsersity, Bahawalpur	IUB
Khairpur University, Kahirpur	KU
Kinnaird College, Lahore	KinnU
Lahore University of Management & Sciences, Lahore	LUMS
National Defense University, Islamabad	NDU
National School of Public Policy, Lahore	NSPP
National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad	NUML
Pakistan Institution of Development Economics, Islamabad	PIDE
Peshawar University, Peshawar	PeshU
Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad	QAU
Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur	SALU
University of Baluchistan, Quetta	UB
University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad	UF
University of Gujrat, Gujrat	UG
University of Karachi, Karachi	UK
University of Sindh Jamshoro, near Hyderabad	US

Appendix B: Abbreviations and Acronyms

- GINI Governance Institutes Network International
- GPA Grade Point Average
- HEC Higher Education Commission
- HRM Human Resource Management
- NGO Non-Governmental Organization
- PA Public Administration
- PP Public Policy
- PM Public Management
- TTS Tenure Track System
- TADA Travel And Daily Allowance

Appendix C: List of Foreign Universities Assessed

- Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton
- The Fletcher School, Tufts University
- Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin
- Goldman School of Public Policy, UC at Berkeley
- Institute for Economic Policy Research, Stanford University
- The Hertie School of Governance, Germany
- Centre for the Study of Law and Governance, Jawaharlal Nehru University
- Health Economics, Policy, and Management, University of Oslo
- Lee Kwan Yew School of Public Policy, Singapore
- SIPA, Columbia University
- SAIS, Johns Hopkins University
- Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Japan
- Maxell School of Syracuse University
- Indian Institute of Public Administration

Appendix C: List of Interviewees

#	Institution	Interviewee	Contact
1	Beacon House National University (BNU)	Mr. Hafeez Pasha, Dean Ms. Farzana Shahid, Registrar Mr. Ijaz Hussain, Asst. Professor	042.571.4752
2	Centre for Public Policy & Governance, FC College (CPPG)	Dr. Saeed Shafqat, Director	042.923.1581-88
3	Fatima Jinnah Women's University (FJWU)	Ch. Shoib Akhtar, Asst. Professor	051.927.0050-7 Ext. 144
4	Gomal University (GU)	Dr. Shadiullah Khan, Dean Faculty of Arts.. Dept. of Public Administration	0966.750.424-9 Ext. 3054
4	Hamdard University (HU)	Mr. Ameer Haider, Director Hamdard Institute of Mgmt. Sciences	021.453.3447 021.454.3210
5	Higher Education Commission (HEC)	Ms. Ghayur Fatima, Deputy Director, Curriculum	051.904.02441
6	Institute of Administrative Sciences (IAS), Punjab University	Dr. Nasira Jabeen, Professor	042.923.1812
7	Institute of Business Administration (IBA)	Mr. Izhar M. Hussain, Director Centre for Executive Education Ms. Sumera Muhammad, Coordinator	021.921.5535 021.921.5458 Ext. 1231
8	International Islamic University (IIU)	Dr. Danishmand, Dean Faculty of Management Sciences	051.925.7950
9	Karachi University (KU)	Dr. Akhtar Baloch, Chirman Department of Public Administration	021.926.8174
10	Lahore University of Management & Sciences (LUMS)	Dr. Rasul Buksh Rais, Professor Dr. Abid Burki, Professor	
11	National Defense University (NDU)	Dr. Sarfraz Hussain Ansari, Asst. Professor	051.2008125710
12	National School of Public Policy (NSPP)	Mr. Rahat ul Ain, Dean	042.921.3351
13	National University of Modern Languages (NUML)	Maj Gen (retd.) Syed Usman Shah, Chair Governance Department	051.925.7636
14	Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE)	Dr. Abdul Qayyum, Registrar Dr. Idrees Khawaja, Asst. Professor	051.9201140
15	Peshawar University (PeshU)	Mr. Amir Hussain, Office Manager	091.570.1808

		Institute of Management Studies	
16	Quaid-e-Azam University (QAU)	Dr. Rifaat Hussain, Professor & Chairman, Dept. of Defense & Strategic Studies Dr. Ghulam Shabbir Khan Niazi, Chairman, Department of Administrative Sciences	051.9064.3076 051.926.43102
17	Shah Abdul Latif University (SALU)	Mr. Imdad Jhokio, Lecturer Dept. Public Administration	92.300.312.9135 0243.928.0051
18	University of Sindh, Jamshoro (US)	Dr. Zareen Abbasi, Chairperson Department of Public Administration Dr. Mohammad Buksh Burdi	022.265.4397

Appendix D: List of Tables

Table 1: Policy & Governance Programs in Pakistan.....	20
Table 2: Public Administration Program Concentrations	22
Table 3: Program Curriculum in the Policy Domain	23
Table 4: Full Time Faculty Strength.....	25
Table 5: Full Time PhD Faculty Academic Expertise	28
Table 6: Full Time Master's Level Faculty Expertise.....	29

Appendix E: Survey Form

General:

Which Program do you have: _____ 1. Public Policy 2. Public Admin 3. Governance

Which Degree do you offer: _____ 1. MA 2. M.Phil 3. Executive MA

What is the current Student Size: _____

When did the program start: _____ Years

What are your goals for 2012: Starting a new program _____ if Y _____
Increasing Student Strength _____ if Y how many _____
Increase Concentrations _____ if Y which _____
Increase Electives _____

What is the duration of the program: _____ Semesters

of Credit Hours (CH) / papers required for graduation: _____ CH _____ papers

of courses/papers offered: _____ courses/papers

Each CH requires: _____ Lecture hours and _____ preparation hours

Philosophy:

Do you categorize your program as: Academic _____ OR Professional _____

Have you articulated a Program Philosophy/Vision/Goals: _____ Y/N

List three main objectives of your program: _____

Program Structure:

Number of CH/papers for Core Courses: _____ CH _____ papers

Number of Concentrations Offered: _____ if Y,
Conc1: _____ # of Students: _____
Conc2: _____ # of Students: _____
Conc3: _____ # of Students: _____

Specify Core Course Category: Economics _____ Governance _____ Technology _____
Public Policy _____ HRM _____ Public Admin _____ Research Methods _____ Communication Skills _____

Number of Required CH/papers for Concentrations: _____ CH _____ papers

Is a research thesis required for graduation: _____ Y/N. If Y, # of CH _____ Duration _____

Is a summer internship required for graduation: _____ Y/N.

Curriculum:

How has the curriculum been categorized: Cat1 _____ Cat 2 _____
Cat3 _____ Cat 4 _____
Cat5 _____ Cat 6 _____

What %age of Required Courses are: _____ Lectures _____ Seminars _____ Discussion
_____ Lab

What %age of core courses are: Theoretical _____ Practical _____
What %age of concentration courses are: Theoretical _____ Practical _____
What %age of course offered are: Theoretical _____ Practical _____

Do you offer a course/paper on: ICT _____ Qualitative Research Methods _____
Quantitative Research Methods _____ Any specific Skills _____

Do you provide Course Syllabus on first day of class: _____ Y/N

Does your course syllabus articulate:
1. Course Description _____ 2. Grade Computation Breakdown _____
3. Faculty Office Hours _____ 3. Required Texts _____ 4. Suggested Texts _____
5. Outline for Each Week _____ 6. Reading for Each Week _____
7. Learning Outcomes for Each Week _____

Academic Experience:

How many total faculty members do you have: _____ Full Time _____ Part Time

Do you have Faculty Advisors for students: _____ Y/N if Y, How many students to 1 faculty adviser: _____

Do you conduct Orientation for new students: _____ Y/N if Y, Duration in _____ Hours

Duration of Faculty Office Hours per week: _____ Hours

How many of your students worked as Research Assistants last semester: _____

How many of your students worked as Teaching Assistants last semester: _____

Do students evaluate the course at the end of the semester: _____ Y/N Are evaluations made public _____

Do students evaluate the professor at the end of the semester: _____ Y/N Are evaluations made public _____

Which courses should be required for Governance: _____ Number, names

Faculty:

of PhD in Full Time Faculty: _____ # with Foreign Degrees _____

of PhD in Part Time Faculty: _____ # with Foreign Degrees _____

of Masters in Full Time Faculty: _____ # with Foreign Degrees _____

of Masters in Part Time Faculty: _____ # with Foreign Degrees _____

Name	PhD	FT/PT	YrsOfExp	YrsOfTchgExp	#ResearchPublic
CourseTaughtLastSem	Areas of Focus				

How many courses does each Full Time Faculty need to teach every year _____

What %age of time do you dedicate for: Teaching _____ Admin _____ Research _____

Does University provide funding for Research Conferences _____ Y/N How much per year Rs _____

Students:

What is the Average Class Size: _____

Number of Students in: Conc1 _____ Conc2: _____ Conc3 _____

Average GPA of graduating class: _____

How many students graduated in May 2009: _____ % of inducted Students _____

What is the tuition fee: Rs _____ / CH Rs _____ / Sem

What %age of students had tuition scholarship: 100% _____ >= 50% _____ >= 25% _____ >=10% _____

Status of students of last graduating class: %Job before graduation _____ %Job 3 mths after graduation _____
% Further study _____

List students clubs: Leadership _____
Community Service _____
Social _____
Conc1 _____
Conc2 _____

Admissions:

What is your admissions criterion: Years of Education _____ Required GPA/class _____

How many candidates applied: _____

Do you take a test: _____ Y/N Which: GMAT _____ GRE _____ SelfCreated _____

How many candidates did you Interview: _____

How many candidates did you Accept: _____

How many candidates joined the Program: _____

Infrastructure:

How many class rooms have

Built in Projector: _____ Leveled seating: _____ Round table discussion arrangement: _____

How many independent project rooms are there for group study: _____

How many full time dedicated staff do you have for Placement Services: _____

Do you have an online resume data base of you students: _____ Y/N

How many full time dedicated staff do you have for Alumni Relations: _____

How much time does it take a student to get transcript: _____ days

Library:

What are the business hours of the library: _____ to _____ _____ days/week

Do you have an independent library or share the university library: _____ Indep/Share

How many books do you have with Governance as Title or Keyword: _____

How many books do you have with Public Policy as Title or Keyword: _____

Is the library catalog electronic & searchable: _____ Y/N

Which Academic Journals do you have access to:

Print Copy: _____

Electronic Copy: _____

Do you have access to Jstor _____ Y/N

Which other electronic outlet: _____

How many newspapers so you subscribe to: _____

Laboratory:

What are the business hours of the laboratory: _____ to _____ _____ days/week

Do you have dedicated use of Lab: _____ Y/N Or Is it Shared with the university: _____

How many computer workstations do you have in the computer lab: _____

Do you have Office Management Software in the lab: _____ Y/N

Which statistical software do you have in the lab: _____