



DARE-RC

DATA AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

جراتِ تحقیق ملے

Institutional Research Capacity Mapping (IRCM)

Dr. Fatima Rehan Dar
CEO, Oak Consulting





DARE-RC
DATA AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
RESEARCH CONSORTIUM
جراتِ تحقیق ملے

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
The Preamble and Study Focus	4
Expected Outcomes.....	6
Research Plan.....	7
Findings.....	8

Institutional Research Capacity Mapping (IRCM)

Executive Summary

The study investigated the research capacity of institutions responsible for conducting research in the field of education. The universities offering M Phil and PhD degree programs in Education and a few think tanks with active research profiles became the subject of study. Representatives from 17 institutions were interviewed for the said purpose. A total of 5 universities were selected from Punjab (3 public sector, 1 private and 1 autonomous), 3 from Sindh (1 private and 2 public), 2 from KPK (1 public and 1 private sector), 2 from Balochistan (both public sector), 1 public sector university each from Gilgit-Baltistan (GB) and Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT). Out of all the universities, 3 were women universities. A total of 53 responses were collected through a survey from MPhil and PhD students from the same universities. In the survey, there were 25 male and 28 female respondents. As part of the desk review, institutional websites along with their curricula as well as the website of the Higher Education Commission were analyzed.

The desk review findings revealed that there were 247 universities in Pakistan with 88 universities functional in Punjab, 71 in Sindh, 43 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, 11 in Balochistan, 25 in ICT, 7 in Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) and 2 in GB. Out of the total, 60% of universities are in public while 40% operate in the private sector. A total of 42% male and 25% female PhD faculty members are teaching in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Among the universities in Pakistan, 61 of them offer MPhil and PhD programs in Education. During the academic year 2021-2022, 67% of students chose to enroll in the discipline of Education, showing a significant interest in the very field. Furthermore, in the year 2021-2022, 2099 students successfully achieved their PhD degrees, with 1373 being males and 726 females. Similarly, during the same year, a total of 48,774 students completed their MPhil degrees, consisting of 27,305 males and 21,469 females.

The combined analysis of the desk review, interviews and student survey revealed that the main purpose behind research initiatives was to bring forth innovation in the field, find evidence based and contextual solutions to problems and influence policy discourse. The organizations endeavored to achieve the same target through research grants from HEC, Offices of Research, Industrialization and Commercialization (ORICs), publications in research journals, research partnerships with government and donors, and through article and book publications. Nevertheless, the research had a relatively low output and impact due to several reasons such as the dominant focus of HEC's mandated policy to publish for promotion to high professorial ranks, fulfil the degree requirements, lack of research facilities in institutions, poor quality research input, more focus on quantitative rather than qualitative studies, low quality social science journals, poor quality of academic and scholarly writing skills and a



big disconnect among various stakeholders including academia, think tanks/NGOs, donors and government.

The findings also indicated lack of adequate curricular support in preparing research scholars. Despite the frequency of research seminars, applied projects and practicum conferences, the major impetus remained on completion of course work at MPhil and PhD levels. Moreover, the rigorous processes of the Quality Assurance Departments at universities fell short of promoting quality because of low quality of research supervision compounded by allocating more than the required number of students per supervisor. Additionally, the scholarly engagements of researchers mainly centered around publications in HEC approved journals or donor funded projects.

Substantial disconnect among various stakeholders and low academia-industry linkage for collaborative research was cited as the biggest gap in conducting quality research. Furthermore, the excessive workload of university faculty, along with the inadequate quality of research supervisors at the MPhil and PhD levels, multiplied by the lack of access to resources and modern technology for conducting quality research, emerged as other big challenges. Additionally, difficulty in securing funds to conduct quality research studies, lack of accountability in the research processes, lack of variety in researchable areas and dearth of contextual based research were also quoted as major issues.

To enhance the research quality and make a meaningful impact in the country it was recommended to activate research forums to maintain quality of research standards in the country, promote collaborative research, start mentoring and capacity development programs for research training, secure funding for demand driven research studies, differentiate between teaching and research universities, adjust workload for quality research and teaching, revisit HEC's policy for academic promotions, discourage donor funded decontextualized research, make research degree programs more research intensive, engage qualified resource for research, strengthen peer review systems, and make government the ultimate consumer of research.



The Preamble and Study Focus

Educational research is a systematic and rigorous inquiry to study or solve educational challenges for knowledge advancement and systemic improvements in the field of education. The main purpose is to inform practice and make policy decisions. Farrell, Davidson, et al., (2018) state that research is typically used to shape policy or practice decisions, develop a worldview of problems and solutions, validate prior held positions, preferences, or decisions and incorporate research processes in practitioners' work. As the output of research has a huge bearing on future practices and knowledge development, it is incumbent to pursue research with strict adherence to the dimension of quality. Margherita, Elia, and Petti (2022) attribute research quality to three main dimensions: research design, research processes and research impact. While research design presents the ex-ante or ultimate focus of research prior to implementation, research processes indicate the execution of research activities through the application of tools and procedures. Consequently, the research impact specifies the influence it exerts on scholars and practitioners and the utilization of findings by society in general. Pakistan faces a dilemma when it comes to conducting quality research. Naveed and Suleri (2022) are of the view that due to historical, ideological, political and cultural reasons, and as a consequence of weak disciplinary and methodological training at most universities in Pakistan, social science based knowledge produced in the country is not just low in quantity but is also of poor quality. Gilani (2021) identifies lack of interest of students and academic staff, deficiency of highly qualified research staff, lack of fully equipped research labs and lack of research funding as important reasons for poor research output in Pakistan. Moreover, the quality of research has also been adversely undermined by the prevailing 'publish or perish' policies. Naikade and Kamthan (2020) label it as a *toxic practice*. Hammersley, Gomm, Glaesser and Cooper (2012) also opine that the publish or perish syndrome has converted research publications into corporate targets to be achieved at all costs by multinational corporations. The view coincides with the affirmation made by Clarivate Analytics (as cited in Jahangir, Azam, & Bilal, 2021) posting a 21% increase in the research output of Pakistan in the year 2018. The surge in publications is relational to the diktat put forth by the Higher Education Commission (HEC), which makes research publications the major criterion for promotion at the university level. Hoodbhoy (2009) opines the same and states that citations and publications have multiplied because the HEC has explicitly linked publication with career promotion. In order to explore the matter further the said study mapped out the research capacity profiles of institutions both academic and think tanks/NGOs working in the field of education to examine their capacity to do quality research. For the attainment of the said target, the study focused on degree-



awarding institutions because of their focus on research conducted both by students and the faculty. The study included a few think tanks/NGOs and CSOs involved in doing research and impact evaluations in the domain of education.

The purpose of the exercise was to identify the institutions with active research profiles and assess the gaps and challenges in their capacity to undertake, report and disseminate rigorous and quality research in the field of education. The results of the said study will lay down the foundation for planning and offering the targeted research capacity building activities. Additionally, the findings will help to inform the research agenda in education in Pakistan through policy level recommendations.



Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes of the study are to:

- identify institutions with active research profiles in the discipline of education
- identify the purpose of institutional research output at the tertiary level
- examine the curricula of MS/MPhil and PhD programs in education in preparing quality researchers
- examine an institution's approach to developing research capacity.
- analyze the preparedness of institutions in carrying out quality research
- inspect scholarly engagements of academics for quality research output
- examine the quality of research outputs by research active institutions
- explore the role of universities and think tanks in establishing research practice partnerships (RPP)
- identify the gaps and challenges in the capacity to undertake quality educational research
- examine ways of improving institutional research outputs

Guiding Questions for the Study

The following questions guided the study:

1. What institutions, both degree awarding and think tanks, are conducting research on school education in Pakistan?
2. What is the purpose of undertaking research in education?
3. What is the research capacity of the researchers in conducting research?
4. What is the institution's approach towards developing the research capacity of faculty students and other personnel?
5. How do the curricula, mentoring programs and strategies used at the tertiary levels prepare quality researchers in education?
6. How do the scholarly engagements of academics prepare them to do quality research in education? Do they partner with national or international agencies to undertake quality research?
7. What resources are used to support research activities in institutions?
8. How does academic preparation at the tertiary level support quality educational research output?
9. What is the role of universities and think tanks in establishing research practice partnerships (RPP)
10. What are some gaps and challenges in ensuring quality research output at the tertiary level?
11. How can quality educational research be ensured at the institutional level?

Research Plan

Data for the above questions was collected through the following research tools:

No.	Tool	Guiding Questions	Sample
1	Desk Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What institutions, both degree awarding and think tanks, are conducting research on school education in Pakistan? 2. How do the curricula at the MS/MPhil and PhD levels support research preparation in education? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Websites of institutions - Post graduate Curriculum documents
2	Semi Structured Interviews	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the purpose of undertaking research in education? 2. What is the research capacity of the researchers in conducting research? 3. What is the institution's approach towards developing the research capacity of faculty students and other personnel? How do the curricula, mentoring programs and strategies used at the tertiary levels prepare quality researchers in education? 4. How do the scholarly engagements of academics prepare them to do quality research in education? Do they partner with national or international agencies to undertake quality research? 5. What resources are used to support research activities in institutions? 6. How does academic preparation at the tertiary level support quality educational research output? What is the role of universities and think tanks in establishing research practice partnerships (RPP)? 7. What are some gaps and challenges in ensuring quality research output at the tertiary level? 8. How can quality educational research be ensured at the institutional level? 	<p>Semi-structured interviews were conducted of 14 Chairpersons/seni or faculty of Education Departments from the 4 provinces.</p> <p>3 Senior personnel of think tanks/NGOs were also interviewed</p>
3	Questionnaire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do the curricula, mentoring programs and strategies used at the tertiary levels prepare quality researchers in education? 2. What is the research capacity of the researchers in conducting research? 3. What are some gaps and challenges in ensuring quality research output at the tertiary level? 4. How can quality educational research be ensured at the institutional level? 	<p>MS/MPhil and PhD level students from at least one to two public and private sector universities from each province were selected for data collection.</p> <p>A total of 53 responses were generated.</p>

Findings

The following section reports the findings of the study:

1. Desk Review Findings

As reported by Higher Education Data Repository (HEDR) Annual report for the year 2022-2023, there are a total of 247 Higher Education Institutes (HEI) in Pakistan.¹ Out of 247 HEIs, 88 are in Punjab, 71 in Sindh, 43 in KP, 25 in ICT, 11 in Balochistan, 7 in AJK and 2 in Gilgit-Baltistan. Out of the total HEIs, 60% are operating in the public sector while 40% comprise the private sector. There are 34,822 male (42%) and 2200 (25%) female PhD faculty members working in various HEIs in Pakistan.

It is estimated that a total of 61 universities are offering PhDs in Education in Pakistan.² A total of 2099 students (1373 males and 726 females) have graduated with a PhD degree in Education in the year 2020-21 while 48,774 (27,305 males and 21,469 females) have graduated with MPhil degrees in the same year. Of the total enrolments for the year 2020-21, 67% students are enrolled in education programs in Pakistan.

The data on the research landscape of the country showcases a promising picture. According to the HEC's Annual report 2019-20, there have been 25300+ publications in Pakistan, with 13% increase from the year 2018-19³. Moreover, the Offices of Research, Innovation and Commercialization (ORIC), established since 2010 are mandated to facilitate research and development (R&D) activities in higher education institutions with a dedicated emphasis on innovation and commercialization aspects of research. ORICs have showcased 238 HEC funded and 815 non-HEC funded R&D projects for the FY 2019-20. It has also been reported that during the FY 2019-20, 1503 cases for research travel grants were processed for university faculty, PhD scholars, and MS students at Pakistani universities and an amount of Rs. 228.9 million was released for the said purpose (p.26). Furthermore, exponential research has been done to date in the discipline of education. The Pakistan Research Repository, HEC serves a valuable research resource that has a data of 1203 research papers related to different aspects of

¹ <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/universities/HEDP/PublishingImages/Pages/Component-4/Annex%203%20HEDR%20Annual%20Report%20%28C4%29.pdf>

² <https://www.eduvision.edu.pk/institutions-offering-education-with-field-education-at-doctorate-level-in-pakistan-page-1>

³ <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/AnnualReports/Annual%20Report%202019-20.pdf>

education⁴. However, with voluminous research publications, the field of education continues to suffer the research quality gap.

The curricula set for MPhil and PhD programs in education heavily rely on course work completion. Some of the courses offered at the said levels are Career Counseling and Education, Education and Research, Education Management, Education Policy and Development, Educational Leadership and Management, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Educational Planning and Management, English Language Teaching, Sports Science and Physical Education, Teaching of English as a Second Language, Innovative Technologies in Education, Art Education, Distance and non-formal education, Educational Development, and Educational Training, Advanced Course in Quantitative Research, Curriculum Theories and Practices, Social and Psychological Perspectives in Education, Advanced Course in Qualitative Research, Educational Leadership and Change Management, and Teacher Education, Gender in Education, Early Childhood Education and Development, Educational Assessment & Measurement, Cross-cultural Study of Teacher Education, Curriculum Studies⁵. For the award of MPhil/MS/Equivalent degree, candidates are required to complete 30 credit hours of coursework or complete 24 credit hours of course work along with a minimum of 6 credit hours for research work/thesis. For the completion of an MPhil degree, 6 credit hours of research is mandatory. Moreover, course work of 18 credit hours (preferably in the first year) is mandatory, followed by a comprehensive examination for granting candidacy as PhD researcher. Also, acceptance/publication of at least one research paper in an HEC approved "X" category journal is a requirement for the award of Ph.D. degree ("Y" in the case of Social Sciences only).⁶ In order to launch a PhD program it is a mandatory requirement to have at least 3 relevant full time Ph.D. Faculty members in a department. Furthermore, the HEC mandates that not more than 5 PhD students should work under the supervision of a full time faculty member. This may be increased to eight subject to prior approval of the HEC. The program structures, therefore, are in place to run the said programs. However, the quality of the programs is strictly linked to the quality of faculty, their firm grounding and experience in research practices, and the processes through which academic program reach completion including the research rigor and intensity.

Further details regarding research outputs of universities can be found in Appendix -1

⁴ <https://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/simple-search?filterquery=Education&filtername=subject&filtertype>equals>

⁵ <https://www.eduvison.edu.pk/programs-offered-in-education-at-doctorate-level-in-pakistan>

⁶ <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/faculty/Plagiarism/Documents/Graduate-Education-Policy.pdf>

2. Interview Findings

The following section reports the findings of the semi structured interviews taken from Deans, departmental heads and senior faculty members teaching in the discipline of Education. The following themes emerged from the findings:

a) Quality Research and its Purpose

The respondents described quality research as an authentic experience and a means to generate new knowledge to improve society. It was also defined as an exploration of phenomenon in the social and physical world to address the learning crises. Moreover, it was looked upon as the discovery of new knowledge that had remained hidden and an enabler to fill the capacity gap. Most of the respondents, however, were of the view that in Pakistan the purpose of research was reduced to the fulfillment of degree requirements at the MPhil and PhD levels. One of the respondents remarked, *"Most scholars don't want to learn the skills of the trade but to get their degrees."* They further remarked that in the case of academia, the purpose of research was to achieve the *"magic number"*. The magic number was defined as the number of paper publications required to get professorial ranks. (10 publications for associate professor and 15 in the case of full professor). *"We conduct research for the sake of research: for publications,"* remarked one respondent. *"We are habitual of conducting research which is prescriptive in nature,"* remarked another respondent. Although the purpose of research was to bring forth innovation in the field and find evidence based and contextual solutions to problems, the respondents opined that the purpose of research in Pakistan was mostly confined to paper publications as HEC considered it the only criterion for promotion in academic ranks. According to the current HEC's Graduate Education Policy, 2023 the university professors are mandated to publish one research paper in W category journal within the last 3 years after PhD or at least five research publications in X and Y category journal within 5 years of PhD completion⁷. Haque and Orden (2017) are of the same view and opine that faculty in Pakistan view research as an activity that has, at its principal end, journal publication as a requirement for career advancement. Many faculty members across Pakistan feel that research is treated as a 'numbers game' in which quantity is incentivized over quality.

⁷ <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/faculty/Plagiarism/Documents/Graduate-Education-Policy.pdf>

b) Research Output and Impact

The respondents were very clear that most of the research output was devoid of quality. *"Research has become a formality than a contribution"*, remarked one respondent representing the public sector. Most of the research output in academia was the result of supervision of research thesis of MPhil and PhD scholars which was part of the degree completion program. Moreover, most respondents were of the view that research output came in the form of publications in X, Y and Z and other impact factor journals recognized by HEC.

Most respondents were of the view that less qualitative research was being done. For better research output and impact, it was necessary to conduct more qualitative research. *"When you embark on a qualitative inquiry, you are actually living the same experience, and in the process of pursuing it, you begin to make an impact,"* remarked one respondent from public sector. Most research projects in education departments, however, followed the positivist paradigm and used surveys as the most favoured tool. It was an easy and quick way to conduct research, however, depth of problems could not be gauged through surveys alone. One of the respondents opined that the best way to bring impact was to get engaged with the community and get closer to them. This could be achieved by doing more ethnographic and phenomenological studies. However, this was not the case as 80-85% research was done through quantitative approach. Another respondent viewed the problem from the point of view of a lack of facilities for conducting qualitative studies. Students in some public sector universities did not have access to the latest materials, tools and facilities to conduct qualitative studies, hence their dependence on quantitative tools. One of the respondents attributed lack of research impact to the unresponsiveness of major stakeholders. *"I have not been able to change biology textbook on the basis of my research,"* decried one respondent from the public sector. Another respondent from the private sector attributed lack of research impact to the language dilemma. Since the language of the research publication was English, the findings and results could not be communicated and made intelligible to common people, hence lesser impact on society.

The majority of respondents regretted that the research output and impact in academia was low. The main reason cited was the poor quality of research input given at the MPhil and PhD levels. One reason cited was the lack of research dissemination strategies at a wider level. Another reason cited was the inadequate language skills of students. *"80% of*

students are weak at academic writing", commented one respondent from the private sector. Even if the research courses were integrated into the curricula, poor English language abilities constrained the student-researchers to conduct quality research studies. The problem compromised quality research supervision as the primary focus shifted from ensuring quality research output to correcting language errors or writing style. It was suggested that to secure better research output, rigorous research preparation was needed to be ensured at the undergraduate and MPhil levels. As the sole intention of pursuing research was the fulfilment of degree requirements, effective output could not be guaranteed. One public sector respondent claimed that *"90% researches are done only for getting a degree."* The impetus, therefore, remained towards the fulfilment of the said criterion mainly which took away the essence of quality research output. Research became more of a mundane reality where it was done for its extrinsic value only. A few respondents also raised concerns over lack of good quality social science journals where impactful research could be published for wider dissemination.

A few respondents referred to positive research outputs resulting from their research work. An example was given about the empowerment of principals in the public private partnership EMO model in Sindh as a consequence of context based research. Another public sector respondent cited an example of research resulting in a book publication and its use in schools on the important theme of healthy and safe schools. One public sector respondent attributed positive research output to her team's work on HEC's funded National Research Programs for Universities (NRPU) project while others considered positive output as raising awareness in community on important issues as nutrition education and preparing well informed students with better professional skills. One respondent from the private sector explained that he had initiated homeschooling practices on the basis of his PhD research work,

Other examples of impactful research studies resulting in major reforms were cited by think tanks where work on inclusive practices led to the passing of National Assembly bills on minority rights, initiation of teacher subject forums in Punjab, high schools as hubs for pedagogical support, publishing of storybooks titled 'Humsafar' for schools, improvements in language assessment practices in Punjab, establishment of 2000 primary schools and appointment of 6000 teachers in Balochistan.

Representatives of think tanks and NGOs considered their research outputs as a way to bring systemic changes through the initiation of policy level dialogues. They were,

however, of the view that for effective research outputs most organisations were dependent on external research experts to conduct studies which were mainly supported by national or international donors. Moreover, because of the disconnect between academia, think tanks and NGOs there was no common ground where impactful studies based on contextual issues could be commissioned. The think tanks provided the view point that universities, donors and think tanks worked in silos. There was no common ground where they could work as joint forces for quality research. Representatives of the think tanks shared that they sometimes involved university faculty as independent researchers. Unless universities came on board as partners, demand-driven researchers could not be forthcoming.

The respondents were of the view that the only impact of research could be seen in their own work as university professors, students or where the findings informed their practices. The larger impact, however, was not seen. *"I don't find any consumer of research...we don't have copies of researches in our own library,"* commented one respondent from the public sector. They felt that the ultimate consumers of research were either their own selves, libraries, google scholar and research journals. Most of the research work was used in print form for citations and reference purposes without substantial impact on society. Moreover, the think tanks felt that the ultimate consumer of research should be the government. Although high impact level, donor funded, research projects were done by think tanks, the government fell short of taking adequate measures for incorporation. They expressed the need of ownership to be taken by the government on high level researches which were indicative of policy level educational reforms. This was indicative of lack of coordination among think tanks, donor agencies and government. There needed to be clarity of roles with donor being the main financier, think tanks or academia as identifiers of knowledge gaps and main research bodies and government being the ultimate consumer of research through policy making and implementation. *For further elaboration on institutional and interviewee's research output please refer to Appendix-1.*

c) Integration of Research in Curriculum

The respondents generally expressed satisfaction over the integration of research in MPhil and PhD curricula. They explained that research culture was ensured through regular research seminars, research based assignments, applied projects, reflective inquiry, dedicated courses on quantitative and qualitative research, practicum and

practicum conferences. However, most of the respondents expressed the opinion that, *"It's not enough"*. The efforts done to build research understanding was not sufficient because of the poor background of students in research and theory-laden *research courses*. *"16 years of education does not prepare students for research work,"* opined one respondent. Moreover, it was reported that according to the latest HEC policy MPhil could also be done without research. The practice would jeopardize systematic research skill development as the pressure to learn research would ultimately fall on the PhD programs. Higher degree programs needed to become more research intensive, opined most respondents. One respondent recommended allocating at least 9 credit hours for research building skills at MPhil level. Other respondents commented that despite the rigour of course work and research input, many students were incapable of developing research orientation. Part of the problem could be attributed to lack of access to library facilities, up to date materials, computer software and latest research journals to build research capacity of students.

d) Ensuring Quality of research

Most of the respondents from academia reported that their Quality Assurance Departments were mainly responsible to ensure the quality of research at the MPhil and PhD levels. There were various committees that ensured the systematic progress and quality of research at various stages of research development. Moreover, regular research seminars were also held to monitor the progress and quality of the research process. Similarly, peer review processes also determined the publishable quality of research. However, it was regretted that such processes were not enough to ensure quality as the real essence behind research was missing. *"Quality enhancement cell does not see the quality research...generating a report on the basis of a software,"* claimed one respondent from public sector. Turnitin software did not guarantee quality and depth of research as it was a simple plagiarism check complained one respondent.

It was also reported that in the absence of quality supervisors, quality research could not be guaranteed. *"Quality assurance depends on the quality of supervisor,"* reported one respondent from the private sector. Due to shortage of supervisors at the tertiary level, faculty were overburdened with research supervisions. *"Quality is compromised when a supervisor takes 20+ supervisions,"* explained one respondent from the public sector. It greatly undermined the quality of supervision. Moreover, students were provided with supervisors whose domain of expertise differed from the area of investigation proposed

by the student. As a consequence, it affected the quality of supervision as well as the research process. *"Research is a demanding task that must not be juggled with other responsibilities such as teaching, raising children or managing family life, otherwise the researcher could not give quality time to research"*, opined one respondent from the public sector.

The think tanks differed in their perspective on quality assurance in research. They were largely dependent on external researchers to spearhead their research studies. One way they ensured quality was through getting quality and experienced researchers on board and having research coordination units to monitor research activities.

e) Scholarly Engagements and Research Partnerships

A few respondents defined their scholarly engagements as being part of active professional learning communities. One respondent from public sector claimed that she was a *Pakistan-U.S. Alumni Network* (PUAN) member and regularly involved herself in scholarly work, and also mentioned as being part of a research café (a think tank on research based dialogues). Another public sector respondent claimed that she was engaged with some local scholars in Balochistan in the form of a consortium on research discourse. One respondent from the private sector explained that he was doing research work on teacher licensing as part of his post-doc with institutional support. Another respondent from Public Sector University claimed that his department was working with Shanghai Normal University on collaborative research and also working with UNICEF and UNDP on donor funded projects. One respondent from a think tank explained that they worked with academia and took their assistance in designing research projects. Another respondent from a think tanks explained that they designed a course on citizenship education which was taught in renowned universities in Punjab.

Most respondents from academia were also of the view that their personal scholarly engagement in research was restricted to research publications in HEC recognized journals. They were compelled to publish 1-2 research articles, viewed one respondent. Others were of the view that because of excessive teaching load, it was not possible to pursue quality research. Hinting at teaching workload, one respondent claimed that, *"Even a full professor is teaching 3 courses."* A few others stated that their own universities had allocated some funds for scholarly activities through the Office of Research, Innovation and Commercialization (ORIC). A few others were engaged in research through the HEC funded

National Research Program for Universities (NRPU) and international collaboration because it was important for university ranking. However, majority of respondents both from the public and private sectors claimed that universities had little or no research collaborations with think tanks and NGOs. *"NGOs don't look at universities for research; there is a disconnect,"* claimed one respondent from academia. It was expressed that there was no clear policy for the merger of academia and think tanks on collaboratively pursuing the research agenda for effective and quality research delivery.

Respondents from think tanks also thought that universities did not share researches with them.. *"Researches must be shared with us,"* cited one respondent from the think tank. Universities were hubs of knowledge creation and if research processes and findings were shared through regular seminars and dialogues, better research capacities could be built either way and effective ideas could be generated for more need based research. If the educators were trend-setters, then think tanks were trend developers. Think tanks modified an education policy and worked on its implementation. They both could collaborate to bring about positive changes in the field of education. A British Council study titled, *The University Research System in Pakistan* quoted that core education stakeholders (policymakers,, government officials, regulators, donors, business leaders, professionals and media representatives) and the wider public remain disengaged from university research: they generate little by way of demand for research-driven solutions.⁸

f) Challenges Faced to Ensure Quality of Research

The respondents cited the following challenges that affected quality of research in Pakistan:

1. HEC's policy that considered paper publication as the major criterion for promotion was cited as the biggest hurdle by both public and private sector universities towards quality research output.
2. Excessive workload of faculty jeopardized quality research in both public and private sector universities. Most of the faculty was engaged in teaching, therefore, quality research could not be done.
3. Poor quality of research supervisors at the MPhil and PhD levels was cited as a major issue towards quality assurance in research by both private and public sector representatives; institutions did not prepare quality researchers; capacity development programs for researchers were not available.

⁸ https://file.pide.org.pk/pdf/the_university_research_system_in_pakistan.pdf

4. In the public sector, there was lack of availability of resources including access to digital resources and up to date software for data analysis; further, access to data was difficult as organizations did not cooperate to facilitate data collection for research work.
5. It was difficult to secure funding to do quality research studies; limited amount of Rs. 25,000 was given to supervise MPhil thesis. There was no major financial benefit for supervising research reported by both public and private sector respondents.
6. There was a lack of accountability in the system as reported by the public sector as a challenge: no control on quality student intake, pressure on faculty to enable poor quality students to qualify in research practices. "*Less than 50% deserved to be given PhD degrees*", commented one respondent from the public sector.
7. There was lack of coordination among various stakeholders including think tanks, NGOs and government to disseminate research findings.
8. Both the public and private sector reported that there was lack of variety in researchable areas: hackneyed topics were chosen for research.
9. Universities were not doing need-based research studies was the perspective given by think tanks.
10. It was reported that students were being harassed by faculty members to get publications in their names. "*Students often face pressure to get a research article published using the name of the supervisor while working on their PhD research*", observed one respondent from the public sector.
11. In the case of donor funded projects, the research areas being identified by the donor emerged as a problem as most of the projects were devoid of local knowledge and needs.
12. The think tanks considered pending approvals by the donor for research commencement as a big challenge as it wasted enormous time and affected research quality.
13. The think tanks considered that research did not rank high as a field of study and therefore the research efforts were not valued in Pakistan. Quality researchers held little significance as they found little acknowledgement and appreciation of their work.

g) Recommendations to Improve Quality of Research in Pakistan

The following recommendations were provided to improve the quality of research in Pakistan:

Research Practice

1. There should be initiation of Research Forums to ensure research standards in the country.
2. Education Departments of various universities should collaborate together for quality research. This would promote positive research culture.
3. There should be mentoring programs at universities where senior professors/researchers should work with novice lecturers/faculty and train them in research practices
4. HEC must reconsider its promotion policy based on publications only.
5. Donor driven research should be discouraged as they are devoid of contextual needs. Research agenda must be indigenous.
6. Research centers should be established at every university to help students with academic writing skills
7. Qualified human resource should be engaged for research capacity development at all levels

Research Process

8. Adequate funding to be ensured to conduct need based research. Institutional support was essential to pursue quality research.
9. There should be more emphasis on the quality of research rather than the number of research publications; HEC must consider differentiating between research and teaching universities. Some universities with research capabilities must groom researchers while teaching universities could develop excellence in teaching.
10. Workload management at universities was important to do both quality teaching and research. For women PhD scholars, 8 years' time bar for PhD should be made flexible as women had to split their time between job and domestic commitments.
11. Research degree programs should focus more on research skill development than content based courses
12. Establishment of strong accountability systems for quality research was necessary. Peer review systems should be strengthened to ensure the quality of research
13. Training of research supervisors must be ensured. The research skills of university faculty must be improved.
14. More qualitative studies need to be encouraged for in-depth research



Research Output

15. Universities should become hubs of knowledge creation. This can be ensured through research collaborations with other stakeholders including think tanks/ NGOs etc.
16. University level research must be disseminated at a larger level with stakeholder support.
17. Systems must be strengthened for the government to own research findings.
18. Government should be the main consumer of research.



Responses from MPhil and PhD Scholars on Research Capacity Building

Data was also collected from MPhil and PhD scholars, both from the public and private sector universities and responses were solicited regarding their own research output, quality of research teaching and gaps and challenges in quality research output. A total of 53 responses, 25 males and 28 females, were gathered from students. About 81% students belonged to the public sector universities and 15% from private universities. The rest studied in autonomous institutions. A total of 49% and 45% respondents were enrolled in PhD programs and MPhil programs respectively while the rest in MS programs. About 70% of the respondents were enrolled in NACTE accredited MPhil and PhD education programs while 21% were enrolled in the same programs where the NACTE accreditation was in process, however, 9% of respondents were enrolled in non-accredited education programs. A total of 91% of respondents had gone through the process of conducting research themselves as part of their research degree programs and termed their experience satisfactory. About 92% considered their research programs as research intensive as well and 66% found their own capacity to conduct research as good, 26% considered it excellent while 7.5% termed it average. The findings were in sharp contradiction to the earlier findings generated through interviews where majority of university faculty, both public and private, decried the poor quality of student intake and their lack of understanding of research processes. It was also noteworthy that the students in their qualitative comments stressed the need to make M Phil and PhD degree programs more research intensive and the need to support universities with modern research tools for smoothly conducting research activities. It was also observed that respondents often provided assertive responses in the survey questionnaire. When responding negatively, they often failed to provide supporting details. For instance, some participants simply replied with 'yes', 'no', or 'good' and when asked to explain their reasons for any negative experience with the research, they failed to do so. The assertive statements in the questionnaire might have stemmed from a desire to present their research work as a best practice, as taught to them. It was also worth noting that almost all of them shared valuable recommendations on how to further improve research quality in academia. The details are presented in the coming paragraphs.

Respondents were asked about the output of the research conducted by them. About 54.7% of the respondents commented that the research they conducted was part of the requirement towards the fulfilment of the degree program only. About 26% of the respondents claimed that their research output, in the form of research based projects and assignments, informed their classroom practices as teachers, while 13.2% thought that their research led to policy level reforms, mainly in the in the form of recommendations given as a consequence of research findings, and another 26% attributed their output to national and international conference presentations only.



Responding to the question on sufficiency of resources to conduct research, 81% of respondents considered the resources sufficient while 19% considered them otherwise. Among the reasons cited for the insufficiency of resources, lack of IT facilities including access to websites and online data collection at universities, lack of training in modern data analysis software, lack of travel allowance for data collection were cited as major problems.

The research scholars generally expressed satisfaction over the quality of research teaching. About 85% students felt that their faculty taught qualitative research well while 92% termed that faculty taught quantitative research courses well. However, a few reported that the busy schedule of faculty impacted quality teaching of research. A few others termed lack of face to face interaction, lack of supervision and inability of the faculty to properly explain the assignments as key impediments towards quality teaching of research. One respondent commented that the faculty, *"don't consider these courses worth studying. Their perception is they will learn research once they start doing it."*

In response to the question on how the academic preparation at university was helping them as researchers, 77% indicated that it was helping them to become active researchers in the field. Since majority of the responses from students came from public sector universities, the response stood in sharp contrast to the comments made by the university faculty where they claimed that the M Phil and PhD curricula was not research intensive and was a means to fulfil degree requirements only. About 37% opined that the academic preparation was enabling them to publish articles in research journals only, 22.6% indicated that it was a means to get degrees only. About 15% termed it as a way to develop theoretical understanding of research only, while 6% termed it as a means to get funded projects.

Students came up with varied and multiple responses when asked about the gaps and challenges in ensuring quality research output at the tertiary level. About 47% of respondents believed that research did not have a social impact because of low industry-academia linkage. Another 43% opined that researches done at the tertiary level were not demand driven while 28% felt that tertiary level research studies focused more on course work than research itself. A total of 26% attributed the reason for poor research to less research intensity at the undergraduate level while 22% recognized excessive faculty workload to poor research output. A thin 5.7% students felt that university faculty were not trained in research teaching.

When students were asked to comment on how the quality of educational research could be ensured at the institutional level, the majority of them observed that the selected topic of student research should align with the supervisor's area of work. Also, they felt that research should be directly linked with industry demand. Moreover, they reiterated the need for allocating not more than 3 research



students per supervisor, while others opined that research supervisors should be more knowledgeable about research. This finding coincided with the faculty's observations on the same issue as well. One faculty too agreed that, "*supervisors supervise researches in bulk, which in turn, does not produce quality research*". The students further implied that the faculty needed more training in teaching research and dealing with research students in a friendly and professional manner. Faculty must give adequate time to students to build their research capacity. Additionally, they felt that research intensity should be built by having less content based courses and more active research. Furthermore, students opined that research work should be more time efficient. They also remarked that research capacity of students should be strengthened at the undergraduate level too. They also added that universities needed to have an enabling research environment and should focus on conducting research rather than teaching research. They further recommended that research students should be given stipends by the government and adequate measures should be taken to facilitate research especially during data collection stages.

Conclusion

Quality research ensures that it provides evidence that is robust, ethical, transparent and impactful and can be further utilized to inform policy making. Barrett and colleagues (2011) argue that "the quality of research should be judged not only by the rigours of the academic disciplines, but also by its contribution and impact within society" (p. 27). Strong and dominant research cultures ensure such interventions. For the improvement of quality research, it is, therefore, incumbent to nurture strong research cultures by following ethical standards, doing 'meaningful work' (as narrated by one respondent), making research a strong component of departmental strategic plans and observing research practices through participation at research forums. Zhu and Engels (2014) also adds that organizational planning, strategies and capabilities help in the enhancement of a strong culture of research at universities.

The short study was done to analyze research practices, their output and impact, how research was integrated in the curricula at tertiary level, challenges that were faced towards conducting quality research and recommendations for systemic improvement. The results both from the faculty and students indicated that research at the M Phil and PhD levels was mainly done to fulfil degree completion requirements. The faculty pursued research mainly as a means to acquire promotions in ranks. Jahangir, Azam, and Bilal (2021) stated that scholars were judged, evaluated and promoted on the basis of their research output because of which the number of publications to one's credit was given immense importance thus making it an individual's gateway to job attainment, career success, and promotion. The quality of research output and the wide ranging impact of research therefore remained poor because of the extrinsic motivation to publish for career advancement than the intrinsic desire to consider it as a tool for deep learning and improvement. Welsh (2021) too opined that the intense focus on publications had transformed research productivity into a numbers game, degraded work-life balance of researchers, and relegated the relationships among researchers and practitioners.

It was also concluded that there was a substantial disconnect between researches done by universities and think tanks. Think tanks tended to dominate the policy research landscape and universities remained isolated from government, industry and civil society, and that collaboration between think tanks and universities was highly circumscribed (Naveed and Suleri, 2015). Moreover, universities remained isolated from carrying out policy level education research and mostly pursued research as part of curriculum requirements. In order to bridge the gap, it was imperative to carry out research practice partnerships for improved research output and impact. Arce-Trigatti et al. (2018) highlighted, "The RPP model is gaining traction as a potentially useful way to connect research, policy, and practice in education" (p. 576). Coburn (2019) too stated that research collaborations shifted the discourse away

from primarily instrumental to conceptual use of research for local decision making. Coburn and Penuel (2016) further elaborated that research partnerships provided independent analyses of education policies and practices, and assisted policymakers and practitioners in the interpretation and dissemination of findings. Such initiatives were the need of the hour as they helped to pursue a common need based research agenda. Researchers therefore must collaborate more with practitioners (Di Benedetto, Lindgreen, Storgaard, & Clarke, 2019). Involvement of principal stakeholders including academia, think tanks, government and donors to contextually understand and situate the problems and seek joint solutions remained a plausible route to undertake any research activity of merit.

It was further observed that the curricula at the MPhil and PhD levels were not research intensive and in order to develop a thorough understanding of research principles, the preparation for research had to commence from the undergraduate level. The same deficit was highlighted by the think tanks who also fell short of strong research teams to carry out in-depth research work and were dependent on external researchers to conduct research studies from their platforms. While the think tanks/NGOs managed to ensure quality of research by engaging well versed researchers from the market, the universities continued to struggle with quality because of the struggle to manage teaching and research work together and poor research training. As reiterated by faculty and students, poor resource allocation for research was also considered as a major factor for poor quality of research output. Nauman (2016) highlighted the same and explained that the budget allocated for research conducted in Pakistan was not addressing the existing problems; instead, it was used on implementation of the flawed research policies. Lack of allocation of financial resources given to pursue policy level research in the country led to unavoidable reliance on external donors who came with their own agenda for research opined Haque and Orden (2017). The same was reiterated by think tanks who felt that due to the dependence on donor funded research, research in Pakistan was sometimes devoid of context. It was also stressed that the quantum of qualitative research studies needed to increase in the country for seeking solutions to core educational problems; impetus on quantitative studies alone would not suffice. Naveed in a 2013 study funded by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) provided an overview of entities that conducted educational policy research, including university departments, private sector consultancies, government institutes and donor agencies. The study noted that education played a diminutive role in informing overall policy research, remained statistical in orientation and inadequately coordinated or articulated into a community of practice.

Research in common phraseology refers to the search for knowledge Kothari (2004). Boaz and Ashby (2003) argue that the conceptualization of research quality should "address the 'fitness of purpose' of



research" and not simply satisfy methodological quality benchmarks. In order for research quality to improve in Pakistan it is imperative to conduct research for its intrinsic value. This can be partly achieved by making universities hubs of research creation and knowledge; Moreover, systemic reforms are required in the entire educational system where research takes a centre stage and is integrated well in the curricula to fine tune the research skills of students from the undergraduate to the post graduate levels. Jahangir et al (2021) state the same and opine that the institutionalized hegemonic research traditions in Pakistan require reconceptualization and reconfiguration of ethical, intellectual and research narratives to engender research-friendly ethos in Pakistan. Furthermore, research capacity building of university faculty is fundamental to improving research quality. Ridley (2011) views research capacity building as a process aimed at developing research skills and equipping researchers with sound research methodologies that enable them to carry out and produce high-quality research. Moreover, Nguyen (2016) adds that by focusing on the infrastructure necessary for conducting research, recruiting, developing, and motivating staff members, research capacities can be strengthened. Munn (2008) further views engagement in research as a professional activity, critical reflection on professional experience, and interaction with fellow researchers as critical aspects in research capacity development. Updating and fine-tuning research capacity skills of university faculty and other researchers, seeking funds for demand driven research for effective impact and scholarly collaborations are thus ways in which the research landscapes can be strengthened in Pakistan.

References.

1. Barrett, A., Crossley, M., & Dachi, H. (2011). International collaboration and research capacity building: Learning from the EdQual experience. *Comparative Education*, 47(1), 25–43.
2. Boaz, A., & Ashby, D. (2003). Fit for purpose? Assessing research quality for evidence based policy and practice. ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice.
3. Arce-Trigatti, P., Chukhray, I., & López Turley, R. (2018). Research-practice partnerships in education. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *The handbook of sociology in education in the 21st century* (pp. 561–579). Springer International. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76694-2_25
4. Coburn, C. E. (2010). Partnership for district reform: The challenges of evidence use in a major urban district. In C. E. Coburn, & M. K. Stein (Eds.), *Research and practice in education: Building alliances, bridging the divide* (pp. 167–182). Rowman & Littlefield.
5. Coburn, C. E., & Penuel, W. R. (2016). Research-practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics, and open questions. *Educational Researcher*, 45(1), 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16631750>
6. Di Benedetto, A., Lindgreen, A., Storgaard, M., Clarke, A.H. How to collaborate really well with practitioners, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Volume 82, 2019, Pages 1-8,
7. Farrell, C. C., Davidson, K. L., Repko-Erwin, M. E., Penuel, W. R., Quantz, M., Wong, H., Riedy, R., & Brink, Z. (2018). A descriptive study of the IES researcher-practitioner partnerships in education research program: Final report (Technical Report No. 3). National Center for Research in Policy and Practice.
8. Gilani, S. A. (2021). Need of Quality research in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Physical Therapy (PJPT)*, 3(02), 01. <https://doi.org/10.52229/pjpt.v3i02.1160>
9. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International.
10. Hammersley, M., Gomm, R., Glaesser, J., & Cooper, B. (2012). Challenging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide. *Challenging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide*, 1-288.
11. Hoodbhoy, Pervez. "Dr Pervez Hoodbhoy Responds to Nature Article on Pakistan's Higher Education Reform." Review of Osama, Athar, Adil Najam, Shamsh KassimLakha, Syed Zulfiqar Gilani, and Christopher King. "Pakistan's Reform Experiment." *Nature – International Journal of Science* 461, No. 38 – 39 (September 3, 2009)
12. Jahangir, T., Azam, S., & Bilal, M. (2021). Publish or perish: deconstructing research culture in higher education institutes of pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education & Language*, 7(1).
13. Naveed, A., & Suleri, A. (2022). Making 'impact factor' impactful: Universities, think tanks and policy research in Pakistan. *Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Islamabad*. http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/sites/default/files/Pakistan%20TT-university%20study_Final%20June.
14. Margherita, A., Elia, G., & Petti, C. (2022). What Is Quality in Research? Building a Framework of Design, Process and Impact Attributes and Evaluation Perspectives. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 3034
15. Munn, P. (2008). *Building research capacity collaboratively: Can we take ownership of our future?* *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(4), 413–430.
16. Naikade, K., & Kamthan, M. (2020). QUALITY RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN INSIGHT IN THE CULTURE OF PUBLISH OR PERISH. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(9), 4205-4221.
17. Naveed, Arif. *Landscaping the Institutions of Educational Policy Research in Pakistan: Who Is Doing What?* Report. Sustainable Development Policy Institute. Paper 2. March 26, 2013.
18. Nauman, S. (2016). "Lack of critical thinking skills leading to research crisis in developing countries: A case of Pakistan". *The Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers*, doi: 10.1002/leap.1091.

19. Nguyen, T. L. (2016). Building human resources management capacity for university research: The case at four leading Vietnamese universities. *Higher Education*, 71(2), 231–251
20. Ridley, B. (2011). Educational research culture and capacity building: The case of Addis Ababa University. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 59(3), 285–302.
21. Welsh, R. O. (2021). Assessing the quality of education research through its relevance to practice: An integrative review of research-practice partnerships. *Review of Research in Education*, 45(1), 170–194.
22. Zhu, C., & Engels, N. (2014). Organizational Culture and Instructional Innovations in Higher Education: Perceptions and Reactions of Teachers and Students. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(1), 136–158.
23. <https://www.sahe.org.pk/sahe-publications/>
24. <https://journals.sdpi.org/index.php/JoDPRP>
25. <https://www.scspeb.org/annual%20report/report-2021-22.pdf>
26. <https://ue.edu.pk/jrre/introduction.php>
27. <https://www.lcwu.edu.pk/images/2023/Downloads/ORICAnnualReport2022.pdf>
28. <https://or.lums.edu.pk/or-operations>
29. <https://www.fccollege.edu.pk/office-of-research-innovation-and-commercialization-oric/>
30. <https://jgsi.fjwu.edu.pk/jgsi/>
31. <https://sujo.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/SURJ>
32. <https://www.iba-suk.edu.pk/oric/index>
33. <https://admissions.szabist.edu.pk/Index.aspx>
34. http://journals.uop.edu.pk/journal_detail.php?journal_id=12
35. <https://www.buitms.edu.pk/Research/>
36. <https://ojs.aiou.edu.pk/>

Appendix -1: Research Outputs of Institutions and Faculty Interviewed

No.	Name	Province	Institutional Research Profile	Personnel Interviewed	Organization's research output
1	Society for the Advancement of Education (SAHE)	Lahore, Punjab	Some of their research projects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender Equity and Social Inclusion(GESI) - Responsiveness in Education Research, - Education Monitor, - Scaling Strategy for Innovations Aimed at Data-driven School Improvement 	Muhammad Azhar, Program Manager	Total publications: 60 Since 2020: 5
2	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	Islamabad, ICT	SDPI established in 1992 has around 1000 publications to its credit in the form of white papers, research articles and policy notes. The institute publishes a journal titled, 'Journal of Development Policy, Research and Practice' (JODPRP), which provides a diverse array of research and working papers, policy briefs, and argumentative essays on issues pertaining to sustainable development.	Rabia Tabbasum, Senior Research Associate	Total publications: 15
3	Society for Community Strengthening and promotion of Education (SCSPEB)	Quetta, Balochistan	Some of their research projects include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SCSPEB has conducted a research study on analysis of Annual Matriculation Result 2014 for Balochistan. 2. SCSPEB has also partnered with Society for Advancement of Education in conducting a study on Non-Formal Basic Education in Balochistan. 3. The organization has developed District Education Development Plans 2016-21 for all districts of Balochistan. 4. SCSPEB has also developed Balochistan Education Sector Plan 2021-25. 	Irfan Awan Head of programs	Around 5 research outputs shown on website

No	University	Province	Institutional Research Profile	Personnel Interviewed	Interviewee's Research Output
1	University of Education, Lahore	Punjab	<p>Number of faculty members: 65 Except for a couple of them, all are PhDs</p> <p>The university offers undergraduate and post graduate programs and publishes a Journal of Research and Reflections in Education (JRRE). It is a refereed interdisciplinary journal and publishes articles relating to education covering a wide range of areas relating to (a) social, natural and life sciences, and (b) arts, culture and philosophy. It provides a forum, for the publication of empirical papers from the field of education and all dimensions of education.</p>	Dr Intzar Butt Director, Directorate of Extension and Outreach University of Education, Lahore	No. of publications: 45 Since 2020: 10
2	Lahore College for Women University, Lahore	Punjab	<p>Faculty of Education has 4 departments offering undergraduate and post graduate programs with around 35 faculty members: STEM Education, Physical Education, Elementary and Teacher Education, Educational Planning & Development and TESOL.</p> <p>In the year 2021, Faculty of Education posted 57 publications with total impact factor of 9.2. other details of publications can be viewed at https://www.lcwu.edu.pk/research-publications.html</p> <p>One of the senior faculty members in Education has been awarded the HEC funded NRP project in 2022. The project will equip the selected schools with the materials and resources required for carrying out STEAM projects and activities. The co-implementing partners for this project are: Centre for Engineering Education and Outreach at Tufts University (Collaborators) who will provide pedagogical support, and Door of Awareness (DoA), a non-profit organization that runs free schools for underprivileged communities in Lahore.</p>	Dr Asma Shahid Kazi Chairperson, Department of Professional Studies	Total no. of publications: 35 Since 2020: 17
3	Lahore University of management and Sciences, LUMS, Lahore	Punjab	The School of Education (SOE) offers an MPhil in Education Leadership and Management and Executive MPhil Education Leadership and Management program. It has 9 permanent and 8 adjunct faculty; 4	Dr Gulab Khan Assistant Professor	4 article publications; 3 book chapters

			<p>teaching fellows are also associated with SOE as well.</p> <p>The Office of Research (OR) acts as a bridge between LUMS faculty and national and international donors or sponsors.</p>		
4	Forman Christian College University, Lahore	Punjab	<p>The Faculty of Education comprises of Department of Education and Department of Health and Physical Education. There are 8 full time and 2 adjunct faculty members teaching the B Ed and M Phil programs.</p> <p>The university has showcased 18 book publications of its faculty on http://library.fccollege.edu.pk/fcc-research/faculty-publications. None of them is related to Education. There are 10 paper publications listed under the Education discipline from 2016-2021. equals">http://58.27.197.146:8080/jspui/simple-search?filterquery=Education&filtername=subject&filtertype>equals</p> <p>The university houses a policy think tank, Centre for Public Policy and Governance (CPPG). The projects under the think tank can range from purely a research exercise to those involving varied interventions including seminars, policy dialogues, trainings and policy formulation.</p>	Dr Thomas Martin, Dean and Associate professor, Faculty of Education	Total publications: 13
5	Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi	Punjab	<p>The Department of Education has 6 faculty members and offers B Ed, M Phil and PhD programs in education.</p> <p>Two HEC ongoing funded research projects are listed on the website titled, "Promoting Inquiry Informed Practice-Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice for Participants of Pre-Service Teacher Education Program" since 2016 and "Promoting Tolerance through Attitudinal Change: Implementing Three Week Instructional Plan with Students of Higher Secondary Schools of Rawalpindi". The latter received Rs 6 million HEC grant.</p> <p>The university publishes a Journal of Gender and Social Issues (JGSI) that has been recognized in HEC's Y category for the year 2022-2023. A funded research project in education was also done in</p>	Dr Farhana Khursheed, Associate Professor	Total publications: 21 Since 2020: 15

			2020-2021 titled Secondary School Preparedness in response to Covid-19 Epidemic: Ensuring the Safe School Environment.		
6	University of Sindh, Jamshoro	Sindh	<p>The Faculty of Education has 6 departments. https://usindh.edu.pk/faculty/fe The faculty offers B Ed, B A, MA, MPhil and PhD programs in various fields of education. The university publishes 16 research journals out of which 1 journal belongs to the discipline of Education. The Sindh University Journal of Education (SUJE) publishes original, conceptual, and research-based articles related to all major areas of education in general and teacher education in particular in the Pakistan context. The Journal, however, prefers to publish articles whose primary purpose is to report the methods and results of an empirical study. The present issue of the journal is the 46th since its launch.</p>	Dr Shakeela Shah Assistant Professor	Total publications: 32 Since 2020: 14
7	Sukkur IBA	Sindh	The department of education offers B Ed and M Phil programs. Published articles not shown on the website.	Dr Irfan Ahmad Rind, professor and Head of Education	4 ongoing funded research projects 11 completed research projects 3 book chapters 22 journal publications 4 unpublished reports
8	SZABIST	Sindh	<p>SZABIST publishes 3 research journals: Journal management and social sciences & economics, Journal of Health and Biological Sciences, Journal of Independent Studies and Research Computing</p> <p>The Department of Education offers MS and PhD in Educational Leadership and Management and has 4 permanent faculty members. A total of 9 research</p>	Dr Naeem Akhtar, Assistant Professor and Head of Department	40 publications in total. Since 2020: 25

			papers are listed in the discipline of Education category		
9	University of Peshawar, Peshawar	KPK	<p>The Institute of Education houses 9 faculty members and offers BEd, Mphil and PhD programs.</p> <p>The university publishes 17 journals out of which 1 journal belongs to the Education category. 'The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences' (JHSS) is a refereed and internationally indexed journal recognized as a Y category HEC journal.</p>	<p>Dr Syed Munir Ahmad</p> <p>Associate professor</p>	<p>Total publications: 54</p> <p>Since 2020: 14</p>
10	Abasyn University, Peshawar	KPK	<p>Record of About 46 research publications shown on website. None of them is from the discipline of Education.</p> <p>A total of 8 faculty members teach in the Department of Education. The department offers B.Ed and Mphil programs.</p>	<p>Dr Farzana Saleem</p> <p>Head of Department</p>	
11	Balochistan University of Information Technology, Engineering and Management Sciences (BUIITEMS)	Balochistan	<p>Department of Education offers 4 years B Ed program. The department has 8 faculty members.</p> <p>BUIITEMS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (BJSSH) is a scholarly journal of research and cotes opinions on academic discourse.</p> <p>BUIITEMS showcases 1500 + publications in total with RS 25 million ORIC funded research projects, Rs 162 million national and international funded projects, 108 publications from funded projects and 20+ book publications https://www.buitms.edu.pk/Research/</p>	<p>Dr Fozia Ahmad Baloch,</p> <p>Head of Department</p>	<p>Total publications: 13</p> <p>Since 2020: 11</p>
12	Sardar Bahadur Khan Womens' University, Quetta	Balochistan	<p>The Department of Education offers B Ed, MA and M Phil programs.</p> <p>No data of faculty and research provided on website</p>	<p>Dr Alia Ayub</p> <p>Head of Department</p>	<p>Total publications: 7</p>
13	Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad	ICT	<p>The Faculty of Education is one of the largest faculties of the university with 47% enrolment of the university and contributor of 53% to the total annual university exchequer. At present 30 programmes and 135 courses in its eight department/Institutes are being run by the faculty. The faculty offers B Ed, M Phil and PhD programs in various fields of education.</p> <p>AIOU publishes 22 journals out of which the following are from Education discipline:</p>	<p>Dr Afshan Huma</p> <p>Head of Department, Educational Planning, policy Studies and Leadership</p>	<p>Total publications: 27 including 2 books</p> <p>Since 2020: 11 articles published</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Journal of Early Childhood Care and Education (JECCE) - Pakistan Journal of Education (PJE) - Journal of Educational Leadership and Management (JELM) etc. <p>The Allama Iqbal Open University has taken a lead in formulating a "Digital Transformation Policy" which is a flagship initiative aimed at digitizing the learning materials for improving the learning experiences of learners. The said initiative along involves carrying out end-to-end automation of all university processes.</p>		
14	Karakoram International University, Gilgit	Gilgit-Baltistan	<p>The Department of Education offers B Ed, MA, M Ed and M Phil degree programs. There are 9 regular and 12 visiting faculty members in the department.</p> <p>In the current year, 05 articles have been published in national and international journals and 06 workshops and conferences have been attended by the faculty.</p>	Dr Sadruddin Qitoshi Head of Department	Total publications: 20 Since 2020: 8