Centre for Peace and Development Initiatives (CPDI) would welcome reproduction and dissemination of the contents of the report with due acknowledgments.

Centre for Peace and Development Initiatives (CPDI)
House # 370, Street # 75, E11/3 MPCHS Islamabad
t: +92 51 2375158-9, +92 51 431 94 30
f: + 92 51 8443633
email: info@cpdi-pakistan.org
www.cpdi-pakistan.org

Disclaimer:
Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the contents of this publication. The organization does not accept any responsibility of any omission as it is not deliberate. Nevertheless, we will appreciate provision of accurate information to improve our work.

ISBN: 978-969-9484-07-0
Following the School Paisa!

Report IV – District Toba Tek Singh
Table of Contents

Executive Summary .................................................................................................................. 1
Introduction and Background .................................................................................................. 3
Chapter 1: Research Objectives and Methodology ................................................................. 5
  1.1 Research Objectives ......................................................................................................... 5
  1.2 Research Sampling .......................................................................................................... 5
  1.3 Research Analysis Framework ........................................................................................ 5
  1.4 Data Sources .................................................................................................................... 6
  1.5 Primary Data Collection Technique .............................................................................. 6
Chapter 2: District Budgetary Analysis .................................................................................... 7
  2.1 Total Current Education Budget .................................................................................... 7
  2.2 Current Budget: Salary and Non-Salary ....................................................................... 8
  2.3 Current Budget for Primary Education .......................................................................... 9
  2.4 Current Budget for Secondary Education .................................................................... 10
  2.5 Comparison of Primary and Secondary Education Budget ......................................... 10
  2.6 Unit Cost ......................................................................................................................... 11
Chapter 3: Service Delivery Assessment .................................................................................. 12
  3.1 Sampled Schools ............................................................................................................ 12
  3.2 Information about the Head Teachers .......................................................................... 12
    3.2.1 Gender and Residential Status of Head Teachers .................................................. 12
    3.2.2 Level of Education of Head Teachers ..................................................................... 13
    3.2.3 Work Experience of Head Teachers ....................................................................... 13
  3.3 Information about Teachers ............................................................................................ 15
    3.3.1 Residential Status of School Teachers ................................................................... 15
    3.3.2 Teachers’ Position .................................................................................................... 15
    3.3.3 Teachers Attendance ............................................................................................... 16
    3.3.4 Level of Education of Teachers ............................................................................. 16
  3.4 Enrolment and Pass out ................................................................................................... 17
  3.5 Facilities at Schools .......................................................................................................... 19
    3.5.1 Condition of Class Rooms ...................................................................................... 19
    3.5.2 Availability of Basic Facilities .................................................................................. 20
    3.5.3 Drinking Water Facility ............................................................................................ 20
    3.5.4 Text Books ............................................................................................................... 21
3.6 School Councils .................................................................................................................. 22
3.6.1 Presence and Composition of School Councils ............................................................. 22
3.6.2 Frequency of School Council Meetings ........................................................................... 22
3.6.3 Functionality and Satisfaction with School Council Performance ................................. 23
3.7 Monitoring and Evaluation .................................................................................................. 24

Chapter 4: Citizen’s Voice ....................................................................................................... 26
4.1 Information about Parents .................................................................................................... 26
4.1.1 Level of Education ........................................................................................................... 26
4.1.2 Employment Status of Household Heads ......................................................................... 27
4.2 Number of Enrolled Children ............................................................................................. 27
4.3 Facilities at Schools ............................................................................................................. 28
4.3.1 Availability of Facilities in Schools ................................................................................... 28
4.3.2 Satisfaction with the Available Facilities .......................................................................... 29
4.3.3 Availability of Chowkidar ................................................................................................ 30
4.3.4 Parent’s Satisfaction ......................................................................................................... 30
4.4 Who Accompanies Child to School ..................................................................................... 31
4.5 Information about School Council ...................................................................................... 32
4.6 Out of Pocket Expenditure .................................................................................................. 32

Chapter 5: School Analysis ..................................................................................................... 34
5.1 Do Schools get their Funds? ................................................................................................ 34
5.2 Do Funds Reach on Time? .................................................................................................. 34
5.3 Do Schools get all the Funds? .............................................................................................. 35
5.4 Do Schools spend all the Funds? If Yes, on What? .............................................................. 35
5.5 Do Schools Generate Funds? ............................................................................................... 36
5.6 Compliance with RTE ......................................................................................................... 38
5.7 Are Schools Apolitical? ....................................................................................................... 39

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations .................................................................... 41
6.1 Conclusion .......................................................................................................................... 41
6.2 Recommendations ............................................................................................................. 42
Lessons Learnt ......................................................................................................................... 44
List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Current Education Budget of District Toba Tek Singh .......................... 7
Figure 2.2: Salary and Non-Salary classification of Current Budget ......................... 8
Figure 2.3: Current Education Budget for Primary Schools .................................... 9
Figure 2.4: Current Education Budget for Secondary Schools ................................. 10
Figure 2.5: Primary and Secondary Education Allocation as a Percentage of Total Current Budget ........................................................................................................ 11
Figure 3.1: Percentage Schools by Level and Type ................................................. 12
Figure 3.2: Gender of the Head Teacher (%) ....................................................... 13
Figure 3.3: Head Teacher Resident, of UC (%) ...................................................... 13
Figure 3.4: Education of Head Teacher ................................................................. 13
Figure 3.5: Total Service Period of Head Teachers ................................................. 14
Figure 3.6: Experience as Head Teacher ............................................................... 14
Figure 3.7: Experience as HT in the Current School ............................................... 14
Figure 3.8: Percentage Teachers Resident of Union Council ................................. 15
Figure 3.9: Number of Allocated v/s Filled in positions ......................................... 15
Figure 3.10: Percentage Teachers' Attendance ...................................................... 16
Figure 3.11: Teacher’s Education in different school types and level of schools ........ 17
Figure 3.12 Comparison of enrolment during years 2012-13 and 13-14 .................... 17
Figure 3.13: Appeared and passed out in Year 2012-13 .......................................... 18
Figure 3.14 Appeared and passed out in Year 2013-14 .......................................... 19
Figure 3.15: Condition of Class rooms ................................................................. 19
Figure 3.16: Facilities at schools ......................................................................... 20
Figure 3.17: Drinking water sources in different school levels ................................. 20
Figure 3.18: Receiving and Distribution of Text Books in Schools in 2013-14 .......... 21
Figure 3.19: Receiving and Distribution of Text Books in Schools in 2014-15 .......... 21
Figure 3.20: Number of Schools having School Councils ..................................... 22
Figure 3.21: Composition of School Councils ....................................................... 22
Figure 3.22: Percentage Frequency of SC Meetings ............................................ 22
Figure 3.23: Frequency of Functions Performed by SC .......................................... 23
Figure 3.24: Satisfaction with the Performance of School Councils ......................... 24
Figure 3.25: Percentage Schools Visited by Outside Officials ................................. 25
Figure 3.26: Percentage Schools Visited by M&E Officials ..................................... 25
Figure 4.1: Level of Education of House Hold Heads (HHH) .......................................................... 26
Figure 4.2: Occupation of House Hold Heads (HHH)................................................................. 27
Figure 4.3: Availability of Basic Facilities in Schools ................................................................. 28
Figure 4.4: Availability of Education Facilities ........................................................................ 28
Figure 4.5: Satisfaction with the Basic Facilities ........................................................................ 29
Figure 4.6: Satisfaction with Education Facilities ....................................................................... 30
Figure 4.7: Chowkidar at Schools (Percentage) ......................................................................... 30
Figure 4.8: Parent's satisfaction regarding various aspects ......................................................... 31
Figure 4.9: How do children commute to school? ..................................................................... 31
Figure 4.10: Parent’s Information about School Councils ....................................................... 32
Figure 5.1: Fund received by Primary and Middle schools against entitled amount for FY 2013-14 ................................................................................................................................. 35
Figure 5.2: Expenditure Patterns at Different School Levels ...................................................... 36
Figure 5.3: Generation of Funds by Schools .............................................................................. 37
Figure 5.4: Earnings from Different Sources ............................................................................ 37
Figure 5.5: Percentage of Schools Tabbing Different Resources ............................................ 38
Figure 5.6: Percentage Schools that faced Political Influence ................................................ 39
Figure 5.7: Political Influence over Education Department .......................................................... 40
List of Tables

Table 1.1: Sampling of District TobaTek Singh- Phase IV ..........................................................5
Table 2.1: Percentage share of Salary and Non-Salary Budget .................................................8
Table 2.2: Unit Cost per Student and per School..........................................................................11
Table 4.1: Gender wise segregation of school going children..................................................27
Table 4.2: Out of Pocket Expenditure as reported by Parents ......................................................33
Table 5.1: Funds received by Schools in FY 2013-14..................................................................34
Table 5.2: Delivery of Funds to Schools .......................................................................................34
Table 5.3: Average Expenditure of Schools against Different Heads ...........................................36
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>Assistant Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Budget Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDI</td>
<td>Centre for Peace and Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDO</td>
<td>Executive District Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDO F&amp;P</td>
<td>EDO Finance and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPF</td>
<td>Education Promotion Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>Farogh-e-Taleem Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHHs</td>
<td>Household Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kms</td>
<td>Kilometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEO</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDF</td>
<td>Medium Term Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSB</td>
<td>Non-Salary Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESRP</td>
<td>Punjab Education Sector Reforms Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETS</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Tracking Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILDAT</td>
<td>Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKR</td>
<td>Pakistani Rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Revised Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE</td>
<td>Right to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>School Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Union Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements

The Fourth PETS survey report ‘Following the School Paisa’ is the result of efforts of entire team. Field enumerators led by the Senior District Coordinator Muhammad Shahid carried out Public Expenditure Tracking Survey, collected data from schools, conducted interviews and acquired copies of the relevant records. Data Consultant Khan Bahadur Sultan compiled the data and generated the analysis. Research Assistant Faiza Kanwal provided valuable support to the Program Manager Raja Shoaib Akbar in compiling the report. Graphic Designer Naveed Ashraf designed the cover page. Executive Director Amer Ejaz provided guidance and support at every step.

The acknowledgements will remain incomplete if the support of Ilm Ideas is not mentioned here. This study and the publication of the report have been possible with the support of the Ilm Ideas.
**CPDI and Budget Reforms**

Budget reform has stayed a hallmark endeavor of CPDI since the past many years. CPDI has worked over the years on issues related to budget. A number of research reports have been launched and advocacy initiatives undertaken to ensure that budget processes are followed, budgets are participatory and need based. CPDI has been successfully implementing its transparency and accountability interventions in the selected districts while maintaining amicable relations with the district governments and civil society groups. CPDI believes in accountability, transparency and responsible governance for upholding the constitutional rights of citizens of Pakistan. In this regard CPDI is working extensively in education sector to ensure Citizens’ Right to Education. As a part of this ongoing intervention, CPDI has conducted Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS\(^1\)), after its successful implementation in various countries, including India, where it was highly successful.

---

\(^1\) PETS is a tool aimed at monitoring how much of public resources reach intended target groups and at diagnosing problems in service delivery so as to identify bottlenecks in program implementation and to generate information that will improve government decision-making process. It examines the manner, quantity and timing of release of resources to different levels of government, particularly the units responsible for the delivery of services and resources reaching beneficiaries.

Executive Summary

“Following the School Paisa” is a research study initiated by CPDI under its project “Our Money Our Responsibility” for two districts of Punjab: Jhang and Toba Tek Singh. This report specifically pertains to district Toba Tek Singh with an aim to: analyze budgetary allocations, assess school condition, gauge satisfaction of beneficiaries with respect to service delivery, track the financial resources received and expended by schools, identify leakages, determine the implementation status of Article 25-A, and propose a set of recommendations accordingly. CPDI intends to create awareness among the society and promote the culture of transparency and accountability in Education sector through this study.

The current budget for education has increased by 20.65% in the FY 2014-15 as compared to that of the last year. Revised current budget remained Rs. 4,233.5 million in FY 2013-14 as compared to Rs. 3,827.5 million in the last FY 2012-13. Although the non-salary budget has remained 1% or less since 2010-11, yet there has been a phenomenal increase of 1,119.32% in the allocated non-salary budget of the FY 2014-15 as compared to meager increase of 8.95% in FY 2013-14.

The findings of the survey conducted in 66 government schools of District Toba Tek Singh, highlights the ground realities of Education sector. The sample comprised 48% primary schools, 32% elementary schools and 20% secondary schools. The overall enrollment has increased around10.5% in FY 2013-14 along with an improvement in the percentage of passed out students as compared to the last year. The investigation regarding school facilities ended with the conclusion that the secondary schools are equipped with most of the basic educational facilities and infrastructure, but many of the primary and elementary schools are deprived of such basic facilities such as furniture for teachers and students, drinking water, washrooms, sports equipment, computer labs etc. Gas supply is a rare commodity in all the schools, and is almost non-existent in all the sampled Primary schools. The parents are generally unaware of the existence of School Councils and their functions. Parents also informed that they had to bear out-of-pocket expenditures on account of admission fee, examination fee, maintenance fund, stationery cost, student-fund, school leaving fee etc.

The study also revealed that due to the insufficient educational funds by the government, the schools generate more than 50% of the resources on their own. About 99% of the sampled schools generate 60.7% of their total income from Farogh-e-Taleem Fund (FTF). The public schools charge PKR 20 per child, per month as the Education Promotion Fund or more commonly known as FTF.

The leakage in the budget can be attributed either to the least priority given to the school related expenses, or to the diversion of funds to other sectors or other heads within the education sector. The analysis of the budgetary data shows leakage of 38% and 2% in the non-salary budget for the FY 2009-10 and 2011-12 respectively, similarly 2.86% leakage was observed in the resources of primary schools in FY 2012-13. But data for FY 2013-14 shows no leakages in the non-salary budget as well as the School Council (SC) budget. Though the leakage has been stopped yet the timely transfer of the funds to schools is an impediment; most of the schools received the SC fund during third quarter of the fiscal year, this is an impediment in judicious use of the available resources.

Leakage can be described in simple words as the transfer / diversion of funds from or non-release of the funds to a particular sector to which these funds were actually allocated at the start of a particular fiscal year. Leakage is calculated as percentage of difference in allocated and revised budget estimates: \[\left(\frac{RE - BE}{BE}\right) \times 100\]
The study also highlights occasional incidences of political influence in schools which also needs to be considered by the concerned officials. The facts and figures also confirm that in terms of providing free and compulsory education to all children aged 5-16, the education department is clearly not conforming to “Right to Education” as stipulated in article 25A of the constitution of Pakistan.

The study concludes with a few recommendations that stem out of the analysis of the dataset. The district government should issue orders to the school management authorities to ensure the implementation of “Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2014” and make sure that the students are not charged for education hence avoiding the violation of the Act as well as Article 25-A of the constitution. The NSB should be increased up to 12% of the total current education budget as recommended in the MTDF and the education department should build its strength for the efficient utilization of the monetary resources. The funds should be provided timely to the schools to ensure smooth functionality of the education institutes. Moreover, there is a serious need to build the capacity of the SC members to improve the performance of school councils. The government should make efforts to provide for missing facilities and in filling the vacant teachers’ positions, especially in Primary schools. Last but not the least; the girls’ education should be promoted by running education campaigns to increase their enrollment in the schools, these campaigns need to be specially focused in rural areas.
Introduction and Background

Pakistan being a developing country has to cope with a number of socio-economic issues. For the government to prioritize any one sector out of the various sectors, such as energy, health, law and order or education along with others, is not as simple a task as one might think. While looking at the state of affairs, level of growth and development of the advanced economies of the world, one gets an inspiration to follow them on similar patterns of growth, but in consideration of the hardcore realities and resource scarcity of one’s own country. The on-going demographic transition, globalization and education revolution has necessitated the formation of an educational system which brings out worthy human asset, which is creative, avid and possesses high spirits of economic wellbeing at the same time. Therefore, education should be listed as the foremost priority of the government.

Most of the countries have flourished through investing in education for their population, thus resulting in massive human capital for the country. Pakistan also intends to equip its masses with human capital to drive the economy on the path of development. For the very purpose, the government introduced Right to Education under Article 25-A of the constitution of Pakistan to ensure that every citizen, between 5 to 16 years of age, has access to free and compulsory education. This is a substantial step taken by the government which not only lessens the financial burden on parents and guardians of the school going children, belonging to any class and sect, but also guarantees that the children attain quality education at the schools. To implement this, Punjab government has passed Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act 2014 that disallows collection of any fee or charges and sets the duty of the government to provide ‘good quality’ education to students.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) 2015, the Pakistan vision 2025 and the 11th five year plan 2013-18, among other similar plans of the government, exhibit that the education sector is now being given due attention along with other social agendas. The current ruling party in Punjab had declared in its manifesto that it would increase total education budget to 4% in 2018 from a meager 2% of GDP allocated over the last few fiscal years. This is not as sufficiently high an investment as required, as in the past the National Education Policy (2009) committed to increase education budget to 7% as a percentage of GDP (PILDAT 2011). Nevertheless, it can be considered as a first step towards a brighter future along with the other intended improvements in the education sector such as: achieving 80% universal literacy, having 100% enrollment up to elementary schools, provision of missing facilities, timely provision of free text books, designing uniform curriculum for all provinces and establishment of computer labs in public high schools etc.

Punjab is the biggest province of Pakistan having a population of approximately 72.5 million, covering an area of 205,344 sq. km. It is a hub of various economic, social and political activities thus, very important unit of the federation. It has 36 districts out of which District Jhang and Toba Tek Singh are the focus of our study. In FY 2011-12, Punjab achieved the literacy rate of 60% where, males were 70% literate as compared to 51% of the females. The current literacy rate (population aged 10 years and above) in Punjab, as estimated by PSLM survey 2012-13, is estimated to be 62% which is 2% higher than the literacy rate reported in 2011-12.

---

3 Section 3, Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act 2014  
4 Section 4 (b) Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act 2014  
5 Pakistan Muslim League (N)- National Agenda for real change- Manifesto 2013  
6 Right to Free and Compulsory Education in Pakistan- Enforcement of Article 25-A of the Constitution of Pakistan (June 2011)  
7 Pakistan Millennium Development Goals Report 2013
Education budget of Punjab has been hovering around 6% of the total budget over the past few years. The education sector budget allocated for the FY 2012-13 was PKR 67,276 million whereas the budgetary allocation for FY 2013-14 is PKR 74,625 million. The education budget allocation for the current year has exceeded from the prior year by about 11%. While looking at the actual spending in 2012-13, the budget has been revised by a 27% decline from the amount actually allocated. On one hand, the government intends to spend more on the education sector whereas on the other hand, the money intended to be spent on education in the previous year has been diverted to other sectors, leaving many unresolved problems in education. Though, it is necessary to increase the allocation in education sector, but this alone is not a sufficient condition that can guarantee the sector’s development, until the allocated amount is utilized under the intended heads in entirety.

The objective of our study is to analyze the conditions at public schools (in concerned districts), the budget allocated at school level and the discrepancies present, if any. The overall budget allocated for school education in Punjab is PKR 41,584 million which is approximately 56% of the total education budget of the province. The remaining amount is streamed to higher education, special education and other education related expenses. This total sum comprises PKR 26,000 million development budget and Rs. 15,584 million current budget. A major part of the budget, around 63%, is given away for the development purposes and a small proportion of 37% is given away to deal with the current expenditures of the school education. The question arises here is that, whether the budget is actually spent the way it was assigned? During the last FY 2012-13, the total revised budget observed a downfall of about 40%, wherein the development budget was under-utilized by a massive 93% and the current budget was over-utilized by 62%. This again reveals that the budget is not utilized the way it should be, leaving many development purposes overlooked.

Centre for Peace and Development Initiatives (CPDI) project “Our Money Our Responsibility”, supported by Ilm Ideas, has contributed for the efforts to assess the implementation status of right to education in two districts of Punjab: Jhang and Toba Tek Singh. It not only performs the analysis of the budgetary allocation in education sector but also deeply analyzes the supply and demand side information at the grassroots level through the Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) covering both the schools and the households of school going children. This project covers 310 sampled schools in total from both the districts which constitutes about 10% of the total number of schools in these districts.

This is the second year of the project, in which PETS surveys were repeated for comparison with the baseline. Latest Information Technology (IT) tool smart phones based survey for data collection and activity monitoring has been utilized for conducting survey with much reduced chances of error and improved efficacy. It serves both the purposes of monitoring field activities along with the creation of direct data base on the server.

The report presents informational facts and figures through the analysis of primary, elementary and secondary school education specific data.
Chapter 1: Research Objectives and Methodology

This chapter discusses the research objectives, data sample, research analysis framework, data sources and data collection techniques.

1.1 Research Objectives

1. To examine budgetary/financial allocation and its disbursement in the education sector at the district level and to identify leakage of allocated funds.
2. To investigate on-ground realities and the situation at school level, hence to find answers to the questions provided below:
   i. Are funds provided to schools?
   ii. Are funds provided to schools in time?
   iii. Do schools receive all the allocated funds?
   iv. Do schools spend all the funds in full? If yes, then on what?
   v. Do schools generate their own resources?
   vi. Do schools comply with Right to Education?
   vii. Are schools apolitical?
3. To gauge access to education, quality of education and the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries availing these educational services.
4. To propose an array of recommendations intended to aid policy makers in sorting out problems that were highlighted in the study.

1.2 Research Sampling

This sample covers about 10% of the entire population i.e. total number of schools in both the districts. About 156 schools in both districts were surveyed in the first phase of the first year and 154 schools in the second phase of the same year. This is the second year of project, and the entire exercise of the first year would be replicated this year.

We are in the third phase of the project, which includes survey of 67 schools in District Toba Tek Singh and 89 schools in District Jhang. The sample schools were selected by using a two stage stratified random sampling technique, in consideration with the level and type of school. To assess the satisfaction of beneficiaries about service delivery, facilities and performance of the SC, parents of four children from each sampled school were interviewed.

Given below is the sampling of schools in District Toba Tek Singh for the second year survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level-wise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Sampling of District TobaTek Singh- Phase IV

1.3 Research Analysis Framework

Research framework was designed to discuss every possible dimension of interest from this survey. The analysis framework was designed for both the primary and secondary data. As for the Secondary data, the district budget books were used to extract the education sector

---

8 Respondents for beneficiary assessment survey (BAS) were identified through convenient sampling.
budgetary data, i.e. allocated budget as well as the revised budget. The report analyzes only the non-development data, with its classification into salary and non-salary budget. Other relevant secondary data was also obtained from various accessible online sources. The framework determined the dimensions of analyzing the budget trends; identify leakages as well as to calculate per unit cost in terms of schools and students. The formula used to identify leakages is given below:

\[
\text{Leakage} = \frac{\text{Capitations Grant Received (RE)} - \text{Intended Capitation grants (BE)}}{\text{Intended Capitation grants (BE)}}
\]

The report further extends to discuss the minute details of the education sector from the information gathered through predesigned survey forms, from both teachers and parents. The analysis looks down into the enrollments and pass outs, teachers’ position, availability of various facilities, level of satisfaction, awareness of parents about various child related matters, efficient working of School Councils, average expenditure on a child, source of income of schools, informal fee if any among other dimensions.

The research analysis framework has been further designed to inquire about seven key questions which are related to funds, their timely delivery and usage, generation of funds through other sources, political influence on schools and the compliance with Right to Education (RTE). These questions cover a broader area of analysis and provide interesting information not only through the PETS, but also through Focus group Discussions (FGDs).

1.4 Data Sources

The primary data has been collected through PETS questionnaires designed for household heads and service providers i.e. the head teachers or senior teachers in the absence of head teachers. Key Informant interviews for education managers such as the EDOs and DEOs were also designed to gather relevant data from them. FGDs were conducted to reach the ground realities of the education system through discussions with parents, teachers and School Council members. The field team also gathered copies of the records from the schools and offices wherever required.

As for the secondary data, Punjab budget books and district budget books were used for the analysis of education budgetary data. Other online sources such as the Punjab Millennium Development Goals report, School improvement plans, Alif Ailan Pakistan district education rankings etc. were reviewed for additional information.

1.5 Primary Data Collection Technique

The third phase PETS is an improved version of the previous surveys as it uses an advanced Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tool for the collection of primary data. CPDI for the first time has introduced smartphones based survey for data collection and activity monitoring. It is an efficient and effective mode of collecting data from the field; as it not only saves the time and energy of the enumerators but also monitors the field activities with enhanced efficacy. The automatically generated database keeps a track of the activities and, through regularly generated reports, can help to identify missing data, if any. Hence this ultimately reduces the chances of error and the problem of missing data.
Chapter 2: District Budgetary Analysis

Education budget is divided into current and development budget. The former is used to meet the salary expenses, operational costs and other miscellaneous expenses whereas the latter is used to cater the major expenditure heads relating to infrastructure and development of new projects. The educational institutes, particularly the schools need to be maintained on regular basis which requires operational budget. Therefore this chapter discusses the current education budget of the district\(^9\).

2.1 Total Current Education Budget\(^{10}\)

The current education budget has shown an upward surge over the successive years. The budget allocated for the fiscal year 2014-15 is PKR 4,985 million as compared to the previous year 2013-14 having an allocation of PKR 4,131.9 million. The increase of 20.65% in the current year’s budget is quite evident in figure 2.1. While comparing the various FYs, the data shows that the largest percentage increase of 46% in allocated budget has been observed in FY 2010-11; however the increase of 853 million rupees is historic and the highest in terms of rupees in million.

![Figure 2.1: Current Education Budget of District Toba Tek Singh](image-url)

---

\(^9\) Statistics mentioned henceforth are provided in two decimal places while the calculations presented in the report are based upon numerics that go up to six to eight decimal places.

\(^{10}\) All the calculations for the current budget for BE 2014-15 in this chapter also include special non-salary budget (NSB) grant under Punjab Government Letter No. PESRP-ADA 1-09/2014/12282; dated: June 20, 2014
2.2 Current Budget: Salary and Non-Salary

Current budget is further classified into Salary and Non-Salary budget. The salary budget as the name suggests is used to pay the salaries of the support staff, clerks, teachers, head teachers, and various public officials in education department. The other part of the current budget, known as the non-salary budget, is used to bear the operating expenses other than the salary related expenses such as repairs, maintenance and fixations, administrative costs, utilities and rents etc. Table 2.1 shows that, of the total current budget, a minor sum is allocated for the non-salary budget whereas more than 98% is allocated for the salary budget with exceptions in FY 2009-10 and 2014-15 where 3% and 8.6 % is allocated respectively under the non-salary head. The non-salary allocation in the current FY 2014-15 is the highest percentage of allocated budget in any year to meet the operating expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary (%)</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>98.16</td>
<td>99.12</td>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>99.26</td>
<td>99.39</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Salary (%)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Percentage share of Salary and Non-Salary Budget

The analysis of the budgetary data from another perspective gives interesting insights. The non-salary budget estimate (BE) of FY 2014-15 is 1813.7% higher than the non-salary BE of the FY 2011-12. Similarly the non-salary budget allocation has increased by 55% in FY 2013-14 and by 1119.32% in FY 2014-15 as compared to previous FY. This implies that the government has paid attention to the voices being raised for increase in the non-salary budget (NSB) and has raised the NSB substantially.

Moreover, as the figure 2.2 presents, the comparison of allocated and revised budget shows that, despite the paramount allocation of salary budget, revised budget has exceeded the budget estimate by 2.8%, 3% and 1.7% in FY 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 respectively. In case of non-salary budget, where on one hand the revised estimate of FY 2011-12 shows...
leakage of 2.3%, the RE of FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 depicts overutilization of 87.3% and 92.6% respectively.

The shift from leakage towards overutilization of operating budget brings us to two possible conclusions: Firstly, the district government is determined to stop the leakages and provide the required resources even if these are more than the actual allocation. Secondly, owing to the inaccurate anticipation of the district government, given the high revised estimates in previous years, the allocated non-salary budget is not sufficient when compared to the actual needs of the district, thus resulting in a high revised budget estimates by the end of the year.

2.3 Current Budget for Primary Education

The year wise current budget for Primary Education can be seen in figure 2.3 below. The budget shows an overall increasing trend. The budget estimate for the current FY 2014-15 is Rs. 3,297.4 million which is 18.8% greater than that of the last year and 57% greater than the FY 2011-12. The figure also presents the salary and non-salary classification of the primary budget. The salary budget has increased in every year whereas the non-salary budget allocation has experienced a downfall of around 37.4% and 46.3% in the FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively. However, the non-salary budget allocation is 490 times (49667%) higher in the FY 2014-15 as compared to the last FY, similarly it is 167 times (16615%) higher than the allocation in FY 2011-12.

The salary budget, for the past four years, covers on average about 99.97% of the total current primary education budget. Nevertheless, the data depicts REs of salary budget higher than the BEs in these years. Contrarily, the non-salary allocations are far below 1% for primary education during the same years. The comparison of BE and RE for these years shows that the leakage of 39.3% in non-salary budget of FY 2011-12 has been reverted to an overspending of 5067% in the FY 2013-14. This implies that: a) the problem of leakage of funds is no more apparent in the budgetary data, and b) the insufficient allocation of the non-salary budget results in immensely high revised estimates. (figure 2.3)
2.4 Current Budget for Secondary Education

The secondary education budget has also been increasing over years, where more than 98% is allocated to the salary expenses against the meager amount of less than 2% for non-salary expenditure. The situation is slightly better as compared to the Primary education budget where the non-salary allocation is almost non-existent. The non-salary budget has showed decreasing trend from FY 2009-10 till FY 2012-13. However, the non-salary allocation in the recent years has somewhat improved, showing increase in allocation of 29% and 1000% in FY 2013-14 and 2014-15 respectively. (Figure 2.4)

![Figure 2.4: Current Education Budget for Secondary Schools](image)

Despite the low allocations for non-salary budget, there has been a leakage of 4% in FY 2010-11 and of 6.9% in FY 2011-12. This trend of leakage does not seem to exist any longer as the REs of the FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 display an over spending of 70.4 % and 66.8% respectively.

2.5 Comparison of Primary and Secondary Education Budget

The comparison between the budget allocation for Primary and Secondary Education is shown in figure 2.5 below. It is apparent that about 67-70% of the current budget is allocated for Primary Education against less than 30% allocated for Secondary Education. The government gives more funds to Primary education, because of the large number of Primary schools as compared to the secondary schools.
2.6 Unit Cost

Unit cost per student and per school has also been calculated by the research team. Unit cost has been calculated by using the district budget statistics provided in the start of this chapter and the enrolment and school statistics provided by the EDO. During the year 2013-14, total 270,659 students went to 1170 schools in the district while 176,304 students out of the total were enrolled in 706 primary schools. Table 2.2 (below) tells the story of the unit cost; during FY 2013-14 the government spent PKR 16,352 on each primary school student in district Toba Tek Singh out of which only PKR 104 was spent on non-salary expenditure. Whereas an average of total PKR 4,083,531 was spent on each primary school with a meager average of PKR 25,984 as non-salary expenditure during FY 2013-14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-14 (RE)</th>
<th>Unit cost per Student (PKR)</th>
<th>Unit cost per School (PKR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>16,248.23</td>
<td>15,392.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Salary</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,352.28</td>
<td>15,641.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Unit Cost per Student and per School
Chapter 3: Service Delivery Assessment

District Toba Tek Singh has 67% net enrollment rate for girls and 71% for the boys in Primary schools\(^{11}\). According to a recently launched report by Alif Ailaan, more than 80% of the schools have electricity, water and boundary wall. Given the precise information about the district in various studies, this study intends to probe into various possible dimensions in detail. Therefore, the survey was conducted in 67 schools of District Toba Tek Singh.

The Head teachers of the schools were interviewed regarding the various service related matters at school level. However, the senior or junior teacher was interviewed in absence of the head teacher or senior teacher respectively. This part of the exercise has been very imperative in capturing the supply side of the Education sector. The questionnaire covered various dimensions including enrollment, passed out students, availability of teachers, basic facilities, information about the school councils, monitoring and evaluation, as well as the political influence in education sector if any, among others. This chapter presents the results obtained from the PETS conducted at sampled schools.

3.1 Sampled Schools

A total of 66 schools were selected for Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) in district Toba Tek Singh. The sample included fair proportion of all levels of schools with about 48% primary, 32% elementary and 20% secondary schools. Similarly, due care was taken to include three different types of schools, where around 36% boys, 23% girls, and 41% mixed schools were part of the sample. (Figure 3.1)

3.2 Information about the Head Teachers

3.2.1 Gender and Residential Status of Head Teachers

The study includes responses from both the male and female Head Teachers. Figure 3.2 shows that male and female HTs were almost 50% overall in all sampled schools. The figure also presents gender segregation according to the level of schools.

\(^{11}\)Alif Ailaan Pakistan District Education Rankings 2014
The HTs were asked if they were residents of Union Councils where the sampled schools were situated. About 48.5% of the HTs of sampled schools were found to be the residents of the UCs against 51.5% non-resident HTs (Figure 3.3). The HTs of Primary schools were mostly resident as compared to the HTs in Middle and Secondary schools.

### 3.2.2 Level of Education of Head Teachers

The HTs were also asked about the highest level of education attained by them. About 53% of the HTs at Primary schools held Masters Degree, 34.4% held Bachelors degree and 12.5% held, under Bachelors degrees. This shows that the sampled Primary schools include a significant percentage of Head Teachers who are under qualified for the post.

The situation is somewhat better in Middle and Secondary schools where about 85.7% and 92.3% HTs hold Masters Degree respectively. None of the HTs was qualified below bachelors. Overall, 71.2% HTs are Masters qualified, 22.7% are Bachelors qualified and only 6.1% are below bachelors as shown in figure 3.4.

### 3.2.3 Work Experience of Head Teachers

The experience of the HTs is one of the important indicators of the performance of the schools as a more experienced HT can manage the school affairs much better in comparison to an inexperienced HT.
The HTs were asked about their total work experience. About 73% of the HTs overall had work experience of ten years and more and only 13.6% of the HTs had an experience of less than three years. (Figure 3.5)

They were also asked to share the number of years they have served as HTs in any school and as HTs in the sampled school (Figure: 3.6; 3.7). Thirteen out of nineteen HTs have served in the same school for more than ten years, constituting about 19.7% of the total HTs. Seventeen out of nineteen HTs have been serving in the sampled school for three to ten years, constituting about 25.7% of the total HTs. The remaining 54.5% have been serving in the same school for less than three years.

The data implies that HTs at different school levels have different years of work experience. The HTs mostly have less than three years of experience of serving in the capacity of HT in the same school. The remaining 49.4% have experience in excess of three years. Having experienced HTs gives rise to a hope of improvement in the Education sector where the heads are not only well aware of the problems, but hold experience to resolve the matters handily.
3.3 Information about Teachers

3.3.1 Residential Status of School Teachers

The head teachers in all types of schools were asked to share the number of teachers that were resident of respective union council of the school. Figure 3.8 above shares detailed data with respect to the types of schools and different grades. The data shows that overall, less than 50 percent of the teachers are resident of the UCs where the sampled schools exist, this means that half of the teachers have to travel every day from one UC to another to reach the school. This travel causes wastage of time, energy and money and is more problematic for female teachers especially in the rural areas where the mode of transportation are both rare and poor.

3.3.2 Teachers’ Position

Figure 3.9 above displays the number of filled teaching positions against allocated seats. The data shows that around 90% and more of the allocated seats were filled in both the years;
where most number of vacant seats existed in Primary schools. A comparison of both the years shows that the percentage vacant seats for Primary schools increased up to 10% in FY 2013-14 against 7.6% last year whereas the percentage vacant seats for Secondary schools decreased up to 3% in FY 2013-14 from 4.2% in FY 2012-13. However, the percentage of vacant seats remained almost same for Middle schools in both the years.

The vacant seats imply that the number of teachers in schools is less than the number of required teachers which might result in extra burden on already present teachers in terms of teaching the other classes and performing duties of other teachers in addition to their own assigned tasks. The teachers being over burden might give less attention than required to the students, ultimately affecting their performance, especially at the basic level of education- the Primary education.

During an FGD the teachers said: *There should be more hiring of Primary school teachers as the number of teachers available for Primary classes is not sufficient in the schools, increasing burden of the existing staff members and ultimately affecting the quality of education.*

### 3.3.3 Teachers Attendance

The survey also attempted to find out the percentage of teachers present on a random day. The attendance was less than 100% in all sampled schools. The data depicted that about 96% teachers were on duty in boys’ schools, 89.6% in girls’ schools and 94% in mixed schools, implying lowest percentage attendance in girls’ schools. The female teachers who were mostly absent were those teaching grade VI-X. However, the attendance was quite better at the primary level.

![Figure 3.10: Percentage Teachers' Attendance](image)

**Figure 3.10: Percentage Teachers’ Attendance**

### 3.3.4 Level of Education of Teachers

The survey also included questions about the level of education pursued by the teachers teaching in the sampled schools. Figure 3.11 and figure 3.12 depicts the level of education by

---

12 On the day of survey
types and levels of schools respectively. The data shows that about 64% of the teachers in boys schools hold masters degree, 27% hold bachelors’ degree and 9.1% are those having below bachelors’ degree. The percentage of teachers in girls’ school having masters degree is 56% which is much better as compared to mixed school teachers having less than 50% master degree holders.

On the other hand, the analysis according to the various school levels has brought us to the conclusion that teachers in Secondary schools are well educated as compared to those in Primary and Middle schools. To our surprise, about 41% of the teachers in Primary schools have not even done bachelors. The teachers who themselves are not well educated cannot improve the quality of education at schools, especially at the basic education level of grade I-V.

![Figure 3.11: Teacher’s Education in different school types and level of schools](image)

### 3.4 Enrolment and Pass out

The research team tried to probe into the performance of schools by knowing the enrolment of students and the annual results of the schools. The overall number of enrolled students in 2014 in the sampled schools has increased by 10.5% as compared to the previous year. Gender and grade wise segregation of data further establishes that the number of enrolled boys in Secondary grades has increased the most by 15.6% whereas the number of girls enrolled in same classes only increased by 4.8% during the same period. During year 2013-14 enrolment of the girls in primary schools increased by 6.6% as compared to year 2012-13; whereas the number for boys rose about 12.5% for the same period. (Figure: 3.12)
While speaking in and FGD the SC members mentioned about the increase in enrolment and their efforts in this regard: *We make efforts to increase the school enrolment. We try to create awareness among the parents about the importance of education and we are successful in increasing enrolment to some extent.*

Moving ahead further with the calculation on the appeared and passed out percentages of the students in different grades the research team found out that the ninth class result remained fairly low during year 2012-13 and merely around 50% of the students, both boys and girls, got passed through the exams.

---

**Figure 3.13: Appeared and passed out in Year 2012-13**

Over all pass out percentage for primary and elementary classes remained 93% and 95% respectively with both boys and girls results hovering around 93% for primary grades, whereas the boys were found ahead of girls in elementary classes with 98% and 88% respectively. In class tenth, for the same year, 89% boys passed as against 75% of girls while over all class X pass-out percentage remained 84%. (Figure: 3.13)

In year 2013-14, as compared to the previous year, total 4.6% more students appeared in primary elementary and secondary exams. Results of primary and elementary grades showed similar pass out trends as were seen in year 2012-13 whereas ninth and tenth class results fell drastically to 42% and 75% respectively. Girls performed better in 2013-14 and improved their pass out percentage by 7% in 9th and 9% in 10th grades while boys’ results declined by 15% and 18% in the same classes respectively. (Figures 3.13, 3.14)
3.5 Facilities at Schools

3.5.1 Condition of Class Rooms

The data collected through PETS shows that almost all classrooms in Boys’ schools have electricity connection against 96.6% rooms in mixed schools and 92.7% rooms in girls’ schools. The HTs were also asked to enumerate the rooms that need major and minor repairs separately. The diagram below shows that classrooms in all types of sampled schools need some sort of minor or major repairs. About 24.8% rooms in girls’ school need major repairs as compared to 16.7% rooms in boys and 12.2% rooms in mixed schools. Moreover, 14.4% boys’ schools need minor repairs in comparison to 10.8% mixed and 8% girls’ schools respectively. Summarily, most of the rooms in girls’ schools are in need of major repairs whereas most of the boys’ schools are in need of minor repairs respectively.
3.5.2 Availability of Basic Facilities

It is difficult for the schools to produce improved outcomes in the absence of basic facilities at schools such as: libraries, science labs, toilets, boundary wall, staff rooms, play grounds, electricity etc.

Figure 3.16: Facilities at schools

Figure 3.16 above reflects the percentage of available facilities at schools. The Primary schools do not have libraries and science lab, therefore this question was asked in other two school levels. Less than 15% middle schools have libraries and less than 5% have science labs. Overall, only 26.5% of middle and secondary schools have libraries, and 32.4% have science labs. Electricity and functional toilets are the two facilities that are present in almost all the schools. Staffrooms are rare in primary schools as compared to secondary schools. Separate toilets were also not present in all primary and middle schools. Around 78.8% of all schools had both: boundary walls and student space and 74.2% had play areas. Although a number of schools do have basic facilities, but it is the responsibility of district government to make these facilities available in all the schools in the district.

3.5.3 Drinking Water Facility

Drinking water is also a very basic necessity due to which the HTs were also asked about the sources of drinking water available in schools. Figure 3.17 below shows that well or bore hole is the commonly used source of drinking water in schools whereas a small percentage of schools, that is about 6.1% of the schools also use piped water and water tanks both.
3.5.4 Text Books

The timely provision of books is important for the students to save their time, and for the completion of syllabus within the respective education year. The survey conducted with the HTs also included questions relevant to the provision of text books to students in sampled schools. The school level wise data depicts that all Primary schools received and distributed the books till April 15 in the year 2014-15 against 88% in the previous year. The Secondary schools faced the highest percentage delays in the provision of books, followed by Middle schools in both the years. (Figure 3.18, 3.19)

![Figure 3.18: Receiving and Distribution of Text Books in Schools in 2013-14](image)

The data shows that on the whole, books had been received and distributed by 86.4% of the schools till April 15 in 2013-14 while the remaining 13.6% of the schools did the distribution later than April 15. On the other hand, the situation appears to be much improved in 2014-15, where about 94% of the schools had distributed the books till April 15, while remaining 6% faced delay in receiving and distribution. Even 6% of the schools hold a large number of students who suffer due to the delay in books provision. The EDO education should take this
matter into hand to minimize the delay in the provision of books to the students as much as possible.

3.6 School Councils

3.6.1 Presence and Composition of School Councils

The data shows that all the sampled schools had their respective school councils as shown in figure 3.20. While analyzing the composition of the SCs, the data depicts that the SCs are mainly comprised of parents, following general members and teachers. Overall, SCs have 50.6% parents, 32.1% general members and 17.3% teachers. An analysis at the individual school level shows that although the parents are the major portion of members of SCs in all schools, yet the percentage of parents’ share is less in Secondary schools as compared to Primary and Middle schools. However the number of teachers as SC members and general members is comparatively higher in Secondary schools. (Figure 3.21)

3.6.2 Frequency of School Council Meetings

About 98.5% of the HTs were the chairpersons of the SC, therefore they were asked to share the frequency of SC meetings of their school councils. The SCs mostly had meetings on monthly basis, where about 83.3% of the HTs informed of holding meetings every month. About 15.2% said meetings were held every week and a very minor percentage of HTs admitted of having meetings on yearly basis rather than every month or week. The SCs meet to discuss the matters relevant

Figure 3.20: Number of Schools having School Councils
Figure 3.21: Composition of School Councils
Figure 3.22: Percentage Frequency of SC Meetings
to schools and meetings that are held after longer time periods indicate that the SCs are not active in resolving the school affairs. This also raises question on their effective functionality.

### 3.6.3 Functionality and Satisfaction with School Council Performance

In answer to the question about the functionality of SCs, the HTs informed that SCs were functional in all the sampled schools. The HTs were further asked to share the frequency with which SCs performed various tasks such as: monitoring attendance, increasing admission, bringing physical improvements in schools, employing teachers on temporary basis as and when required, and to oversee the co-curricular activities. The figure 3.23 below displays the frequency of the functions.

![Figure 3.23: Frequency of Functions Performed by SC](image)

The head teachers, when asked about performance of various functions by the SCs, 59% of the HTs said that SCs monitor attendance on monthly basis while 21% of them mentioned that their school council never performed this function. About 36.4% of the HTs said that SCs made efforts to increase enrollment of student in respective schools every month while 16.7% said their SC never made any efforts for this purpose. When asked about the co-curricular activities, highest number of the HTs, (38.5%) accepted that their School Councils never did anything regarding the co-curricular activities at the schools.

Where on one hand, 44.6% and 38.5% of the HTs verified of the struggle of SCs in bringing physical improvement on monthly and quarterly basis, there were 13.8% HTs, on the other hand, who denied of such efforts by SC. Last but not the least, the HTs were also asked about the efforts of the SC to cope with any requirement of hiring temporary teacher to fill the vacant post or get additional human resource for increasing needs. About 50% of the HTs said that no such function had been ever performed by SCs while 15.6%, 10.9%, 6.3% and 17.2% of the head teachers said their SC performed this function on monthly, quarterly, six monthly and on yearly basis respectively.

The teachers said during FGD: *The SC members do not visit the schools. Even the members are least aware of the functionality and performance of SCs and do not perform the assigned functions regularly.*
After asking the HTs about the existence of SC, composition of SC and frequency of functions that lay in the domain of SC, they were further asked to express their satisfaction with the performance of school councils. About 62.5% of the HTs expressed satisfaction with SC performance, 9.4% were very satisfied, 23.4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and a meager 4.7% were not at all satisfied overall. The satisfaction is highest in Middle schools and lowest in Secondary schools. A very small percentage of HTs expressed a very high level of satisfaction, where Primary school HTs took the lead by 15.6%. Although the SCs fail to perform a lot of functions as much regularly as required, yet most of the HTs seemed quite satisfied with their performance. (Figure 3.24)

![Figure 3.24: Satisfaction with the Performance of School Councils](image)

### 3.7 Monitoring and Evaluation

The schools are generally visited by a number of government officials at various time intervals. The HTs also shared the information regarding visits made by the officials which include EDO, DEO, AEO, DMO, M & E Assistant among others. Figure 3.25 below shows that the least number of schools were visited by EDO and DMO. The M&E Assistants visited almost all the Primary and Middle schools, with an exception of Secondary schools where only 76.9% schools were visited as reported by HTs. The AEOs visited all sampled Middle schools, 96.9% Primary schools and only 38.5% Secondary schools whereas the DEO visited 81% Middle schools, 69.2% Secondary schools and 65.6% primary schools respectively. The comparison between the various school levels shows that the secondary schools are least visited by the officials as compared to primary and middle.
The M&E Officials visit the schools quite on and off for a number of reasons which include: meeting with head teacher, teachers and SC members, observing classes and facilities and checking school records. The HTs of all the schools were asked to share the purpose of visits of M&E Officials. Figure 3.26 shows that more than 90% of the schools were visited by the M&E officials to meet with the school head teachers, to observe classes and facilities, and to check school records. About 87.9% visits were made to meet the teachers and least visits were made to meet the SC members. While comparing the visits with respect to the level of schools, the data shows that fewer visits are made in Secondary schools for the above stated purposes as compared to Primary and Middle schools.
Chapter 4: Citizen’s Voice

Capturing the supply side alone cannot serve the purpose, until and unless the demand side is also incorporated. Therefore, being a comprehensive study, the responses of 264 household heads (HHH) has also been included to find out their level of information and satisfaction with the schools where their children are enrolled. Four parents of four randomly selected students for each sampled school were interviewed regarding their own level of education, occupation, number of school going children, level of satisfaction with the facilities, the education expenses etc. The responses from the focus group discussions (FGDs) conducted with parents, teachers and SC members were also included to support the data with the ground realities.

4.1 Information about Parents

4.1.1 Level of Education

Level of education of parents/guardians is very important for the education of the children as generally educated parents can be more concerned about the education of their children as compared to the uneducated parents. The beneficiaries assessment survey (BAS) asked the household heads (HHHs) about their level of education. Figure 4.1 below shows that according to the information provided by HHHs, about 43% female and 25% male HHHs are illiterate; Overall 26% of the HHHs are illiterate. None of the female HHHs held education above secondary level while 21% and 5% male heads held secondary and intermediate education respectively. Only 5% and 6% male heads held bachelors and masters degrees respectively, (Figure: 4.1). These statistics depict that the students coming to these schools hail from the families that do not have long affiliation with education and this situation might lead to lack of interest for education in the children as well as in parents.

![Figure 4.1: Level of Education of House Hold Heads (HHH)](image-url)
4.1.2 Employment Status of Household Heads

The respondents were then asked to share the nature of occupation of the HHHs as shown in figure 4.2 below. The nature of occupation can somewhat explain the affordability of the parents to educate their children. According to the figure, majority of the male heads i.e. more than 75% collectively, are engaged in casual labor or are self-employed or do farming or livestock. The minimal ratio of the female household heads does not change the overall situation where more than 75% household heads have these three above mentioned occupations with government employment being the fourth largest occupation at 17% (Figure: 4.2). Above statistics depict that most of the children going to these schools belong to the households that have low income occupations; this further implies that they might not be able to make any special investment in the education of their children.

![Figure 4.2: Occupation of House Hold Heads (HHH)](image)

4.2 Number of Enrolled Children

The respondents were asked to share the number of children between the age of five to sixteen in each sampled household and it was further inquired that how many of them were getting education. The data received shows that overall 84% children from the sampled household were attending schools. Further, gender segregation of the data shows that 86% of the male children were going to schools whereas this percentage fell down by further four percent to 82.5%. This implies that the dream of universal literacy is still far away and a lot more is required to be done to bring all out of school children to the schools. (Table: 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-16 years age</td>
<td>School Going</td>
<td>Between 5-16 years age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong> →</td>
<td><strong>86 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.56 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Gender wise segregation of school going children
During FGDs with the teachers, they said: *It is very difficult to educate parents about the importance of education and to convince them get their children enrolled in schools but we still make efforts in this regard.*

### 4.3 Facilities at Schools

#### 4.3.1 Availability of Facilities in Schools

The respondents were asked to share the availability of various facilities in their child’s school. Figure 4.3 displays the availability of basic facilities while figure 4.4 shows the availability of education facilities.

---

**Figure 4.3: Availability of Basic Facilities in Schools**

According to the information provided by the respondents, more than 80% schools have almost all the basic facilities except for gas which is hardly present in 3% of the sampled schools as informed by them. School buildings, electricity, boundary walls, furniture for teachers, drinking water and wash rooms are present in most of the schools as compared to other facilities such as running water in wash rooms, furniture for students, and playgrounds which are comparatively less in the same schools.

---

**Figure 4.4: Availability of Education Facilities**
Similarly, in response to questions about the education facilities, the parents informed that almost all schools had black boards, teaching staff and text books were also provided but the schools were lacking computer labs, libraries and sports equipment for the students to play. These facilities are very important in today’s world of technological advancement. Computer labs and libraries should be constructed in all schools. The sports equipment should also be provided to keep students physically active in addition to improving their knowledge and intellect.

4.3.2 Satisfaction with the Available Facilities

The respondents were not only asked about the available facilities but also to express their level of satisfaction with those facilities.

The respondents mostly seemed satisfied with almost all the facilities. The dissatisfaction was highest with the gas facility, followed by furniture for students, school building and washrooms. Besides this, the respondents were about 90% satisfied with the facilities in one way or the other- that is either satisfied, partially satisfied or highly satisfied. The percentage of high satisfaction is almost negligible as shown in the figure 4.5 above.

The respondents also expressed their level of satisfaction with the available education facilities. The figure 4.6 below shows that parents were somewhat satisfied with the facilities which include available teaching staff, computer staff, library, sports equipment, black board and text books. There was slight dissatisfaction of about 3.8% and 3.2% with the teaching staff and computer lab respectively. About 6.1% respondents were highly satisfied with available text books facility, while 5% were partially satisfied and 88.2% were satisfied. Overall, the dissatisfaction seemed quite low as informed by the parents.
4.3.3 Availability of Chowkidar

When asked about the presence of a chowkidar at schools, about 47.3% parents responded in an affirmative against 48.9% who denied the presence of chowkidar. Moreover 3.8% of the parents did not know if there was any chowkidar or not. Summarily, less than 50% of the schools had chowkidars.

4.3.4 Parent’s Satisfaction

In addition to the satisfaction with facilities at schools, the parents must also be concerned about the quality of education imparted in the school where their children are enrolled. Few variables that can be used as indicators for this purpose include teaching methods, response of teachers towards the queries of the children, and an overall active administration. In response to these questions, figure 4.8 presents the responses of the parents.

The satisfaction is highest for Secondary schools as compared to Primary and Middle schools for all three variables. Unfortunately, parents who have children going to Primary and Middle schools are not hundred percent satisfied but overall more than 93% respondents were satisfied with the pedagogical methods, teacher’s responses in addition to school administration.
4.4 Who Accompanies Child to School

The Primary schools are generally large in number and present in almost close vicinity therefore 65.6% students of primary schools commute alone and 29.7% move in groups respectively. Only 4.7% of the students are picked and dropped by family members. Similarly, 55.4% of the Middle school children go on their own, 32.5% move in groups and only 12% go with their family members respectively. In case of Secondary schools, which are generally located at long distances, a decrease of the percentage of children who travel to the school on their own is witnessed. About 35% lesser students go to Secondary schools on their own as compared to students going to Primary schools. About 52.8% move in groups and 17% are accompanied by family members. (Figure 4.9)

During FGD, the participants said: *Normally children studying in schools go alone which gets difficult for those students who are enrolled in Middle and High Schools as schools other than Primary are located in far flung areas. Therefore the government should provide transport facility to the students commuting from nearby villages.*
4.5 Information about School Council

The respondents were also asked various questions regarding the existence and functioning of school councils. Of the 264 respondents who were surveyed, only 23.5% knew about the existence of SCs. About 18.6% said that SCs were quite functional. When asked if they were members of school councils, only 17.8% were found to be SC members, and only 16.7% were invited on the SC meetings conducted on regular basis. Overall, only around 12% of the parents marked SC performance as good or excellent. (Figure 4.10)

The figure is self-explanatory of the fact that parents are mostly unaware about the existence of SCs. Even those who know about it do not seem to know much about the functionality of SCs, meetings of SCs, performance of SCs etc. The unawareness of the parents also adds to the unsatisfactory performance of SCs as there is no one to hold the SC members accountable for their performance.

The participants of the FGD said: The parents are unaware of the existence of school councils. They should be made aware of the presence, functionality and performance of SCs through various campaigns.

4.6 Out of Pocket Expenditure

The poor parents mostly find it difficult to bear the educational expenses of their children due to various financial constraints. With an average family size of 6.7 members, it gets really difficult for the parents to provide all the children quality education. Therefore, survey included questions about the various out of pocket expenditures that parents have to bear.

During FGDs with the parents, they said: We have to pay a monthly fee of Rs. 20 to the schools as Farogh-e-Taleem fund. The schools however do not charge us any other sum of money on monthly basis.

About 18% parents informed of paying examination fee of Rs. 26.3 on average, about 11.8% said they paid school leaving fee of an average Rs. 83.87, and about 10% pay student fund of Rs. 117 on average. A very small percentage of parents informed of paying maintenance fund and admission fee. When asked about monthly fee and stationery cost, almost all the respondents reported that they paid Rs 20 and Rs. 526.4 on monthly basis and randomly respectively. (Table 4.2)
The table shared below shows that the parents are still bearing a number of educational expenses for their children. Where on one hand it is the right of every child between 5 to 16 years of age to have free education as determined by the law, the parents on the other hand have been seen paying a sum of money under different heads and at different intervals of time. Of all the various types of expenses, paying monthly fee is a clear violation of Right to Education and should be seriously considered by the concerned authorities to keep it a voluntary contribution rather than a compulsory fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission Fee</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>58.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Fee FTF</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Fee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>26.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/ Note Books/ Stationery Cost</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>526.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leaving Fee</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fund</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Cost (Rs)</td>
<td>117.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Out of Pocket Expenditure as reported by Parents
Chapter 5: School Analysis

This Chapter deals with the availability of monetary resources at school level, expenditure of schools, and government’s efforts to implement the RTE. The team has interviewed head teachers, senior teacher and school council members to assess the situation on ground. The most difficult part of the survey was to audit the cash books and FTF registers of 67 sampled schools. The team rendered all the efforts to get the copies of the above mentioned financial record from all the sampled schools and perform critical analysis of income and expenditure of the schools.

5.1 Do Schools get their Funds?

The schools always need monetary resources to run the day to day affairs. Generally there are three major sources of income for the schools which include: School Council Fund, Administrative Budget and Special Development Grants. The Primary and Middle schools are entitled to the school council fund whereas the Secondary schools receive administrative budget. The development grants are given to the schools to meet the infrastructure needs.

The PETS included questions about the obtainment of SC funds and administrative funds by the sampled schools. Table 5.1 below shows that all the sampled Primary and Middle schools received the SC fund and all Secondary schools received administrative budget in the FY 2013-14, as reported by the Head Teachers and verified from the school record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Received by Schools</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Budget</td>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Council Fund</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Funds received by Schools in FY 2013-14

5.2 Do Funds Reach on Time?

The timely delivery of funds is very important for the smooth functioning of the school related affairs. Delay in the delivery would not serve the purpose for which the funds are actually allocated. The HTs were asked to share the information about the time span in which the funds have been disbursed to them in two recent fiscal years. Table 5.2 below shows that the funds are mostly received in the third quarter in both the years. Where a very small percentage of schools also received funds in the first two quarters in FY 2012-13, none of the Primary and Middle schools received funds in the first quarter in FY 2013-14 respectively. About 3.4% Primary schools received funds in second quarter and 96.6% received in third quarter, whereas almost all sampled Middle schools received funds in the third quarter of FY 2013-14 as informed by the HTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012-13</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q-1</td>
<td>Q-2</td>
<td>Q-3</td>
<td>Q-4</td>
<td>Q-1</td>
<td>Q-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
<td>87.5 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>90.5 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.7 %</td>
<td>5.7 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Delivery of Funds to Schools
The number of schools facing delay, in terms of receiving funds in the third quarter, increased in 2013-14 as compared to the last year rather than improving in terms of receiving funds in first two quarters.

5.3 Do Schools get all the Funds?

The Primary and Middle schools are entitled to receive school council funds as discussed earlier in this chapter. Each Primary school is entitled to Rs. 20000 per annum\(^{13}\) and each Middle school is entitled to Rs. 50000 per annum. All sampled Primary schools were entitled to a sum of Rs 800000 and Secondary schools were entitled to a sum of Rs 1050000 collectively. Figure 5.1 below shows that both types of schools: Primary and Middle have received the SC fund as per the allocation, according to the cash book information provided by the HTs.

![Figure 5.1: Fund received by Primary and Middle schools against entitled amount for FY 2013-14](image)

5.4 Do Schools spend all the Funds? If Yes, on What?

The schools are given the SC funds, administrative budget or any other sum of money to spend under various heads which include: administration cost, maintenance of building, repair and purchase of furniture, learning material, salaries of additional staff members etc. Figure 5.2 below explains that most of the school fund is spent on administration related expenses and on the maintenance of school buildings, where around 53.4% of resources are utilized for the former and 39.4% are used for the later respectively. Minimal amount is being spent for expenses related to staff salaries, learning materials, and repair and purchase of furniture which is overall less than 7.5%.

\(^{13}\) The Model Primary schools are entitled to Rs. 40000 per annum. There are eight Model Primary schools in our sample.
Figure 5.2: Expenditure Patterns at Different School Levels

The data also presents the average cost incurred by every type of school under different expenditure heads. Table 5.3 shows that overall, the schools spend Rs. 81043.4 for admin cost, Rs. 59812 for building maintenance, Rs. 13888.7 to pay salaries of additional staff members, Rs. 12096.3 for the repair and purchase of furniture and Rs. 6968.1 to buy learning material. This implies that schools spent most part for the administration related expenses, followed by additional staff salary and furniture. School level wise data is also given in the table below.

The SC members said during FGD: *The expenditures incurred by the School councils are properly recorded, registers are maintained, and can be checked by anyone if required.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure type</th>
<th>Admin Cost</th>
<th>Building Maintenance</th>
<th>Staff Salary</th>
<th>Learning Material</th>
<th>Furniture: Repair &amp; Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>660399</td>
<td>1107258</td>
<td>37500</td>
<td>74807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20637.5</td>
<td>34601.8</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>5754.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>949639</td>
<td>1607208</td>
<td>89780</td>
<td>108473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45220.9</td>
<td>76533.7</td>
<td>14963.3</td>
<td>9861.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>3738826</td>
<td>1233129</td>
<td>53273</td>
<td>46668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>287602</td>
<td>94856.1</td>
<td>13318.3</td>
<td>5185.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>5348864</td>
<td>3947595</td>
<td>180553</td>
<td>229948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>81043.4</td>
<td>59812</td>
<td>13888.7</td>
<td>6968.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Average Expenditure of Schools against Different Heads

5.5 Do Schools Generate Funds?

The funds allocated to the schools are not sufficient enough to meet the needs of schools. Therefore, the schools are left with no other option than to generate financial resources on their own. The HTs were asked to share information about the sources of funds for the
schools. According to the data provided in cash books, schools generate more than fifty percent of the resources on their own. Secondary schools generate 71% resources, against Primary and Middle schools that generate 53% and 57.7% respectively.

During the FGDs with the teachers, they said: *The budget allocated to the schools by the government is insufficient to meet the needs of the schools. The schools therefore generate Farogh e Taleem fund and meet their needs.*

![Figure 5.3: Generation of Funds by Schools](image1)

The HTs were further asked to share the sources of income through which the funds were generated. The major contributor in the pool of funds is Farogh-e-Taleem Fund which contributes 60.7% to the total income. The Administrative budget contributes 15.5%, SC fund contributes 20.6% and other miscellaneous sources of income contribute merely 3.2%. The data also supports the fact discussed earlier that the Primary and Middle schools are not entitled to administrative budget the same way as Secondary schools are not entitled to SC fund.

![Figure 5.4: Earnings from Different Sources](image2)

An effort was made to interpret the data in another dimension. The study tried to find out percentage of schools that are generating income from various sources including FTF, SC
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fund, Administrative Budget and other miscellaneous sources. Figure 5.5 below shows that almost all the schools generate income from FTF, 19.7% obtain monetary resources from administrative budget, 80.3% obtain from SC fund and 86.4% also use other sources of generating funds. Other sources can include bank profits, voluntary donations by philanthropists, and earnings from sale of trees planted at schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Fund</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Budget</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 5.5: Percentage of Schools Tabbing Different Resources](image)

### 5.6 Compliance with RTE

After the 18th constitutional amendment, free and compulsory education up to the age of sixteen is now a fundamental right of every child in Pakistan. According to article 25-A of the constitution “the State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of five to sixteen years in such manner as may be determined by law”. Hence, responsibility to ensure compliance to children’s “Right to Education” (RTE) rests with the state. Now, as a result of abolition of concurrent list, each province is responsible to ensure implementation of Article 25-A.

The Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act 2014”, passed by the assembly on 27th of October 2014, is the most recent development for implementation of RTE in Punjab. Moreover number of measures has been taken to reform the education sector, for instance; the increase in the education budget, special allocation of non-salary education budget to selected districts, formation of education commission, education committees, monitoring cell and task forces. Despite the measures mentioned above, there still exists a great need to make concrete efforts to ensure implementation of Article 25-A.

The survey shows that the enrolment rate remains low; UPE campaigns have not succeeded in bringing all out of school children to the schools. Even today the schools lack adequate number of class rooms and teachers; students still have to sit on the floor and even out in open. Infrastructure facilities like availability of drinking water, clean and functioning toilets, library, play grounds, sports equipment and boundary walls etc. are missing and those that are available are not up to the mark. This scenario is certainly not in accordance with what Article 25-A stipulates i.e. “Right to Education” (RTE).
Farogh-e-Taleem Fund has been a major contributor in the non-salary resources of the schools in the past. The fund established for collection of local contributions has become an informal tool for imposition of fee on the students. The data shows that a fix amount of twenty rupees is collected from the students per month in the name of “voluntary contribution”; this practice is clear violation of the RTE. Moreover some of the schools also collect contributions for issuance of school leaving fee certificate or maintenance fund etc. Government of Punjab has taken an initiative to provide additional non-salary budget for schools in the selected districts; district Toba Tek Singh has been included in the second phase of this initiative for the fiscal year 2014-15. This is a positive step and gives an opportunity to the district government to (i) raise the quality of education and facilities in schools (ii) eradicate any fee or charges being collected in schools in the name of FTF and similar funds and leave these options open only for the “real voluntary” contributions that are made only on the efforts of the school council teachers and parents collectively.

The promulgation of Punjab Free and Compulsory Education Act 2014 is a step towards right direction. The law not only acknowledges the RTE but also explicitly declares that no student or parent shall be liable to pay any fee or charges for education. The law also imposes penalties upon those who do not abide by it. Passage of subordinate legislation for implementation of RTE is welcomed with optimism that government will take appropriate steps for implementation of the law in letter and spirit.

5.7 Are Schools Apolitical?

Of the various factors that affect the performance of the schools, one important factor is the political interference in the school related matters. When the HTs were asked about any kind of political interference they had faced while serving in the current schools of their duty, about 6.1% admitted that there was some kind of political interference in their schools against 93.9% who denied it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>6.1</th>
<th>93.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6: Percentage Schools that faced Political Influence

The HTs were further asked to share whether they had come across any political influence generally in the education department. The incidences reported by the HTs include political influence in: appointment of teachers, transfer of teachers, disciplinary enquiry, and misuse of school building as shown in figure 5.7 below.
Although the number of incidences does not seem to be very large, but even a little political pressure can affect the performance of the education institutions therefore the government must take this matter seriously and bring an end to any kind of political interference in the school affairs.

![Pie chart showing political influence over Education Department](image)
Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

Following the School Pisa report IV conducted for the purpose of analyzing various aspects of Education sector relating to budgetary allocation and disbursements, service delivery and beneficiaries’ satisfaction, provides insight into education sector performance in District Toba Tek Singh. Review of the district education budget and school cash books, interviews of the district education managers, head teachers and the parents, FGDs with the teachers, SC members and the parents have provided quite reliable data for this report. After analysis of the data the research study has reached to following conclusions:

Budget allocated by the government is the main source of financing for any sector of the economy; this study has probed into this matter in detail. The share of the non-salary budget has remained below five percent of the total current education budget over the years as against the 12% allocation suggested by MTDF. The funds allocated to government schools to run their day to day affairs are also insufficient in comparison with actual annual expenditure of the schools. This study not only reveals insufficiency of resources but also affirms the delays in the disbursement of the allocated funds. This situation forces the schools to generate funds from their own sources including charging informal fee from students. The informal fee includes FTF, admission fee, examination fee, student fund, maintenance fund and school leaving fee etc. Where more than 50% of the resources for recurrent expenditure are generated by the schools, FTF has been found as the major source of their earning. This trend is completely against Article 25-A of the Constitution of Pakistan. Budget allocation for the FY 2014-15 has shown a positive improvement in the situation; Punjab Government has included district Toba Tek Singh in the list of those districts that receive special non-salary budget (NSB) grant for schools. Sum of routine non-salary budget and the NSB grant in current fiscal year show historic increase in the non-salary budget by 1119.32% in FY 2014-15 as compared to previous FY: the total non-salary budget allocation for the FY2014-15 is RS. 426.8 Million, 8.56% of the total current education budget.

Delayed delivery of funds is also an obstacle for schools to ensure purposeful spending of these resources during a fiscal year. It was also witnessed that most of the sampled schools in Toba Tek Singh district receive their SC funds in 3rd quarter of the financial year, making it tough for school administrations and their respective School Councils to prioritize the expenditures. The study has also tried to track the leakages in the non-salary budget; according to the revised budget estimate (RE) 2013-14 education department received 92.6% more resources in lieu of non-Salary budget as compared to the initial allocation (BE) at the start of the same fiscal year. Similarly the analysis of the data extracted from the cash books of the schools shows that though late but all the schools received the School Council fund during the FY 2013-14. Hence no leakage was found, either in the non-salary budget or in the SC Fund, during the FY 2013-14.

The study also discusses the various aspects of service delivery in detail. The overall enrollment in the education year 2013-14 has increased by 10.5% as compared to the last year where the number of boys who have entered school has surpassed the number of the enrolled girls in the same year. In year 2013-14 the girls have performed better than boys and improved their pass out percentage by 7% in 9th and 9% in 10th grades as compared to the last year while boys result declined by 15% and 18% in the same classes respectively. Most of the HTs in all three levels of school hold masters’ degree and few hold bachelors’ degree while 12.5% head teachers in primary schools are qualified below bachelors. However 40% of the teachers at Primary schools are qualified below Bachelors. The allocated posts for the
teachers increased in FY 2013-14 by meager 0.39% whereas an analysis of the filled-in posts shows that about 91.9% seats were found filled in 2013-14 as against 92.9% last year. This shows that there are more vacant seats in the recent year as compared to the last year. The data also revealed that 96.1% of the teachers were present in boys’ schools on the day of survey, whereas 89.6% teachers were present at the girls’ schools.

As far as the condition of class rooms is concerned, the HTs informed that there are about 17% of class rooms in boys’ schools and 25% that of girls’ schools require major repair. Almost 99% of the class rooms in boys’ schools and 92% in girls’ schools have electricity connection. The secondary schools were found much better in terms of available facilities as compared to the Primary and Elementary schools. Library, science lab, gas, staff room for teachers, separate toilet for girls, and play areas were the most wanted facilities at schools, especially at the primary schools, as notified by the HTs. Statics of primary schools show that 10% of these schools don’t have toilet, one third of mixed primary schools are deprived of separate toilets for girls, 28%, 34% and 4% of the primary schools don’t have boundary wall, play area and electricity respectively. However, the parents informed that the schools were also deprived of gas facility and sports equipment for the students in addition to the other missing facilities highlighted by the HTs. Besides all the missing facilities, the parents and the HTs both agreed that the text books had been received and distributed to students in time; 94% of the students received the books before mid of April. The parents seemed quite satisfied with the teaching methods, teacher’s attention towards child’s queries and school administration in Elementary and Secondary schools as compared to the Primary schools.

As far as the School Councils (SCs) are concerned, only about 23.5% of the parents were aware of the presence of the SCs while a meager 18.6% said that these were functional. Interestingly, more that 80% of the parents who were aware about the SCs, and were their members; implying that the SCs were not engaging with the local communities and were working in isolation. This practice is against the very idea of establishment of such councils. Moreover the SCs were performing the entitled responsibilities less frequently than required. According to the information provided by head teachers: 21% SCs never monitored attendance of the teachers; 17% never made efforts to increase the admissions of students; 14% never worked for any physical improvement of the school and 39% never tried to organize co-curricular activities in the schools. Only 12% parents said that they were satisfied with the performance of the SC. Despite the fact that data shows low level of SC performance, 62.5% of the HTs expressed satisfaction with the performance of the SCs, may be because head teachers themselves were chair persons of the School Councils.

The survey also revealed the fact that various officials made a number of visits to the sampled schools during the year. The M&E assistant and the M&E Officers made maximum visits to the schools, thus looking into different matters of school such as: meeting with the HTs, teachers, observation of classes, facilities and to check the school records.

The survey also probed into presence of any political influence in the affairs of education sector as it was witnessed that schools are not completely apolitical. As far as resource allocation and overall performance is concerned, political influence can have serious impact on public education sector. Fortunately, a very small number of incidences of political influence have been experienced and reported by the HTs. Overall, there is a very low level of political influence in any kind of administrative or other matters of the school.

6.2 Recommendations

To keep pace with the changing needs of time, education sector must undergo regular reforms. In the current situation, as results of PETS suggest there is need to bring reforms in
need based budgeting, overall functionality and management of the education sector. The concerned authorities should look into this matter at the earliest. Based on the findings of the survey, following recommendations are put forward:

a) The provincial and district governments should stop the violation of article 25-A of the constitution and put an end on charging of any kind of formal or informal fee at schools. After passing of ‘Punjab free and compulsory education Act 2014, the government should make sure that students are not charged and the “voluntary” taleem fund allowed in the law must remain voluntary. District governments must issue orders to the schools to strictly abide by the law and the monitoring teams, already working in the field, must also check this aspect during their visits to schools in future.

b) The phenomenal increase in the non-salary budget (NSB) of FY 2014-15 is a positive step; the department should build its strength on it and every effort should be made for judicious and need based expenditure of these additional resources. Secondly, current NSB stands at 8.5% of the total current budget that is still fairly low and needs to be brought in line with MTDF recommendations i.e. at least 12% of total current budget.

c) Although the non-salary education budget for the FY 2013-14 shows zero leakage, yet there is a need to maintain the culture of avoiding leakages in the monetary resources. This can be made possible if the district government prioritizes the education sector budget in consideration with the needs of the schools and stream the allocated funds to schools according to timeline rather than diverting them to other expenditure heads. The district government should also monitor the release of funds and their expenditure on monthly bases to avoid under spending.

d) Timely provision of the resources is also important, data makes evident that schools have not been receiving the allocated resources in time therefore it is recommended that the NSB should be disbursed on quarterly bases and each school should receive its share at the start of each quarter.

e) The school councils established for betterment of the schools have been found lacking the initiative according to the findings of the report. Government should chalk out a comprehensive and continuous capacity building plan for the school council members to enhance their administrative and financial management skills for the effective functioning of SCs hence ensuring the community participation in the management of the schools.

f) Though government has been working on provision of missing facilities but the data reveals that the primary schools have remained somewhat neglected, even in the case of vacant positions of the teaching staff. It is recommended that government should continue its drive for provision of missing facilities and filling vacant posts during next year as well and should give first priority to the primary schools.

g) The education of girls is equally important as that of boys; relatively low enrolment rate of girls suggests that the local education authorities must run a continuous enrolment campaign for the girls, especially in the rural areas.

The implementation of the above mentioned recommendations can be made possible by the participatory engagement of all the stakeholders including School Councils, NGOs, CBOs, education activists, electronic and print media along with the government itself.
Lessons Learnt

- Public Expenditure tracking Survey is a quite technical exercise that requires a lot of digging-in the record books as well as understanding of the budget and funds disbursement mechanisms from province to districts and then from district to school level. To get this task done a team with experience of ordinary surveys might face more difficulties as compared to the one who has more understanding of the budget, government records, working of the government departments and the style of government record-keeping.

- ‘PETS’ is a time taking exercise because it involves lot of traveling, record review and calculations. While planning a PET survey these factors must be kept in mind and sufficient time, enough number of research team members and adequate financial resources must be pooled.

- Data held at different offices might not reconcile because of different reasons including inability of the officials to timely update the record, unavailability of trained human resource at schools level to keep the financial record, division of the required data in the record books of different institutions. Therefore it is very important to introduce built-in cross checks in the survey so that no mismatching data creeps in the survey record.

- A PETS data set contains lot of variety and is normally very huge; the number of data entries might cross hundreds of thousands as it did in the case of this study. With such huge size little mistake might raise questions on the validity of entire data set. To avoid data discrepancy and minimize the chances of mistakes a multi-layer monitoring mechanism on the field activities, data entry and analysis needs to be placed. A solution that this age of technology provides us is to make the data collection live and transparent for the virtual monitors while keeping the field monitoring mechanism intact, this is what CPDI team did before starting the third survey. Data collection with the help of tools that make it available to the desk monitors the moment it is collected in the field makes it possible for the monitors to look for mistakes or any calculation errors and seek corrections or re collection of data on the same day. This technique does not replace the field monitoring unit rather it strengthens their efforts and brings accuracy and reliability in the data.

- Budget books are the largest data available for a PET exercise but the challenging part about the district budget book is that it contains the traditional budget heads that sometimes do not support a sector specific study. For example a district current budget book contains separate budget for each secondary school but there is no head that shows allocation for any specific elementary school, rather it has to be found in a budget head named district office elementary education or deputy district officer elementary education (a block allocation\(^\text{14}\)), similarly one cannot find a separate

\(^{14}\) Block allocation is a budgetary term that means allocation of funds to a certain sector without dividing it to subunits. For example allocation of a lump sum amount for entire sector of primary education instead of dividing it into administrative offices, monitoring units, training units or schools will be called block allocation.
allocation for any specific primary school because there are tehsil wise block allocations for the primary education. More over even the allocation of the regularly disbursed SC fund is not traceable in the budget book. The development budget is more complicated because most of the times it does not have sector division, rather all the development schemes are divided on the basis of the nature of work required, secondly the education development schemes are funded by provincial development program, special MNA grants by the federal government and the district development budget. The situation stated above make the study more difficult, time taking and mind boggling. Before embarking upon the PETS the research team must try to get complete understanding of the budget books that they would be reading to extract data. Secondly they must not confine themselves to the visible budget lines only; rather they should search for each single budget entry in the budget book that might relate to their area of study and then probe for its actual link to the specific area in that sector. Constant contact with the office of EDO finance and planning helps in resolving these issues because they are the people who have written these budget items in the specific budget heads. A close working relationship of the CPDI research team with the EDO F&P helped understand and resolve such tricky issues during the Public Expenditure Tracking Survey in district Jhang and Toba Tek Singh.
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