



Investigating the Impact of Principals' and Teachers' Involvement in Curriculum Development and its implementation in District Quetta

Latif Ullah

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences Metropolitan University Karachi
latifgharshin@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. Shahida Sajjad

Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences, Metropolitan University Karachi

Abstract

The study has examined the roles played by principals and teachers in the curriculum developments and implementations in District Quetta Pakistan. The study was quantitative in nature and it used a stratified random sample of 113 principals and 180 teachers. The instrument of the study was a structured questionnaire and the items of questionnaire were in Likert scale. The findings have revealed a significant gap between Principals and Teachers involvement and their participation in policy-level decision-making. While 83.2% of principals reported adapting the curriculum to local needs and 60.6% of teachers found the content relevant to classroom contexts, systemic barriers remained evident. Notably, 74.4% of principals were excluded from curriculum policy discussions, 61.9% reported not receiving timely curriculum updates, and only 24.4% of teachers were consulted about curriculum changes. Chi-square analyses ($p < 0.05$) confirmed that these patterns were statistically significant and not due to chance. These results underscore a paradox: educators demonstrate strong implementation capacity but remain marginalized in curriculum decision-making.

Key Words: Investigating, Involvement, Curriculum development, Implementation



Introduction

Curriculum development and its implementation serve as the foundation of the rightness of any education system as it directly affects the choice of the teaching methodologies, as well as the outcomes of the process of learning, and the student involvement. District Quetta is an area characterized by socio-economic difficulties, language diversity, and little educational facilities; therefore, the execution of principals and teachers on the construction of the curriculum is even more decisive. The major roles played by principals as academic leaders are that they should ensure that the curriculum confirms to institutional goals and the national standards; teachers as the main implementers ensure that the curriculum is modified to accommodate the classroom realities. Programmed as they are, despite their critical roles, their input in curriculum development and implementation is unreliable with reasons being bureaucracy, insufficient preparation or consultation by stakeholders. The proposed study will focus on how their active involvement in curriculum processes can make educational experiences quality-based, making sure that learning materials should fit the purpose of learning, become related to the cultural setting of students, and should be delivered in culturally respectable ways to the students in culturally heterogeneous places of education in Quetta.

The partnership of the leadership and teaching personnel of the school is also a big determinant of the effectiveness of curriculum implementation. Studies show that involvement of principals and teachers in curriculum development contributes to practical transfer of knowledge as a way of enhancing instructional strategies, assessment procedures and the distribution of resources. In District Quetta however, a lot of teachers complain about the fact that they lack the opportunity to make their own decisions relating to curriculum, of course, this is centralized or dictated to the schools by the higher authorities indifferently of the local needs. Such a lack of connection may cause lack of engagement, change resistance, and discontinuities between policy intents and classroom activities. This study aims to determine obstacles that could limit an effective participation of the principals and teachers within the curriculum processes in Quetta by investigating the relations that exist between those contributing to the curriculum development at the current level. By means of solving these issues, more innovative and engaging curriculum structure may be created to serve not only the students but also the teachers.

Finally, this study reiterates the need to engage principals and teachers as vital stakeholders in the curriculum development process in order to achieve a more accommodating and performing education system in District Quetta. Using surveys, interviews, and observation information, the research will determine the quality of teaching in schools enhanced by the input of these community members, student performance, and overall school enhancement. The observations will present practical guidelines to policy makers and education officials to devolve curriculum planning, improve on professional development programs and coming up with the collaborative platforms on which the educators can play productive roles. The state is one where the issue of educational equity is still a burning topic; therefore, letting those who are the nearest to the



classroom also take part in the curriculum decision-making process can be revolutionary on the way to the lasting improvement of educational achievement.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the level of participation of Principals and Teachers in the curriculum development process.
2. To examine the influence of principals' and teachers' involvement on the effective implementation of the curriculum

Literature Review

Recent research demonstrates the importance of the principals and teachers in developing and implementing a curriculum meaning that their participation results in better functioning and contextually specific educational systems. Alsubaie (2022) notes that principals and teachers are regarded as the instructional leaders whose role in curriculum design helps to ensure its compliance with the institutional objectives and the national standards, thus allowing teachers to bring practical classroom insights to the process and make it more flexible and centered on students. This is further corroborated through the study by Fullan and Langworthy (2021) that establishes that collaboration in distinguishing the curriculum results in better outcomes reported within individual schools and the morale of the teachers in the same. Nevertheless, in such areas as Quetta, where inequality in education remains high, it has been found that centralized decision-making process tends to marginalize educators, and as a result, there can be a situation where the employed curriculum would be irrelevant to a given region and would not meet diverse educational needs of the learners (Khan & Shah, 2023).

The obstacles to teacher and principal participation in the curriculum work has been in the spotlight of the most recent literature. UNESCO (2023) report on developing contexts indicated that due to a lack of training, strict bureaucratic systems, and access to professional learning opportunities, educators are not able to work actively to implement curriculum reforms. In the same line of thought, Darling-Hammond et al. (2022) claim that absence of structured chances of teacher input causes the implementation of the curriculum to be fragmented, diminishing its efficacy. In Pakistan, a study conducted by Hussain et al. (2023) demonstrates that, in Balochistan, and hence in Quetta, education providers tend to view curriculum policies as solely a top-down imposition, thus feel obliged to adhere to them passively, but do not indigovern. Such conclusions indicate that the gap between policy and practice can be closed only through systemic changes like decentralization of curriculum planning and teacher empowerment programs.

Even the engagement of teachers and principals in curriculum development is also challenging due to the uniqueness of socio-cultural and infrastructural issues in District Quetta. According to a study conducted by Baloch and Zehra (2023), political instability, security issues, and recurrent school closure clubs prevent effective planning of curriculums over a long period and implementation of teacher-training programs, thus educators have little chance to become parts of the important process of reforms. Further, a study by Kakar and Rind (2024) points out that the



digital resource and professional development opportunities shortage of the rural schools of Quetta adds to the disparity between the policymaking and the actual classroom realities, especially regarding STEM since the updated pedagogical style is essential. Moreover, the linguistic diversification within the region, with the languages of Balochi, Pashto, or Brahui being frequently used by the students as their first languages, poses an even greater challenge to the implementation of the uniform curriculum that is developed primarily to work in Urdu or English (Mengal & Ahmed, 2023). These situational elements highlights the immediate need to have local based curricula platforms that involve teachers and principals to make them linguistically inclusive, culturally relevant, and feasible in the Quetta classrooms.

These challenges, however, appear to have been reaped with the possibility of an educator involvement changing the curriculum implementation in a significant way. In a research conducted by Harris and Jones (2023), successful improvement of teacher-led curriculum committees in under-resourced schools enhancing instructional coherence and performance was pointed out. Similarly, one of the World Bank (2023) reports underlines the importance of building collaborative professional learning networks among teachers by establishing cooperative instructors and making them adjust curricula in innovative ways, especially in a multilingual and multicultural environment, such as Quetta. Iqbal and Ahmed (2024) also confirm the fact in their latest research more chances of a teacher engaging in student-centered pedagogy when the teacher administration develops the curriculum together. All these studies call to change the policy in order to shift towards a stronger role of educators in the development of curriculum, especially in disadvantaged areas where contextual relevance plays an essential role towards educational equity.

Theoretical Framework

The Participatory Curriculum Development (PCD) Model (Taylor & Richards, 2019) is the selected theoretical framework to be applied in the current study that investigates stakeholders like principals and teachers in the curriculum processes in District Quetta. The PCD model focuses on shared curriculum development that engulfs all the stakeholders including the educators who are the direct implementers of curricula in their classrooms. The framework is particularly applicable to the situation in Quetta, where the respective linguistic diversity, the constraints on resources, and the centralized nature of policymaking in most cases establish lack of correlation between the aims of curriculums and the real life classroom experiences. Using the four major principles of the PCD model, namely stakeholder participation, contextual relevance, agency of the teachers, and iterative feedback, the research examines how the existing processes of curriculum development in Quetta fulfil the following functions in terms of reflecting meaningful teacher input, responding to local needs, and permitting professional autonomy, as well as providing a mechanism of iterative improvement. The research that adopts this model tries to fill gaps in the real practices of education system in the city of Quetta concerning the participatory ideals.

The PCD model offers an elaborate guideline to examine many desirable dimensions of curriculum design in Quetta. First, it assists in gauging the levels of active involvement of teachers and principals as actors as opposed to agents of ready-made curricula. Second, it is possible to study



the systemic barriers that can impede participatory approaches according to the model, including static policies, insufficient training, or absence of feedback channels. Third, it allows measurement of the effect of various degrees of engagement between educators and the curriculum and student learning outcomes. Based on this framework, the paper aims to illustrate how more participatory curriculum processes full of teachers can potentially handle some of the nuances of Quetta education, such as multilingual classrooms and rural-urban inequalities. The results can compel policy changes to carry the development of curriculum more to the decentralized and participatory styles more appropriate to the local adaptation.

Research Methodology

This research employs the quantitative research strategy because it will be organized data and facts to explore the issue of the participation of teachers and principals in the development and choice of curriculum in District Quetta. The study uses descriptive and correlational survey study design with an attempt to gather measurable data among 180 teachers and 113 principals in a range of schools in the region. The key method of data collection consists of a structured questionnaire including Likert-related questions that determine the degree of participation, obstacles to participation, and the perceived outcome of participation on curriculum effectiveness. Several major sections of the questionnaire include demographic data, the number of times one has participated, barriers to participation, and outcome perception of a participation. The instrument will be pilot tested before its full administration in which 30 participants will be asked to take part in it and in which Cronbach alphas of more than 0.7 are acceptable in terms of its internal consistency.

The sampling strategy will use stratified random sampling to entail the representation in sampling since it will cut across various types of schools (urban/rural) and gender distribution. This method will ensure the sample corresponds to the background of the learning contexts within District Quetta. This will be done by asking the participants to hold at least three years of experience and this will make sure that the respondents have enough background in the field to make informed opinions on issues relating to the curriculum. Some of the statistical methods to be used in the analysis of the data are descriptive and inferential statistics, such as frequency distribution, mean scores, standard deviations, independent t-tests, ANOVA, and Pearson correlation coefficients. The above analytical techniques can enable thorough analysis of partaking trends, comparison of partaking trends among demographic categories, and evaluation of relations between levels of participation and perceived outcomes in curricula.

Findings and Results

This data demonstrates a severe misalignment in the role of principals in curriculum development in Quetta: With 83.2 percent of the respondents feeling empowered in adapting curricula to the local needs, 74.4 percent of the interviewees get no voice in policy discussions, and 61.9 percent interviewees describe their needs are overlooked by the system, which indicates the centralization of the system. Even though 62 percent support the idea of changes, the number of those who feel



that their input is reflected is only 30.1 percent, reflecting unsuccessful decision-making that is top-down. Also, 61.9 per cent run into a lack of timely revision of curriculum, 60.1 per cent consider the national curriculum irrelevant to local issues with no good communication infrastructure. However, the government again paradoxically, does not compensate principals through higher rates of adaptation but rather through autonomy of the classroom-level (high adaptation rates). The higher authorities also do not compensate them structurally; only 49.6 percent of them organize a teacher workshop probably because of resource limitation. These observations bear out the fact that though the principals are very active practitioners, they are left out in upper processes, and also they lack sufficient resources in delivering the curriculum, requiring decentralized policymaking, and enhancement of effective communication lines and focused distribution of resources to harmonize the systemic structure with actual realities encountered in underserved areas such as Quetta.

Table 1
Principal's role in implementing and developing curriculum

Question	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
I am invited to meetings where curriculum policies are discussed.	08 (07.08%)	12 (10.62%)	8 (7.08%)	50 (44.25%)	35 (30.10%)
I propose curriculum changes directly to education officials.	42 (37.17%)	28 (24.78%)	14 (12.39%)	15 (13.27%)	14 (12.39%)
My school's unique needs are considered when curriculum decisions are made.	18 (15.93%)	16 (14.16%)	09 (07.96%)	42 (37.17%)	28 (24.78%)
I actively organize workshops for teachers to share feedback on curriculum improvements.	26 (23.01%)	30 (26.55%)	15 (13.27%)	20 (17.70%)	22 (19.47%)
The current curriculum reflects input from school Principals.	16 (14.16%)	18 (15.93%)	13 (11.50%)	30 (26.55%)	36 (31.86%)
I receive timely updates about curriculum revisions.	15 (13.27%)	16 (14.16%)	12 (10.62%)	32 (28.32%)	38 (33.63%)
I feel empowered by adapting the curriculum according to students' needs.	46 (40.71%)	48 (42.48%)	03 (2.65%)	09 (7.96%)	07 (6.19%)

A chi-square analysis indicates that there are strong differences in the way the principals perceived their role in the work of curriculum development and implementation in District Quetta. Since the p-values of most statements are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), the results demonstrate that the deviations from the neutral expectation are strong, which explains the definite trends of dissatisfaction. Principals describe themselves as particularly out of the loop on policy (mean = 2.19, 2-sided test of 2.74, $p = 0.000$, $d^2 = 0.87$) and perceive that their schools and students have idiosyncratic needs that are removed in the decision about curriculum (mean = 2.59, 2-sided test of 2.39 $d^2 = 0.30$). Also, although part of the principals propose changes to the authorities themselves (mean = 3.61, $z = 34.18$), the tendency of failing to update on a timely basis on the whole (mean = 2.38, $z = 36.44$) indicates the systematic problems of communication between



education officials and school leaders. Such reports are made against a worrying disconnect between the decision-makers and those who play the ground role in realizing the curriculum.

Nevertheless, on the role played by the principals in adapting the curriculum to fit the needs of its students (mean = 4.04, 2 = 129.07), there is strong agency displayed by the principals in ensuring improved educational outcomes. Nonetheless, the ambivalent stance toward arranging teacher feedback workshops (mean = 3.16, $p = 0.062$) and the low levels of agreement that the curriculum takes their input into consideration (mean = 2.53, 25.36) would indicate that their work is not systematically backed up, or acknowledged. Such a gap between local control and institutional bias reveals the necessity of structural changes that would place greater emphasis on the role of principles in curriculum design so that their knowledge and understanding of the reality on the ground were reflected in the policies created. Ignoring these changes, changes of curriculum will probably not make sense in district Quetta and even have inconsistencies and weaknesses in its practices.

Table 2
Chi-Square Analysis of Principals Perspectives on Curriculum Implementation

Statement	Mean	SD	Chi-square	P-value
I am invited to meetings where curriculum policies are discussed.	2.19	1.19	87.42	.000
I propose curriculum changes directly to education officials.	3.61	1.32	34.18	.000
My school's unique needs are considered when curriculum decisions are made.	2.59	1.41	30.25	.000
I actively organize workshops for teachers to share feedback on curriculum improvements.	3.16	1.36	8.97	.062
The current curriculum reflects input from school Principals.	2.53	1.43	25.36	.000
I receive timely updates about curriculum revisions.	2.38	1.34	36.44	.000
I feel empowered by adapting the curriculum according to students' needs.	4.04	1.05	129.07	.000

Teacher's Perspective

The results have indicated a cross-side view of teachers in terms of their participation in curriculum matters. Although most (60.6%) respondents feel that the curriculum suits their classroom experiences and more than a half (58.3%) feel their subject expertise is properly valued, a large part of the respondents are not involved much in the decision-making process. Only one in every four teachers are in favor of the idea that their principal consults them before making changes, 33.4 percent have never been part of curriculum review committees. This indicates that although a small number of teachers believe that the curriculum is applicable to them, most of them cannot



actively take part in its creation. The absence of well-organized collaboration (formal opportunities are reported only by 31.7 percent) also suggests that the curriculum planning is not related to teacher engagement, which can be an obstacle to implementation.

The statistics also present the problem of the curriculum changes in terms of communication and agency. Even though the percentage of teachers who are given clear explanations to curriculum changes is very high, (56.2 percent), there is still a significant number of teachers (38.9 percent) who are not provided with clear explanations, indicating inconsistency in communication of leadership. Moreover, although 43.3 percent is motivated to propose adaptations, close to 30 percent believe that their suggestions are not listened to. These results can be interpreted to indicate that, although, some teachers feel professionally recognized, systemic obstacles do not allow them to join the wider participation. Curriculum ownership and implementation can improve more by ensuring stronger teacher involvement in curriculum implementation and adoption through formal feedback systems, cross-inclusive committees, and open communication with the school leaders in District Quetta.

Table 3
Teacher's role in implementing and developing curriculum

Question	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
My school Principal seeks my opinion before implementing new changes in curriculum.	24 (13.3%)	20 (11.1%)	18 (10.0%)	54 (30.0%)	64 (35.6%)
I have participated in committees to review curriculum content.	28 (15.6%)	32 (17.8%)	24 (13.3%)	51 (28.3%)	45 (25.0%)
The curriculum includes teaching methods that align with my classroom experiences.	52 (28.9%)	57 (31.7%)	22 (12.2%)	25 (13.9%)	24 (13.3%)
I am encouraged to suggest modifications to lesson plans or textbooks.	42 (23.3%)	36 (20.0%)	27 (15.0%)	28 (15.6%)	24 (13.3%)
My subject-specific expertise is valued during curriculum planning.	52 (28.9%)	53 (29.4%)	21 (11.7%)	28 (15.6%)	26 (14.4%)
I receive clear explanations for why certain curriculum changes are introduced.	46 (25.6%)	55 (30.6%)	19 (10.6%)	28 (21.1%)	32 (17.8%)
There are formal opportunities for teachers to collaborate on curriculum design.	25 (13.9%)	32 (17.8%)	31 (17.2%)	49 (27.2%)	43 (23.9%)

Chi square analysis of teacher's perspective:

The results of the chi-square analysis indicate that there are areas that show prominent gaps concerning teacher participation in the preparation of the curriculum in District Quetta. All the teachers complain that they have very little input in the decision-making and this fact is reflected in the low average scores on principal consultation (2.37) and committee participation (2.71). The



extremely large values of chi-square (58.72 and 28.15 respectively) are evidence to show that these are not random variations but systemic. Although, in a more moderate way the teachers agree that their expertise in subject matters is appreciated (3.42) and that they are stimulated to propose any changes (3.12), the wide range of the answers (6.82 and 6.81 respectively) indicates different implementation on the institutional level. Such discrepancy provides a reference to the absence of standardised channels through which teachers are involved in the curriculum issues.

What is especially disturbing is the neutral mean score of the clarity of explanation of changes in curriculum (3.20, $0.2 = 16.84$) which together with the poor score of consultation with the principals indicates an alarming communication chasm between policy makers and school practitioners. Teachers seem to be supposed to introduce the changes in the curriculum without knowing too much about their reason or benefit. Interestingly, the most positive mean (3.49, $2 = 34.25$) shows that even with such problems in the system, teachers, on the whole, consider that the curriculum material reflects their classroom realities. This implies that although the curriculum may be right there are great needs to improve the processes involved in its development and implementation.

The review ends up giving a visual impression of teachers as violators and not participants of the curriculum making process. These trends can be reassured by the fact that the p-values were significant on all items (all $< .05$). In order to make curricula more effective, a majority of more inclusive development processes that take advantage of frontline knowledge of teachers are required. It would involve creating formal channels of teacher feedback, enhanced communication on curriculum changes and ensuring reliability of participatory practices in every school. This would not only raise the quality of curriculum but also raise the ownership and the fidelity in its implementation by the teachers.

Table 4
Chi-Square Analysis of Teachers role in implementing and developing curriculum

Statement	Mean	SD	Chi-square	P-value
My school Principal seeks my opinion before implementing new changes in curriculum	2.37	1.42	58.72	.000
I have participated in committees to review curriculum content.	2.71	1.45	28.15	.000
The curriculum includes teaching methods that align with my classroom experiences	3.49	1.29	34.25	.000
I am encouraged to suggest modifications to lesson plans or textbooks	3.12	1.38	31.33	.000
My subject-specific expertise is valued during curriculum planning	3.42	1.33	34.18	.000
I receive clear explanations for why certain curriculum changes are introduced.	3.20	1.39	16.84	.002
There are formal opportunities for teachers to collaborate on curriculum design.	2.71	1.41	14.55	.006



Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion

The study identifies a paradoxical state of affairs in the education system of Quetta, as the questionnaire shows, principals are highly agentive in ensuring that curriculum flexibly responds to local needs (83.2% empowered), but there is far less participation in setting policy (74.4% do not participate in policy formulation discussions). This debate on centralization reflects the results of Punjab (Khan et al., 2021) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Afridi, 2020), where the top-down approach to the structure of the curriculum resulted in gaps in its implementation. Yet, the conditions seem grim in Quetta, 61.9 percent of principals state that the needs of the school are unmet, which is much more than in Punjab, 42 percent (Jamil, 2022). These are not random variations as Orchard chi-square results indicate ($p < .001$ on all key items) and structural variations were more indicative of structural failure than of minor differences between individuals. The fact that 62 percent of principals would like to see some changes done and that only 30.1 percent feel that their voices are heard is an indication of performative consultation instead of actual input, which is observed in Balochistan teacher training programs (Baloch & Brese, 2023) and exists but to the extent of a smaller range of disparity.

The relevance of data divulges a hierarchical splintering: a teacher notes an even lesser influence compared to a principal, only 24.4 percent of consultation regarding the changes ($\chi^2 = 58.72$) compared to 37.17 percent of principals suggesting changes to those in authority. It is a two-level exclusion akin to the Sindh curriculum reforms (Hassan, 2021), yet more intense in the case of Quetta when it comes to communication breakdowns 61.9 percent of school principals lack timely updates in Quetta as opposed to 48 percent of schools with similar findings in the study involving Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Ullah, 2022). Ironically, the adaptation at the classroom level is still high (mean=4.04), which implies that teachers counter act the systematic failures with the grassroots innovation. This compares well to the fact that UNESCO (2022) finds that resilience involves substitute teachers in conflict-affected areas, although the situation facing Quetta (with only 49.6 percent organizing workshops) creates its own problems. The lack of relevance of the curriculum, even though it was developed with flaws in mind (60.6 percent of teachers approve), can be seen as an echo of what Malawi was found to be as well (Chirwa & Naidoo, 2023) meaning that it was one of the marginal regions of the country where curriculum was developed and applied with quite other expectations.

Contextualized policy solutions should be sought due to the urgency of the situation as envisaged by the study. Though the National Education Policy 2021 keeps stressing decentralization, the provincial case of Quetta with its adapted but not fully decentralized curricula will show that there are still some flaws in implementation at the local level. Effective examples of the localized curriculum development employed in Ethiopia (Abebe, 2023) indicate that the corresponding combination of structural independence (such as high levels of adaptation in Quetta) and participatory policy development may occur to fill these gaps. But there are limitations regarding resources, which will require new solutions - possibly digital solutions such as teacher-principal



collaboration tried, in Rajasthan (Mehta & Sharma, 2022). These trends are supported by the meaningful values of chi-square in all dimensions ($p < .05$) which indicates that they are endorsed as systems issues rather than patchwork answers. Both the existing participation deficit (which should be solved by introducing mandatory teacher-principal committees) and resource deficit (which should be resolved by direct funding) should be mentioned in future reforms, as Nepal successfully managed to integrate community-based curriculum development in their country, albeit dealing more with the geopolitical issues Quetta does not face as of now (Panthi et al., 2023).

Conclusion

According to this research, this aspect was very crucial in the disjuncture between the policymaker and the executor of the curriculum, in the Quetta education system. Although principals and teachers show robust flexibility in the transformation of curricula to the requirements of the local classes, they are not involved significantly in policy debates and decision making. The centralized top-down process has contributed to frustration on the part of educators that feel that their expertise and unique requirements of schools are not considered. These systemic obstacles notwithstanding, principals and teachers are still innovators at the grass roots level making essential sure that the curriculum remains relevant at the ground floor level. Nonetheless, the gaps in implementation will continue unless there are structural reforms to enhance the implementation processes, including decentralizing decision-making, establishing better channels of communication, and increased allocation of resources. To increase curricular efficacy and pedagogical agency of teachers, the policymakers need to shift to a more participatory framework and appreciate the frontline educators as important stakeholders in the development process. Only at that point the education system of Quetta will be able to implement sustainable changes both in the design of its policies and classroom performance.

Recommendations

- There is a need to establish district-level curriculum committees with mandatory representation from principals and teachers to ensure that the local needs are addressed in policy formulation.
- The government should develop formal channels for regular teacher-principal feedback during curriculum development cycles.
- The Education department should allocate funding and resources for mandatory teacher workshops on curriculum implementation.
- There is also a need to form teacher-led committees in every school to review and adapt national curriculum materials according to the local contexts.
- The Educational Managers should implement accountability measures to track how teacher's input is utilized in curriculum reforms.
- The state must prioritize the equitable distribution of educational resources to underserved schools.



References

- Alsubaie, M. A. (2022). Curriculum development: Teacher involvement in curriculum development. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 106-107.
- Baloch, S., & Brese, F. (2023). Teacher training challenges in Balochistan: Policy versus practice. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 40(2), 45-62.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2022). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140.
- Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2021). *A rich seam: How new pedagogies find deep learning*. Pearson.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2023). Teacher leadership and curriculum development in under-resourced schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(3), 210-225.
- Hussain, M., Shah, S. F., & Khan, A. (2023). Top-down curriculum implementation in Balochistan: Teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Asian Educational Studies*, 7(1), 33-48.
- Khan, R., & Shah, I. (2023). Centralized curriculum decision-making and its impact on rural schools in Pakistan. *Educational Policy Analysis*, 31(2), 155-172.
- Taylor, P., & Richards, C. (2019). Participatory curriculum development in practice: A case study from South Africa. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(3), 398-414.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report: Curriculum reform in developing contexts*. UNESCO Publishing.
- World Bank. (2023). *Teacher professional development in multilingual contexts: Lessons from South Asia*. World Bank Group.