Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

Universal Educations of College Policy – Trainings for Pakistani an on Modernization and Danger

Muhammad Khizir Abbas[1*], Muzamil Hussain AL Hussaini[2]

[1,2]PHD Scholar, Pakistan*

Corresponding Email: [1]muzamilqurtuba@gmail.com*

Received: 06 March 2022 **Accepted:** 20 June 2022 **Published:** 29 July 2022

Abstract: This editorial provides background information and outlines the goals of this special edition of Pakistanian Educational Research Journal, which gathers four stories of research on schools that are being marketed as cutting-edge learning settings from various foreign contexts (ILEs). The overarching goal is to increase our understanding of innovation, as well as the difficulties and dangers that people involved in the creation and use of ILEs face. We start by highlighting a few crucial factors for academics involved in ILE projects, which put a focus on participatory methods to innovation and educational and social transformation at the forefront of the work. We then highlight a few points for readers to remember as they reflect on the arguments made in different paper

Keywords: Advanced Education Atmospheres, Revolution, Universal, Danger, College Policy.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evolution and Danger

The interaction between the instructional and social uses of buildings by users and the aims and motives that underlie creative school designs is complicated and full of potential opportunities and tensions. Innovation inherently entails risk and has a tense relationship with approaches to school design that are based on evidence. We want to improve knowledge on innovation and risk in school design in relation to the settings and the experiences of individuals who create, work in, and study in these cutting-edge learning environments in this special issue that focuses on worldwide studiesof school design (ILEs).

Recent significant studies have examined innovation in school design from the perspectives of teachers' post-occupancy pedagogic uses of space and social configurations, the active negotiation of classroom participants in new learning spaces, and with a greater voice in the school design processes (Carvalho et al., 2020; Koko and Hirsto, 2020). (Niemi, 2020). According to Tse et al. (2014), risk assessment in new school construction frequently concentrates on the difficulties of design and construction in terms of building delivery (e.g.,

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

Carpenter and Bauman, 2016), the use or abuse of new technologies (e.g., Istance and Kools, 2013), or environmental performance (e.g.,Barrett et al., 2015).

Benito (2003) stated that the learning environment is both a historical physical construct and a cultural entity that may be modified by teaching. Moos (1979) suggested that the learning environment involves a complex interaction of social, cultural, organizational, and physical variables. Both innovation and risk are involved in this change.

Despite the commonly held belief that improved learning results and staff and student wellbeing can be supported by innovative school design, these goals are not always achieved. This is often due to a mismatch between the goals of the school's design and the users' values and educational methods (Deppeler and Aikens, 2020). The writers' shared concern that innovation and risk in cutting-edge school buildings should be examined from the standpoint of learning provided the idea for this special issue on worldwide studies of school design. The articles examine the alignment or misalignment between the concerns of those who plan and build the school and those who teach and consider pre-occupancy and post-occupancy innovation in school design.

Global education systems must adapt to the changing requirements of various learners in the context of quick socioeconomic and technological change while also guaranteeing that all students are empowered and prepared to confront the challenges of the 21st century (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2018). Educational systems face a difficulty in creating environments that foster the growth of these capacities while operating in the uncertain and risky situations of the present and the future. The aim to maximize creativity in the physical learning environments' design has been a significant technique for achieving these results.

Advanced education atmospheres

Open and flexible learning environments have become common in classrooms around the world, most notably in Australia and New Zealand but also in the Pakistanian contexts of the Netherlands, Austria, Germany, Finland, Spain, and parts of the United Kingdom (Könings et al., 2017; Schabmann et al., 2016; Reh et al., 2011). Over the past ten years, there has been an increase in the amount of money invested in school infrastructure as part of global initiatives to reform education for the future.

In order to meet the goals of the 21st-century learning competencies (i.e., communication, teamwork, critical thinking, and creativity), schools are being constructed, redesigned, and promoted as ILEs (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2017). As a result, study and discussion on the design of the learning environment in schools have increased both theoretically and empirically, as well as in contexts of global education policy and practice.

Complex research evidence on how the physical environment affects learning is available (Woolner et al., 2018), and there are divergent viewpoints on how to best design schools to fulfil this policy goal. The opinions and viewpoints of school stakeholders as well as the

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

pedagogical procedures used in alternative learning environments are similarly understudied (Deppeler and Aikens, 2020; Schabmann et al., 2016). According to Reh et al. (2011), the metaphor of a more open environment for individual learning was at odds with the development of new classroom inequalities in the German context.

This emphasizes the possibility that the intentions behind school design goals could have unintended repercussions in actuality. Another danger is the potential disconnect between the opinions of school architects, builders, and engineers, who tend to focus on technical difficulties,and the users of the school after occupation (Woolner et al., 2007).

Translation errors cause any instructional potential to be lost, leaving "teachers and students who may consider buildings as a fixed, indifferent, or even an unresponsive background of their teaching and learning" (Koutamis et al., 2017:295). School administrators were largely accepting of ILEs, according to Schabmann et al. (2016), however there were obstacles due to a lack of resources, expertise, and professional networks. Carvalho and Yeoman (2018) emphasize the significance of ILE research that examines the connections between theory, design, and practice and, on the other side, pedagogy, place, and people. This emphasizes the significance of study on the intricate relationships between the design process, educational environments, and pedagogy.

Melodies

The four papers that make up this special issue all work to deepen our understanding of how school design processes might be shaped to strike a balance between innovation and risk in order to createbuilt school environments that are appropriate for various social contexts and in connection with the larger social challenges of equity and quality education. While operating in various policy contexts and partnership configurations that affect the forces driving change, responsibility, autonomy, and choice, the authors have a shared interest in participatory approaches to achievingthese goals.

Together, the articles offer important interdisciplinary and cross-cultural insights from research done on four continents, offering lessons for Pakistanian situations about potential user participation in school design as opposed to the standardized designs used by many Pakistanian countries. The researchers use data from a variety of sources and stakeholders and both qualitative and mixed method research methodologies to report on findings from single and multiple school case studies.

The articles heavily emphasize the intricacy of relationships between design processes, environments, pedagogy, culture, and relationships represented by individuals who operate in schools by drawing on their study with schools. The articles outline the difficulties, advantages, and hazards for a variety of stakeholders, including policymakers, educators, parents, and students, as well as document the evolving connections between practice and design through time.

Critique of the policies and procedures that support the transition of education and schooling in the twenty-first century is a major theme in all of the situations. The writers evaluate the relationships between innovation and risk in various educational and societal contexts by

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

critically analyzing power and control in the policy environment and by using a variety of theoretical frameworks. The authors draw attention to the conflicts that exist between educational policy that is adopted at the level of governance and the subsequent execution of that policy by those involved in altering the place and purpose of schools in order to redesign them for teaching and learning.

The studies highlight the range of viewpoints among the stakeholders and the involvement of teachers, students, parents/caregivers, and architects in the design processes of their schools while examining the influence network. Although the articles are based on international research, they also discuss their findings in connection to pertinent Pakistani literature in an effort to encourage deeper thought about the nuanced interactions between innovation and risk in educational planning.

Summary of the documents

Harry Daniels, Ian Thompson, Hau Ming Tse, and Jill Porter, the authors of the first publication, provide the findings of a longitudinal study of 10 secondary schools established in the United Kingdom. Their research focuses in particular on the opportunities and possible dangers associated with the cooperative design of creative spaces that "may impact the discourses and practices of teaching and learning while the building is occupied." The authors emphasize the difficulty of collaborative design procedures.

The partnership involves a wide range of stakeholders, each of whom has different goals, degrees of influence, and motivations. Their actions are also influenced by "broader social and cultural history as well as the mediating effect of the social connections in institutions." The authors urge the development of a "new vision of collective" that disrupts power and command dynamics and may pave the way for innovation "in the evolution of complex systems of human action."

The next study by Leon Benade is placed in a totally different setting, where the New Zealand Ministry of Education has been promoting ILEs since 2011. The study described in Benade's paper looked into how parents were invited to take part in and/or contribute to school design procedures. Architects, delivery managers, and parents all had diverse perspectives on the ILEs and how their opinions were appreciated, reiterating themes expressed in the first study about unequal power and influence. With a focus on the thinking and policy-making that support ILEs in the global setting, Benade sheds light on the twin themes of innovation and risk.

Another illustration of the significance of tailoring design to local settings and situations may be found in the study "Innovation and risk in an innovative learning environment - A private-Public collaboration in Australia" by Joanne Deppeler, Deborah Corrigan, Luke Macaulay, and Kathleen Aikens. As analytical tools, the authors use a conceptual framework for risk in public service innovation and a responsible innovation (RI) framework to analyses how different stakeholders perceived and interacted with their new school that was created through a partnership.

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

The authors emphasize the difficulties and the significance of taking into account various stakeholder requirements as part of participatory procedures, which is consistent with the findings from other studies in this special issue. The authors contend that implementing a RI framework offers a mechanism to enhance the alignment of school design with user needs and to facilitate an institution's ongoing adaptation to deal with unforeseen changes in the environment.

Finally, another perspective on alignment may be found in the study by Pamela Woolner, Ulrike Thomas, and Jennifer Charters, titled "The hazards of a standardized school building design: Beyond aligning the pieces of a learning environment." The authors create a theoretical framework to examine the dangers connected to the reconstruction of a secondary school in the United Kingdom. The objective was to comprehend how members of the school community, including the school head, faculty, and students, perceived and dealt with the school's reconstruction. This school case demonstrates how several aspects of epistemic and social design are in harmony.

However, despite the fact that it is acknowledged that social relationships, instructional approaches, and structural resources out of line frequently provide "major hazards for school building projects," The danger of "a missed opportunity to embrace a broad vision of emerging pedagogies" is said to be greater than the risk connected with "performativity and conservatism" in school design, according to the authors. The writers argue that the objectives and functions of education for children and society should be given more weight.

Ultimate opinions

Design and learning are complex social behaviors, and the contributions in this special issue collectively provide theoretical resources and approaches to further establish a research agenda. In doing so, the papers illustrate innovative methods of working in response to the shifting learning environment in schools and offer global insights that can help Pakistani context maximizeinnovation while reducing risk.

In order for academics, educators, architects, policy-makers, and planners to make the inclusive and responsible judgments in the innovation and study of learning environments that will be required to advance this agenda, it is our desire to frame debates and provoke debate (Ribeiro et al., 2018).

Teachers all around the world are now acutely aware of the value of coming together in physical places of learning as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Many have been prompted to reevaluate the value of social and emotional development as well as what is vital in education as a result. The future research agenda envisioned in this special issue includes Both thinking about the future of innovative learning environments and taking lessons fromearlier attempts at innovationand risk in school design.

2. REFERENCES

1. Barrett P, Davies F, Zhang Y (2015) The impact of classroom design on pupils' learning: Final results of a holistic, multi-level analysis. Building and Environment 89:

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

118–133.
2. Benade L, Jackson M (2017) Intro to ACCESS special issue: Modern learning environments. Educational Philosophy and Theory 49(8): 744–748.
3. Benito AE (2003) The school in the city: School architecture as discourse and as text. Pedagogica Historica 39(1): 53–64.
4. Carpenter N, Bauman DC (2016) Project delivery method performance for public school construction: Design–bid–build versus CM at risk. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management 142(10): 1–10.
5. Carvalho L, Yeoman P (2018) Framing learning entanglement in innovative learning spaces: Connecting theory, design and practice. British Educational Research Journal 44(6): 1120–1137.
6. Carvalho L, Nicholson T, Yeoman P, et al. (2020) Space matters: Framing the New Zealand learning landscape. Learning Environments Research 23: 307–329.
7. Deppeler JM, Aikens K (2020) Responsible innovation in school design – A systematic review. Journalof Responsible Innovation 7(3): 573–597.
8. Istance D, Kools M (2013) OECD work on technology and education: Innovative learning environments as an integrating framework. Pakistanian Journal of Education 48(1): 43–57.
9. Kokko AK, Hirsto L (2020) From physical spaces to learning environments: Processes in which physical spaces are transformed into learning environments. Learning Environments Research 24:71–85.
10. Könings KD, Bovill C, Woolner P (2017) Towards an interdisciplinary model of practice for participatory building design in education. Pakistanian Journal of Education 52(3): 306–317.
11. Koutamis A, Heuer J, Könings KD (2017) A visual information tool for user participation during the lifecycle of school building design: BIM. Pakistanian Journal of Education 52(3): 295–305.
12. Mäkitalo-Siegl K, Zottmann J, Kaplan F, et al. (eds) (2010) Classroom of the Future: Orchestrating Collaborative Spaces. Rotterdam: Sense Publications.
13. Moos RH (1979) Evaluating Educational Environments: Procedures, Measures, Findings and Policy Implications. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
14. Niemi K (2020) 'The best guess for the future?' Teachers' adaptation to open and flexible learning environments in Finland. Education Inquiry. Epub ahead of print 9 September 2020. Crossref Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2017) The OECD Handbook for
15. Innovative Learning Environments, Educational Research and Innovation. Paris: OECD Publishing.
16. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2018) The Future of Education and SkillsEducation 2030. Paris: OECD Publishing.
17. Ribeiro B, Bengtsson L, Benneworth P, et al. (2018) Introducing the dilemma of societal alignment for inclusive and responsible research and innovation. Journal of Responsible Innovation 5(3): 316– 331.
18. Reh S, Rabenstein K, Fritzsche B (2011) Learning spaces without boundaries? Territories, power and how schools regulate learning. Social and Cultural Geography 12(1): 83–98.

Journal of Multidisciplinary Cases
ISSN: 2799-0990
Vol : 02 , No. 04 , June-July 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/JMC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/jmc24.8.14

19. Schabmann A, Popper V, Schmidt BM, et al. (2016) The relevance of innovative school architecture for school principals. School Leadership and Management 36(2): 184–203.
20. Tse HM, Learoyd-Smith S, Stables A, et al. (2014) Continuity and conflict in school design: A case study from building schools for the future. Intelligent Buildings International 7(2–3): 64–82.
21. van Merriënboer JJ, McKenney S, Cullinan D, et al. (2017) Aligning pedagogy with physical learningspaces. Pakistanian Journal of Education 52(3): 253–267.
22. Woolner P, Hall E, Higgins S, et al. (2007) A sound foundation? What we know about the impact of environments on learning and the implications for Building Schools for the Future. Oxford Reviewof Education 33(1): 47–70.
23. Woolner P, Thomas U, Tiplady LJ (2018) Structural change from physical foundations: The role of the environment in enacting school change. Journal of Educational Change 19:223–242.