



## The Ninth ANTRIEP Policy Seminar and Members Meeting



Release of **ANTRIEP Modules: Making School Successful** during ANTRIEP Policy Seminar held at New Delhi (INDIA) October 19-21, 2011. In Picture (from Left to Right) Anton De Grauwe, IIEP; R. Govinda, President of the Network; Amarjit Singh, MHRD, Govt. of India; and K. Sujatha, Focal Point, NUEPA.

### *In this issue...*

Report on ANTRIEP Activities	3
A Summary of Discussion on the Report	7
ANTRIEP Seminar on The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or barrier to equity	8
News from Member Institutions	12
ANTRIEP Member Institutions	16

The Ninth ANTRIEP policy seminar on "The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity" was held at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India, on October 19-21, 2011, followed by a meeting of ANTRIEP member institutions on October 22, 2011.

Representatives from member institutions i.e. NAEM, BRAC, CAMP (Bangladesh), IAB (Malaysia), Balitbung Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Indonesia), KEDI (South Korea) CERID and NCED (Nepal), SEAMOINNOTECH (the Philippines), NIE (Sri Lanka) and ACER (Australia) participated in the seminar and meeting.

The President of the Network Dr. Xiuhua Dong of Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development, P.R.China sent her message as she could not attend the meeting. The Chairperson of the Network changes at every Annual Meeting and as per the convention, the head of the institution hosting the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network till the next Annual Meeting takes place. Accordingly Professor R. Govinda, Vice-chancellor, NUEPA, New Delhi, India, took over as the new president of the Network and Presided over the proceedings of the ANTRIEP Meeting thereafter as Chairman.

On behalf of the Focal Point, Professor Pranati Panda, NUEPA, New Delhi, presented a detailed report of the ANTRIEP activities during the years 2009-2011, which was circulated among the members. The report highlighted the activities of the Network including publication of five training modules on “Making Schools Successful” and also identified areas of priority action in coming years. The report underlined the need for closer interaction among the member institutions in the area of research and training. The complete text

of the report is published in this issue of the Newsletter.

This was followed by a detailed discussion on the future activities of the ANTRIEP. Some possible themes for future issues of the Newsletter were discussed. A summary of the discussion of the Ninth Annual Meeting is also published in this issue of the Newsletter. Mr. Lim Sothea, Director of Planning Department, Ministry of Education, and Cambodia attended the Meeting as an observer.

The Meeting ended with a vote of thanks proposed by the Focal Point appreciating the contribution made and continued support extended by the member institutions to the activities of the Network.

The Meeting of the member institutions was preceded by a seminar on “**The role private actors in education: An opportunity for innovations or a barrier for equity**”. This issue of the Newsletter carries a report on the Seminar.

**Editor**

For Editorial correspondence please contact:

***Prof. K. Sujatha***

***Editor***

***ANTRIEP Newsletter***

***National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA)***

***17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016, India***

Tel: (+91 11) 26967784, 26962120

Fax: (+91 11) 26853041, 26865180

E-mail: ksujatha@nuepa.org

sujakalimili@yahoo.com

## REPORT ON ANTRIEP ACTIVITIES\*

### The Background

Education system all over the globe, particularly in the developing countries, has experienced continued growth even in the closing decades of the previous century. The growth and expansion of the system has put tremendous pressure on the governments to plan and manage the system effectively. One of the recent reform strategies adopted in many countries to overcome the management challenges is decentralisation of the system. Decentralisation becomes successful only when planning and management competencies are developed at the local levels. Similarly, the recent move towards school autonomy has necessitated enhancing planning and management skills to implement academic and non-academic activities at the institutional level. In other words, expansion of the system, accompanied by the decentralisation process and school autonomy, has increased the number of actors involved in the planning and management of education and, as such, the demand for capacity building in educational planning and management has increased manifold in all countries, especially in Asia.

In most of the countries, there has been considerable emphasis on expansion of pedagogical training facilities. However, such facilities are not readily available in the area of educational planning and management. Very often, the number of institutions providing training in educational planning and management has remained very small as they have not increased in proportion to the increase in number of educational planners and managers. This has resulted in lack of capacities in educational planning and management in many countries. Paradoxically, in the phase of decentralised planning and management, whatever limited number of capacity building institutions are available, are situated at centralised locations, thereby impeding the very process of decentralisation. Therefore, there is an immediate need to diversify and expand the institutional

arrangements for capacity building of educational functionaries.

Many countries of the Asian region have organisational arrangements, though limited in numbers, for developing capacities of educational functionaries at various levels of the education system. These institutions have long-standing experience in assisting their respective governments in strengthening planning and management capacities. All these institutions were functioning till very recently rather in isolation and with very limited interaction with similar institutions situated either within the country or in other countries of the region. The level of communication among the institutions was simply poor as there was no mechanism for exchanging and sharing of ideas and experiences on a regular basis. With this backdrop, the idea of building a Network of Educational Planning and Management Institutions situated within the Asian region was rightly conceived and well in time.

The idea of forming a Network emerged at a workshop in Kathmandu in December 1994 and it became a reality at a workshop in New Delhi in December 1995 when 12 institutions from eight Asian countries formed the ANTRIEP Network. Since then the number of institutions has increased to 17 that includes also IIEP, Paris. The overall objective of the Network is to create co-ordination among the member institutions located in different countries of the region with a view to sharing experiences and ideas towards realising the growing demand of capacity building in various aspects of educational planning and management. The Network ensures regular exchange of technical information among the member institutions; it facilitates continuous upgrading of knowledge and skills among the professionals of the participating institutions through learning from each other's experience and in launching co-operative research

---

\* Presented at the Ninth Annual Meeting of ANTRIEP Meeting held at New Delhi, India on October 22, 2011

and training activities in areas of common interest. The Network brings out a bi-annual Newsletter also that helps in dissemination of the information regarding various activities of the Network.

### **Organisational Arrangement**

Any training and research institution in the region involved in educational planning and management can become a member of the Network. To be a member of the Network, the institute has to address its request expressing willingness to become a member to the Focal Point. No fee is charged for joining the Network. It was decided unanimously, in the very First Annual Meeting held in New Delhi in 1995, that the International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP) would provide special and continued support till the Network became self-sustaining and self-directed; that the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), New Delhi, would act as the Focal Point of the Network during initial years, and that the president of the Network would be on rotation basis. The Network is successfully functioning with the academic guidance and necessary support from the International Institute of Educational Planning, Paris. The National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, continues to function as the Focal Point.

Since the Presidentship is on rotation, normally the host of the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network, which changes at every Annual Meeting. The current Chairperson of the Network is Director General, National Institute of Education, Colombo, Sri Lanka, that hosted the Third Annual Meeting. The role of the Chairperson is to preside over the Annual Meeting, examine the applications for the new membership, if any, and give suggestions to the Focal Point for better facilitation of the Network activities.

As mentioned earlier, the Network at present has 16 member institutions from 10 countries of Asia, in addition to the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris. Of the 16 institutions, four are from India, three from Bangladesh, two from Nepal,

and one each from China, Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philippines, Republic of Korea, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The Network keeps on requesting its member institutions to contact and encourage similar institutions in their respective countries to become member of the Network. After 1998, no new member has joined the Network. However, there were some preliminary enquiries about the possibility of becoming member of Network by some institutions from some countries. We are sure new members from more countries of the region would join soon. The third Annual Meeting of the Network made a request to each of its member institutions to contact and encourage similar institutions in their countries to become members of the Network. Any member institution continues as a member of the Network by its active contribution to the activities of the ANTRIEP.

### **ANTRIEP Activities during 2009-2011**

#### ***Annual Meetings***

The vitality and dynamism of the Network is well proved through the regular Annual Meetings, which became a conviction. The Annual Meetings create an opportunity for the member institutions to have intensive and intimate interaction and exchange of ideas and experiences on a regular basis. Further, combining these meetings as follow up of a seminar on a selected theme enhances the value of the annual meetings. So far the seminar is initiated by the IIEP. This approach creates an opportunity for the member institutions to attend the annual meeting without financial obligations. The third Annual Meeting of the Network was held at NIE, Colombo, as a follow up of a Seminar on **School Efficiency**. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Network was also organised in the same vein in China as a follow up of the Seminar on **Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher**. We are grateful to SIHRD, China for their keen interest and initiative in organising the Fourth Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP.

The discussions during the Annual Meetings included ANTRIEP activities and also about scheduling of the next Annual Meeting. Till now, IIEP is providing the significant proportion of funding for the Annual Meetings. However, in some cases, the funding support for the member institutions is also mobilised directly by the member institutions from several agencies such as the European Union in case of India, UNICEF in case of Nepal etc. This is a good trend that needs to be further explored in other countries also.

### *Newsletter*

As decided in the First Annual Meeting that the Focal Point would bring out the Newsletter biannually, the Newsletter was started in 1996. The Network is successfully bringing out the Newsletter for the last four years regularly. More importantly, the Newsletter helps greatly to share the experiences of different countries on selected themes especially on planning and management of primary education. The themes for various issues of the Newsletter are discussed during the Annual Meetings. The Newsletter brought out after the Eighth Annual Meeting were devoted to **Education Systems for a Changing World: Innovations and Challenges** (Jan- June, 2010); **Interplay between Teacher Policy and Practices** (July- December, 2010) and **Ethics, Conduct, Competency for Teacher** (Jan- June, 2011). As a normal practice 10 copies of the ANTRIEP Newsletter are sent to each of the member institutions so that they can send them to other institution of their choice. All efforts are being made to keep the schedule of the Newsletter and overall, it has been published regularly. However, the response from the member institutions rather slow and non-encouraging in contributing articles.

The Newsletter has incorporated the item on Institutional News, covering research and training activities. While the brief information about the completed researches, training activities of the member institutions and forthcoming programmes is found to be useful by the members, however, information from some of the member institutions is not forthcoming.

The Newsletter is more and more widely distributed with each successive issue. In addition to the member institutions and distribution by member institutions to other agencies within the respective countries, it is distributed among individuals, institutions, agencies and partners at the international levels. Several encouraging responses have been received which demonstrates an increased interest in the publication.

### *Publication of Seminar Proceedings*

NUEPA, along with ANTRIEP, and IIEP have published a set of five training Modules on “**Making School Successful**” prepared by a team of experts drawn from member institutions as sequel to the research study conducted under ANTRIEP on “Improving School Management: Learning from Successful Schools in Asia”. The five modules include: (i) Successful Schools; (ii) Managing People at Work; (iii) Managing Student Affairs; (iv) Managing External Relations; and (5) School Development Planning. 10 sets of modules each will be sent to all the member institutions.

There is a need to revise the ANTRIEP brochure incorporating update institutional information and also adding more details about the areas of priority and list of important publications of member institutions.

### *Exchange of Documents and Information*

Exchange of documents and information related to different activities of member institutions was visualised as a means to keep themselves informed and knowing the developments in member institutions. Accordingly, in all the Annual Meetings, it was emphasised that the member institutions should exchange information among themselves. Compared to earlier, the bilateral exchange of documents and information seems to have increased to become multi-lateral, so to say. It is found that some individual member institutions do request other member institutions for relevant research or reference materials pertaining to the interest areas of their research work. The Focal Point has received feedback from some of

the member institutions that as and when such requests are received, they have been responding positively by sending the documents to other member institutions. Similarly, some of the member institutions send research documents brought out by them to the member institutions. A few member institutions have set a positive trend by sending and exchanging the information about their regional and international training programmes with all the member institutions as a regular feature.

### ***Visits and Exchange Programmes***

The period following the previous Annual Meeting was fortunate to see many visits materialising. These included visit of Director, IIEP to NUEPA, to IIEP by the Vice-Chancellor of NUEPA and faculty members from the Focal Point. And probably many more staff members might have visited different member institutions of which the Focal point does not have information. Although not under the Network, a few study visits among the member institutions as a part of sponsored programmes by international agencies also took place. NUEPA faculty had an occasion to visit KEDI in Seoul to attend a PROAP sponsored workshop. However, there is a need for the member institutions to initiate dialogue with bilateral and multilateral international agencies to explore possibilities of providing funding support for exchange programmes. There is a need to evolve a more systematic and a common framework for exchange of personnel among the member institutions.

### ***Workshops and Training Programmes***

Annual meetings alone may not be enough to sustain the Network and to make it more effective. In addition to the annual meetings, regular interaction and collaboration through mutual participation in training programmes among the member institutions is essential. This will not only reinforce the Network activities but also help the member institutions in internal capacity building. We do not have information about member institutions whether they had conducted any such

training programmes or workshops where the participants were also from the member institutions of their Network.

Thus, a number of training programmes are being organised by the member institutions and some of the participants attending these programmes are from other member institutions. There is an immense potential for developing such collaborative training programmes. The challenge ahead for the Network member institutions is to develop close interaction with the governments of respective countries. Most of the recent educational reforms in the region are according importance to invest more on capacity building. As a part of capacity building programmes, study visits and training programme are sponsored by the funding agencies in different countries. In fact, some of the members of the Network are also engaged in organising training and study visit programmes on the request of respective governments or funding agencies. However, the Network is hardly involved in these programmes. Therefore, there is a need to make concerted efforts through close interaction with the governments of respective countries that sponsor such programmes to make the Network as the medium to facilitate training activities.

### ***Collaborative Research Projects***

For mutual benefit and sustained inter-institutional linkages, collaborative research becomes an important impetus. Though many important research studies were sponsored and completed as a part of ANTRIEP activity, in recent years, however, hardly any research study was undertaken under the network.

### ***Changes in Heads of Member Institutions***

Heads of several member institutions have changed after the Shanghai Meeting in 2009. Professor Kahalil Mahshi has taken over charge as Director at the IIEP and Professor R. Govinda as new Vice-Chancellor of NUEPA, the Focal Point. New Directors have taken

over NAEM, Bangladesh; IAB, Malaysia; and Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research, Indonesia.

### ***Future Perspective Action***

While efforts will continue for mobilising funding support for the collaborative projects, attempts are also needed to mobilise resources at individual member institutions. The member institutions may need to incorporate some of the ANTRIEP activities in their annual budget under development programmes. This arrangement may facilitate to have regular

collaboration among the member institutions at bilateral and regional levels.

On behalf of the Focal Point of ANTRIEP, may I take this opportunity to thank the IIEP, the president of the Network and all the member institutions for their invaluable guidance and persistent support to the Network activities, which kept the Network alive and active all these years.

***Pranati Panda***  
*NUEPA, New Delhi*  
E-mail : pranatipanda@nuepa.org

## **A Summary of Discussion on the Report**

The meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions is always organized along with a Seminar. The Ninth Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions held at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi on 22<sup>nd</sup> October ,2012 too was preceded by a Seminar on “The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity”. Representatives from 17 member institutions of the Network attended the Meeting.

The Meeting commenced with reading a message sent by Dr. Xiuhua Dong, Director, SHIRD, China the outgoing Chairperson of the Network which was followed by a presentation of the ANTRIEP Activities Report by Professor Pranati Panda, on behalf of the Focal Point. According to the convention established by previous Network Meetings, the Chairperson of the Network changes at every meeting and normally the host institute of the ANTRIEP Meeting assume this responsibility until the beginning of the Network’s next meeting. Professor R. Govinda, Vice-Chancellor NUEPA, India assumed the responsibility of

Chairperson of ANTRIEP. Professor Govinda chaired and conducted the proceedings of the Meeting thereafter.

The Network Meeting discussed the report which was followed by its approval by member institutions and discussions on the probable topics for the subsequent issues of the Newsletter and it’s cover design. There was discussion on strengthening bilateral relationships of member institutions, initiating collaborative research studies and developing research proposals. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks by the Focal Point. The summary of the discussion is given below.

The probable topics for the forthcoming issues of the Newsletter will focus on the ANTRIEP seminar and Ninth Meeting. Subsequent issues of the Newsletter will consider such areas as Education and Globalisation, School Monitoring and Evaluation, Public Examinations, Educational Reforms, Vocational Education and Skill Development, Literacy, Innovations and Best Practices.

In recent years, no collaborative research studies were taken up under ANTRIEP although IIEP has involved some of the member intuitions in some research studies. Members discussed the scope for initiating collaborative research as a part of the ANTRIEP activity. ACER, Australia has evinced interest to assist in developing research proposals. Vice-Chancellor NUEPA opined that there should be more regional

programmes and research collaboration among member institutions and will consider incorporating some regional programmes and collaborative research activities in NUEPA's academic schedule.

**K. Sujatha**  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
E-mail : ksujatha@nuepa.org

## ANTRIEP Seminar on The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or barrier to equity

### *The public and non-public actors*

The debate on the respective roles of public and non-public actors in education has always been a fairly contentious one, but it has become more complex in recent years because the constitution of both the groups has become more diversified. Neither group is monolithic. Neither group is particularly "good" or "bad". Non-public actors referred to in the discussions at the ANTRIEP seminar ranged from NGOs who work with the most disadvantaged kids, to warlords who enroll children in their armies. The public sector has also become more complex, because of policies of decentralization and school autonomy. What further enriches this debate, and also makes it more intricate, is the diversity between countries: Sri Lanka does not recognize any private school, while in Fiji, the few remaining public schools will all soon become private. In most countries, there is a growing demand to strengthen the involvement of non-public actors.

During the seminar, two contrasting story lines appeared to explain the popularity of this demand.

Storyline 1 starts from the finding that there is an unbridgeable gap between the demand for education and whatever the government will be able to supply. Luckily, there are private providers who help fill this gap. And equally also, the parents have become more aware of their rights and are less uncritical when

assessing the school quality and performance of schools. As such, the involvement of private providers offers the public, including the poor, with a wider choice and increases access.

Storyline 2 is less optimistic. Its point of departure is that governments are renegeing on their commitment to provide universal basic education, influenced as they are by an ideology which lauds privatization. The gap in supply, thus created, is filled by non-government actors, who are not always properly regulated by the government and may provide low-quality education at a high cost. Those who are not served by public schools, have little choice but to opt for private fee-paying schools.

Interestingly, these two story lines may both be true, depending on the country and on specific situations within each country.

### *The impact of greater non-public provision*

The specificity of each context moulds the impact of increased non-public provision. Impact has to be examined on access, quality and equity, also on issues such as empowerment and national integration.

When commenting on these different issues, we need to look at the immediate impact on specific schools or groups and at the indirect impact on the education



system. To illustrate this with an example: in Sri Lanka, several schools receive equipment from private companies. Can we object to what seems a simple act of generosity, which benefits school children? Maybe not; but two questions have to be asked: do we know if these beneficiary schools are among the neediest? And what is the impact on neighbouring schools who do not benefit from any gifts and thus may become less attractive to parents?

The impact on access of increased non-public provision is surely positive, as more school places are provided. However, the impact on accessibility, on the affordability of access is less evidently positive, if a greater share of school places are offered by fee-charging schools.

The impact on quality led to very interesting but contradictory debates. A representative of a major private school network claimed, figures at hand, that private school students have better results than those in public schools. But other presenters, who analyzed such data more critically, showed that public schools perform as well as private schools, once we take into account the students' socio-economic background and the schools' environment. Other presenters put doubt on the claim that competition between (public and private) schools will lead to higher quality, as in many countries such a competition tends to be between the "fairly bad" public school and the "not so very bad" private school and, therefore, leads to only marginal improvements.

This does not mean however that we cannot learn from what successful private schools have done. The strategies which explain their success include:

- Individualized attention to students;
- Stronger relations with parents and the community; and
- A well-functioning system of teacher support and accountability.

This last point may be the most difficult for public schools to develop. Several discussions emphasized that public school systems fail, on the one hand, to offer teachers an attractive career and, on the other hand, to sanction them when they misbehave or to support them when they underperform.

Teacher accountability is a crucial but complex issue. It is probably correct that problems of teacher absenteeism or chronic underperformance are less prevalent in private than in public school systems because of the more direct relationship between the private school teachers and their "boss". But the existence of a rather well protected national teaching service is not a historical coincidence: it is the result of a perceived need to protect teachers from the vagaries of local control and from local interests, and to offer them a genuine professional status. The challenge is to find strategies which strengthen teacher accountability without further breaking down their professional status. Allowing school principals some say in the selection of teachers, offering school boards the possibility to withhold teacher salaries in extreme cases and giving parents the authority to control teacher presence and behaviour may be relevant ideas.

When discussing the impact of the expansion of private education, the greatest concern relates – in the literature as well in reality – to the risks of increased disparities and segregation. The debate around disparities is well known and needs little further comment. The risk of segregation has been somewhat less discussed but is fundamental: the purposes of the education system are to prepare for citizenship, one crucial aspect of which is learning to live together.

Private schools tend to have a less diversified student body than public schools, partly for financial reasons but also because of the choices that schools and parents make. Schools tend to refuse students who do not correspond to their image of the ideal student, and parents may be intimidated by schools that seem to be out of their children's league. Such segregation is particularly worrying in "young" countries which are

still relying on their public education system to form a common nation or in nations characterized by deep heterogeneity.

When, in addition, central authorities are relatively weak and fail to ensure the respect of national regulations (including the curriculum), the risk that separate education systems, which transmit different values, exist within one country, becomes worrying. However, it may be unfair to blame private schools for creating disparities. These disparities existed before. Private schools simply work within and profit from these existing disparities. Their existence may make disparities worse, but this is not necessarily an argument for their abolition. Rather, it emphasizes the need for global equity-focused policies, including through the regulation of private education.

### ***Regulating non-public actors***

The debate about the nature of such regulation and the forms it should take is contentious because this debate reflects conflicts on some core principles. Everybody can agree on one principle, namely that education is a right, not a privilege. But beyond that area of agreement, fundamental differences of opinion appear. Individuals should have the right to choose the school to send their children to, as this is an important decision for the present and future life of their children. Or governments have the right, the duty to control the distribution of students among schools, to avoid segregation and to enhance social integration. Values of individual freedom, on the one hand, and of social equity, on the other hand, cannot both be fully realized but have to be kept in balance. In the same manner, private and public interests are at times in conflict.

Countries have formulated different answers. Various countries accept that education is a for-profit exercise; others (South Korea, for instance) refuse any for-profit schools. This diversity of policies is unavoidable because of the differences in emphasis put on the above-mentioned values. It is, therefore, irrelevant to want to impose a unique package of policies. What can be done,

however, is to learn from successful experiences and to summarize some policy suggestions that came out of the seminar debates.

Three policy suggestions of a somewhat practical nature may need to accompany the formulation of a policy on private education.

First, there remains a need for better information on the extent of private education, on the wide spectrum of private schools and their many differences, on the characteristics of their pupils and their quality. The nature and impact of private tuition needs further research, as does the role that private actors have in policy formulation. Such a stronger information base is useful for decision-makers, who need aggregated analysis on trends, and for parents, who want much more specific information on the performance of schools, so that they can make well-informed decisions.

Secondly, consultation between stakeholders in education, and in particular between public and private actors, has to be promoted in order to overcome the mutual suspicion between these two groups. Private schools tend to accuse public schools of being inefficient, to offer low-quality and especially to be unaccountable. Public officials may feel that private schools' only interest is in the profit they can make, and that they will do so at any cost. Such mutual suspicion is partly unfounded and unhelpful to the education system. Developing consultation mechanisms, at central and at local level, remains thus a priority.

Thirdly, it could be useful to develop taxonomy of the different tasks and responsibilities to make an education system function effectively, in order to identify which of these tasks can easily be performed by private actors and which ones should be performed by public authorities. Such taxonomy evidently cannot replace policy debate, but it can help making the debate more constructive.

These practical measures will facilitate the development of a policy on the role of private actors, which is inspired

by the global policy objectives of higher quality and equity.

The seminar participants, although aware of the possible risks of poorly regulated expansion of private education, recognized the positive contribution that private actors can make.

The involvement of private actors can be promoted but on two essential conditions: firstly, the curriculum remains common to all schools as this represents the heart of a national education system. Secondly, for all children who cannot afford a particular private school, there should be an accessible alternative of reasonable quality.

In practice, these two conditions translate into obligations for governments: the obligation to develop and ensure the respect of a national curriculum and the obligation to provide sufficient schools of good quality, in particular for the most disadvantaged.

In any country, private actors in education work within a regulatory framework developed by the national authorities. This framework consists for instance of the minimum conditions of the facilities and the teachers. Ideally, such a framework should not only be used to

control private (and public) schools, but maybe more to support and guide them.

But two almost unavoidable questions have to be confronted. Firstly, some of the behaviour we want to regulate is intensely human behaviour: the desire to be better than others, to offer one's children the best possible future, the search for profit are elements which promote the expansion of private education and will not disappear. The second question is most preoccupying. The countries where private education has expanded most anarchically and where regulation is most needed are precisely those where the public authorities were unable to provide sufficient schools or to offer schooling of acceptable quality. In other words, the same authorities who are unable to regulate their own public school system, is now being asked to regulate this more complex and diversified education market.

This final point again emphasizes the need for strengthening the capacities of national authorities in the monitoring, through supervision and support, of all schools, be they public or private.

*Anton De Grauwe*  
*IIEP, Paris*

E-mail : a.de-grauwe@iiep.org

## **Modules**

### **Making School Successful**

A comparative research study on successful schools conducted under the ANTRIEP in seven countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri-Lanka, Malaysia, and the Philippines) showed that heads of schools play a critical role and possess common characteristics though they adopted different strategies in managing schools. Despite significant differences in the context and conditions characterising different schools, managerial skills of school heads emerged as a significant factor contributing to effective functioning of schools. Specifically, possessing a set of core skills of planning and management by the school heads was found to form essential pre-condition for making the schools successful.

As a sequel to this collaborative research on successful schools, a set of five modules on " Making School Successful " have been prepared by a group of experts from ANTRIEP member institutions from India, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Malaysia and International Institute of Educational Planning, Paris through workshops organised in Nepal and Sri Lanka. The five modules cover: (i) Successful Schools; (ii) Managing People at Work; (iii) Managing Student Affairs; (iv) Managing External Relations; and (v) School Development Planning.

National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India which is the Focal Point of ANTRIEP has printed the modules, synthesis report and School Cases studies.

## News from Member Institutions (January - June 2011)

### **Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI)**

*Seoul, Korea*

- The KEDI-UNESCO, Bangkok joint international seminar was held in July 2011. The seminar discussed the policies on teachers and educational finance and major issues around the cooperation for educational development. The participants also discussed the future plan to improve the quality of education.
- Held an international youth symposium on “Presentation of Self-Oriented Theses in Humanities, Natural and Social Sciences” in August, 2011. Youths older than 12 from home and abroad presented the results of self-oriented independent research.
- An international forum on “Global Crisis of Higher Education Finance and its Counter Measure” was held in September 2011.
- As part of the celebrating the 50th anniversary of Korea signing a treaty of amity with Australia, a Joint conference of Korea-Australia on “The Plan to Increase the Quality of Higher Education and Mutual Cooperation between Korea and Australia” was held in September 2011.
- Held the 12<sup>th</sup> international conference on education research on “International Education Cooperation for Sustainable Development in the Context of Globalization” in October 2011 to examine and share the up-to-date educational research from home and abroad.

- An international symposium and launching ceremony of Gifted Education Database (GED) was held in October 2011. This project publicized the opening of GED to the staff of gifted and talented education, the citizens and international society.
- A symposium on “Global Education and the Competency of Teachers in 21st Century” was organized in November 2011. This symposium was aimed to make a plan to train future global teachers in Korea by presenting foreign cases of global education and teacher training, and discussing related policies and promotion strategy to enhance the quality of teacher training institutions.
- KEDI in collaboration with Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences organized in November 2011 a workshop on ‘Policy on Teachers to present education, screening, qualification, and training process of teachers in both countries.

### **Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD)**

*Shanghai, China*

- Conducted a research study on “**Finance Performance Evaluation and Index System on the Special Investment in Higher Education in Shanghai**”. The research report was evaluated by an expert panel, and found a strong positive significance for its practical application. A series of governmental regulations were formed based on the research report.
- Participated in the research program of Shanghai Education Commission

on **”Research on the Inspection and Evaluation System on the Balanced Development in Shanghai Compulsory Education”**. The research findings have been used in the design of the government educational supervision system through the development of relevant standards and assessment system.

- Entrusted by the Department of Development and Planning of Ministry of Education, conducted a study on **“Assessment on the Educational Development Goals on Provincial Levels during the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan”**. The assessment report provides the central educational administrative departments an objective basis to adjust the guidance to higher education and secondary vocational education in the 12th Five Year Plan.

### **National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA)**

*New Delhi, India*

- NUEPA conferred Doctor of Literature Honoris Causa on Professor Amartya Sen, Lamont University, Professor, Harvard University and Nobel Laureate.
- NUEPA with the support of Government of India has setting up the India African Institute of Educational Planning and Administration a pan African institute in Republic of Burundi.
- A team of academics and senior policy makers led by Minister for Education, Government of Burundi, visited NUEPA to discuss on setting up of India African Institute of Educational Planning and Administration in Burundi.
- A comprehensive database on Elementary Education in India under District Information System for Education (DISE) has successfully

covered 1,4 million primary and upper primary schools in all the districts in the country. The School Report Cards published cover quantitative and qualitative information on students, teachers, infrastructure facilities and other school related variables. The School Report Cards of DISE had won national e-governance and e-India awards and Manthan South Asia award. Education Information System is now covered secondary education and made it as Unified DISE. All the data on elementary and secondary education can now be accessed with the click of a mouse ([www.dise.in](http://www.dise.in)).

- Completed a study on the **“Functioning of Education Committees at School Level”**. The study examined the role, functions and effectiveness of Village Education Committee, School Development Committee, PTA etc., in school management and supervision. The study covered 1,006 schools in 14 states. The research findings have policy planning implications at system and school levels.

The January-June 2012 issue of the ANTRIEP Newsletter will cover the papers presented during the ANTRIEP Policy Seminar on **The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovations or a barrier for equity**.

- A research study on **“Participation of Muslims in Higher Education”** was conducted with a major objective to identify the factors for low participation. The research showed that income barrier in terms family occupation and compulsion for early earnings constrain participation in higher education, though they may have opportunity to get high returns by investing in higher education.
- Participated in collaborative research of **“Consortium for Educational Access,**

**Transitions and Equity (CREATE)”** with the Centre for International Education, University of Sussex. Several institutions in Africa and Asia also participated in Consortium. NUEPA had been engaged in generating research which included community and school surveys in Madhya Pradesh state. Various research reports and two dozen thematic papers were prepared and published from the survey data. The papers and research reports are found in **ww.create-rpc.org**

For further details on ANTRIEP activities contact

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)  
7-9 Rue Eugene - Delacroix  
75116 PARIS, France  
Fax: + (33) 1 40728366  
email: a.de.grauwe@iiep.unesco.org

National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA),  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg  
NEW DELHI-110 016, India  
Fax: + (91 11) 26853041, 26865180  
E-mail: ksujatha@nuepa.org

# Glimpses

of ANTRIEP Seminar Held at NEW DELHI (India)  
on November 19-21, 2011



## ANTRIEP Member Institutions

1. Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Education, Taleemi Chowk, G-8/1, P.O. Box 1566, ISLAMABAD, Pakistan (<http://aepam.edu.pk>)
2. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), 19 Prospect Hill Road, Private Bag – 55, Camberwell, Melbourne, VICTORIA-3124, Australia ([www.acer.edu.au](http://www.acer.edu.au))
3. Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Puslit Penelitian), Office for Educational and Culture Research and Development (Balitbang Dikb) Ministry of Education and Culture, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman, Senayan, JAKARTA – 12041, Indonesia.
4. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) 75, Mohakhali Commercial Area, DHAKA – 1212, Bangladesh ([www.brac.net](http://www.brac.net))
5. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), 5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, DHAKA – 1207, Bangladesh ([www.campebd.org](http://www.campebd.org))
6. Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), D.B. Rodda Road, Jubilee Circle, DHARWARD - 380 001, Karnataka (INDIA) ([www.cmdr.co.in](http://www.cmdr.co.in))
7. Centre for Education Leadership Development, (CELD), National Institute of Education (NIE), Meepe Junction, Padukka, Sri Lanka ([www.nie.lk](http://www.nie.lk))
8. Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Sri Layang 69000, Genting Highland, PAHANG, Malaysia
9. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 PARIS, France ([www.iiep.unesco.org](http://www.iiep.unesco.org))
10. Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), 92-6 Umyeon-Dong, Seocho-Gu, SEOUL 137-791 KOREA, ([www.kedi.re.kr](http://www.kedi.re.kr))
11. National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM), Dhanmodi, DHAKA – 1205, Bangladesh ([www.naem.gov.bd](http://www.naem.gov.bd))
12. National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Sanothimi, BHAKTAPUR 2050, Nepal ([www.nced.gov.np](http://www.nced.gov.np))
13. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 (INDIA) ([www.ncert.nic.in](http://www.ncert.nic.in))
14. National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi –110016, India ([www.nuepa.org](http://www.nuepa.org))
15. Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development, Tribhuvan University, P.O. Box 2161, Balkhu, Kathmandu, Nepal, ([www.cerid.org](http://www.cerid.org))
16. Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), 21 North Cha Ling North Road SHANGHAI - 200 032, China
17. South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, SEAMEO INNOTECH P.O. Box 207, Commonwealth Avenue, U.P. Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines ([www.seameo-innotech.org](http://www.seameo-innotech.org))
18. State Institute of Educational Management & Training (SIEMAT), 25 P.C. Banerjee Road, Allenganj ALLAHABAD, Uttar Pradesh, India
19. The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P) House No.3 & 4, F-17/B, Block VII KDA Scheme 5, Clifton, Karachi-75600, Pakistan ([www.akdn.org/akes](http://www.akdn.org/akes))
20. The Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development, (AKU-IED), 1-5/B-VII, F. B. Area Karimabad, P.O. Box No.13688, Karachi-75950, Pakistan (<http://www.aku.edu>)

Edited by K. Sujatha on behalf of the Focal Point, ANTRIEP and published by the Registrar, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 and processed/printed by the Publication Unit, NUEPA at M/s Anil Offset & Packaging Pvt. Ltd., Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-110007, India