

The Sixth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting

The Sixth Annual Meeting of ANTRIEP member institutions was held at the South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation, Regional Centre For Educational Innovations and Technology (SEAMEO INNOTECH), Diliman, Quezon City, The Philippines, on 9 July 2004. The proceedings of one day meeting started at 1000 hrs. Representatives from 15 member institutions i.e., NAEM and BRAC (Bangladesh), Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy



Sixth Annual Meeting of ANTRIEP Member Institutions, The Philippines

In this issue...

<i>The Sixth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Report on ANTRIEP Activities</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Meeting at SEAMEO-INNOTECH, The Philippines</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Improving Quality Through Reforming School Management</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Profile of New Member</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>News from Member Institutions</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Member Institutions</i>	<i>16</i>

Research (Indonesia), KEDI (Korea), CERID and NCED (Nepal), AKU-IED (Pakistan), CPDEM, NIE (Sri Lanka), NCERT, SIEMAT, CMDR and NIEPA (India), IAB (Malaysia), SEAMEO INNOTECH (The Philippines) and IIEP (Paris) participated in the meeting.

Mr. Chua Hong Tam, Head, Department of Human Resource Management, IAB, opened and chaired the meeting as Mr. Ishak Sin, Director of IAB, the Chairperson of the Network could not unfortunately attend the meeting. The Chairperson of the Network changes at every meeting of ANTRIEP member institutions, and as per the convention, the head of the institution hosting the ANTRIEP meeting becomes the Chairperson of the Network till the next ANTRIEP Meeting takes place. Accordingly, Dr. (Mrs). Erlinda C. Pefianco, Director, SEAMEO-INNOTECH, took over as the new president of the Network and presided over

the proceedings of the ANTRIEP Meeting thereafter as its Chairperson.

On behalf of the Focal Point, Professor K. Sujatha, NIEPA, New Delhi, presented a detailed report of the ANTRIEP activities during 2002-04, which was circulated among the members. The Report highlighted the activities of the Network, identified areas of priority action in the coming years and explored various initiatives to promote closer interaction between the members, like the Newsletter and other institutional publications, exchange programmes, workshops, training programmes, study visits and collaborative research projects. Completion of the case studies of successful schools, which formed the important input for the preceding seminar on “**Improving School Management: Learning from Successful Schools**”, was also reported in the meeting. The report underlined the need for closer interaction between member institutions and the policy-making authorities in the respective countries, initiating more bilateral arrangements among member institutions in the areas of research and training. It emphasised the need for initiating steps for bringing larger number of institutions to the Network as associate members, especially from those countries, which have many member institutions, and also bringing new member institutions from countries, which are not represented in the Network. The presentation was followed by discussion on the report and future activities of the ANTRIEP, including themes for future issues of the newsletter. The complete text of the report and a summary of the sixth Annual Meeting of ANTRIEP are published in this issue of the Newsletter.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks proposed by the Focal Point, appreciating the contributions made and continued support extended by the member institutions, especially IIEP, Paris to the activities of the Network.

The ANTRIEP meeting was preceded by a seminar on “**Improving School Management: Learning from Successful Schools**”. The seminar was funded by IIEP from the financial assistance received from World Bank for ANTRIEP project and Network activities. A brief summary of the seminar is published in this issue of the Newsletter.

We wish a **Very Happy New Year** to all our member institutions and readers.

Editor

For Editorial correspondence please contact:

*The Editor
ANTRIEP Newsletter
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration (NIEPA)
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi - 110 016
India*

Tel: (+91 11) 26861913, 26962120

Fax: (+91 11) 26853041, 26865180

*E-mail: ksujatha@vsnl.com
ksujatha@niepa.org*

The January-June 2005 issue of the ANTRIEP Newsletter will focus on **Curriculum and Textbooks: Issues and Reforms**. The member institutions are requested to send their contributions to the Editor not later than 30 March 2005.

Report on ANTRIEP Activities*

Background

Realising education as one of the key factors for socio-economic development has a remarkable effect on the expansion of educational system all over the world and, more so, in the developing countries. Education system in the developing countries has witnessed continued growth, particularly in the last two decades. The growth and expansion of the system has put immense pressure on the governments to plan and manage the system effectively, ensuring equity and quality. It is, in this context, that several countries have adopted new strategies and planning processes.

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 brought to focus again the issue of enhancing planning and management skills to implement the academic and non-academic activities at the institutional level. In other words, expansion of the system, accompanied as it is 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. However, institutions to impart capacity building on a large scale, especially in all the required areas, do not exist in many of the countries of the Asian region.

In most of the countries, there has been considerable emphasis on expansion of pedagogical training institutions. 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 and far, as they have not increased in proportion to the increase in the number of educational planners and managers leading to 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, they are situated at centralised locations, thereby encumbering the very process of decentralisation. Therefore, there is an urgent 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 for developing capacities of educational functionaries at various levels of the education system. These institutions have a long-standing experience in assisting their respective governments in strengthening planning and management capacities. All these institutions were functioning, till very recently, in isolation and they rarely got a chance to meet among themselves to share their experiences and expertise. Moreover, there used to be very limited interaction among similar institutions situated either within the country or in other countries of the region. There was no mechanism for exchanging and sharing ideas and experiences on a regular basis. With this backdrop, the idea of a Network of Educational Planning and Management Institutions, situated within Asian region, was rightly conceived.

The idea of developing a Network in this region took a concrete shape at a workshop in Kathmandu in December 1994 and it became a reality at the workshop in New Delhi in December 1995 when 12 institutions from eight Asian countries formed the ANTRIEP Network. Since then the number of member institutions has increased to 19, including 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 experiences and in launching co-operative research and training activities in areas of common interest. The Network also brings out a bi-annual Newsletter consisting of articles on selected themes that help to share and understand experiences of respective countries and dissemination

* Presented at the Sixth Annual Meeting of ANTRIEP held at Manila, The Philippines on July 9, 2004

of the information regarding various training and research activities of member institutions 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 First ANTRIEP Meeting held in New Delhi in 1995 that the International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris, would provide special and continued support till the Network becomes self-sustaining and self-directed; that the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi, would act as the Focal Point of the Network; and that the Chairman of the Network would be on rotation basis. The Network is successfully functioning under the academic guidance and necessary support from the International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris. The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, continues to function as the Focal Point. Any member institution continues as a member of the Network by its active contribution to the activities of the ANTRIEP.

Since the Chairmanship is by rotation, normally the host of the ANTRIEP Meeting becomes the Chairman of the Network, which changes at every ANTRIEP Meeting. The current Chairperson of the Network is Dr. Ishak Sin, Director, Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Genting Highland, PAHANG, Malaysia that hosted the Fifth ANTRIEP Meeting. The role of the Chairperson is to preside over the ANTRIEP 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 18 member institutions from 10 countries of Asia, in addition to the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris. Of the 19 institutions, four are from India, three each from Bangladesh and Pakistan, two from Nepal and one each from China, Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philippines, Republic of Korea 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,

as it also did at the Fifth ANTRIEP Meeting. We are glad to inform that after the ANTRIEP Meeting 2002, Aga Khan Education Service Pakistan, Karachi has joined the ANTRIEP as a member. National Centre for Educational Research, in Beijing, China has expressed a clear interest in joining the network, as shown by its participation in the Seminar and also at this meeting. There were also some preliminary enquiries by some institutions about the possibility of their becoming member of the Network. We are sure new members from some of these countries of the region would join the Network soon.

ANTRIEP Activities During 2002-04

ANTRIEP Meetings

The vivacity and zing of the Network are well established by the ANTRIEP Meetings it holds and which have become a convention. The ANTRIEP Meetings provide an opportunity for the member institutions to have intensive and intimate interaction and exchange of ideas and experiences on a regular basis. Further, making these meetings an integral follow up part of a seminar on selected theme enhances the value of the ANTRIEP Meetings. So far, the seminar has been initiated by the IIEP. This approach creates an opportunity for the member institutions to attend the ANTRIEP Meeting without financial obligations. The Fifth ANTRIEP Meeting of the Network was held at IAB, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia as a follow up of a Seminar on School Evaluation for Quality. The Sixth ANTRIEP Meeting of the Network has also been organised as a follow up of the Seminar on "Improving School Management : Learning From Successful Schools".

We are grateful to SEAMEO-INNOTECH, The Philippines, for their keen interest and initiative in organising the Sixth ANTRIEP Meeting.

The discussions during the ANTRIEP Meetings focus around Network activities and also to consider scheduling of the next ANTRIEP Meeting. The IIEP provides significant proportion of funding for the ANTRIEP Meetings. The World Bank, through a Grant to IIEP, offered support to ANTRIEP in 2003-04 and is expected to continue doing so in 2004-05.

Collaborative Research Projects

For mutual benefit and sustained inter-institutional linkages, collaborative research has been conceived an important impetus. A collaborative project was initiated

on **Improving School Management in Asian Countries** with the ardent suggestions of member institutions and also considering that very little empirical research has been conducted in the Asian region on the role of head teachers and their impact on school improvement. The project consists of a series of research studies, workshops and training activities spread over a period of 4 years and carried out in a collaborative manner by the member institutions of ANTRIEP. The project was undertaken in two phases. Firstly, a series of national diagnoses on the management of headteachers was undertaken by several members. These were presented and discussed at the Shanghai Seminar in 2000. A comparative analysis was then prepared. Both the analysis and the case studies are now being published by the IIEP for ANTRIEP. In a second phase, the programme moved to the school level, case studies on particularly successful schools were carried out. IIEP in consultation with NIEPA, the Focal Point prepared the broad outline of the research proposal covering scope, objectives and important research questions to be examined in the case study of schools. The same has been sent to all member institutions requesting to prepare detailed research proposal considering their own country educational context. Eight member institutions from 6 countries sent their specific proposals. The research proposals including methodology, structure and organisation of case study was finalised in a workshop organised at Bangladesh during April 2003. Another workshop was organised in Nepal during December 2003 to discuss the draft case studies. The research teams from the member institutions participated in both the workshops. While IIEP, Paris, funded the conduct of case studies including workshops and the local member institutions i.e. NAEM and CERID hosted the workshops. The theme for the just concluded seminar was based on the school case studies. The school case studies had become a valuable input of the just concluded seminar organised under ANTRIEP.

Workshops and Training Programmes

ANTRIEP Meetings alone may not be enough to sustain the Network and make it more effective. In addition to the ANTRIEP Meetings, regular interaction and collaboration through mutual participation in training programmes among the member institutions are also essential. This will not only reinforce the Network activities but also help the member institutions in internal capacity building.

Three of the member institutions made a beginning in this direction during 2003-04. Under ANTRIEP institutional collaboration, NIEPA, in association with IED-AKU, Pakistan and CEMD, NIE, Sri Lanka, organised a ten-day training programme on Monitoring and Evaluation for the staff of IED in Colombo and some of the faculty members of CEMD also attended the training. Aga Khan Educational Service, Pakistan (AKES,P), the newly joined member and NIEPA are collaborating to conduct training programme shortly for heads of AKES,P schools in Karachi.

In fact, some of the member institutions are organising regional programmes as well as programmes for functionaries from other countries. In 2002-03, NIEPA organised specific programmes for Sri Lanka, apart from its regular International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration. One of the Faculty members from NAEM (Bangladesh) participated in International Diploma Programme of NIEPA during 2004. UNESCO New Delhi has requested IIEP and NIEPA to jointly organise a series of training programmes for E-9 countries as a follow-up to Dakar Declaration 2000. As part of this, NIEPA and IIEP has organised training programmes in NIEPA, Delhi. The participants for this programme included some of the ANTRIEP member institutions in the region.

NIEPA has signed a MOU with Department of Education, Royal Government of Nepal to implement DANIDA funded capacity building programmes on decentralisation in planning and management of education. Staff members of NCED and CERID participated in the training programmes organised under NIEPA-Nepal Education Project. Similarly, CERID and NCED were involved in a capacity building programme organised by IIEP sponsored by DANIDA in Nepal.

These programmes are generally not organised by the Network. However, the institutions and participants are from the member institutions of Network. Similarly, KEDI (Seoul) in collaboration with PROAP (UNESCO), Bangkok, has organised a regional training programme on Planning and Management of Educational Policies, where some of the participants were from the member institutions of the Network, including NIEPA. The IIEP has launched a distance training programme on sector analysis, in which many ANTRIEP institutions have been invited to participate. NIEPA and IIEP are also conducting a collaborative study on Secondary Education. Thus, a number of training programmes are

being organised by the member institutions and some of the participants attending these programmes are invariably 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 and social safety net programmes in the region are according importance to invest more on capacity building. As part of capacity building programmes, study visits and training programmes are sponsored by the funding agencies in different countries. In fact, some of the members of the Network are also engaged in organising training programmes and study visits 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 and also with the international funding agencies that sponsor such programmes to make the Network as the medium to facilitate training activities. If partnership is developed among the member institutions in designing and organising the training programmes, it would not only help to strengthen the quality and relevance of the training programmes on educational planning and management but would also help build the capacities of many member institutions in their gap areas. This can also help some of the member institutions, which, at present are not conducting any regional or international training programmes to gain experience and exposure.

There can be several ways of collaboration, from helping to improve the capacities of member institutions to convergence of expertise from different member institutions in designing and conducting the training programmes. This aspect was persistently envisaged right from the beginning of the Network but has always been difficult to materialise. In view of the increased inter-institutional visits and participation in training programmes, it is imperative to develop concrete collaborative training programme proposals. It is also important to explore the possibilities of being funded for such collaborative programmes by international agencies. It is equally important to have a common framework and perspective plan for developing collaborative training programmes and also to act proactively to develop close linkages with the respective governments of member countries. We may need to

prepare a concrete plan of action with future perspective for the next two to three years.

Newsletter

It was decided in the First ANTRIEP Meeting that the Focal Point would bring out a Newsletter bi-annually, the Newsletter was started in 1996. The Network is successfully bringing out the Newsletter for the last eight years regularly. More importantly, the Newsletter helps greatly to share the experiences of different countries on selected themes, especially on planning and management of education, recent trends in educational policies, reforms, etc.. The themes for the various issues of the Newsletter are discussed during the ANTRIEP Meetings. The Newsletter brought out immediately after the Fifth ANTRIEP Meeting was devoted to reporting about the ANTRIEP Meeting itself. This was followed by three other issues, which focussed on the **Role of Public Examinations in Improving Quality of Education; Place and Role of Women in Educational Management and Improving School Management: Case Studies of Schools**. The member institutions were prompt and positive in their response for contributing to the Newsletter themes. 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 institutions of their choice. All efforts are being made to adhere to the publication schedule of the Newsletter and overall it has been published regularly without delay. However, even with persistent efforts, contribution of papers from some of the member institutions is not forthcoming.

As per the suggestions made in the earlier ANTRIEP Meeting, the Newsletter has incorporated a feature on Institutional News, covering research and training activities. While the brief information on the completed researches, training activities and forthcoming programmes of the member institutions is found useful by the members, it would, however, be appreciated if all the institutions send such information.

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

Newsletter are also found to be used as references for comparative studies.

Publication of Seminar Proceedings

During the Third Meeting of the ANTRIEP held in Colombo in 1998, most of the members suggested that the proceedings of the preceding seminar may be brought out as an ANTRIEP publication. Following this suggestion, bringing out the publication of the proceedings of the seminar has become a convention. During the Shanghai seminar, the member institutions had presented country study reports on "School Management: Role of Head Teachers". The country reports and a synthesis report along with the seminar proceedings are published in two volumes by IIEP. Similarly, the proceedings of the seminar held at Kuala Lumpur and synthesis of presentations on 'School Evaluation for Quality' are under publication by IIEP. Very soon, the publication will be sent to all member institutions.

Visits and Exchange Programmes

The exchange programmes are aimed at establishing and strengthening organisational linkages and relationships. Frequent and close interaction among the academics working in the same area is essential for developing collaborative research and training. During the last two ANTRIEP Meetings, this aspect was discussed in detail and some of the institutions offered to facilitate the visits by providing free boarding facilities. During the period 2002-04, a positive trend has emerged as a good number of member institutions have set the tradition of exchange visits and formalised collaborations in organising training.

The period following the previous ANTRIEP Meeting witnessed significant increase in interaction of member institutions through mutual visits, collaborating and participating in training programmes and seminars, exploring the possibilities of common areas of interest, study visits etc. These included visits to NIEPA by the Director, Deputy Director and Faculty of IIEP, Paris. Faculty members, Director and in-charge Focal Point from NIEPA (India), Executive Director, CERID (Nepal), Faculty of KEDI (Korea), Assistant Director General, CEMD, NIE (Sri Lanka) visited IIEP, Paris. IED-AKU (Pakistan) invited Asstt. Director General of CEMD-NIE Sri Lanka on two occasions to make presentation on decentralisation and teacher appraisal. One of the Faculty members of IIEP has been invited by KEDI to deliver a distinguished lecture. A team of CERID (Nepal)

and NCED staff visited NIEPA and NCERT (India). Director NCED (Nepal) and Executive Director, CERID and Director and Faculty of NIEPA had visited each other institute for having discussion regarding common areas of interest and possible collaboration. Similarly, Faculty members of NIE attended training programmes in NIEPA and NCERT. Two of the Faculty members from IAB, Kuala Lumpur visited IED-AKU (Pakistan) to study educational leadership training programmes of IED. One of the Faculty members of NIEPA has had an opportunity to visit SIHRD, China.

Probably many more staff members might have visited different member institutions of which the Focal Point does not have information. In view of the collaborative project taken up under the Network, we hope that in the coming years, there shall be more bilateral exchange programmes.

Some of the institutions are in the process of preparing proposals for having formal exchange programmes. NIEPA has made provision in its budget for collaborative comparative research studies and visiting fellowships. However, there is a need for the member institutions to initiate dialogue with bilateral and multilateral international agencies to explore the possibilities of obtaining funding support for exchange programmes. There is need to evolve a more systematic and a common framework for exchange of personnel among the member institutions.

ANTRIEP Logo and Web-Site

In the previous ANTRIEP Meetings, many members felt that the Network has reached a stage when it needed to develop an ANTRIEP logo. I am glad to inform that the ANTRIEP logo has been designed and finalised after suggestions from member institutions. The soft copy of the Logo has been sent to all member institutions for using on ANTRIEP related documents. Similarly, during the last meeting in Kuala Lumpur, members had suggested to launch a web-site for ANTRIEP. NIEPA, the Focal Point has agreed to design and develop the ANTRIEP web-site. The Focal Point with the guidance of IIEP successfully designed the web-site. Before uploading the information, the Focal Point has requested all the members to send their suggestions and also to revise information about the institutional profile. Except one or two institutions, we did not receive suggestions from the members. The web-site provides information about ANTRIEP, research and training activities and ANTRIEP Newsletter (pdf format), forthcoming events,

profile of member institutions, link to important web-sites etc. The ANTRIEP web-site also provides web-mail facility for the member institutions. The ANTRIEP e-mail ID (for contact person and heads of member institutions) was intimated to all the member institutions.

ANTRIEP Brochure

Since its inception, ANTRIEP has traversed a long way in terms of research, training, publications and other network activities with sustained vigour and usefulness. Therefore, there is an urgent need to revise the ANTRIEP brochure in view of joining by new member institutions and increased activities of ANTRIEP; institutional information of members also requires to be updated by adding more details about the areas of priority and list of important publications of member institutions. Members may like to discuss in this meeting about revising the ANTRIEP brochure.

Exchange of Documents and Information

Exchange of documents and information related to different activities of member institutions was visualised as means of keeping informed and knowing about the developments in member institutions. Accordingly, in all the ANTRIEP Meetings, it has been emphasised that the member institutions should exchange information among themselves. Compared to earlier, the bilateral exchange of documents and information seems to have increased. 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 many of the member institutions indicating 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 the information about their regional and international training programmes to all the member institutions as a regular feature. As most of the institutions bring out some of their documents in English, therefore, it seems there is an immense scope for improving the exchange of documents and more information on regular basis. There is a need to work out *modus operandi* for institutionalising the exchange of documents, both bilaterally and also sharing among others.

New Members

Aga-Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P), Karachi (Pakistan), expressed keen interest to become a member of the Network. We had requested them to send a brief profile of their institution. With the approval of ANTRIEP Chairman, AKES,P has been admitted as a member of ANTRIEP. The brief profile of AKES,P is being published in the Newsletter. We welcome representative of AKES, P for the Sixth ANTRIEP Meeting.

Changes in Heads of Member Institutions

Heads of some of the member institutions have changed after the Kuala Lumpur Meeting. New Directors have taken charge in NIEPA, India, NCERT, India; IAB, Malaysia; NAEM, Bangladesh; NCED, Nepal; and AEPAM, Pakistan.

Perspectives for Future Action

In the next 2-3 years, the major focus of ANTRIEP will be two-fold. Firstly, undertaking studies on the role and functioning of District Education Officers. It will also be a priority to finalise, consolidate and prepare a synthesis report of the school case studies. Secondly, operationalisation of the collaborative training project which is a major task that covers identifying training needs of persons involved in school improvement, using research and case studies generate training modules, organise workshops and capacity building programmes on improving school management. In this context, the emphasis, nevertheless, could be on the need and importance of developing close interface with the national and provincial governments and policy makers of the respective countries of the member institutions. The effective implementation and institutionalisation of capacity building activities will largely depend on the support and acceptance received from the decision makers and policy planners. This implies that the member institutions are required to initiate dialogue and discussions with their respective governments.

It is necessary for ANTRIEP to identify the priority areas in research and training for countries to facilitate collaboration accordingly. However, the capacities of member institutions vary sharply in terms of professional expertise and resource base. In this context, it would be more beneficial to have bilateral collaborations so that common programmes can be devised and training activities can be jointly organised. Bilateral collaborations not only save time and resources but

also help to avoid duplication of efforts. More importantly, the bilateral arrangements will help to exchange the professional support and also to improve the institutional capacities of member institutions and thereby the quality of capacity building activities. Exchange of expertise and resource persons can be more meaningful and effective at bilateral level.

The collaborative endeavours emphasise on **bottom-top** approach in organising the training activities. However, the existing member institutions may not be in a position to reach out to larger areas in their respective countries. It has since been felt during the earlier ANTRIEP Meeting that the Network has reached a stage when we may have to think in terms of country-based local Networks.

In other words, each member institution in its respective country needs to play a leadership role in organising the Network activities, more particularly in execution of the collaborative projects. Developing a sub-networking system by the member institutions would immensely help in local capacity building and launching the training activities for the head teachers whose is quite large number. Despite the importance of such networking, the member institutions have yet to make headway in this regard. The ANTRIEP Newsletter can become a forum for exchanging information and sharing experiences of the sub-network members.

While efforts will continue for mobilising funding support for the collaborative project, attempts are also needed to mobilise resources at individual member institutions. In many of the member countries, external funding projects are in operation and international, bilateral and multilateral agencies are providing funding for different education projects related to quality improvement in which capacity building is the major component. Efforts to develop close interaction with respective governments and initiate dialogue with the funding agencies by the member institutions are essential to obtain local funding. In this context, India has been successful in mobilising funding from agencies like European Commission, DFID and Colombo Plan Secretariat. Other member institutions in other countries need to emulate this model for resource mobilisation.

The member institutions may need to incorporate some of the ANTRIEP activities in their annual budget under development programmes. This arrangement may facilitate regular collaboration among the member institutions at bilateral and regional levels. Similarly, the member institutions may perhaps like to consider the

proposal of working out a common frame in which the host country may subsidise the boarding arrangements and the respective countries meet local transportation and travel funding. In fact, NIEPA has such an arrangement with some of the institutions abroad and has signed MOUs in this respect. We are sure that many of the member institutions may be having such arrangements in their own way. Such provisions will facilitate increased and frequent bilateral interactions. The Focal Point will welcome information about these arrangements whenever such bilateral exchanges take place.

On behalf of the Focal Point of ANTRIEP, may I take this opportunity to thank IIEP for invaluable guidance and relentless support to the Network activities, which kept the Network alive and active all these years. Prolific thanks are due to the Chairman of the Network and all the member institutions for their constant support and cooperation which makes the network function effectively. We would like to convey our special thanks to the World Bank for providing generous Grant to IIEP for supporting ANTRIEP activities. We all felt the conspicuous absence of Mr. Gabriel Carron, the architect of the Network, both during the seminar and in this ANTRIEP meeting. On behalf of all the members of the Network, I would like to convey that we missed him immensely and owe him gratitude for his eminent guidance and academic inputs in making research and other activities of ANTRIEP a successful venture for all these years.

Thank you one and all.

K. Sujatha
On Behalf of the Focal Point

ANTRIEP Meeting at SEAMEO-INNOTECH, The Philippines

The Sixth Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions was held on 9 July 2004, at South East Asian Ministers of Education Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology (SEAMEO-INNOTECH), Diliman, QUEZON CITY, The Philippines. As per the past practice, a Seminar, preceding the meeting, was also organised on the theme “Improving School Management: Learning from Successful Schools” from 6-8 July 2004. Representatives from 15, out of total 19 member institutions participated in the meeting. The agenda for the meeting included: presentation of the report of the Network activities, followed by discussion on the report and its approval by member institutions; discussion on probable themes for the subsequent issues of the newsletter; strengthening bilateral relationships and implementation and follow-up action of ANTRIEP project on School Improvement. The meeting ended with a formal vote of thanks by the Focal Point. A resume of the discussion is given in the following paragraphs.

The ANTRIEP meeting is traditionally opened with an introductory address by the Chairperson of the Network. However, the Chairperson of the Network, Mr. Ishak Sin Director, Institut Aminuddin Baki, Malaysia, could not unfortunately attend the meeting. Mr. Chua Hong Tam, Head, Department of Human Resource Management, Institut Aminuddin Baki, Malaysia was requested to open and chair the meeting. His opening remarks were followed by a presentation, by Professor K. Sujatha, on the ANTRIEP Activities, on behalf of Focal Point. According to the practice established by previous Network meetings, the Chairperson of the Network changes at every meeting and normally the host institute of the ANTRIEP meeting assumes this responsibility until the Network’s next meeting. The Chairperson of the meeting Mr Chua Hong Tam called upon Dr. (Mrs) Erlinda C. Pefianco, Director SEAMEO-INNOTECH, to assume the responsibility of the Chairperson of the ANTRIEP. Dr. (Mrs.) Erlinda C. Pefianco thereafter chaired and conducted the proceedings of the meeting.

The participants were very glad with the progress made by the Network and the report of the Network activities presented by the Focal Point. The representatives of the member institutions adopted the report. Discussions on the report were followed by a discussion on probable topics for the forthcoming issues of Newsletter. As per practice, it was decided that the next (December, 2004) issue of the Newsletter will focus on the ANTRIEP seminar and meeting. Several topics were suggested for the subsequent issues of the Newsletter, which included: (i) Curriculum and Textbooks: Issues of Planning and Management; (ii) Role and Functions of District Education Officers; (iv) Local Level Planning and Management in Education etc. Since there were a number of suggested topics, it was left to the Focal Point to choose some of these topics in consultation with the IIEP, Paris and announce them in the subsequent issues of the Newsletter, as per the past practice.

There was a good discussion on the implementation of ANTRIEP project on “Improving School Management” by finalising the Case Studies of Successful Schools and preparing training modules to initiate capacity building of school heads by the member institutions.

The report on the ANTRIEP activities, presented by the Focal Point, showed an increasing number of bilateral collaborative activities organised by the member institutions. All participants were appreciative of this development. It indicated growing strength. It was considered that bi-lateral co-operation should be further encouraged and promoted. The improvement in the communication system in the ANTRIEP member institutions has helped better interaction among themselves. The Focal Point reported the launching of ANTRIEP web-site. All these developments point to the good progress made by the Network and the contribution of each member institution towards the expanding activities of the Network. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chairperson and member institutions.

K. Sujatha
NIEPA, New Delhi

Improving Quality Through Reforming School Management

Improving the quality of education is a priority objective. To do so, the functioning and management of schools need to improve. Although much is known about the characteristics of successful schools, there is little clarity about what strategies and devices the principals rely on to achieve success. ANTRIEP, therefore, undertook a series of case studies to respond to that question and, once the studies were completed, organised a policy seminar to discuss its findings with decision-makers from the Asian region. These findings form a unique research base, of great utility to policy-makers.

School autonomy, decentralization and popular policies throughout the world put the school principal at the heart of quality improvement. International research highlights the crucial contribution that school management makes to teacher and student performance and identifies the characteristics of successful principals, including strong leadership, achievement-orientation and good community relations. Such lists, however, are of limited use to principals, who want to make their school successful, or to policy-makers who need to know what strategies to promote. Against this background, ANTRIEP has undertaken case-studies on successful school management. Their purpose is to understand how specific schools improve and to encapsulate the road to success that a school's management adopts. The thirty case-studies were undertaken in Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka covering primary and secondary, rural and urban, public and private schools, with sizeable or limited resources. This forms a unique research base, of great utility to policy-makers committed to improving quality through reforming school management.

The case studies were discussed at the ANTRIEP Policy Seminar held in Manila from 6 to 8 July 2004 on this theme. Some 60 people participated in the Seminar, about 25 being members or institutions interested in joining the ANTRIEP and the remaining were from Ministries and international agencies. Five UNESCO offices in the region (Regional Office, Bangkok, PROAP, Beijing, Delhi, Dhaka, and Kathmandu) also sent their representatives. SEAMEO-Innotech, a member of

ANTRIEP, hosted the Seminar and provided excellent administrative and practical support. Dato' Asiah, chairperson of the IIEP Governing Board, chaired both the opening and the closing sessions. The Secretary of Education invited all participants for an official dinner. The programme started with a presentation of the synthesis paper prepared by Dr. K. Sujatha from NIEPA. This was followed by case-studies on two contrasting schools: a large urban secondary school in the Philippines and a small rural primary school in Bangladesh. Discussions then examined four strategies, upon which headteachers in the successfully managed schools rely:

- * improving the school's physical environment: a first step in a school's transformation;
- * developing staff cohesion and team building: balancing delegation, supervision and support;
- * using assessment for improvement: going beyond the diploma disease;
- * respecting the student as an individual: an indispensable ingredient of a successful school.

On each of these four themes, one or two institutions made an introductory presentation. During the third day, the group was divided into three to discuss how to spread successful practices throughout the system. The groups focussed on three questions: can all schools become successful or are there any pre-conditions to achieving success? Is school autonomy necessary for success, and, if so, in which areas? How can headteacher capacities be built or what reforms at national level and in training institutions are necessary?

What follows, is a summary of the seminar conclusions, in response particularly to two questions: which management interventions explain the success of a school? and how can such successful interventions become a systematic practice?

How to make a school successful?

A long series of strategies and practices could be listed, but by far not all are present in all schools. Four themes were identified as particularly crucial.

- * Many successful school heads pay much attention to the physical enhancement of the school as a first step towards the overall improvement of the school. There are various reasons for this: the visible aspect; it is relatively easy to implement, once even some minor resources are available, and less complex than improving the school's management or teaching practices; it also allows the involvement of all actors - students, teachers and parents. A focus on this issue should, however, not be seen as avoiding the more crucial aspects of the school's functioning; it can be a first step towards a wider transformation of the school. It is useful to remember this when asking schools to prepare improvement plans, which - when too ambitious - fail to be achieved.
- * The core to an institution's successful functioning probably lies in getting the balance right between delegation to, supervision over and support of staff. There is not one single model: some heads are strongly control-oriented, while others allow their staff more leeway. In all schools, however, whatever autonomy is given to individual teachers, it is accompanied by a monitoring mechanism and by incentive measures. These can be moral or financial, where salaries are low and additional allowances of great importance.
- * One consistent characteristic of successful schools is that they put great emphasis on student assessment. The main use of this assessment is not selection of students for further progress, but improving the school's quality. This can be done in different ways: to identify strengths and weaknesses in learning and teaching; to spot students with specific problems for remedial teaching; to make teachers feel responsible; to create transparency; and, in some cases, to create competition between teachers or teaching departments. This, however, raises two wider issues. Firstly, there could be a conflict between the assessment undertaken within the school and the external one, which generally is used simply for student selection or certification. It is good to remember that schools operate within a culture, which can be quite different from the one they attempt to promote. Secondly, while in some schools more competition between staff may be useful, others may need stronger collaboration.

This tension between competition and collaboration came to the forefront a few times during the Seminar.

- * Arguably, the aspect that characterizes successful schools more than any other is the strong focus on the student as an individual, with specific characteristics and needs. The Seminar used the term "child-friendly" to describe the school's management and environment. This is expressed in various ways: remedial teaching; the promotion of peer teaching; the involvement of students in monitoring and decision-making at classroom level and regularly at school level; and the importance of extra-curricular teaching. This child-friendliness is easier to achieve when students and teachers feel a sense of belonging to the same community (which could be the school or the locality). This has implications for teacher recruitment.

Turning exceptions into tradition

All systems have at least a few successful schools; the challenge is to spread successful practices throughout the system, to turn what are exceptions into tradition. Before looking at the policy-implications, it needs stressing that, while the 30 successful schools were quite diverse, a few pre-conditions were present everywhere: principals with good qualifications and experience and, therefore, with credibility as professionals; a fairly stable teaching force, diverse in age and experience but with a core group in the school since a long time; and a minimum number of basic inputs.

When discussing the policy-implications, three issues received particular attention: supervision and support; accountability; and capacity-building.

- * Headteachers are indeed key to successful schools, but they need to work within a supportive policy environment. The schools belong to an education system and their relation to the local education office, the system's incarnation at local level, is crucial. There is a need to reform school supervision, by changing its mandate – from inspection to support and professional development; its focus – towards the most needy schools; its practices – from school visits to a mixture of visits, workshops, exchange between schools and the creation of school networks.

- * An integrated accountability framework needs to be developed which links the different actors to whom the school and the teachers are responsible: the administration, the other teachers and schools; the students and parents and the public at large. Each of these actors can be given a role to play. At the same time, though, school accountability also implies that schools have the basic resources, that they know what such a basic level implies and can voice demands.
- * The capacities of school managers need improvement – in administrative, managerial and pedagogical matters. Capacity-building needs to turn these key actors into professionals, whose autonomy can then be increased. Indeed, capacity-building, professionalism and autonomy are closely linked.

The feasibility of such reforms is constrained by several factors. Firstly, structures do not replace cultures. Many successful schools set up committees or undertake improvement planning. Policy-makers may want to impose these everywhere. But this will not make for a change and they risk to be empty vessels, if the culture of joint decision-making, participation and quality

assurance is not already present. The implication is not that schools cannot change, but that change is a long process, which needs to be supported and not imposed. Secondly, there is a risk of conflict between the needs of the individual school and those of the system. Schools prefer to choose their own students and teachers, and to keep an innovative and effective principal. This runs counter to a concern about equity and the spreading of reform.

Thirdly, contexts differ widely between countries and schools. This is an obvious point that it is easily forgotten. Monitoring teachers through the use of microphones in classrooms is objectionable to many, but raises no eyebrows elsewhere. Negotiating with teachers is considered unavoidable in some schools, but deemed as weak leadership in others. Culture plays a role and so does the level of teacher professionalism. In other words, a unique model of a successful school does not exist, but there are many different roads to success.

Anton De Grauwe
IIEP, Paris

Profile of New Member

The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P)

The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P) has a long standing in imparting education across Pakistan, with its first school being established in 1905 at Gawadur, Balochistan. With an objective of improving both access and quality of education, the AKES,P directly manages and operates 187 schools and 6 hostels spread across various regions of Pakistan. Significantly, one of the major initiatives of AKES,P is establishing 90 Community Based Schools through community mobilization. AKES,P realizes the crucial role of quality teachers and educational managers and hence puts a strong emphasis on professional development benefiting teachers, trainers and school managers in developing their expertise in teaching methodology and content, school leadership and management, and early childhood education.

AKES,P also considers research and evaluation essential for school improvement and program planning and development. It has established a Research and Evaluation Unit, both to support and maximize research productivity across AKES,P schools and operations and to assist its project partners and stakeholders in strengthening evaluation and research capacities. While promoting the use of research findings to improve the practices in its own schools and gauging the impact, AKES,P also disseminates its learnings at various national and international fora and engages in discussions with policy makers for research and policy advocacy.

News from Member Institutions

Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI)

Seoul, Korea

- * Hosted an international seminar sponsored by OECD and the Korean Ministry of Education on “The Challenges and Tasks of Teacher Policy.”
- * Organised the 8th KEDI-UNESCO Joint Seminar on “Primary Education Management for Basic Learning Ability Improvement” during December. Experts and researchers from KEDI, UNESCO Bangkok and 8 participants from Asian Pacific countries attended the seminar.
- * Conducted study on **Developing a School System Suitable for a Knowledge-based Society**. This study evaluated the problems of the current school system to find ways of developing a new system that is better suited for a knowledge-based society. The study covered issues on diversity of subjects offered in high schools, the majors offered in higher education, and possibly switching the pre-college school system (grade twelve) from 6-3-3 years system to 5-3-4 years. The overall inner structure of the education system has changed rapidly raising doubts about its ability to sufficiently serve a knowledge-based society. The problems with the current system become particularly clear when looking at the fervorish cutthroat competition for college entrance and excessive private tutoring. The purpose of the study was to come up with a plan for a new system that can better meet the needs of the 21st century.

National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)

New Delhi, India

Organised a study visit for faculty members of Kabul Education University, Kabul, Afghanistan during September to observe a range of training delivery systems

including traditional teacher training college programmes as well as innovations such as satellite radio-based distance learning and use of ICT in classrooms in India.

Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)

Dhaka, Bangladesh

- * As follow up of the ANTRIEP research on case studies of successful schools a national seminar was held by BRAC jointly with the National Academy for Educational Management. Two papers covering case studies on primary schools by BRAC and case studies of secondary schools by NAEM were presented. About 90 invitees from government agencies, school heads, management committee chairpersons, education officials of upzila and district levels, research institutions and the NGOs participated in the seminar. The UNESCO Dhaka Office provided financial support to this seminar.
- * The Educational Research Unit of BRAC has completed study on: **Quality with Equity: The Primary Education Agenda**. A study on competency achievement of BRAC school students at the end of grade V covering three type of BRAC operated schools viz., Non-formal Primary Schools; Community Schools and BRAC Formal Primary Schools.

State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT)

Allahabad, India

- * Organised a series of Dissemination Workshops on Successful School Management as a follow up of completion of case studies conducted under ANTRIEP research project. Participants included heads of schools, teacher educators and field level education officers.
- * Conducted an evaluative study on **Para Teachers**. The findings of the study include: The stakeholders

perceived that the scheme was very useful and it was able to address the intended objectives. The appointment of local persons as Shiksha Mitra had assisted in ensuring the opening of schools even in the remote areas. The enrolment of all the children of the disadvantaged groups especially, girls had improved, with the appointment of Shiksha Mitras. The interface between the school and community has also improved.

**The Aga Khan Education Service,
Pakistan (AKES,P)**

Karachi, Pakistan

Organised 10-day Training Programme on "School Management and Evaluation" for Principals of AKES,P schools at Karachi in collaboration with NIEPA, New Delhi during August, 2004.

**Centre for Multi-disciplinary Development
Research (CMDR)**

Karnataka, India

- * Organized a regional workshop relating to the preparation of Human Development Report-II for Karnataka jointly with UNDP, New Delhi, Planning Commission, Govt. of India, Planning Department, Govt. of Karnataka.

- * Organized a workshop jointly with Aga Khan Educational Services (AKESI), India in September 2004. The focus of the workshop was to estimate unit costs of educational services for enrichment of school level education.

**National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration (NIEPA)**

New Delhi, India

- * A 5-member delegation from Beijing Academy of Education Sciences (BAES), China visited in November, 2004
- * The XXI International Diploma programme in Educational Planning and Administration will commence from February 1, 2005 at NIEPA, New Delhi. About 45 participants from 31 countries are likely to take part in this programme.
- * One-month Course on Management and Planning for the faculty members of the National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Ministry of Education, Government of Nepal under NIEPA-NEPAL Project is being organized from December 20, 2004 to January 15, 2005.

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

National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration (NIEPA)
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
NEW DELHI-110016
India
Fax: + (91 11) 26853041, 26865180
ksujatha@vsnl.com, ksujatha@niepa.org, niepa@niepa.org

ANTRIEP Member Institutions

1. Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Education, Sarya Chowk, G-8/1, ISLAMABAD, Pakistan
2. Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Puslit Penelitian) Office for Educational and Cultrual Research & Development (Balitbang Dikb) Ministry of Education and Culture, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman, Senayan JAKARTA - 12041, Indonesia
3. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), 75, Mohakhali Commercial Area DHAKA - 1212, Bangladesh
4. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), 5/14 Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, DHAKA - 1207, Bangladesh
5. Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), D.B. Rodda Road, Jubilee Circle, DHARWAD - 580001, KARNATAKA, India
6. Centre for Professional Development Education Management (CPDEM), National Institute of Education (NIE), Meepe junction, Padukka, Isurupaya Battaramulla, Sri Lanka
7. Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Malaysia Sri Layang, 69000, Genting Highlands PAHANG, Malaysia
8. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7-9 Rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 PARIS, France
9. Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) Umyeon-dong, Seocho-Gu, SEOUL, Korea
10. National Academy for Educational Management, (NAEM) Dhanmodi, DHAKA -1205, Bangladesh
11. National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Sanothimi, BHAKTAPUR 2050, Nepal
12. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI - 110 016, India
13. National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI - 110 016, India
14. Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID), Tribhuvan University, Tripureshwar, KATHMANDU, Nepal
15. Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), 21 North Chaling Road, SHANGHAI - 200 032, China
16. South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation, Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, SEAMEO INNOTECH, P.O. Box 207 U.P. Diliman, QUEZON CITY, 1101, The Philippines
17. State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT) ALLAHABAD, Uttar Pradesh, India
18. The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES, P) House No.3 & 4, F-17/B, Block VII, KDA Scheme 5, Clifton KARACHI-75600, Pakistan
19. The Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development, (AKU-IED) 1-5/B-VII, F.B. Area, Karimabad, P.O. Box 13688, KARACHI-75950, Pakistan

Edited by K. Sujatha on behalf of the Focal Point, ANTRIEP and published by the Registrar, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 and processed/printed by the Publication Unit, NIEPA at M/s Suchi Advertising, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110 007, India