

# NEWSLETTER

# ANTRIEP

VOL. 7 NO. 1, January - June 2002

Bi-annual

## Financing of Education *Issues and Innovations*

The convention of ANTRIEP has been organizing an international seminar followed by an annual meeting of the member institutions. The next ANTRIEP seminar will be held at the Institute of Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Malaysia from July 2-4, 2002. As in the past, this will be followed by the network meeting on the next day (July 5).

The theme selected for this year's seminar is School Evaluation for Quality Improvement, a write-up on which is included in this issue of the Newsletter (see page 8).

We are happy to inform the readers that the International Institute of Educational Planning, Paris has undertaken

international research on School Evaluation for Quality Improvement. The member institutions have been requested to prepare their country papers on this theme and presented the same at the seminar.

With an encouraging response from our member institutions, national governments, international and bilateral agencies and many individual experts, this seminar, like the previous ones, will be an important event in strengthening the network activities and providing a good opportunity for extending and establishing linkages with agencies and institutions beyond the member institutions.

As announced, the theme of this issue of the Newsletter is "Financing of Education: Issues and Innovations". The responses have been positive and prompt from the member institutions who have contributed articles on the theme based on their respective experiences. The country articles included are from KEDI (Korea), Institute Aminudin Baki (Malaysia), Institute of Educational Development- Aga- Khan University (Pakistan) and NIEPA (India).

The paper from KEDI (Korea) highlights important issues and challenges in financing education and discusses the results of a public opinion survey on educational investment. It suggests structural reforms for securing adequate finances and for effective utilization. Although 7.4 per cent of GDP in Korea is spent on education, the per capita educational expenditure is far smaller than in advanced OECD member countries. Government has expanded the education system by making the individual citizens to assume the lion's share of the cost of education. Korean people are aware of the importance of education and the need for increased educational investment but they are strongly against individual beneficiaries assuming responsibility for paying for public education. The government's education budget

### ***In this Issue....***

<b><i>Financing Education in India Issues and Innovations</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
<b><i>Financing Education in India Educational Financing in Korea:</i></b>	<b><i>3</i></b>
<b><i>Need for Structural Reform</i></b>	<b><i>6</i></b>
<b><i>ANTRIEP Seminar in School Evaluation for Quality Improvement</i></b>	<b><i>8</i></b>
<b><i>Educational Financing in Pakistan: Trends and Practices</i></b>	<b><i>10</i></b>
<b><i>Financing Education in Malaysia: Issues and Innovations</i></b>	<b><i>13</i></b>
<b><i>News from Member Institutions</i></b>	<b><i>18</i></b>
<b><i>ANTRIEP Member Institutions</i></b>	<b><i>20</i></b>

being relatively larger, it would be hard to expand it further. The paper elucidates the need for restructuring the system of educational financing in Korea based on the criteria of equity and efficiency. Some of the reforms proposed include increasing the tax burden, restructuring the extremely centralized educational finance system, strengthening the local governments and communities in mobilising resources and remedying the inefficient educational expenditure.

The article from the Institut Aminuddin Baki (Malaysia) describes the mechanism of financing education in the country. It expounds effect of recent economic crises and recession on public funding of education, which compelled to adopt cost-effective and efficient methods of spending the limited resources. Education being a federal subject in Malaysia, it has consistently received the largest allocation every year. Free education is extended up to secondary schooling. The government resources are largely directed towards improving the infrastructure facilities and to provide school grants. In recent years, several innovations including student loan and scholarships, liberalization of private education, corporatisation of private universities, community and private support, minor scholarships, food assistance and school health programmers etc were adopted in order to improve access, equity and efficiency of the system.

The paper from IED-Aga Khan University (Pakistan) elucidates the extent of financial allocation and trends in spending for education in general and elementary education in particular. It highlights the reasons for a significant percentage of the budget allocation remaining unutilized and failure to achieve the long-term targets. The article presents the main concerns of the Education Sector Reforms (2001-2004), which is an action plan for implementation of the current educational policy, envisaging devolution of power at the political front and decentralization of planning and financial management. The paper strongly comments the need for involving and developing partnership with NGO sector, which is fairly large in Pakistan, involving communities seems to be the most viable option for increasing the pace of educational development. For effective decentralization in decision-making and financial management, capacity building at the district and local levels is essential and requires organizational/structural support for the same.

The article from India critically examines the trends in public expenditure on school education and briefly discusses some of the recent policy initiatives to finance elementary education. It also attempts to review the

changing criteria for examining the level of financing of education in an economy. It stresses that, in terms of adequacy, equity and efficiency criteria, the level of financing education in an economy can be judged. International comparisons of the relative share of education sector in total public expenditure and/or the percentage share of GNP spend on education are other alternative indicators for assessing the level of public investment in education in any economy. Following the international comparisons, national physical targets and financial requirements (particularly for achieving the goal of universal elementary education), and equity and efficiency criteria, the financial resources available for funding education is found to be highly inadequate in India. For improving finances for education, the central as well as the provincial governments have taken several policy initiatives such as decentralization for greater community support, external aid and privatization. These and several other policy measures, however, it is argued, may further deepen the crisis in financing education in India. The article clearly underlines the point that the current financial crisis in education in India is transparent and the crisis is more likely to continue in future.

Despite different levels of economic and educational development, there are some common trends and problems in financing education, among different countries in the region. A general problem across the countries is that they are not able to muster enough financial allocation for education. Since Korea and Malaysia are allocating substantial proportion of their budget for education, they are, however, constrained to enhance the finances to meet the increasing demand for education and quality improvement. Though Korea spends a higher level of GDP on education, the per capita expenditure is relatively small compared the other OECD countries with similar level of economic development resulting in poor quality of education. As there is no choice to choose the schools, the households in Korea spend considerable amount on private tuition and are reluctant to pay to schools to improve the quality of facilities. In case of Malaysia, the recent economic crises, coupled with extension of free education up to secondary level, has created financial inadequacies to meet access and equity issues. However, Malaysia has adopted several measures to overcome the budgetary constraints for education. Pakistan has a unique problem in that not only educational budget is declining but also the significant proportion of budget allocation remains unspent. Perhaps this may be a problem in some other countries too. Adopting decentralization, mobilising local resources developing partnership with NGOs are some of the measure that are put forth here for improving educational finances and for efficient utilisation of resources.

# Financing Education in India

## Funds for Education: Adequate?

The level of financing education in an economy can be judged in terms of adequacy, equity and efficiency. It should be first judged in terms of adequacy: whether the finances provided for education are adequate or not. In the 1960s, international comparisons were the fashion, and investment in education in any economy was used to be judged in terms of international comparisons particularly with reference to the share of education in GNP and the share of education in the government budget.

Though the international comparisons still continue to be important, later adequacy of the financial resources is judged in terms of physical targets. Enrolment (ratios) targets were taken as the yardsticks. Universal primary education was begun to be considered as essential, and it was felt that resources should be provided adequately to meet this goal. Provisions of schools accessible to all population; reduction in dropouts, repetition, etc., have been viewed as important criteria in determining the level of finances for education.

Particularly, since the beginning of the 1980s, equity considerations, besides considerations for quantitative expansion (e.g., provision of schools), and improvement in quality (e.g., increasing the number of trained teachers), seemed to have exerted considerable influence on public financing of education. With respect to equity, it is felt that equality in outcomes cannot be ensured, but equality in inputs, i.e., equality in opportunities, can be ensured. Accordingly, the issues that received much attention of the educational planners and researchers relate mostly to equality in educational opportunities — regional, caste and gender groups of population — measured in terms of literacy, enrollments and number of institutions.

Even though there is relatively considerable research on efficiency considerations in education, their importance is being realised only of late when finances for education are subject to severe squeezes. Two aspects relating to efficiency are important: efficiency of investment made in education, and cost effectiveness. The former is measured in terms of labour market outcomes, essentially rates of return to education, which

refer to the overall or labour market efficiency of investment in education, while the latter, viz., cost effectiveness refers to efficiency of investment made in educational outcomes such as number of pass-outs of the system, survival and transition rates, etc. The labour market efficiency is also referred to as external efficiency, and measures on cost efficiency as internal efficiency. While cost effectiveness analysis explains how efficiently the resources are being used to produce the given output in the schools, rate of return analysis shows how efficient is the overall investment in education.

## How is India Doing?

The level of financing of education in India cannot be regarded adequate based on any of the above criteria: international comparisons; targets and requirements; and equity or efficiency.

## International Comparisons

The most standard and popular indicator used to measure finances for education is the percentage of GNP devoted to education, though some of the limitations of this indicator are well known. According to the *Human Development Report 2001*, India ranks 104<sup>th</sup> with respect to share of public expenditure on education in GNP, among the 143 countries on which such data are available. India was devoting 3.2 per cent of her GNP to education (1995-97). In comparison a large number of countries spend more than six per cent, some more than eight per cent and a few more than ten per cent on education. Some of the countries, which spend more than four per cent of GNP on education, are even economically poorer than India. India had set a long time ago a target of six per cent of GNP to be spent on education. This target still eludes, and may continue to elude in the near future.

The second most important standardized indicator in this context is proportion of government budget devoted to education. This is also preferred to the earlier one, as governments have more direct control on government budgets than on GNP. Again India fares very poorly in comparison with not only advanced countries, but also even some of the poor countries of the globe. Out of the total government (central and state) expenditure, India

was spending 11.6 per cent on education (1995-97), compared to more than 15 per cent in many advanced countries. The corresponding figure was above 20 per cent in several rich and poor, and small and big countries, such as Singapore, Poland, Costa Rica, Estonia, UAE, Lithuania, Mexico, Macedonia, Venezuela, Thailand, Saudi Arabia, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Namibia, Morocco, Botswana, Togo, Yemen, Cote d'Ivoire, Senegal, Gambia, Guinea, and Rwanda.

In terms of both the indicators, India was faring better during the 1980s. But after the economic reform policies were introduced in the beginning of the 1990s, public finances for education were subject to severe squeezes. The relative priorities were also affected, and the shift has been away from education sector. Generally, it is suggested by the UNDP and other international organisations that about 20 per cent of the government budget and 5-6 per cent of GNP should be allocated to education in the developing countries.

### ***Physical Targets and Financial Requirements***

Though India does not have clearly and quantitatively defined physical targets in terms of enrolment and enrolment ratios at all levels of education, India has clear goals as far as literacy and elementary education are concerned. Universal literacy and universalisation of elementary education have been clearly defined and detailed plans are also regularly made, even during the pre-Jomtien (Conference on Education For All) period. Both goals are elusive.

The inadequacy of financial resources is clear when we look at the slow pace of growth in enrolments. According to the National Sample Survey (52<sup>nd</sup> round), hardly 70 per cent of the children of age group 6-13 were attending schools in 1995-96. The number of pupils per teacher has been on rise, which was already at a high level. A large number of schools still do not have basic infrastructure facilities. Finances provided by the government in the five year or annual plans or in the annual budgets do not match the physical norms and targets laid down by the government itself, say, e.g., establishment of schools in all habitations, pupil-teacher ratio, the ratio of upper primary school to primary schools, provision of incentives to children, etc.

An expert committee, appointed by the Government of India, chaired by Tapas Majumdar estimated that the country would require an additional amount of Rs. 137 thousand crores for the next ten year period, i.e., about

Rs. 14 thousand crores a year, or on average about 0.7 per cent of national income per annum, for universalisation of elementary education alone. Hardly a small fraction of this requirement is made available.

### ***Equity and Efficiency***

Are resources provided to education adequate to ensure equity in the system? The gender, caste and regional inequalities in literacy, enrolment ratios and attainment of educational levels are glaring. As the NSS report for 1995-96 shows, even in the younger age group of 6-10, only 58 per cent of the girls in rural areas were attending school, compared to 84 per cent among boys in urban areas. Almost all the school-going children are expected to receive free textbooks and stationery from government in elementary education. Only 35 per cent of the children in primary schools receive textbooks and five per cent stationery; and even noon meals was provided only to 27 per cent of the students in primary schools. Further, essentially due to financial reasons, cheaper methods of schooling (e.g., EGS — Education Guarantee Scheme — schools in rural remote areas, under/un qualified and under/un trained para teachers, etc.) are introduced, which would further increase inequalities in the system.

High rates of dropout and repetition and low rates of achievement of minimum levels of learning by children speak about the low levels of internal efficiency in school education. With inadequate funding to provide qualified teachers and attractive learning environment in schools, internal efficiency cannot be better. The high private and social rates of return to education – primary to higher – indicate that the education system in India is severely under funded, even from the narrow point of view of economic efficiency.

### ***Major Policy Initiatives***

What have been the recent efforts in improving finances for education in India? Despite official recognition of education as an investment, and as a 'crucial investment for national survival' by the Government of India in the *National Policy on Education* 1986/1992, the pattern of allocation of resources to education is far from satisfactory. In a sense, the financial crisis in education is transparent, and the crisis is feared to continue. Three important policy initiatives are worth noting in this context, that may accentuate the financial crisis, rather than easing it; and they refer to decentralisation, external aid and privatization.

### ***Decentralisation***

Following the 73<sup>rd</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> amendments to the Constitution of India, several measures are being initiated to decentralize responsibilities of education to local bodies and village communities. It seems one of the principal aims of decentralisation has been mobilisation of community resources – voluntary as well as compulsory — for education, through constitution of school development funds at several layers – school, village, block, *mandal*, district, etc. Since financial devolution does not take place much to the local bodies, only the responsibilities of mobilisation of resources for education seem to have been devolved. The State may find it convenient to gradually reduce, if not altogether abdicate, its responsibility of financing education.

### ***External Aid***

Following the budget squeezes for education, which were also necessitated by the adoption of new economic reform policies, first central government, and now rather directly many state governments have resorted to external assistance for education, particularly for primary education. Now, almost all states – rich and poor alike, compete for external assistance and external aid is being viewed as the only source of additional funds for improvement of education on large or small scale. Primary education in India that was not dependent on external assistance for nearly four and a half decades after independence is now critically dependent on external aid. What will happen at the closure of some of the currently operating externally aided projects in education, such as the District Primary Education Project (DPEP)?

Fears are already high in the minds of many – the state governments, the people as well as the international organizations.

### ***Privatisation***

Privatization of education takes two forms: financial privatisation, i.e., raising private resources such as fees (fashionably known as cost recovery) in public education, and secondly, direct privatisation, i.e., opening private self financing schools, and transfer of public and state aided private schools to private bodies. Though both these phenomena are clearly visible in case of higher education, they are not, nevertheless, confined to higher education. These issues are being raised in policy debates on school education, including elementary education. Privatisation is viewed as the most important instrument to solve problems of finances, which is an altogether untenable assumption, given the experience of India and even of other countries. But recent initiatives in privatisation are in consonance with the new economic reform policies, which do not recognise the ‘public good’, the ‘merit good’ and the human right nature of education, not to speak of national Constitutional provisions.

These and several other policy measures being initiated in several states in India may indeed deepen the financial crisis in education.

*Jandhyala B G Tilak*  
*National Institute of Educational*  
*Planning and Administration (NIEPA)*  
*New Delhi, India*  
*E-mail: jtilak@niepa.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

National Institute of Educational  
Planning and Administration (NIEPA)  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI-110 016  
India  
Fax: +(91 11) 6853041, 6865180  
E-mail: ksujatha@vsnl.com, ksujatha@niepa.org,  
niepa@vsnl.com

# **Educational Financing in Korea**

## *Need for Structural Reform*

### **Introduction**

Education is becoming more and more important in a knowledge-based economy. Although Korea has a much higher rate of school enrollment than other countries at similar stages of economic development in Asia, Latin America and Europe, it lags behind in quality of education. Relatively less public investment partly contributes to the low quality of education. The share of the education budget in Korea's overall government budget is comparatively high (20.5 per cent in 2000). However, as the size of Korea's government revenue is much smaller than that of many other countries, Korea's outlay for public education as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) is smaller not only than that of advanced countries but also that of some of the developing countries. Although 7.4 per cent of the GDP in Korea is spent on education, the per capita educational expenditure is far smaller than in the advanced OECD member countries. Moreover, much of the expenditure on public education is contributed by the private sector.

### **Major Issues and Challenges**

More investment is urgently needed to solve the current problems in education. The reality is that there is neither specific nor general agreement on how to raise the necessary financial resources or who should assume the main burden of mobilizing the required resources. The fact that some policy-makers are of the opinion that there is no logical justification for giving high priority to investment in education is a clear proof of the lack of understanding of the importance of such investment. A sufficient education budget cannot be secured because greater importance is attached to other sectors: the defense budget for a self-reliant economy; the economic development budget for sustained growth; the infrastructure budget; and the social development budget for stabilizing living standards and enhancing public welfare. Besides, there is a lack of overall societal efforts to improve the poor educational environment.

Those who make decisions related to the education budget, such as the education, economic and political authorities, are not very receptive to demands for increased investment in education. As a result, the

amount invested in education has more or less remained stable for some time now. It is not easy to explain the causes of the gap between the needs of education and actual investment. It may be explained partly by the nature of education itself, which requires large investments but does not produce immediate results. It is also extremely difficult to evaluate the relationship between investment and the quality of education as it deals with human beings. In other words, it is extremely difficult to assess returns to educational investment. However, even considering these characteristics, the major reason as to why there is no deep-rooted understanding of the urgency and importance of educational investment is that few people have put forward a sound logical argument supporting more educational investment. Thus, the case for further increase in educational investment has not been convincingly presented to the taxpaying public, not to mention those who are involved in making decisions on the education budget.

### **Cost Sharing**

Keeping in view the priority given to education by Koreans, the government has expanded the education system. The government has done so by making individual citizens to assume the lion's share of the cost. A number of interesting points arise from the results of opinion surveys conducted among Koreans concerning educational investment. Most Koreans believe that education contributes to national development. More specifically, 96 per cent of the respondents think that education contributes the most to political and social development and 77 per cent assume that it contributes the most to economic development. Around 65 per cent believe that, in view of its importance, top priority should be given to increasing the public investment on education.

There is a strong feeling that investment should be relatively more on primary education. About 43 per cent of people surveyed are willing to increase their spending on education if there is improvement in their household finances and 98 per cent say that they will not cut their educational expenses even if they can barely afford to pay for it. This shows the importance people attach to education in Korea. People also acknowledge the

necessity of paying for private tutoring, that is typical of private educational spending, but feel that the high cost of private tutoring is a serious problem. They believe that the current educational investment is insufficient, for which they blame the government and the National Assembly. They are against levying direct taxes to create more financial resources for education but are generally positive about the effectiveness of the education surtax and expansion of the tax base. In brief, the Korean people accept the importance of education and have an acute awareness of the need for increased educational investment. But they are strongly against making the individual beneficiaries assume primary responsibility for providing financial resources for investment in public education.

### **Optimal Educational Investment**

Education is considered essential to foster competent individuals who can cope with the changing international environment and consequently, the development of the country. Competitiveness cannot but suffer in this era of fierce international competition if there is a shortage of well-trained manpower due to poor education. It is said that the Korean economy has been stagnant during the last few years partly because of the shortage of technologically skilled manpower.

It generally transpires that this situation is the ultimate result of inadequate educational investment. It is not easy to find stable ways to raise the optimal amount of educational fund in Korea. The education budget of the government is relatively large and indeed the largest expenditure item, much higher even than the defense budget. It means that it is very hard to expand the education budget of the central government, even if the basic infrastructure facilities are inadequate in the school sector.

In this context, an increase in the education budget of the central government implies either an increase in the tax burden or restructuring of the current inefficient education expenditure system. In addition to increasing the tax burden, it calls for a fundamental restructuring of the extremely centralized educational finance system. The school failure and bad condition of facilities in educational institutions should be blamed for the lack of choice of the consumers, for the lack of accountability and misconception of the educational autonomy, and also for malfunctioning of the price and competition mechanism.

The public education institutions' tuition system is generally standardized, even if it be a private institution. Koreans do not have choice of selecting the schools of their preference. Especially, at secondary education level, the standardized policy makes every student pay the same amount of tuition fees. Therefore, one who likes to have better quality of education is required to seek private tutoring. It means that the investment in the public education is smaller than the demand, and the duplicate characteristics of the private tutoring and public education make the educational expenditure inefficient.

The international comparison of educational finance reveals the following policy implications for Korea:

- i. The amount of educational investment as a whole is not small, considering the current economic condition in the country. However, the government expenditure on education is relatively smaller than that of the other countries.
- ii. The direct burden on the private sector for financing education, like tuition fees, is very high and the share of public expenditure on education raised through tax money is relatively low.
- iii. Nevertheless, the proportion of educational expenditure in the government budget is relatively very high.
- iv. Before the fiscal transfer at the inter-governmental level, the central government's share of financial burden for educational development is dominant. But after the transfers, the provincial government's share of educational budget is almost 100 per cent. Such a pattern is very unusual, even in countries where educational expenditure is heavily dependent on the central government's budget. In Korea, this happens because of the policy of abnormal educational autonomy, which puts tremendous emphasis on equitable development and fiscal distribution across regions and efficiency in the use of scarce resources.

### **Restructuring Educational Finance**

According to a recent study, Korea needs 16 trillion won more for the next 5 years for investment in public education and around 57 trillion won as tax money finance standard. If the average educational expenditure in OECD countries is taken into consideration, Korea may need around 368 trillion won for investment in public

education in the next five years. This implies that, if the above national and international trends in public expenditure on education are considered, Korea may need a minimum of 4 trillion won and a maximum of 74 trillion won per year for educational expenditure. Fortunately, recent public expenditure on education is more than 4 trillion won per year in Korea. However, for mobilizing of additional resources and for efficient use of educational budget, there is a need for restructuring the system of educational financing in Korea.

The fundamentals of restructuring educational finance in Korea should be based on the criteria of efficiency and equity. The restructuring process needs to focus on the role of private and public sectors in financing educational development in the country and a fair share of the central and provincial governments in educational expenditures by taking into consideration the education service characteristics.

In view of the current situation of the burden of the stakeholders, Korea needs to undertake fiscal structure reform, which may ensure the consumers' choice and competition among the suppliers of educational services and enhance the role of local governments in mobilizing and managing resources for educational development. As the traditional educational finance theory stresses, the central government should guarantee a minimum acceptable quality education regardless of the region and support the equalization grants to the vulnerable provinces. The local governments should support public institutions at the secondary education level, and the private institutions' operating entity should take responsibilities to finance the private schools, in addition to the tuitions and fees.

Korea needs to diversify financing of education. The students should choose private schools and the public schools should guarantee an equitable balanced education to the students who do not have the resources to study in private schools. The national level schools need to be minimized to operate as experimental schools for educational development. Foremost, for the strengthening of the local level educational financing, policy initiatives are needed to increase links with the local governments.

### **Conclusion**

For the enhancement of the resources to finance educational development in Korea, the central government, the provincial governments, the local governments and the private sector should take their fair share of responsibilities. The educational finance system in Korea should be restructured and decentralized to facilitate greater participation of the local governments and communities in mobilization and efficient use of resources for educational development.

Decentralization policy reform should be supported by the efforts to reform the existing governance system of public and private institutions. Relatively less burdened economic and social sectors should take more responsibilities to finance education. The policy initiatives to give incentives for the desired change in financing and management of education at national, provincial and local levels should be implemented.

*You-Kyung Han*  
*KEDI*

*E-mail: ykhan@kedi.re.kr*

## **ANTRIEP Seminar in School Evaluation for Quality Improvement**

### **The Context**

Evaluation occupies a central place on the agenda of education ministries. In most countries, quality improvement has become a top priority of policy makers and they rely on evaluation mechanisms to monitor quality. Various studies have shown that one important determinant of the deterioration of the quality of schools precisely relates to the weakening of evaluation mechanisms, including the professional supervision and

support services. This explains why some countries, which had dismantled their inspectorate services in the 1970s, have re-established them.

More recently, the 'value for money' syndrome, which permeates all sectors of the society, has also hit the education system. This is linked to a stronger demand for accountability in the public service, thereby still increasing the claim for strong control and evaluation mechanisms. The growing interest in school evaluation



finds an additional justification in the present trend towards school autonomy. Recently, in many countries around the world, schools are receiving more freedom in making decisions in fields as crucial as curriculum, staff management and budget. The greater degree of freedom granted to schools has provoked equally greater demand for accountability at school level and for evaluation procedures which should allow federal/central governments to guarantee standards of quality and equity across the system.

## Objectives and Coverage

'Evaluation' serves different purposes. It can be used for selection and certification, in other words to distinguish between students or teachers who have achieved a certain level and those who did not; for accountability: to show that teachers and schools have performed well; and for quality improvement: to inform decision-makers of particular problems faced by schools, to inform schools, stakeholders and the public at large of the strengths and weaknesses of a given school or to inform teachers of issues with which students have consistent difficulties. Many evaluation mechanisms serve the purposes of selection, certification and accountability quite well, but they are too seldom used for quality improvement.

In addition, 'evaluation' can cover different dimensions. It can focus on students (viz. examinations), on teachers (through the traditional teacher appraisal), on schools (through league tables, external audits or self-evaluation) and on the education system as a whole (viz. through the publication of indicator reports or thematic studies on topics of specific concern). More and more research shows that the school as a unit, and not simply the individual teacher, plays a crucial role in quality improvement. Consequently, a growing number of countries are developing tools to assess the quality and performance of the school as an institutional unit.

Previous ANTRIEP seminars explored themes such as school efficiency and school management. It has been highlighted in these seminars that all countries of the Asian region are strengthening and diversifying their school evaluation mechanisms. It has also been concluded that the evaluation mechanisms serve, to some extent, the purpose of accountability but are insufficiently used to help schools to improve its management and teaching-learning process. Since its creation, ANTRIEP's focus has been on quality

improvement. Previous seminars have focussed on this theme from different angles, examining, for instance, how supervision services can improve quality, or the role of headteachers in school improvement.

Therefore, **the main focus of this seminar is on school evaluation.** Its focus is not only on evaluation as such, but also on its impact on school quality. Its overall objective is to discuss **as to how a comprehensive school evaluation strategy, which has a positive impact on the management of the school and its teaching-learning process, can be developed.** The specific objectives of the seminar are to share and examine critically the country experiences on:

- (i) the examination and test systems prevalent (up to the secondary school level) in the participating countries;
- (ii) operational strategies for comprehensive school reviews;
- (iii) methodology and tools for school self-evaluation; and
- (iv) the impact of the above evaluation mechanisms on school quality.

## Themes

The seminar is to deliberate around the following themes:

- (i) How are responsibilities concerning the evaluation of primary and secondary schools distributed between the different levels - central ministry, decentralized offices, schools?
- (ii) What strategies are used by central ministries and by decentralized offices to evaluate the performance of schools?
- (iii) What is the role of the external reviews in such evaluations?
- (iv) In how far are schools themselves involved in the evaluation of their performance?
- (v) What criteria are used to evaluate schools? Are norms and standards available?
- (vi) What use is being made of the information provided by different evaluation devices at different levels?
- (vii) To what extent and how do these evaluation

procedures have an impact on quality improvement of schools?

The core discussions over to be around the three main mechanisms for school evaluation: examinations and tests; external school review or audits; and school self-evaluation.

### **Organisation of the Seminar**

The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi, India, which is the network's focal point; the Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highlands, Malaysia from 2nd to 9th July 2002, which is in charge of the local organization; and the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris, which has undertaken international research in this area, ensure the seminar's preparation.

Participants will include: senior decision-makers from ministries of education; directors/senior staff from ANTRIEP member institutions; international experts and researchers; and specialists from agencies interested in school management and decentralization issues. They

will represent various countries of Asia and the Pacific region including Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam. The total number of participants is to be around 50.

Financial support for this seminar is available from the Colombo Plan Secretariat, the IIEP/UNESCO, Paris and other international funding agencies.

### **The ANTRIEP Meeting**

The seminar will, as a tradition, be followed, on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2002, by a one-day meeting, restricted to ANTRIEP members only, to discuss The progress made and the activities undertaken by the Network since the preceding meeting in September 2000 in Shanghai, China. The Institut Aminuddin Baki will host the meeting.

*International Institute for Educational Planning  
Paris*

## **Educational Financing in Pakistan** *Trends and Practices*

### **Introduction**

The scale of educational spending in Pakistan has remained very low as compared to other countries having a similar GNP per capita income of \$460 (UNESCO, 1995). Despite fairly good economic growth rates for most of its 54 years of existence, the development of social sector, especially in terms of education, is certainly not enviable (Zaidi, 1999). The allocation of resources for education, as percentage of GDP in Pakistan, is significantly less than the 4 per cent recommended by UNESCO for developing countries, averaging at 2.3 per cent in the 1990s. It really decreased during the last three years, though in absolute terms, the allocation did increase from Rs.34.872 billion in 1993-94 to Rs.64.425 billion in 1997-98. Considering the current literacy rate of 49 per cent (61.3 per cent for males and 36.8 per cent for females), such an increase in the budget allocation, however, appears minimal as the country faces a daunting task of educating its remaining 51 per cent, numbering 54 million

illiterates out of the total population of 140.5 million (Economic Survey for Pakistan, 2000-2001).

### **Resource Allocation for Elementary Education**

In Pakistan, the breakdown of total resource allocation is generally done according to levels of education, i.e. primary and elementary (kindergarten, grades I-VIII); secondary (grades IX-XII); technical education; college education; university education; and literacy and non-formal education. In addition, finances are also reserved for teacher education, libraries and books, and other such needs. The share of each sector is determined by the existing needs and priorities of the state. The needs assessment and prioritisation are mainly done at the federal level, and the criteria, according to which such decisions are taken, remain as classified information. For instance, primary and elementary education is to receive almost 43 per cent of the financial allocation for the period

1998-2003 largely due to the current illiteracy rate; governments' commitment for providing basic education for all; and also because of the high social returns it is believed to offer.

### **Trends in Educational Spending**

The actual spending on education over the last fifty years follows a typical trend in that a significant percentage of the budget allocation remains unutilised. Except during the periods 1960-65 and 1970-78, almost all the long-term education plans (generally of 5 years) fell short of their targets at least by 20 per cent. In the first case, almost the entire budget was utilised with only a difference of 0.25 per cent. In the second case, 13 per cent more was spent than the proposed budget and the prime reason was the expansion of time period from the usual five years to eight years. Although the 9<sup>th</sup> educational plan (1998-2003) is still in the implementation phase and data for current year are not available, the pattern of expenditure for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 is no different from the previous with maximum utilisation of 76.88 per cent and 66.59 per cent of the total allocation respectively.

An important reason for consistent under-spending could be traced back to the management and governance structure in Pakistan, which involves a very time consuming process. The plans for spending first prepared at the district level, are approved by the respective provincial authorities, who then forward the same to the federal authorities for decision to be taken about acceptance and allocation for the plans. If the development plans are approved, the same cycle is repeated for communicating acceptance and releasing the actual allocations and funds. Thus, by the time money is released to authorities at district and division levels, it is already middle of the year, with very little time left for actual implementation.

The purpose of spending signifies yet another prevalent trend of educational expenditure in Pakistan. For each sector, a major part of the budget is allocated for achieving bricks and mortars and physical targets, i.e. construction of new schools; residential schemes for teachers and teacher educators; recruitment of additional teachers; training of given number of teachers, etc. In meeting such physical targets, the aspects of quality and effective utilisation of the existing resources are often overlooked. Several examples and past experiences indicate that certain policy recommendations are made even without acknowledging the ground realities and

lessons learnt from the implementation of previous policies. For instance, the recent educational policy (1998-2010) aims at increasing the number of primary schools by 31 per cent, despite the fact that many government schools remain non-functional in their deserted buildings.

### **The Education Sector Reform**

The most recent and important shift has come with the introduction of the Education Sector Reform (ESR), 2001-2004, which is an action plan for effective implementation of the current education policy. Reflecting the devolution process on the political front, the ESR underscores the importance of decentralisation in education and the process of allocation and spending. To increase the efficiency of allocation and its utility, the ESR urges to directly transfer the allocated budget to each province, from where it should be given to districts without any delay. Consequently, the districts and local level authorities would have the autonomy to develop plans and spend the allocation accordingly. In this regard, the ESR also redefines the role of Federal Ministry of Education as a resource mobiliser spearheading education for all and sector-wide reforms, thereby providing space for the involvement of provincial, district and local authorities in decision-making.

Analysing the past and current trends and practices of allocation and spending in education, the aims of achieving 70 per cent literacy by the end of this decade and raising the educational expenditure to 4 per cent of the GDP would be rather difficult to realise. The scale of educational spending being very modest with 2.06 per cent of GDP for 2000-01 and an average of 2.3 per cent in the 1990s, it becomes very important for the government to raise allocation for the education sector. Bridging of the financial and implementation gaps pose as major challenges, despite the role played by some of the important innovations such as the Social Action Programme (1993-2002), which made an additional allocation of Rs.398.7 billion for educational development.

The implementation strategies laid down in the ESR stand some chance. For instance, the ESR urges to build even stronger partnerships to fill in the financial gaps identified, recognising the important role the communities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and private sector are playing in the provision of education. The financial gap for the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the ESR was Rs.3.586 billion. To subsidise the costs involved, it

also offers an incentive package consisting of provision of land, free of cost or at concessional rates, liberal grants of charter, non-commercial rates for utilities such as electricity, exemption from custom duties on the import of educational equipment, etc.

### **Role of the Civil Society and NGOs**

The NGO sector in Pakistan is fairly large and spread out, yet the impact of the NGO initiatives has remained limited (Banuri & Moazzam, 1997). There being an immense diversity in the scope and scale of NGO initiatives, consequently, little coordination is present in various initiatives of this sector. Therefore, integration of all the different initiatives into a national framework becomes very essential. Despite the fact that the NGOs may not work at cross-purpose, their efforts are certainly not geared towards an integrated plan of action. For any development plan to materialise, it is important to take these factors into account.

In fact, involving communities seems to be the most viable option for increasing the pace and scale of educational development in Pakistan. But a reconciliation of the aims, actual capacity and potential of the communities is essential before they share the state's responsibility of providing basic education for all. While accepting that free basic education for all is not an equitable option, as state resources could be used for poorer groups, and in most of the countries this is not even possible (Bray, 1998), feasibility of community participation in financing of education also needs to be assessed, despite the potential danger of overburdening the communities considering the opportunity costs, and direct expenditure made by parents for books, uniforms, food, etc. For Pakistan, community financing of education enhances the already in-equitable scenario of education as not all can afford the costs involved.

Entrusting the communities and districts with financial management responsibilities and decision-making powers under the devolution plans also requires mechanisms for building their capacity. It is, therefore, important to have organisations/structures for providing support to the different collaborators when public-private partnerships are created to sustain the impact and accelerate the pace of social development.

### **Conclusion**

Raising the level of educational spending in Pakistan is an essential condition to bring about reforms considering

the 7 to 8 per cent share of education in total public expenditure, which is the lowest in South Asia (Human Development Centre, 2001). Increased allocations should be accompanied by appropriate measures for effective utilisation of the allocated resources, i.e. setting up of transparent governance structures and inclusive decision-making system as essential and important strategies. Involving communities and NGOs in financial management and resource mobilisation for education is important to bridge the financial gaps. However, it is equally important to ensure that they are not used as mere tools for making up the existing deficit in resource allocations. In Pakistan, there is not only a need for effective implementation but also for knowledge and capacity at the decentralised levels to design and implement development plans and strategies, particularly in the basic education sector.

### **References**

- Banuri, T. J., & Mahmood, M. (1997). "NGOs in Pakistan: An Overview". In *Just Development*, T.J. Banuri, S.R. Khan and M. Mahmood (ed.), Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Bray, M. (1998). "Financing Education in Developing Asia: Themes, Tensions, and Policies". *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 29, pp. 627-642.
- Government of Pakistan (2001). *Education Sector Reforms – Action Plans, 2001-04*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Government of Pakistan (2001). *Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2000-01*. Islamabad: Finance Division, Economic Affairs Advisor's Wing.
- Government of Pakistan (1998). *National Education Policy, 1998 - 2010*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Human Development Centre (2001). *Human Development in South Asia: Globalisation and Human Development, 2001*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- UNESCO (1998). *World Culture Report 1998*. Paris.
- Zaidi, S. Akbar (1999). *Issues in Pakistan's Economy*, Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Amima Sayeed  
AKU-IED  
Islamabad, Pakistan

# Financing Education in Malaysia

## *Issues and Innovations*

### **Introduction**

Malaysia aspires to become a fully developed nation by the year 2020. Towards this end and in order to become a knowledge-based economy (K-economy), emphasis is given to human resource development. In this respect, education and training play vital roles in creating a critical mass of trained, skilled and knowledge manpower to sustain economic growth and increase Malaysia's competitiveness in the global market. Thus, education in Malaysia is considered as a key to human resource development, as also as a tool in fostering national unity, developing the human resources base and ensuring sustained economic growth. Since education in Malaysia is a federal subject, it has consistently received the largest allocation each year to meet the operating costs, and particularly, for the development of primary, secondary and tertiary education since Independence in 1957.

The economic crisis in 1997 and the resulting economic recession in 1998 in Malaysia had an effect on the financial resources available for implementing developmental programmes in different sectors of the economy including education. It also compelled the government to focus on cost effective and efficient methods of spending the limited resources. This had direct implications with regard to financing of education, as reflected in the Eighth Plan. The Eighth Plan gave high priority to education and focused on productivity growth through upgradation of knowledge and skills of the workers and Research and Development. Further, intensifying efforts to nurture and inculcate positive values and attributes among the Malaysians through the education system, social and religious organizations and media was emphasized in the plan.

### **Financing Education**

#### ***Public Cost***

There are two main sources of financing education in Malaysia, i.e. public and private. To a large extent, spending in education is borne from public funds. Although education was funded from the Federal Budget Allocation annually before 1962, school fees were

collected from the parents to defray the cost of providing education in the early years. In 1962, free primary education was made available to all children and school fees were abolished in the fully assisted primary schools. The children were given nine years of free schooling. After the enactment of the Education Act in 1996, free schooling was extended from primary to secondary level. In other words, since 1996, eleven years of school education has been made available free to all children in Malaysia.

The Federal Government places utmost importance on education as reflected by the annual budget allocation. The Federal Government allocates approximately one-fifth or about 20 per cent of its annual national budget to education. In 1996, the share of education budget in total national budget was 19.55 per cent, which increased to 20.43 per cent in 2001, when total allocation for education was RM 18.60 billion.

The government allocates a substantial proportion of its resources to formal education. The resources are largely directed towards improvement of infrastructure facilities in schools such as science laboratory, classrooms, computer laboratories etc. Another aspect of public expenditure includes school grants, i.e. per capita grants for subjects or by subjects and other charges and annual recurrent expenditure, including expenses on utilities and other recurrent expenditures. Under the Third Outline Perspective Plan (OPP3), overcrowding in urban schools is being addressed through relocation of existing schools and construction of additional classrooms and schools. With more subjects in schools being taught, using interactive multimedia technology and web-based teaching, the government proposes to continue to increase investment in education.

In Malaysia, educational support services and special projects are given emphasis to ensure quality education. These include federal minor scholarships; textbook loan scheme; food assistance programme or supplementary food scheme such as milk scheme; school health programme such as dental treatment to primary school children; and school boarding facilities. The Scholarship Division in the Ministry of Education coordinates the

scholarship programmes whereby scholarships are provided to selected students at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Besides, the National Higher Education Loan Fund Corporation also provides education loans. The textbook loan scheme, implemented on a nationwide basis since 1975, covers all levels of education from primary to upper secondary. The aim is to lessen the financial burden of parents from the lower income group and ultimately ensure access to education for every child. The government also implements the Nutrition and Health Programme in the school education sector. It aims to improve the standard of health through proper nutrition and good health practices. The Supplementary Food Scheme and the provision of School Health Services are extensions of this programme. The Supplementary Food Scheme caters to poor pupils from more than 5,000 primary schools throughout the country. These pupils are given supplementary food for 120 school days.

The government solely finances the training of teachers at various levels of school education. The teacher education colleges offer initial teacher training, in-service teacher training, short-term courses and workshops for specialized groups. Pre-service teacher education colleges have always been free. In addition, teacher trainees are paid monthly stipend during their training. To further improve the quality of the teaching profession and to attract better-qualified people, the teachers' service scheme in terms of remuneration and promotional opportunities are reviewed periodically. The government also allocates a sizeable amount of funds towards providing teachers with housing loans, car loans, computer loans, medical benefits, scholarships for further studies or training and other incentives.

### ***Private Cost***

While the government bears a large portion of the direct cost of education in Malaysia, the private costs are borne by individuals and families. These include transport, books and stationery, uniforms, shoes and private tuition or tutorship cost. In addition, parents also have to spend on special fees for school activities, clubs, library usage, sports, Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) subscriptions and so on. Given the non-availability of data, it is very difficult to estimate the private cost of schooling in Malaysia.

Over the years, the private cost of education has gone up, especially for the poor households with several school going children. However, the government

provides financial assistance and support to these households through the provision of Federal Minor Scholarships. Besides, the government, through the Social Welfare Department, subsidizes part of the private cost by providing poor children with uniforms, shoes, books and other private expenses. Several other non-governmental and charitable organizations as well as the PTAs also try to help these children. The government allows withdrawals from the *Employees Provident Fund* to buy computers and also to finance individuals' self or their children's higher education. Another form of encouragement for lifelong learning is by giving tax rebate for financing higher education, science and computer education as well as for buying books and computers.

## **Some Issues**

### ***Concern for Equity***

In Malaysia primary, secondary and higher education are heavily subsidized. The basic objective is to ensure as far as possible equity, efficiency and quality of education. In the Malaysian context, equity means universal access to education, sharing of resources and democratization of primary to secondary levels of schooling. Malaysia hopes to go even further to universalize pre-school education.

Despite various interventions by the government in the education sector, the main beneficiaries are essentially the children from the higher income group. In other words, such subsidies constitute a major source of educational inequity, for they benefit precisely those individuals who have the best ability to pay for education. If cost recovery was possible from this income group, the government would have been able to mobilize additional resources to provide for higher quality educational services to the needy and the lower income group.

### ***Universal Access***

Since 1997, the extension of free schooling facilities for nine to eleven year age-group has further increased the responsibility of the government to create equal educational opportunities, especially at the secondary level of education. One of the major issues now is to create additional infrastructure facilities at the secondary level to provide universal access, particularly for children coming from the lower income groups. This has further increased the financial burden of the government.

## ***Efficiency***

Efficiency can be viewed in terms of higher graduation rate (with acceptable quality) at a given level of school education with lower per capita expenditure. With the provision of eleven years of free schooling, it is hoped that the completion of upper secondary level of education would prepare students better in terms of knowledge and skills required to compete in the labour market. Majority of the public schools in Malaysia are multi-shift schools. This is viewed as an efficient use of available physical facilities in the existing schools. However, in terms of quality and effectiveness, such schools have performed below the desired level. The eventual goal, therefore, is to establish one-session schools in Malaysia. At present, due to financial constraints, the policy of double-session schools is still being practised, though, over the years, the efficiency of the school education sector in Malaysia has gone up remarkably.

## ***Financial Constraints***

Unfortunately, due to a number of reasons, the government faces difficulty in meeting and sustaining all the financial needs of the education sector. In recent years, the economic downturn and shrinking government revenues have forced the government to look for alternative sources of financing education. Furthermore, with the country's growing population, the enrolment of students is increasing faster than the capacity of the government to accommodate them. The relevance of the curriculum and instructional methods at all levels to the national needs has also become one of the growing concerns both for the government and the citizens. Such a pressure for expansion and quality education has led to a growing acknowledgement and appreciation of the role of the private sector and the alternative forms of funding.

## ***Major Innovations***

In seeking to reduce the costs of education, the government would need to consider the strategy of shifting more of the education financing from public to private sources. So far, Malaysia has adopted and initiated several measures towards greater private contribution in the financing of education. These changes will not by themselves solve all the financial constraints, yet they may help the government finance educational expansion. This shift towards a more

equitable and efficient balance of public and private contribution towards educational development in Malaysia is expected to be achieved through the following policy initiatives.

## ***Student Loans and Scholarships***

Introducing loans and selective scholarships would add benefits on almost all counts. They would provide a greater coverage and access to the needy students for higher education. This is more equitable and is a rolling fund where the students contribute their 'share' as they are the main beneficiaries. The commitment of the government is seen by the huge input of funds to the National Higher Education Loan Fund Corporation. This assistance takes the form of long-term, low-interest loans to students who have secured places in tertiary institutions but lack the economic resources necessary for further education. The National Higher Education Loan Fund Corporation provides students in public higher education institutions with loans of RM 6,500 while students in private higher education institutions are eligible for RM 12,000 per annum. They have a 4 per cent administration cost and loans are to be repaid upon employment after graduation. The mode of repayment is via tax deduction over a 15-year period. To promote science-related education, a further incentive of an additional loan of RM 500 a year without the administration charge is offered. A total of 83,849 and 99,896 students were awarded loans in the years 1999 and 2000 respectively.

Financial institutions such as banks are encouraged to provide soft loans to working adults to continue their education. This private credit market to finance education especially for higher education has yet to be an important alternative source of funding. Probably, the private financial institutions are not as ready as the government in facing the high risk of defaults in repayment by highly mobile graduates. They also have yet to devise a proven system of loan recovery.

Although the shift in financing of education is through student loans, it cannot be denied that there is still a need to provide selective scholarships to the poor and intelligent students, based on need, affirmative action and merit. In Malaysia, these selective scholarships are in the critical areas of studying science and technology in the country and abroad. To reduce the outflow of foreign exchange, more scholarships are allocated for local institutions of higher education. These selective

scholarships cover the tuition fees and allowance for the period of study and are dependent on the students' achievement of acceptable academic records. In the year 2000, about 1,049 selected students received scholarships to pursue their studies in local higher educational institutions.

### ***Liberalisation of Private Education***

In line with liberalisation in the provision of education by the private sector to complement and supplement the government's effort, the private sector participation is intensified under the Eighth Plan. The private sector is expected to play an active role at all levels of education with major expansion expected in higher education. This liberalisation has resulted in sharp increase in the number of private education institutions at pre-school, primary, secondary and tertiary levels. These private schools have adopted the national curriculum, which includes the teaching of good values and ethics as well as the preparation for public examinations. Enrolment at the primary and secondary levels in private schools has increased from 116,510 in 1995 to 142,920 in 2000. This effectively expands the coverage of education and transfers the burden of financing education to the consumers.

The Private Higher Educational Institutions Act, 1996 has enabled the private sector to set up private institutes of higher education. Six private universities that offer engineering, business, medicine and multimedia at the degree level were set up. The Act also allowed foreign universities to establish branch campuses in Malaysia. This is in line with the government's effort to increase accessibility to higher education. To ensure quality education in private higher education institutions, the National Accreditation Board was established to provide guidelines and standards for quality control. In addition, the National Higher Education Loan Fund Corporation also provides loan for private higher education students. The private contribution to the financing of higher education is both equitable and efficient.

Further evidence of the importance of private sector involvement in financing education was reflected in the mid-1997 when the country experienced an economic downturn and this had a direct impact on the provision of higher education. Currency depreciation and the stock market collapse not only compelled students studying abroad to return home but also drastically reduced the number of government-sponsored and self-sponsored

students going abroad. There were simply not enough places at the local universities to cope with this sudden demand and the sudden influx of formerly overseas bound students now seeking their higher education locally. Due to the lack of resources in public universities to meet the increasing demand, many of the universities franchised some of their programmes like education and computer science programmes to private colleges as a short-term measure. Under this arrangement, all teaching activities are conducted in the premises of the private colleges while the university provides the entire course curriculum. Upon completion of the programme, the public university confers the degree.

In the case of promoting and developing Malaysia as an international centre for education, the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, has identified the private sector as its 'partner' in its efforts to market higher education to foreign students. This initiative has intensified collaboration of the public and private sector institutions of higher education in providing quality higher education at competitive fees. Educational fairs are held overseas such as those in ASEAN and Middle East countries to market and attract foreign students. In order to export higher education, the Malaysian government encourages the private sector for providing higher education with focus on science and technology-related courses. As a form of encouragement, such private higher education institutions offering technical and medical courses are given incentives by the government. Among the measures put in place to help private institutions are the greater flexibility in the hiring of foreign teaching personnel and less stringent immigration regulations imposed on them.

### ***Corporatisation of Local Universities***

Since April 1998, a new constitution has been introduced for all public universities where structural and managerial adjustments are made in their governance. It is expected that this move will ultimately lead to corporatisation. It facilitates decision-making, reorganization and restructuring of the existing system and the introduction of new salary schemes. This measure is to prevent brain-drain from local universities, and to enable public universities to be more autonomous in their governance as well as be more responsive and relevant to the changing needs and requirements. It is the intention of the government that through corporatisation, all public universities will be less dependent on public funds. Instead of the 90 per cent government funding to public



universities, the target is to reduce it to 70 per cent. With autonomy, institutions of higher education will have greater flexibility in seeking their own revenue resources. This would also ensure efficiency and accountability of educational services.

### ***Community and Private Support***

Although there is heavy government subsidy for creation of infrastructure facilities at primary and secondary levels of education, it is inadequate to provide for the physical, curriculum and instructional needs of all schools. In recent years, more allocation has been made for maintaining, improving and upgrading school facilities. However, the Parent-Teacher Associations, individuals, private organizations, political groups as well as non-governmental organizations and the local community have also been encouraged to contribute in a large way towards funding the physical facilities, equipment, maintenance as well as curricular and co-curricular activities of schools.

It is through their continued support and efforts that enabled the schools to build or expand halls, canteens, library, *surau* (places for prayer) and other amenities. In addition, they also fund curricular and co-curricular activities such as games and sports, school band and the sponsorship of poor students' needs for uniforms, books, shoes etc. Funding of school education by communities, local level organisations and individuals has been the unique feature of Malaysian education.

### **Conclusion**

Malaysia gives high priority to education as it plays a key role in developing its human resources. Education, being the responsibility of the Federal Government, has made the government to bear a substantial proportion of the cost of education that includes the development and operational cost as well as the provision of support services and special programmes. There is free universal education for eleven years in Malaysia. This means that almost the entire direct cost of education is borne by the public. The private cost, which is a small proportion of total educational financing, is borne by individual families.

So far, education for the first eleven years is universal and free for all in Malaysia. It is now reviewing and proposing to make education compulsory. Although

education may be free, parents would still have to pay a sizeable amount each year for the purpose of educating their children. Presently, to help the poor, the government plans to set up a Poor Pupils' Trust Fund. By making education compulsory, the government would have to devise new policies that are appropriate to local conditions to mobilise the required resources to finance educational development. Ultimately, the issue of who should bear the costs and who should benefit from education would always be considered to ensure efficient and equitable financing arrangements.

### **References**

- Chin, V. K. (2002). *Giving the Poor a Decent Education*, The STAR, 10<sup>th</sup> April 2002.
- Economic Planning Unit (2001). *The Eighth Malaysian Plan 2001- 2005*. Putrajaya: Economic Planning Unit.
- Educational Planning and Research Division (2001). *Education in Malaysia: A Journey to Excellence*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education, Government of Malaysia.
- Educational Planning and Research Division (2001). *2001 – 2010 Education Development Blueprint*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education, Government of Malaysia.
- Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (1998). *Human Capital Investment: An International Comparison*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Psacharopoulos, G. & Woodhall, M. (1985). *Education for Development: An Analysis of Investment Choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The World Bank (1986). *Financing Education in Developing Countries: An Exploration of Policy Options*. The World Bank.
- Simrit Kaur et al. (2001). *The Third Outline Perspective Plan 2001-2010*. The STAR, 4<sup>th</sup> April 2001.

*Foo Kim Kiat  
Khuan Wai Bing  
Institute Aminuddin Baki  
Malaysia*

## News from Member Institutions

### **State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT)**

*Allahabad, India*

SIEMAT an impact evaluation study on 'Free Textbooks Distribution for Enrolment and Retention of Underprivileged Students and Teacher/Parental Satisfaction' revealed that the distribution of free textbooks has a positive impact on the enrolment of students, especially among girls and the socially deprived in the backward villages. Almost 85 per cent of parents felt that the books had enhanced their children's interest in reading and they were satisfied with the scheme.

### **The Aga Khan University (AKU) - Institute for Educational Development**

*Karachi, Pakistan*

The AKU organized a research policy dialogue on 'Teacher Education' funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), UK. The participants included policy makers from the federal, provincial and district levels, researchers, teachers, teacher educators, representatives of NGOs and donor agencies. This was the first of the series of five dialogues programmes to be held on key issues in education. The general purpose of the policy dialogue was to create awareness about the role and importance of research in policy-making and to encourage public, private and non-governmental organizations to build research partnerships.

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

*Seoul, Korea*

KEDI organized the Pacific Circle Consortium during May 1-3, 2002. on the theme 'Diversity and Unity in Schooling of Future Citizens in the Pacific-Asian Region'. The Pacific Circle Consortium is an international educational organization dedicated to the improvement of teaching and research about people, nations and issues of the Pacific-Asian region. A total of 142 participants from 16 countries participated, where 72 papers on the theme were presented.

### **Centre for Education Management Development (CEMD)**

*Maharagama, Sri Lanka*

The Centre for Professional Development Education Management of the National Institute of Education has introduced two course of year, duration each these are: Post Graduate Diploma in Principalship and Diploma in Primary School Management. The former comprises residential training, school attachment and reflection and internalization while the latter provides in-service training in educational management to the Principals of primary schools with a combination of distance teaching and contact programmes.

### **National Academy for Educational Management**

*Dhaka, Bangladesh*

- 1 A series of Educational Management and Administration programmes were conducted from January 14 to July 7, 2002, for Bangladesh Civil Service Cadre officers.
- 1 Organized Educational Management and Administration Training course for the Principals of Government and Private Colleges and Madarsas of Post Secondary Schools from January 19 to May 12, 2002 and Educational Management and Administration course for the heads of the secondary schools from January 12 to June 17, 2002.
- 1 Conducted a study on "Better School Management: Role of School Management Committee (Secondary Education Level)". The study examines the role of School Management Committee in improving schools. The study is in progress.

### **National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration**

*New Delhi, India*

- 1 Coordinated a study visit for 14 Sri Lankan delegates during February 15-23, 2002. The main focus of the study visit was on in-service training of primary

school teachers and head teachers and innovations in primary education.

- 1 A 7-member delegation from Ethiopia visited NIEPA on April 16 2002 and interacted with NIEPA faculty on various issues relating to educational planning and administration.
- 1 A 3-member delegation, consisting of Ministry Education, Morocco and two Senior Education Officers visited NIEPA on April 17, 2002. Their main focus was on decentralisation girls' education and information technology.
- 1 Successfully completed Phase I of the Eighteenth International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration during February 1 and April 30, 2002. Nineteen trainees from thirteen countries attended the Diploma course.

**Centre for Educational  
Innovation and Development**

*Kathmandu, Nepal*

- 1 Conducted a study on "School effectiveness in Nepal: Synthesis of Indicators" during January-June 2002. the specific objectives of the study were: (i) to assess school effectiveness with reference to enrolment, retention, achievement scores and availability of educational resources at the school level; (ii) to assess whether economic and socio-cultural background of students contributes or hinders school effectiveness; and (iii) to assess

community/parents' perception of schools.

- 1 Organized a workshop on 'Mobilizing Teachers, Education and their Organizations in combating Child Labour in Nepal'. Teachers and representatives of Teacher Associations, International Labour Organization, Ministry of Labour and MOES participated in the workshop.

**Institute Aminuddin Baki**

*Pohang, Malaysia*

Conducted in-service courses on (i) management and leadership; (ii) management and quality assurance; (iii) curriculum management; and (iv) management skills. Also conducted pre-service courses on (i) National Professional Qualification for Headship; and (ii) Diploma in Counseling.

**National Council of Educational  
Research and Training**

*New Delhi, India*

- 1 Organized an orientation programme for 15 teacher educators from various National Colleges of Education in Sri Lanka from February 4 to May 3, 2002.
- 1 Oriented two Directors of National Authority of Teacher Education, Sri Lanka, on the concept and process of accreditation of teacher education in India and the functions of institutions involved in the process of accreditation.