

The Fourth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting

The Fourth Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions was held at the Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development, Shanghai, China, on 22 September 2000. The proceedings of the one-day meeting started at 1000 hrs. Representatives from 15 member institutions, i.e. NAEM and BRAC (Bangladesh), SIHRD (China), NIEPA, NCERT and SIEMAT (India), IAB



Right to left: Mr. Jiang Minghe, President of the Network; Dr. K. Sujatha, Focal Point, NIEPA; and Prof. Gunawardena at the Fourth ANTRIEP Annual Meeting organised at SIHRD, Shanghai, China

In this Issue....

<i>The Fourth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Report on ANTRIEP Activities</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A Summary of Discussions on the Report</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Seminar on Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>News from Member Institutions</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Member Institutions</i>	<i>16</i>

(Malaysia), Balitbung Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Indonesia), KEDI (Korea), CERID and NCED (Nepal), AEPAM (Pakistan), SEAMO INNOTECH (Philippines), NIE (Sri Lanka), and IIEP (Paris) participated in the meeting.

The President of the Network, Prof. G.B. Gunawardena of NIE, Sri Lanka, delivered the inaugural address, in keeping with the tradition of the Annual Meetings. The Chairperson of the Network changes at every Annual Meeting and as per convention, the head of the institution hosting

the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network till the next Annual Meeting takes place. Accordingly, Mr. Jiang Minghe, Director of SIHRD, China, took over as the new President of the Network and presided over the proceedings of the ANTRIEP Meeting thereafter as its Chairman.

On behalf of the Focal Point, Prof. K. Sujatha, NIEPA, New Delhi, presented a detailed report of the ANTRIEP activities during the year 1999-2000, which was circulated among the members. The report highlighted the activities of the Network and identified areas of priority action in the coming years. It explored various initiatives to promote closer interaction between the members, like the Newsletter and other institutional publications, exchange of documents and information, visits, exchange programmes, workshops, training programmes and collaborative research projects. It reported the completion of the national diagnostic studies on "Role and Status of Head Teacher" initiated as part of the first phase of the collaborative research project of the ANTRIEP on "Improving School Management in Asian Countries: Capacity Building of Head Teachers". It 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 area 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 now have many member institutions, and also bringing new member institutions from countries which are not represented in the Network. The complete text of the report is published in this issue of the Newsletter.

This was followed by discussions on the report of future activities of the ANTRIEP. Themes for future issues of the Newsletter were discussed. Improvement in bilateral cooperation and facilitation of inter-institutional interaction by means of exchange and collaborative research and training

programmes were also discussed. A summary of the discussions of the Fourth Annual Meeting is also 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 the continued support extended by the member institutions to activate the Network.

The Annual Meeting was preceded by a Seminar on **Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher**. This issue of the Newsletter carries a report on the Seminar.

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
Fax: (91 11) 6853041, 6865180
E-mail: ksujatha@vsnl.com
niepa@vsnl.com*

Report on ANTRIEP Activities*

The Background

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

In most of the countries, there has been considerable emphasis on expansion of pedagogical training facilities. However, such facilities are not readily available in the area of educational planning and management. Very often, the number of institutions providing training in educational planning and management has remained very small as it has not increased in proportion to the increase in the number of educational planners and managers. This has resulted in lack of capacities in educational

planning and management in many countries. Paradoxically, in the phase of decentralised planning and management, whatever limited number of capacity building institutions are available, are situated at centralised locations, thereby impeding the very process of decentralisation. Therefore, there is an immediate need to diversify and expand the institutional arrangements for capacity building of educational functionaries.

Many countries of the Asian region have organisational arrangements, though limited in numbers, for developing capacities of educational functionaries at various levels of the education system. These institutions have long-standing experience in assisting their respective governments in strengthening planning and management capacities. All these institutions were functioning till very recently in isolation and there used to be very limited interaction with similar institutions situated either within the country or in other countries of the region. The level of communication among the institutions was poor and 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 forming a Network emerged at a workshop in Kathmandu in December 1994 and became a reality at a workshop in New Delhi in December 1995 when 12 institutions from eight Asian countries formed the ANTRIEP Network. Since then the number of institutions has increased to 17, 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 that helps in dissemination of the information regarding various activities of the Network.

Organisational Arrangement

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

Since the Presidentship is by rotation, normally the host of the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network, which changes at every Annual

Meeting. The current Chairperson of the Network is Director General, National Institute of Education, Colombo, Sri Lanka, that hosted the Third Annual Meeting. The role of the Chairperson is to preside over the Annual Meeting, examine the applications for the new membership, if any, and give suggestions to the Focal Point for better facilitation of the Network activities.

As mentioned earlier, the Network at present has 16 member institutions from 10 countries of Asia, in addition to the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris. Of the 16 institutions, four are from India, three from Bangladesh, two from Nepal, and one each from China, Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philippines, Republic of Korea, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The Network keeps on requesting its member institutions to contact and encourage similar institutions in their respective countries to become member of the Network, as it also did at the Third Annual Meeting. After 1998, no new members have joined the Network. However, there were some preliminary enquiries about the possibility of becoming member of the Network by some institutions from some countries. We are sure new members from more countries of the region would join soon. Any member institution continues as a member of the Network by its active contribution to the activities of the ANTRIEP.

ANTRIEP Activities During 1999-2000

Annual Meetings

The vitality and dynamism of the Network are well proved by the regular Annual Meetings it holds and which have become a conviction. The Annual Meetings create an opportunity for the member institutions to have intensive and intimate interaction and exchange of ideas and experiences on a regular basis. Further, making these meetings as an integral follow up part of a seminar on selected theme enhances the value of the Annual Meetings. So

far, the seminar has been initiated by the IIEP. This approach creates an opportunity for the member institutions to attend the Annual Meeting without financial obligations. The Third Annual Meeting of the Network was held at NIE, Colombo, as a follow up of a Seminar on School Efficiency. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Network is also organised as a follow up of the Seminar on Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher. We are grateful to SIHRD, China for their keen interest and initiative in organising the Fourth Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP.

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

Newsletter

As was decided in the First Annual Meeting that the Focal Point would bring out a Newsletter bi-annually, the ANTRIEP Newsletter was started from 1996. The Network is successfully bringing out the Newsletter regularly for the last four years. More importantly, the Newsletter helps greatly to share the experiences of different countries on selected themes, especially on planning and management of primary education. The themes for the various issues of the Newsletter are discussed during the Annual Meetings. Accordingly, the Newsletter brought out immediately after the Third Annual Meeting was devoted to reporting about the Annual Meeting itself. This was followed by two other issues, which focussed on **Community Participation in School Management**, and

Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads. The member institutions were prompt and positive in their responses 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 keep to the publication schedule of the Newsletter and overall it has been met regularly without delay.

As for the suggestions made during the last Annual 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 of the member institutions and forthcoming programmes are found useful by the members, however, such information from some of the member institutions is not forthcoming.

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

Publication of Seminar Proceedings

During the Third Annual Meeting of the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning, Colombo, 15-17 December, 1998, most of the members suggested that the proceedings of the preceding Seminar might be brought as an ANTRIEP publication. Following this suggestion, the Seminar Proceedings, entitled "School Effectiveness: Asian Experiences" have been brought out as an ANTRIEP publication. This publication is based on the ANTRIEP meeting held

at Colombo and contains a resume of the presentations, deliberations of the seminar and the papers presented by member institutions, such as NIE, NIEPA, KEDI, IIEP and an expert from Australia. This will be widely distributed. This volume is the first among a series of publications to be brought out under the ANTRIEP umbrella.

In the Third Annual Meeting, many members felt that the Network has reached a stage where it needs to develop an ANTRIEP logo. All member institutions were requested to send in their suggestions. A logo has now been prepared and it will be discussed and finalised in the Fourth Annual meeting. Similarly, there is a need to revise the brochure for incorporating updated institutional information and also adding more details about the areas of priority and list of important publications of member institutions.

Exchange of Documents and Information

Exchange of documents and information related to different activities of member institutions was visualised as means of keeping informed and knowing about the developments in member institutions. Accordingly, in all the Annual Meetings, it was emphasised that the member institutions should exchange information among themselves. Compared to earlier the bilateral exchange of documents and information seems to have increased. It is found that some individual member institutions do request other member institutions for relevant research or reference materials pertaining to the interest areas of their research work. The Focal Point has received feedback from some of the member institutions 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. However, still some of the member institutions continue to send the materials and research reports to Focal Point. In earlier Annual Meetings, it was pointed out that the reason for not exchanging the documents regularly was the language constraint as many institutions do not bring out the documents in English. However, it is also true that most of the institutions do bring out some of their documents in English. Therefore, it seems there is immense scope for improving the exchange of documents and information more 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.

Visits and Exchange Programmes

The period following the previous Annual Meeting saw many visits materialising. These included visits to IIEP by the Director of NIEPA and faculty members from the Focal Point; NIE, Colombo; NAEM, Bangladesh; and Chairman of the Governing Board of SIEMAT, Allahabad. Representatives from NAEM visited the Focal Point as part of a course. Mr. Carron visited Focal Point and had several rounds of discussions on the implementation of the ANTRIEP project. Probably many more staff members would have visited different member institutions of which the Focal Point does not have information.

The exchange programmes are aimed to establish and strengthen 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 Annual Meetings, this aspect was discussed in detail and some of the institutions offered to facilitate the visits by providing free boarding facilities. During 1999-2000, a positive

trend has emerged as some of the member institutions have set the tradition of exchange visits and formalised collaborations in organising training.

Director SIEMAT, Allahabad, visited IAB, Malaysia and discussed arrangements for mutual exchange of resource persons and publications between the two countries. There was a proposal for developing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two member institutions. There is an MOU existing between CERID (Nepal) and KEDI (Korea). Similarly an exchange programme between IAB of Malaysia and INNOTECH of the Philippines took place. Although not under the Network, a few study visits among the member institutions as a part of sponsored programmes by international agencies also took place. For instance, staff of NAEM and BRAC from Bangladesh visited NIEPA and NCERT in India. Similarly, NIEPA faculty had an occasion to visit KEDI in Seoul to attend PROAP sponsored workshop. In view of the collaborative project taken up under Network, we hope that in the coming year 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 for visiting fellowships. However, there is a need for the member institutions to initiate dialogue with bilateral and multilateral international agencies to explore possibilities of providing funding support for exchange programmes. For instance, the European Mission Office in India is considering to support some of the Network activities, particularly bilateral visits of professionals and functionaries between Indian and other member institutions. There is a need to evolve more systematic and a common framework for exchange of personnel among the member institutions.

Workshops and Training Programmes

Annual Meetings alone may not be enough to sustain the Network and to make it more effective. In addition to the Annual Meetings, regular interaction and collaboration through mutual participation in training programmes among the member institutions 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 during 1999-2000 in this direction at least. As a follow up measure to the workshop on "Women and Management in the Higher Education" held in Malaysia, SIEMAT, Allahabad has been given the responsibility to organise training programme for master trainers who can later organise regional/university level trainings in their respective countries. Similarly, IAB and INNOTECH have jointly developed, coordinated and conducted a course on Management of Curriculum at INNOTECH. In fact some of the member institutions are organising regional programmes and programmes for functionaries from other countries. In 1999-2000, NIEPA organised specific programmes for Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, apart from its regular course of International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration. Similarly, IIEP, Paris organised a training programme in collaboration with NIEPA, New Delhi on the quantitative techniques in educational research. IIEP will be organising another programme in collaboration with IAB, Malaysia which will have participants from the ANTRIEP member institutions. These programmes generally are not organised by the Network but some of the participants are from the member institutions of Network. Similarly, KEDI, Seoul, in collaboration with PROAP (UNESCO), Bangkok had organised a workshop on human resource development where some of the participants were from the member institutions of the Network. We do not have

information about other member institutions whether they had conducted any such training programmes or workshops where the participants were also from the member institutions of Network.

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 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 their 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 a 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 and study visit programmes on the request of respective governments or funding agencies. However, the Network is hardly involved in these programmes. Therefore, there is a need to make concerted efforts through close interaction with the governments of respective countries 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 also help to 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. Although individual member institutions should follow their own strategies, 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.

Collaborative Research Projects

For mutual benefit and sustained inter-institutional linkages, collaborative research becomes an important impetus. During the Third Annual Meeting held in Colombo, the participating member institutions emphasised initiating collaborative research project in the area of improving school management. The role of the head teachers in initiating the school improvement was the major area of discussion in the meeting. Taking into account that very little empirical research has been conducted in the Asian region on the role of head teachers and their impact on school improvement, it was decided to initiate a collaborative project consisting of studies and capacity building activities focussing on head teachers. Accordingly, a draft project proposal on **Improving School Management in Asian Countries: Capacity Building for Head Teachers** was prepared, and sent to all the member institutions for their comments and observations. An overwhelmingly positive response was received and based on the suggestions and comments, the proposal was finalised.

The major objective of the project is to build capacities of school heads to improve the school management in selected countries of Asia through the ANTRIEP member institutions. The project will consist of series of research studies, workshops and training activities spread over a period of 3 years and will be carried out in a collaborative manner by the member institutions of ANTRIEP. The uniqueness of this project is that it integrates research and capacity building activities. In other words, the research findings will become an input in designing and developing the training programmes. Secondly, some of the member institutions have been organising training for heads of schools as part of their normal training activities. The present project efforts will be to integrate with the ongoing training activities by strengthening them and making them more effective.

The research part of the project has two components. The first component comprises preparation of national diagnoses on head teachers while the second concentrates on specific case studies on current practices and innovations in school management. The national diagnostic studies on Role and Status of Head Teachers were initiated as a part of the first phase of the collaborative research project and being carried out by the member institutions. The theme for the just concluded seminar was based on the diagnostic studies, with the findings of the studies forming a valuable input of seminar, organised under the ANTRIEP.

Changes in Heads of Member Institutions

Heads of several member institutions have changed after the Colombo Meeting. Professor Gudmund Hernes has taken over charge as Director at the IIEP. The DG of NIE and Chairman of the ANTRIEP, Professor Jayatillake, is now replaced by Professor Gunawardena as the new DG of NIE and Chairman of the Network. New Directors

have taken charges in NIEPA, the Focal Point; NCERT, New Delhi; NAEM, Bangladesh; IAB, Malaysia; and Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research, Indonesia. It gives us special privilege to welcome all the new heads of member institutions to the ANTRIEP Seminar and Meeting and look forward to meet them at Shanghai.

Future Perspective Action

In the next 2-3 years, the major focus of ANTRIEP will be on operationalisation of the collaborative project, which includes research and capacity building activities 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 the respective governments.

It will also be a priority to finalise, consolidate and prepare composite report of the diagnostic studies. Based on the findings of the diagnostic studies, a common framework and methodologies will be evolved for preparation of case studies on school management, including innovations, which is the second part of the research component. Regional and bilateral collaborations and interactions will be of utmost importance in designing the training modules, and trying out and launching training programmes for head teachers.

The major issues and problems related with capacity building of head teachers may be common among some of the member countries. 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.

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, NIEPA, in India, has begun a discussion with the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India, and the European Commission Office to consider funding for some of the ANTRIEP activities. The European Commission has, in principle, agreed to provide support for some of the ANTRIEP activities and has extended support for the first part of the studies, including funding for representatives of member institutions attending the Fourth Annual Meeting. We expect other member institutions in other countries 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 to have regular

collaboration among the member institutions at bilateral and regional levels. Similarly, the member institutions perhaps may like to consider the proposal of working out a common framework in which the host country may subsidise the boarding arrangements and the visiting institutions meet the travel funding. In fact NIEPA has such an arrangement with some of the institutions abroad and they have signed MOU in this respect and also when the visiting professionals from other countries request for such facilities. We are sure that many of the member institutions may be having such arrangements in their own way. Such provisions will facilitate more and frequent bilateral interactions. The Focal Point will welcome to be informed about these arrangements whenever such bilateral exchanges take place.

The collaborative project emphasises 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 was already felt during Third Annual Meeting that the Network has reached a stage when we may have to think in terms of country-based local Networks. As such it is essential to develop Associate Members of the Network. In other words, each member institution in its respective country needs to play a leadership role in organising the Network activities, more particularly in operation 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 who are in large numbers.

The ANTRIEP Newsletter can become a forum for exchange of information and sharing experiences of the sub-network members in implementation of the improvement of school management project activities within the country and among different countries. This will in turn

enhance the outreach of ANTRIEP activities. India has initiated a dialogue with European Commission, and Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India, in order to develop a sub-network of training and research institutions at local level.

On behalf of the Focal Point of ANTRIEP, may I take this opportunity to thank IIEP, the President

of the Network, and all the member institutions for their invaluable guidance and persistent support to the Network activities, which kept the Network alive and active all these years.

*K.Sujatha
on behalf of
The Focal Point, NIEPA, New Delhi*

A Summary of Discussions on the Report

The meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions is always organized along with a Seminar. The Fourth Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions held at the Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development on 22 September 2000 too was preceded by a Seminar on “Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher”. Representatives from 15 of the total 17 member institutions of the Network attended the Meeting. More importantly, heads of 13 member institutions participated in the deliberations of the Fourth Meeting, which is the largest number to have ever been present at such a meeting.

The Meeting opened with a short address by Professor G. B. Gunawardena, the outgoing Chairperson of the Network, which was followed by a presentation of the ANTRIEP Activities Report by Professor K. Sujatha, on behalf of the Focal Point. According to the convention established by previous Network Meetings, the Chairperson of the Network changes at every meeting and normally the host institute of the ANTRIEP Meeting assumes this responsibility until the beginning of the Network’s next meeting. The outgoing president thus called upon Mr. Jiang Minghe, Director of the SIHRD, China, to assume the responsibility of Chairperson of the ANTRIEP. Mr. Minghe chaired and conducted the proceedings of the Meeting thereafter.

The Network Meeting discussed the report which was followed by its approval by member institutions and discussions on the probable topics for the subsequent issues of the Newsletter, within-country Networks, strengthening bilateral relationships, the Network’s logo and the successive phases of implementation of the ANTRIEP project. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks by the Focal Point. The summary of the discussions in the Meeting is given in the following paragraphs.

Probable topics for the forthcoming issues of the Newsletter were discussed during the meeting. As usual, the next issue of the Newsletter will focus on the ANTRIEP Seminar and the Fourth Meeting. Subsequent issues of the Newsletter will consider such areas as profiles of outstanding head teachers, linkages between external and internal supervision, curriculum relevance, school regulations, and policy reforms.

Suggestions for specific topics of research, that will be undertaken as part of the ANTRIEP project, included interaction and linkages between head teachers and supervisors, the role of the head teachers in private schools as opposed to public schools and evaluation or assessment of school performance. Further, it was suggested that the topic for the next seminar may centre around the theme

of “School Management Practices”.

The ANTRIEP Newsletter is considered to be a medium that interacts with the outside world, both on issues of current importance and on activities of the Network. The point that was particularly emphasized was that there should be good linkage between the seminar theme, areas identified for research and topics selected for the successive issues of the Newsletter. It was felt that the Focal Point would take into account various suggestions that emerged while finalizing future topics for the forthcoming issues of the Newsletter.

Discussion on the implementation of the project reflected that many institutions were eager to be active partners in the implementation process. There was, therefore, a need to identify areas of comparative advantage for each one of them. This might depend on the research interest and capacity manifested by the institute, as well as the possibility of funding support. It was felt, however, that some institutions, based on their expertise in specific areas of the project, could play a leading role in coordinating certain spheres of research. This would facilitate a better decentralisation of activities and favour the development of regional research capacities. Needless to add, these issues need to be discussed directly with member institutions within the context of specific requests before any decision could be taken.

While on previous occasions, the discussion was more oriented towards regional and international co-operation, the topic that attracted greatest interest during the discussions this time was on bilateral co-operation and interaction. This reflected the internal strength gained by the Network in its operations and hence was an important and welcome change. Many institutions repeated the offer they had made, during the Seoul Meeting (May 1997), to welcome professionals from other member institutions, proposing to subsidize boarding

and lodging facilities. Institutions, like NIEPA, are willing to include this as part of their regular budget. It is possible that other institutions will also be following the same pattern. This is coming to be an easy and viable proposition, especially in the case of those institutions that have their own lodging and boarding facilities.

It was suggested that a database be developed of all those who receive the Newsletter. The idea of developing a Website for the Network was generally welcomed. It was felt, however, that it might be preferable to keep this as a separate Website for the Network, rather than attach it as part of the Website of any particular institution. The Focal Point will consult other member institutions before launching the Website.

The communication system in the ANTRIEP institutions has improved tremendously in the recent past. When the Network came into existence, only very few institutions had electronic mailing facilities; some of them did not even have a fax facility. Now all member institutions have e-mail connections and an electronic networking system, which facilitate communication. This phenomenon needs to be capitalized for exchanging information and documents amongst member institutions. One of the easiest ways of implementing this process is to create a group-wise address for all member institutions. At a later stage, the Network may move towards organizing net forums and virtual seminars, in addition to the regular seminars that are organized under the auspices of the ANTRIEP.

The need for expanding the membership of the Network was given particular importance during the Seoul Meeting. It was felt that a concerted effort should be made in that direction and some suggested that selected institutions from Thailand and Japan should be identified and approached, which would constitute a good beginning towards the expansion of the membership base.

*N. V. Varghese
IIEP, Paris*

ANTRIEP Seminar on Better School Management: The Role of the Head Teacher

The Fourth Meeting of the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning was probably the most ambitious and at the same time, the most successful organized so far. The number of participants exceeded those at the previous meetings, a fact which can be explained both by the popularity and aptness of the seminar theme “Better School Management: the Role of the Head Teacher” and by the attraction of the venue, the surprising city of Shanghai. The local organization was in the hands of the Shanghai Institute for Human Resource Development (SIHRD).

The Seminar’s overall objective was to identify policies and strategies that will improve the quality of schools by strengthening the leadership and management capacities of head teachers. The specific objectives were to:

- Give an overview of the situation of head teachers in different Asian countries, including current government policies concerning the management of the profession of head teachers;
- Explore potential strategies to improve the role of head teachers in leading and managing schools;
- Examine existing capacity-building activities for head teachers in the region and discuss strategies to reinforce them.

There were 71 participants, 26 of whom were Chinese (including some 15 head teachers). The international participants consisted of four groups: members of staff of ANTRIEP institutions, senior

decision-makers within ministries of education, representatives of international agencies, and individual experts.

The working documents consisted of a limited number of thematic papers, prepared and presented by well-known experts. These thematic papers were: Back to the Basics: School Leadership in a Knowledge Society, by Prof. Cheng Kai-Ming, Dean, Faculty of Education of the University of Hong Kong; The Profile of a Successful Head Teacher, by Mr. Nick Thornton, CEO, Australian Principals’ Centre; Community Participation and School Governance - Diverse Perspectives and Emerging Issues, by Prof. R. Govinda, Senior Fellow, NIEPA; and Using Research Projects to Improve School Management, by Mr. Tang Xiaojie, Deputy Director, Shanghai Institute for Human Resource Development. In addition, a set of nine national or state-level diagnoses on head teachers were prepared by the ANTRIEP member institutions. These provided a rich source of information. The thematic papers were presented and briefly discussed in plenary sessions. They were afterwards debated upon in more detail in groupwork, as were the national diagnoses. The discussions were lively and thought-provoking.

Some of the conclusions drawn from the presentations and discussions were:

- The situation of head teachers is very context-specific and depends on: the size and level of the school, the educational policy-environment, the level of social and economic development and the effectiveness of the public service, of which the education system is a part.

- In a number of countries or areas, the state is very weak, the public service ineffective and the available resources extremely scarce. In such an environment, it will be difficult to change the head teachers without first improving that environment. Notwithstanding these differences, many countries experience similar challenges.
- Everywhere, a policy trend towards more school autonomy, and towards emphasizing the role of the head teachers can be noted. There might be a need to reconsider this policy, for at least three reasons: (a) it has not been everywhere the statement of internal pressure or debate, but rather the result of copying seemingly successful external models; (b) the policy has been, from time to time, part of an attempt by national authorities to evade their own responsibilities; (c) the policy needs to be adapted in function of the different contexts described above. This does not imply that it is a mistake to put a greater stress on the role of the head teacher, but that, before such a policy is implemented, most countries need to make serious efforts at awareness-raising, within the society and within school communities in particular, and to take the necessary measures to improve the schools' environment. What is also pre-occupying is that this policy has been accompanied by insufficient policy measures at central level, to strengthen the position of the head teacher.

A number of innovations have been implemented in several countries to improve recruitment, strengthen professional development, offer a more attractive career path and clarify lines and areas of authority. The most comprehensive effort has probably been made in Korea, apart from Hong Kong and different states in Australia. More piecemeal innovations are being tried out in Malaysia, Sri Lanka and China. The overall result of the weakness of these reforms is that there is a wide discrepancy between the present profile of

the head teacher, which has undergone very little change, and the ideal profile of an innovative pedagogical leader. In many countries, the incentives to become or remain a head teacher have been decreasing rather than increasing.

The challenge for most countries is to turn these piecemeal and un-coordinated reform efforts into a global policy framework. Such an integrated policy, among other things, should:

- Clarify the areas of autonomy and the levels of accountability so that head teachers feel strengthened rather than over-burdened;
- Accompany such autonomy and accountability with a strong and consistent support system, especially for newly appointed and/or isolated head teachers;
- Improve recruitment and selection procedures, for instance by early identification of potential head teachers and a system of mentoring by selected innovative practising head teachers;
- Develop a motivating career path, by offering professional development opportunities and strengthening in-service training; and
- Set up a mutual support system and discussion forum for head teachers.

Setting up and implementing such a policy will encounter different challenges. The numbers of head teachers are daunting: about 10,000 in Sri Lanka, some 200,000 in Pakistan and over a million in China. Training such numbers will require creativity. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that the head teachers are only one aspect, and that their interests do not always coincide with those of, for instance, the teachers or the community. Many participants highlighted the particular difficulty of motivating head teachers. The strongest motivation seems to lie not so much in the financial

incentives, but in the experience of seeing their own school improve. Their lack of power and ensuing inability to improve on the situation of their schools is undoubtedly a disincentive. But giving them more autonomy has led in several countries to an unwillingness of staff to take on this position, because of the workload and stress.

While reforming school management offers a complex challenge, there are several reasons for hope. A policy consensus exists that more responsibilities and resources should be given to schools, to guarantee lasting change; several successful innovations have, at little cost, led to more effectiveness in the way central ministries manage schools and head teachers; and, finally, many school leaders have succeeded, against the odds, in transforming their schools into small centres of excellence. In the following months, the member

institutions of the ANTRIEP Network will take up an exciting challenge: they would examine what has made such successes possible; how to reproduce them; and what should be the role of capacity-building institutions to turn these into general practice.

*Anton De Grauwe
IIEP, Paris*

Should a Head Teacher be a Manager or a Leader?

One particular issue, which came up during the discussions in the Shanghai seminar, concerned the profile of a successful head teacher. Participants agreed that defining an ideal profile of a head teacher was crucial but also a very intricate issue. Crucial, because the situation of head teachers is very context-specific. Their situation depends on different factors, such as the size and level of the school, the level of social and economic development of the community, the support received from the inspectorate and so on. Adapting policies to these different contexts is complicated. Much discussion went on in the seminar on: should a head teacher be a leader or a manager; should he (increasingly she) be strong in pedagogy, administration, public-relations, personnel and financial management or in all of these? A single ideal profile might be counter-productive, since much depends on the characteristics of particular schools, on the level of school autonomy and the culture of each country.

Mr. Nick Thornton, of the Australian Principals' Centre, proposed the following distinction between the principal as a manager and as a leader:

Traditional management is often described as: orderly and stable, often focused on the short-term, a style which encourages a cool, aloof and analytical approach which separates emotion from work, primarily a job of control about instructions and procedures.

Leadership "is the work of alchemists".*

Dedication, Doggedness and Difference...

Dedication is about passion, commitment, drive or even obsession

Doggedness is about the capacity to keep going when things are going wrong or when you are in the midst of doubts and uncertainties

Difference is more than passion and doggedness. It is a mixture of personality and talent, and of openness to criticism and new ideas.

* Hardy C. *The New Alchemists*. Hutchinson. London. 1999

News from Member Institutions

National Institute of Educational Management Pahang, Malaysia

- Organised a training workshop in collaboration with IIEP, Paris on “Reforming School Supervision for Quality Management”, during November–December 2000. The main objective was to raise the awareness and deepen the knowledge of the supervisory staff at central and regional levels regarding the reforms in supervision. The workshop covered four themes: (i) supervision as part of an integrated quality monitoring strategy; (ii) the organization and structure of the supervision service; (iii) the management of supervision services; and (iv) effective supervision strategies. Participants from Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Malaysia attended this workshop.

Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee Dhaka, Bangladesh

- Conducted a research study on **Condition of Primary School System in Bangladesh**. The main objectives of the study were to understand overall school environment, teaching style, classroom management, and ongoing evaluation pattern of different primary school systems in Bangladesh. The communication style was completely one-way in the case of *madrasah* education system and the learners hardly responded, and teachers were autocratic in manner and demeanor. This style was quite similar in the non-government registered schools except that learners were comparatively a little more responsive while non-formal schoolteachers followed two-way communication style by involving learners in large and small group activities.
- A research project entitled **Developing Methodology for Curriculum Evaluation: Two Pilot Studies on Mathematics and Social Studies** was undertaken. The major objective was to develop a methodology for assessing learners' achievements in terms of expected learning outcomes, and appropriateness of content, context and methodology for teaching to achieve expected learning outcomes in order to evaluate the curriculum of BRAC Education Program (BEP). The major finding was that the achievement test and interview with learners were found to be useful methods of exploring learners' level of achievement.

National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration New Delhi, India

- A three-member delegation from Comprehensive Primary Education Project (CPEP), Bangladesh, visited NIEPA in November 2000 to interact with NIEPA faculty on various activities conducted by this Institute.
- Director, International Bureau of Education (IBE), Geneva, visited NIEPA in December 2000 to interact with NIEPA faculty on various issues of educational planning and administration.
- The XVII International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration will commence from February 1, 2001 at NIEPA, New Delhi. About 30 trainees from Asian, African, East European and Latin American countries are likely to take part in this programme.

Korean Educational Development Institute Seoul, Korea

- Organised a regional training programme jointly with UNESCO-PROAP on educational planning and management in November 2000. The programme was designed to examine how educational policies have been planned and managed in Korea in relation to the country's national development processes. Representatives from Bangladesh, Indonesia, India, Malaysia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and UNESCO-PROAP participated in the programme.

SEAMEO INNOTECH Manila, Philippines

- Organised an International Conference on New Learning dot com: Knowledge Networking in the World of Learning, in December 2000. About 400 participants from 21 countries attended the conference.
- Organised a special two week course on Textbook Production for 10 officers from Textbook Division, Ministry of Education, Malaysia.
- Organised a two week course during September 2000 on Developing Thinking Skills Across the Pre-School Curriculum: Laying the Foundation, in collaboration with the Israeli Foreign Ministry's International Cooperation Program. It was attended by 22 participants from Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines.

Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development

Kathmandu, Nepal

- Conducted a study on **Short Term Teacher Training Programme at Lower Secondary Level.**
- Organised a training programme for researchers and teachers working in the area of pre-primary classes in Use of PRA Methods in Action Research during July-August, 2000. The main objectives were to develop appropriate skills among the participants in using PRA methods and action research and to identify the areas of action research in the field of childcare.

Academy of Educational Planning and Management

Islamabad, Pakistan

- Organised a series of training programmes for educational administrators from different regions on Good Governance and Effective Management
- Conducted a research study in collaboration with UNESCO on **Measuring Learning Achievement at Primary Level in Pakistan.** Achievement test items were developed for Science, Mathematics and Urdu. The sample consisted of students of Grade V from urban and rural areas of Pakistan. The main findings showed that students achieved significantly higher scores in Science and Urdu than in Mathematics. Girls performed better in Science and Urdu while boys performed better in Mathematics. The achievement scores were highly diversified in different regions.

National Academy for Educational Management

Dhaka, Bangladesh

- Organized a three-month Foundation Training Course for newly inducted officers of the Bangladesh Education Cadre.
- **A Comparative Study of the Textbooks Used by the Formal-Sector Schools and Those Used by NGO Schools** was conducted during July-August 2000. It revealed that the textbooks used by NGO institutions neither conform to the national curriculum nor, in most cases, designed and developed in accordance with the science of textbook preparation.

Centre for Policy Research

Balitbung, Indonesia

- Conducted a workshop intended to find a strategy on strengthening districts' capacity in conducting

educational policy analysis, in September 2000. It was attended by delegations from 26 Indonesian provinces that are members of the Education Research Network for which the Centre for Policy Research serves as the national coordinator and focal point.

- Organised training in the areas of research methodology, educational sector review, and policy analysis, for the members of the Educational Policy Analysis Working Group at district level.

Center for Multi-disciplinary Development Research

Dharwad, India

- Organised a training programme in statistical and research methodologies useful for educational planning and research. Senior scholars and researchers from Population Research Centre and recognized colleges of the region participated in this programme.
- Conducted a research study on **Financial Management of Operation Blackboard Scheme: A Micro Level Study for Seven States** to examine the working of the specific schemes for improving elementary education, focusing particularly on the financial flows and utilization in the scheme.

National Centre for Educational Development

Bhaktapur, Nepal

- Conducted Educational Management Training for Officers to equip them with education policies, implementation procedures and management skills in November 2000.
- Conducted a study on **Training of Teachers: Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of Training in Classroom Practice.** The main objectives were to explore and assess the factors contributing to the non-use of the skills learned from the training. Further, the study aimed at recommending measures to improve training quality for future training activities. The main findings of the study were that the trainers could not become role models for teachers in aspects such as planning lessons, display of materials in the class etc.; Training of Trainers (TOT) did not meet the requirements of PTTC trainers, nor was the TOT based on the needs of trainers which meant that trainers were not adequately prepared; and the large class size and poor facilities at schools have inhibited the use of skills.