



# NEWSLETTER ANTRIEP

Vol. 14 No. 2, July 2009 - December 2009

Bi-annual

## Monitoring and Evaluation for Effective Education Systems

As the world characterizes by globalization and moves towards knowledge-based societies, successful education systems are considered indispensable to ensure good quality education for all children. The issue of educational quality is now central to much policy discourse in Asian countries. Considering education as a key element in nation –state building, many Asian countries have committed themselves to achieve the goals of Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MGD). Each country of the Asian region has evolved their diverse monitoring tools, mechanism and approaches to assess the progress of EFA. However, the coordination and convergence of the information for systems improvement has remained a major challenge. Keeping these significant perspectives in view, the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP) organized its eighth policy seminar from 16-19 September, 2009 at Shanghai on the **Effective Education Systems for a Changing World: Monitoring and Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Education System.**

### *In this issue...*

<i>Multi-dimension Monitoring for Quality and Equity of Basic Education in Shanghai</i>	3
<i>Monitoring and Evaluating Philippine Educational System: New Trends and Challenges</i>	5
<i>The New Approach of Supporting and Monitoring Educational Innovation Policy in Korea</i>	10
<i>Monitoring for Management of Quality Elementary Education in India</i>	13

The seminar basically focussed on how ‘traditional’ monitoring and evaluation strategies and tools are being used to assess the effectiveness of the education administration; analysis of innovative monitoring and evaluation approaches and identify the key constraints to the effective functioning of education administrations and the strategies that can help to overcome these constraints. A meaningful discourse and sharing of experiences took place on the basis of the paper presented by different member institutions on the identified thematic areas. Some selected revised papers have been included in this issue of ANTRIEP News letter. The four articles included in this issue are from SAES (Shanghai), SEAMEO INNOTECH (The Philippines), KEDI (Korea) and NCERT (India).

The paper from Shanghai elucidates the multidimensional system of monitoring for quality and equity of basic education, which have been constantly enriched along with the development of education. Reflecting on the different stages of development of government inspection system, the paper presents a detailed review of the change process. The paper highlights that the evaluation indicators that had been set earlier by districts and counties were more complex and was based on “one yardstick” model. Along with the changing focus on enhancing educational quality, the core of inspection has been concentrating on curriculum development and effective teaching in classrooms. Further to foster a mechanism for society to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the educational system and to provide first-hand information to policy makers, Shanghai Municipal Team for Educational Information Survey has been collecting opinions and suggestions from different stakeholders such as teachers, students, parents, and society. Subsequently, Shanghai's administrative department responsible for education has established a multi-dimensional system for monitoring and evaluating the quality of

education. The different monitoring approach is functionally complementary to each other and includes: Governmental inspection; Professional survey; National and international assessments; and Shanghai Record for Student Growth. The paper concludes by stating that Shanghai will facilitate the communication between various stakeholders, and will endeavor to build a monitoring and evaluation database which will cover all kinds of key information on the monitoring and evaluation of basic education.

The paper from Philippines explores the emerging trends in monitoring and evaluation for assessing the quality of education both at school education and higher education level. Reflecting on the critical issues of education, the paper discusses on the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), which is a package of policy reforms that seeks to systematically improve critical regulatory, institutional, structural, financial, cultural, physical and informational conditions affecting basic education provision, access and delivery on the ground. BESRA which seek to attain the country's Education for All objectives by the year 2015 has quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation framework as its core element. In addition, the emerging trend on M&E is being increasingly tied up with quality assurance system to improve performance of schools and students. The paper further presents a detailed scenario of trends in monitoring and evaluation at higher education level to promote quality higher education. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) devised several strategies and modes of assuring quality and at the same time a system for monitoring and evaluating the quality of educational institutions as well as their programs. Taking all the factors into consideration, the paper concludes by stating that there are enormous challenges from M&E initiatives which should be shared, studied, compared and analyzed for internal policy decisions.

The paper from Korea tries to analyse the new approaches of supporting and monitoring educational innovation policy to address the problems relating to policy making and networking. The paper further clarifies how the Korean educational administration has been performing its function to improve the inefficiency of networking of the past and present policies, and also examine the limitations of the new approach. It presents the conventional monitoring and evaluation, which focuses on supervisor-oriented methods; the new approach of monitoring and evaluation, which is linked to educational quality management, as a systematic approach; and the problems of the new monitoring approach. It was observed that though the new approach is advanced compared to the past, but it's superficial evaluation approach lacks autonomy and networking. The paper also tries to present the endeavor of many educational stakeholders to perform the monitoring approach authentically.

The paper from India explores the integral role of monitoring for management of quality elementary education in the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan SSA (Education for All). Monitoring in the SSA Framework (2001) has been defined as a continuous assessment of progress, diagnosis of weaknesses and strengths and the adoption of remedial and corrective measures. Covering the salient features of the quality monitoring formats, the paper emphasizes how the formats also seek to monitor the provisions of quality-related inputs under SSA, like training of teachers, availability and usage of teaching learning materials, availability of textbooks, functioning of academic support groups. These formats are being implemented in all the thirty five States and Union Territories across the country, as a result of which the self-sustained monitoring mechanism starting from school/ community level to the state level, have been established.

***Editor***

**Editorial correspondence please contact:**

**Pranati Panda, Editor**

*ANTRIEP Newsletter*

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

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

*Tel: (+ 91 11) 26967784, 26962120*

*Fax: (+ 91 11) 26853041, 26865180*

*E-mail: pranatipanda@nuepa.org, pranatipanda@gmail.com*

## Multi-dimension Monitoring for Quality and Equity of Basic Education in Shanghai

### Introduction

By the end of 2007, the population of Shanghai was 18.58 million, 2.6 times the population of Hong Kong. Its per capita GDP was 66,367 RMB (that is, US\$9085.65), surpassing that of most middle-income countries. In Shanghai, 9-year compulsory education and senior secondary education was universalized in the year 1993 and 1997 respectively. In the year 2008, there were 1,446 general primary and secondary schools in Shanghai, with a total student population of 1.22 million. Vocational secondary education were taking place in 129 schools, encompassing a student population of 180,000. In addition, there were 61 higher educational institutions and 53 post-graduate educational institutions, with a student population of 600,000. Currently, the enrollment rate for the 9-year compulsory education is consistently above 99.9 percent, while the enrollment rate for the new senior secondary school students has reached 98 percent.

The local authorities are in charge of basic education as per the regulations of administrative decentralization. The Shanghai Municipal Government is mainly responsible for planning the overall development of basic education in the municipality, co-coordinating and balancing the overall allocation of educational resources, implementing curriculum reforms, organizing entrance examinations for senior secondary schools and universities, monitoring and evaluating educational quality, etc. District and county level government authorities also play a key role in the provision of basic education. They guarantee the allocation of educational funds, build schools, employ and train teachers, and monitor the quality of education. Thus, in Shanghai, the methods of monitoring and evaluating educational quality had constantly enriched along with the development of education.

### Government Inspection

At the end of 1980s and in the early 1990s, the main targets of basic education in Shanghai were to rapidly extend educational opportunity, enhance educational input, and improve students' learning environment. In order to supervise the fulfillment of these targets, the Shanghai Municipal Office for Educational Inspection,

hereby abbreviated to "the Office," was established in September 1987, which was renamed the Office for Educational Inspection of the Shanghai Municipal Government in 1995, with the setting up of educational inspection agencies at the district/county level. The Office and the agencies supervised, investigated, evaluated, and guided the provision of education by municipal and district governments, as well as by primary and secondary schools. The inspection mainly focused on educational input, students' learning environment, teachers' qualification, and so on. During the process of universalizing 9-year compulsory education and senior secondary education, governmental inspection has been effective in safeguarding public input in education.

By the end of the 1990s, Shanghai had achieved great progress in the universalization of basic education, with students' learning environment greatly improved. Therefore, the foci of the inspection shifted to areas such as the formulation and implementation of educational aims and planning, the construction of administrative system and teaching staff, student quality, and learning environment. The districts and counties developed concrete evaluation programmes and indicators on this basis. However, after a certain period of implementation, the districts and counties realized that the evaluation indicators that had been set were complex. Moreover, schools which were at different developmental stages and had different characteristics were being evaluated against "one yardstick," which was disadvantageous for mobilizing schools' initiative and enthusiasm. Hence, in 2003, Shanghai revised its evaluation indicators which now are composed of two parts: basic indicators and development indicators. The basic indicators mainly refer to mandatory and universal standards that the schools must meet. A school which meets these standards is allowed to formulate its own development indicators.

In the last five years, the focus of enhancing educational quality has shifted towards curriculum and teaching. Consequently, the core of inspection has been concentrating on curriculum development, principals' curriculum leadership, effective teaching in classrooms, building of schools' teaching and research divisions, and the alleviation of students' learning burden.

## Professional Survey

In 2004, the Shanghai Municipal Education Commission formally set up the “Shanghai Municipal Team for Educational Information Survey” (hereafter the “Team”), with the purpose of collecting opinions and suggestions from teachers, students, parents, and society; providing first-hand information to policy makers, and fostering a mechanism for society to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the educational system.

The team is based in the Shanghai Academy of Educational Sciences. While some of its team members are full-time, others are part-time. Except for professional research fellows from the Academy, there are more than 40 part-time investigators from district and county research offices all over the municipality, as well as over 130 volunteers.

The Team’s survey concentrates on issues such as students’ learning burden (regularly monitored every April and May), the allocation of educational resources, teachers’ basic quality and occupational stress, implementation of curriculum reforms, cultivation of students’ creativity, and satisfaction with education. Take the regular monitoring of students’ learning burden as an example. During every April and May, investigators monitor the actual learning burden of primary and secondary school students and the burden as perceived by the students themselves. Moreover, they analyze trends and factors in students’ learning burden, and provide early warnings and countermeasures. Between 2004 and 2006, a series of surveys on students’ learning burden found that nearly 80 percent of the students, especially primary school students of grade one and two, did not have enough time to sleep, and bore heavy learning pressures. The Shanghai Municipal Education Commission then took reformative measures in February 2007. It further carried out a pilot scheme to “delay collective educational activities” in four districts. According to the scheme, collective educational activities in primary schools and junior secondary schools would start after 8:15 and 8:00, respectively. Moreover, in August 2007, 35 texts and 400 new words had been removed from Grade 1 and Chinese language textbook from Grade 2.

The survey also looks into society’s general satisfaction with education in Shanghai as a whole, as well as its satisfaction with particular aspects of education, such as the government, schools, and teachers. It shows that the public is positive in terms of the balanced development of education and educational equity, school buildings, equipment and facilities, school

administration, etc. However, the public is also dissatisfied with the quality of education, the building of a healthy workforce, transparent government, and students’ learning burden.

## National and International Programmes for Student's Assessment

In the second half of 2006, four districts in Shanghai participated in a project headed by the Center of Curriculum of the Ministry of Education. The project is a curriculum-oriented evaluation of the performance of Grade 3 students in Chinese and Mathematics and the performance of Grade 4 students in Chinese, Mathematics, Science, and English. The project concerns basic knowledge and skills that the curriculum standards require, as well as the ability to apply them. It compares the educational quality of Shanghai with those of other provinces. Students assessed in urban or rural areas, use different textbooks, and are likely to have very different academic performance. Three different questionnaires were designed for students, teachers, and principals respectively, in order to study from different angles the current situation and potential factors in students’ learning achievements. In October 2007, students in the four districts took the test, followed by another six districts, in November 2008.

Moreover, at the end of 2006, the Shanghai Municipal Education Commission and the OECD signed an agreement over Shanghai’s participation in the 2009 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). On 17 April 2009, a total number of 5,115 students from 152 sample schools took part in PISA. Each student worked on a paper-and-pencil assessment lasting two hours and then completed a thirty-five-minute student questionnaire. The principals of the schools in which students were assessed also filled a school questionnaire.

## Shanghai Record for Student Growth

The evaluation of learning quality is not only about outcomes; more importantly, it is about the process of student development. It is obviously inadequate to evaluate students only by examination. In 2004, Shanghai became the first city throughout China, which took the initiative in applying the *Shanghai Municipal Record for Student Growth*. The *Record* combines various evaluation aspects, such as basic curriculum, expanded curriculum, exploratory curriculum, morality, and behavior. Methods included quantitative and qualitative analysis, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation.



Included in the *Record* are students' self-evaluations, samples of their best work, records of social practice and services, records of physical education and artistic activities, observation and evaluations by teachers and peers, information from parents, as well as examination and test results. The student is the main recorder of this rich and varied information. Meanwhile, the recording process is open to teachers, peers, and parents; who make the record more typical, objective, and true. Thus, after several years of experimentation and improvement, the 'Record' has been implemented in all the primary and secondary schools in Shanghai.

### **Constructing a Multi-dimension System for Monitoring and Evaluating Educational Quality**

After two decades of development, Shanghai's administrative department responsible for education has gradually established a multi-dimensional system for monitoring and evaluating the quality of education. Incorporated in the system are governmental inspection, professional survey, academic performance monitoring, and the 'Shanghai Record for Student Growth'. The different monitoring approaches are functionally complementary to each other and are as follows:

**Governmental inspection:** possessing the power of administrative inspection; initially concentrating on inspecting the government and mainly evaluating the standards of "hardware;" later, turning its focus to inspecting schools and mainly evaluating curriculum development, curriculum leadership, and classroom teaching.

**Professional survey:** a reflection of public opinions, paying close attention to the environment and policy implementation of the educational system as a whole.

**National and international assessments:** providing comparative information nationally and internationally, mainly monitoring students' learning results, but also analyzing factors that affect student achievement by using questionnaires.

**The Shanghai Record for Student Growth:** combining formative evaluation and summative evaluation, with the participation of various stakeholders, evaluating students' learning processes, and providing information concerning their overall quality.

In future, Shanghai will facilitate the communication between various stakeholders, and will endeavor to build a monitoring and evaluation database which will cover all kinds of key information on the monitoring and evaluation of basic education in Shanghai. In order to do this, it is necessary to classify data in a rational manner, collect data in chronological order so as to facilitate longitudinal studies, and stipulate administrative regulations to effectively manage the database and encourage its intensive use by all the stakeholders.

**Minxuan Zhang**  
**Shanghai Academy of Educational Sciences**  
**Shanghai, China**  
**Email: mxzhang@shnu.edu.cn**

## **Monitoring and Evaluating Philippine Educational System: New Trends and Challenges**

### **Overview of the Philippine Educational System**

Education has been a pivotal driver of economic growth in the Philippines. The country is now well-recognized for its education and oftentimes known as the source of overseas professional and highly skilled workers. But how does the country assure quality of its education programs? How is the quality of education monitored and assessed? What are the emerging trends in monitoring and evaluation? This paper explores to answers these questions.

The Philippine educational system is generally categorized into either formal or non-formal. Formal education refers to a sequential progression of academic schooling in three levels, namely, elementary, secondary, and tertiary (i.e., higher education). Elementary education is compulsory for all children aged 7-12. Basic education in the Philippines covers ten years: 6 years of elementary education and four years of secondary. The Department of Education (DepED) is the agency that is responsible for the overall management of the

system. Prior to formal education, Filipino children normally enter pre-school education, which is offered either through a day care center or a formal pre-school. The Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 provides the general objective of basic education: to develop the Filipino learners by providing them basic competencies in literacy and numeracy, critical thinking, socially aware, patriotic and responsible citizens. The Governance of Basic Education Act envisions a curriculum that shall promote the holistic growth of the Filipino learners and enable them to acquire the core competencies and develop proper values.

Though there have been significant gains in basic education in the past decades and the introduction of policy actions to mitigate the educational problems by Department of Education (DepEd), yet chronic education problems still persist. In fact, in some regions of the country, there are decreasing performances in basic education.

### **Trends in Philippine Basic education**

To address critical issues, the Department of Education, with the assistance of the international funding agencies, and all the leaders of the Department of Education embarked on the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (2006-2010) or what is popularly known as BESRA. One of the first program under BESRA that was launched was the *Schools First Initiative (SFI)*, an effort to improve basic education outcomes through a broadly participated, popular movement featuring a wide variety of initiatives undertaken by individual schools and communities as well as networks of schools at localities involving school districts and divisions, local governments, civil society organizations and other stakeholder groups and associations. SFI puts effort on attaining improved educational outcomes for the Filipinos, where outcomes is measured as participation, completion, and achievement of several desired categories of educational results, and also where “improvement” is measured in terms of rising average, reduced variation around average and accelerated reduction of variation below average.

Even as the SFI seeks to improve the way all public schools perform now, the DepED is also undertaking fundamental reforms to sustain better performance. It is pursuing a package of policy reforms that as a whole seeks to systematically improve critical regulatory, institutional, structural, financial, cultural, physical and informational conditions affecting basic education

provision, access and delivery on the ground. These policy reforms are expected to create critical changes necessary to further accelerate, broaden, deepen and sustain the improved education effort already being started by the SFI. This package of policy reforms is called the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA).

### **Overall objectives of BESRA**

The policy actions comprising the BESRA seek to create a basic education sector that is capable of attaining the country’s Education for All objectives by the year 2015. these objectives are:

1. Universal Adult Functional Literacy: All persons beyond school-age, regardless of their levels of schooling should acquire the essential competence to be considered functionally literate in their native tongue, i.e., Filipino or English.
2. Universal School Participation and Elimination of Drop-outs and Repetition in First Three Grades: All children aged six should enter school, ready to learn and prepared to achieve the required competencies from Grade 1 to 3, instruction.
3. Universal Completion of the Full Cycle of Basic Education Schooling with Satisfactory Achievement Levels by All at Every Grade or Year: All children aged six to eleven should be on track to completing elementary schooling with satisfactory achievement levels, at every grade, and all children aged twelve to fifteen should be on track to completing secondary schooling with similarly satisfactory achievement levels, at every year.
4. Total Community Commitment to Attainment of Basic Education Competencies for All: Every community should mobilize all its resources: social, political, cultural and economic; and capabilities to support the universal attainment of basic education competencies in Filipino and English.

In order for the basic education sector to achieve the above listed desired educational outcomes for all Filipinos, BESRA focuses on specific policy actions within five key reform thrusts (KRT), which are schools, teachers, social support to learning, complementary interventions, and DepED’s institutional culture.

### **Trends in Basic Education Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Evaluation**

The Quality Assurance and M&E framework have been designed under BESRA. The need for a 'Quality Assurance and Accountability Framework (QAAF)' is anchored on the view that education is achievable for a wider number of schools that can commit to quality education. The QAAF is a statement of the nation's philosophy for delivering quality education. Translated into process, it is the process of persistently and consistently pursuing the desired quality outcomes with the highest degree of commitment. It describes and defines all key players and stakeholders of basic education schooling.

The principles of quality assurance and accountability framework are:

1. It is outcomes based- the students learning outcomes are the only accepted measures of the standards of quality education;
2. It is school-based, focusing on schools as the key unit for measuring performance and as the key organization for delivering the desired educational outcomes;
3. It empowers the schools for decision making processes and delivering programs to achieve its objectives and goals; and
4. It allows for self-planning, assessment and monitoring of performance vis-à-vis a set of national standards and international benchmarks; and It utilizes the strengths of existing practices in the field.

The DepED took a long time preparing all stakeholders to embrace the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda. Massive consultation and meetings were held to prepare everyone on the new system for quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation. Successful education system in the Philippines is believed to be competed once the reform programs are fully implemented and sustained. The M&E reform and development programs recommended under BESRA should be carried out to maintain and sustain quality education by 2015. However, implementation of the following programs is very challenging for the government as there are lots of debates on the implementation; development of essential curriculum standards in the different learning areas from grades 1-10 following an organizing framework for each one; development of standardized assessment tools to measure student outcomes to

assess: national achievement in various key learning areas for grade 6 and year 4, functional literacy for year 4 students, reading and literacy grades for grade 4 students; development of non-standardized instruments to assess opinions and views of students, parents, teachers, community and other stakeholders; development of Instruments for the assessment of teaching-learning process; development of evaluation instrument for school heads and teachers; development of competency-based teacher standards by discipline; development of electronic based management information system for QAAF; reconceptualization of national assessment system for the DepED; national achievement test to be administered yearly to cover key learning areas; revision of institutional and financing arrangement for managing schools; designation of division and regional supervisors as quality assurance officers; and creation of an independent unit attached to DepED to oversee Q&A and M&E.

### **Trends in Monitoring and Evaluating Philippine Higher Education Institutions**

The *Education Commission Report (EDCOM)* recommended the establishment of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in 1994, which is an independent government agency from the Department of Education (DepEd), tasked to oversee all of the higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines. It currently oversees more than 1,943 HEIs throughout the country, 451 of which are state universities and colleges (SUCs), local government-owned universities and colleges (LGUCs), and other government-funded schools while 1,589 are privately owned. The number of Philippine HEIs has now reached 2,010 (CHED MIS, 2007), suggesting an increase in the number of provisions for higher education. Majority of the courses these HEIs offer are related to academic disciplines that may result in increased trends in overseas employment and migration. At present, there are around 2,438,855 higher education students enrolled in the various colleges and universities throughout the country.

To promote quality higher education, the CHED devised several strategies and modes of assuring quality and at the same time a system for monitoring and evaluating the quality of educational institutions as well as their programs. CHED devised criteria for identifying the centers of excellence (COEs) and centers of development (CODs). Recently system for awarding institutions of higher learning with titles such as "autonomous" or "deregulated status" was developed.

### A. Voluntary Accreditation

Another system that is outside the government, but done through peer monitoring and evaluation, is through a voluntary accreditation system of universities and colleges, with titles of Level I, Level II, Level III and Level IV. The concept of voluntary accreditation was modeled with the US' *Regional Accreditation System*. It refers to the process of endorsing the capabilities of a tertiary institution, which aids in the establishment of national quality standards. Thus, recognition from an accreditation body indicates the capability to offer quality educational programs and disciplines.

Only four accreditation bodies are recognized by the CHED at present, which assist HEIs raise their program levels well above minimal standards, namely, the Association of Christian Schools, Colleges, and Universities Accrediting Agency Incorporated (ACSCU-AAI); the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU); the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA); and the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP).

The FAAP coordinates and certifies the activities of individual accreditation agencies. To date, there are 221 HEIs with 832 programs undergoing various stages of the accreditation process (Pijano, 2007). A voluntary accreditation system in the technical-vocational sector is also currently being implemented by the Technical and Vocational Education Accrediting Agency of the Philippines (TVEAAP).

In the higher education system, there are four levels of accreditation as defined by the CHED. These are: Level I gives applicant status to HEIs that have undergone a preliminary survey and been certified by the FAAP as capable of acquiring accreditation within two years; Level II-accredited programs status receives full administrative deregulation and partial curricular autonomy, including priority in terms of funding assistance and faculty development subsidies; Level III-accredited programs are granted full curricular deregulation, including the privilege to offer distance education courses; and Level IV-accredited HEIs are deemed eligible for grants and subsidies from the Higher Education Development Fund and granted full autonomy from government supervision and control.

The accreditation levels became a basis for the CHED's comparability in terms of quality with those of interna-

tionally renowned universities. To date, only one HEI's programs have been granted Level IV accreditation, that is, De La Salle University (DLSU) (Pijano, 2007).

### B. Identifying Centre of Excellence (Coe) and Centre of Development (Cod)

As highlighted in the Medium Term Higher Education Development and Investment Plan (2001 to 2004) and the Long Term Higher Education Development Plan (LTHEDP) 2001 -2010, the levels and quality of higher education are determined by: "*measuring faculty qualification, the performance of graduates in licensure examination, and the accreditation status of educational programs and employability of graduates.*"

Within those indicators, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) used the following five key result areas toward upgrading quality and international comparability of higher education programs/institutions; improved quality of teachers; improved research and extension capabilities; improved student selection and admission; and improved performance of graduates.

CHED has initially established 275 Centers of Excellence/ Centers of Development in different disciplines lodged in 79 Higher education institutions in the country. The COEs and CODs are provided by CHED with funds and support for student scholarships, faculty development, library and laboratory upgrading, research and extension services, instructional materials and development of existing COEs and CODs from the Higher Education Development Fund (HEDF).

### C. Autonomous and Deregulated Institutions

The Commission improves quality of education through another system which is called deregulation and autonomous awards. Qualified higher education institutions were given autonomous and deregulated status once they have some degree programs with COEs and CODs and higher passing percentage in the board examination. It also means that the HEIs have hired instructors with master's degrees and/or on-going graduate study. Universities who are called as Autonomous and Deregulated are private institutions. They are those identified by the group of evaluators who passed their standards and therefore can enjoy some level of autonomy.

### D. The Institutional Monitoring and Evaluation for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (IQUAME)

This is an existing quality assurance system in higher



education which includes also the performance in licensure examination.

### **Paradigm for Rating, Branding as Emerging Trend in Cost Effective M&E**

There are three prominent paradigms for evaluating Philippine Higher Education academic programs and institutions. Whenever you asked for institutions with good quality of education, there are similar responses from various stakeholders: it refers to university autonomy, accountability and funding. Increasing thrusts on university is part of the trend in decentralization, both in human resources, capacity building and financial assistance.

It is a paradigm in line with the societal demand of spreading resources. Autonomy provides greater freedom to universities. This brand is well-acknowledged the existence of accreditation and accurate evaluation.

University accountability is another paradigm for M&E in the Philippines. It has a lot to do with quality assurance for better recognition by other evaluating bodies, across countries and cultures. This makes universities more flexible but cautious of their limitations especially in designing new academic offerings and in assuring the public of its link on excellence and quality.

University Funding is a paradigm which all universities acknowledge as a “carrot” after the “sticks”. The quest for higher education institutions own brands are highly linked to government funding support; receiving 3 million is you are granted COE and 1.5 if you get a COD status.

### **Other Important Issues and Challenges**

The emerging trend on M&E is it is being increasingly tied up with quality assurance system and framework. Quality assurance is a recent way of calling M&E, a well-tested and validated system for attesting quality of programs and institutions at the national level. It is also important that evaluating institutions and programs in the Philippines through voluntary accreditation is following the trend on deregulation and peer review process. What is a positive response from the government is making use of privately-led voluntary accreditation level as an important consideration for incentive systems and/or funding,

What the accrediting bodies faced as a major challenge is the increasing cost of and its linkage with

international accreditation bodies. UNESCO’s mutual recognition and WTOGATTS professional mobility programs posed higher criteria going beyond the local context- but comparability with international education standards.

Quality assurance through modern M&E tools, for educational institutions has been widely acknowledged as a tool to improve performance of schools and student, and on how to monitor and evaluate effectively. However, this method or strategy is not well appreciated by government agencies and universities who have ranked below other universities in the region. There should be a strong advocacy programs to support this new trend in rating and ranking.

Taking everything into consideration, it is evident that there are enormous challenges from M&E initiatives which should be shared, studied, compared and analyzed for internal policy decisions.

The world is becoming smaller and smaller. As such, every country is trying its best to implement policy recommendations that will result in equitable treatment of graduates all over the world. A research-based comparative rating and ranking is a first step towards full accreditation and recognition.

### **References:**

Basic Education. MDG and Social Progress Thematic Group Paper. 2006

Ogena, Ester and De Guzman, Estefania (2006). Developing Quality Assurance and Accountability Framework for Basic Education Schooling.

Schools First Initiative (2005). PGMA Administration’s Approach to Leading Nation Out of Its Education Crisis

SEAMEO INNOTECH (2007, 2008) BESRA Workshop Completion Report to AUSAID.

Valenzuela, E.PV. Branding in Philippine Higher Education. Paper presented in SEAMEO RETRAC Governing Board Meeting and International Conference. July 2009.

*Ethel Agnes P. Valenzuela*  
South-East Asian Ministers of Education  
Organisation Regional Centre for Educational  
Innovation and Technology  
Quezon, Philippines  
Email: eapvalenzuela@yahoo.com

# The New Approach of Supporting and Monitoring Educational Innovation Policy in Korea

## Introduction

The concept of sustainable development is important to continuously perform the stable growth of a society. The government of Republic of Korea is continuously bringing innovative changes in educational administration. Despite innovative changes in the educational administration, Korean education confronts a few serious problems. The Korean traditional evaluation environment that merely stresses quantitative-oriented outcomes has exacerbated the situation. The paper clarifies how the Korean educational administration has performed its function to improve the inefficiency of networking and inspection on the real situation. In addition, it also explores the process of how educational customers' needs are reflected in improving the inefficiency.

## Conventional Monitoring and Evaluation in Korea

Many researchers have defined the concept of supervision by analyzing administrative situation and reality. Considering the educational situation, the real supervision focuses on more supervisor-oriented approach rather than teaching improvement. With respect to teachers, many administrators in Korea have recognized the teacher as the object of supervision (Joo, 1998). Conventionally, the Korea educational administration focuses on the supervision except autonomy, which has stressed the supervision activity as a passive meaning on Office of Education (OE), school commissioners and educational specialists (Lee, 2005).

With such problem of supervision in Korea, many researchers have recognized the problem of audit in the educational administration. Assuming that audit is the evaluation of person(s), organization(s), system(s), and others in the aggregate, educational administration audit is closely linked to evaluating educational administration-related activities on the above objects. Similar to the principle of supervision in Korea, the audit focused on exposure and punishment without supporting.

Conventionally, there are many types of supervision in Korea such as instructional supervision, clinical supervision, cooperative professional development, self-di-

rected supervision, and many others. Despite many types of supervision, most of supervision in Korea focuses on instructional and clinical supervision. The subject of such supervision tends to be OE, school commissioner and educational specialist.

However, many empirical literatures present that conventional supervision methods have generated serious problem in the Korean educational environment (Lee, 2005). First problem is that OE, school commissioner and educational specialist hardly understand the supervision activity to improve teacher-student learning process. Under the environment, the supervision activity is closely linked to simple class evaluation and insignificant guidance without the class improvement. Second problem is that the characteristic of conventional supervision is closely linked to task- and cause-oriented activity. Under the circumstance, the subject of supervision focuses on evaluating more visible outcome. Furthermore, the improvement of teachers' real speciality is excluded from his/her interest, because the core of his/her concern is the easily measurable outcome.

In addition, the problems of this conventional supervision are closely linked to the real class situation. By the characteristic of supervision, it is difficult that most of the teachers continuously communicate with individual/organization in charge of supervision such as OE, school commissioner, and educational specialist and take the burden to create and use different instructional methods for such supervision, which disturbs the classroom teaching and learning process.

Educational administration auditing in Korea focuses on school administrative and educational activities. According to Jin & Kim (2004), the Korean real auditing in the school is categorized into three activities: educational policy, educational management, and accounting management. Especially, the extent of educational administration auditing and supervision was strictly separated in the past, but the separation has been ambiguous since 2000. Compared to the supervision, the auditing is periodically performed by OEs every three years, and the auditing method is categorized into documentary-and practical-audition; the documentary

audition is the activity that educational officials and specialists-in charge of the auditing-examine the submitted documents, and the practical auditing is the activity that the officials and specialists visit various educational places such as schools.

Similar to the problems of Korea supervision, the educational administration audition has generated many problems. First, the educational administration auditing activity focuses on following the educational principle and policy of government. Assuming that the educational officials and specialists audit school, the activity is likely to focus on how well the school is performing the policy of government. In fact, few Local/Central OEs possess human resources in charge of auditing and general officials tend to audit school. Such temporary management of officials and specialists generates the difficulty of how the auditing should effectively perform its activities and utilize the results hereafter.

### **The New Approach of Monitoring and Evaluation**

On the theoretical basis, the new approach of monitoring and evaluation is based on the recognition of how the educational quality management should be viewed as the systemic approach, and how the supervision, auditing, and OE evaluation should be analyzed within this viewpoint. Considering that the systemic approach can be effective through networking and feedback among each constructed factor, it is necessary that the concept of consulting is closely linked to the feedback. Consequently, the principle of new monitoring and evaluation is based on the systemic approach to improve the improvement of educational quality, which can be supported by feedback/consulting through networking among the constructed factors.

The reality of new monitoring approach is based on school evaluation in Korea. The Korean school evaluation is largely categorized into self-evaluation by each school and evaluation by OE. The research paper focuses on school evaluation by OE because the evaluation is based on objective evaluation indexes. School evaluation by Office of Education focuses on 30% of the whole school with elementary, middle, and high school. Method of the evaluation is closely linked to *outcome-oriented* on the quantitative basis. It was observed that 3,767 (36.8%) schools in 2003, 5,119 (49.0%) schools in 2004, and 3,090 (28.9%) schools in 2005 were evaluated by OEs (Kim, 2006). Furthermore, the evaluators, ones who evaluate district schools are constituted into principals,

vice-principals, teachers, specialists, and others. The school evaluation is based on specialist-review model which is based on the process of visit and confirm after reviewing the report that each school submits. Evaluation of the submitted report depends on the specialists' judgment

According to Kim et al. (2004), the present purpose of school evaluation by OE is to improve the responsibility and specialty of each district school, to manage the quality of each district school, to improve the effectiveness of instruction-learning method, to explore the excellent examples, to confirm the educational policy in the schools, to induce educational improvement by the school constituents, to obtain fundamental information for educational policies, to improve educational activity and form the educational project in the school. With respect to evaluation content, the realm of evaluation is constituted into standard development, regular curriculum, extracurricular activities, and support system (Chung, 2004).

Since 2006, the form of school evaluation was changed to some degree. To begin with, high schools are evaluated by Metropolitan-Provincial and elementary and middle schools are evaluated by District OEs. Second, the school evaluation utilizes *common index and self-index* which include input-process-output in the evaluation index. Considering the presence of many educational stakeholders, the total number of index was decreased. Third, with the previous method, new approach included investigation for the degree of satisfaction, but very little for the degree of academic achievement.

The reality of new monitoring approach is based on Office of Education evaluation in Korea. The OE evaluation is performed under the supervision of Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology. The purpose of the Office of Education evaluation is that each OE takes the responsibility of their policy performance on decentralization and autonomy of educational power. The following purpose of the evaluation is to improve the quality of education through amicable competition among the institutions, and induce spontaneous effort of the institutions. The evaluation is performed by 30 specialists constituted by Evaluation Committee.

In 2008, the evaluation focused on 16 Metropolitan-Provincial OEs, which included all the administrative jurisdictions. The period of the evaluation was from May to June in 2009, and the method was based on visiting

and documentary evaluation. The evaluation is categorized into five fields. First field of the evaluation is to improve the substantiality of school education, which is divided into improve academic achievement, decrease the costs of private education, and improve the curriculum of each school. Second field is to advance school management, which is divided into assuring school autonomy, support various school educations, and reinforce teachers' competency. Third field is to extend the volume of educational welfare, which is divided into increase low-income families' educational support, improve students' health, and escalate preschool & lifelong education. Fourth field is to effectively support educational system, which is divided into support on information-oriented education environment, improve the substantiality of educational finance in the regions, and manage educational facilities. Final field is the others which are divided into perform each regional educational policy, improve the degree of educational stakeholders' satisfaction, and increase the degree of integrity.

#### **The Problems of New Monitoring Approach**

**Superficial evaluation:** In the case of school evaluation, most of the evaluation methods are likely to be outcome-oriented and on the quantitative basis. Though evaluators consult district schools with an important principle, the role of evaluators and the district schools is different from each other in the real situation. The evaluators tend to explore various examples for the evaluation, but the district schools tend to hide their drawbacks to receive better grades in the evaluation. Furthermore, individuals in charge of the evaluation, such as principals and teachers, can neglect the important problems in the schools, because their viewpoint tends to be friendly toward the school. With the drawback that the evaluators can neglect serious problems, it can be difficult to deeply perform the evaluation owing to many evaluation indexes.

In the perspective of OE evaluation, many officials gathering basic data for the evaluation tend to feel much burden in the real situation, similar to school evaluation as mentioned. Furthermore, it is difficult to deeply evaluate the OEs, because the period of the evaluation is relatively short (2 months). Therefore, due to the above mentioned problems, the inclination of the school evaluation can be slightly substantial.

**Lack of autonomy and networking:** Compared to the conventional evaluation method, the new evaluation

approach is a merit in that all of district schools and OEs can gather various data as much as they want to. Especially, each district OE possesses a right that they can evaluate district schools without any disturbance. Nevertheless, few district schools and OEs understand how they should collect the evaluation-related data. Even though Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) developed various evaluation indexes and manual for the school and OE evaluation, the evaluation index of each OE is different from each other and few officials-in charge of the evaluation know the evaluation process. Furthermore, the problems that the new evaluation approach is slightly substantial and autonomy, there are few networking among OEs.

#### **Conclusion**

It is necessary that many educational stakeholders should endeavor to perform the monitoring approach as authentic meaning. The monitoring approach as authentic meaning is that evaluator(s) appropriately counsel to educational stakeholders after analyzing current educational problems on the artless conditions. For the purpose of performing the authentic monitoring approach, it is necessary to maintain the evaluator's objective viewpoint and evaluatee's honest information provision. On the activities of evaluator and evaluatee, each of them can receive much support to excellently perform the innovative monitoring process. In the case of OE evaluation, it is necessary to extend the evaluation period for deeply monitoring process because the current period is highly short.

Secondly, the improvement of networking among stakeholders is a solution to decrease the ineffectiveness of current monitoring approach. The current monitoring approach is based on weak connection between pre and post-monitoring. Though many evaluators attempt to jointly own the better example of schools and OEs after monitoring, little development direction is performed to improve many problems in schools and OEs owing to the weakness solidarity among stakeholders of pre and post-monitoring. Consequently, before and after monitoring, educational stakeholders should present various solutions and effective directions for educational policies on the monitoring process.

Thirdly, it is important that policy-makers support to understand not "how educational stakeholders should increase the autonomy" but "how educational stakeholders should utilize the autonomy" for



themselves. Actually, compared to the previous time, there are many self-regulated factors in the school and OE evaluation, proceeding the monitoring in Korea. Never the less, few stakeholders practically utilize the factors of autonomy, presenting that there are many self-regulated factors for the monitoring. For example, many evaluators tend to refer to other evaluation indexes for the school and OE evaluation. Therefore, all administrators and policy-makers should endeavor to generate various supporting-systems to effectively perform the autonomy

Jin, D. S., & Kim, B. C. (2004). A Study on the Connecting System among School Evaluation System, Supervision System, and Inspection System for Quality Management of Schools. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 22(2), 65-90.

Joo, S. W. (1998). *Collegial Supervision (peer-coaching) Method in Schools*. *The Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 20(1), 47-65.

Kim, D. S. (1997). *A Study on the Model of Total Quality Management in School Organizations*. Dissertation from Chonbuk National University.

Kim, Y. Y. (2006). *Haggyopyeongga-ui Hyeonhwangwa Gaeseonbanghyang [The Present State of School Evaluation and Improvement Direction]*. Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development.

Kim, et al. (2004). *Haggyopyeongga-ui Hyeonhwang mich Baljeonbang-an [The Present State of School Evaluation and Development Direction]*. KEDI.

Lee, C. H. (2005). *A Research on Autonomous Activation of School-based Supervision*. *Educational Research*, 25(1), 159-199.

**Yang Seung Sil**

*Korean Educational Development Institute  
Seoul, Korea, Seoul 137-791  
Email: violynn@kedi.re.kr /*

## Monitoring for Management of Quality Elementary Education in India

### Introduction

Monitoring is an integral part of every programme, project or task and an essential condition for successful accomplishment of goals. It is a process of watching regularly the progress of a programme in order to identify the smoothness and/ or problems that are being encountered in implementing the major aspects of the programme. Such an assessment helps in taking corrective measures needed for the purpose of optimizing the effectiveness of a programme (Dave, 1980). The National Policy on Education (1986) emphasizes that within a multilevel framework of educational development, Central, State and District and Local level agencies will participate in planning, coordination, monitoring and evaluation. (Part X, The Management of Education, National Policy on Education, 1986). The Programme of Action to the National Policy on Education (1992) suggests to have critical look at different aspects of monitoring such as: institutional arrangements; the achievements to be monitored into specific terms; assignment of responsibilities and identification of milestones; collection and analysis of data; information flows between different levels (such

as the institutions, State, Centre); arrangement for corrective measures based on feedback; and qualitative aspects of monitoring. Therefore monitoring is considered as an integral component of any governmental scheme of education .

### **Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA): A Programme of Universalisation of Elementary Education**

In the year 2001, India launched nationwide programme *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (Education for All), which aims to universalise elementary education of satisfactory quality for all children in age group of 6-14 years by 2010 in a mission mode. It also focuses to bridge social, regional and gender gaps, with the active participation of the community in the management of schools.

With a view to realizing these goals, various dimensions/ parameters of elementary education having potential to effect on both quality and quantity are identified and their nature and scope determined. The broad dimensions that seem to influence quality of elementary education include: basic infrastructural facilities;

Management and community support; School and classroom environment; Curriculum and teaching-learning material; Teacher and teacher preparation; Teaching-learning time; Classroom process; and Learners' assessment, monitoring and supervision.

### **Monitoring as inbuilt mechanism in SSA**

SSA has proposed a community based planning and monitoring system. Monitoring has been defined in the SSA Framework (2001) as a continuous assessment of progress, diagnosis of weaknesses and strengths and the adoption of remedial and corrective measures. It is suitably used to provide useful feedback about strengths and weaknesses of the programme. These aspects exist both within and outside classroom and are functional at all levels.

Some of the salient features of the monitoring mechanism in SSA are: Community based monitoring with full transparency; Establishment of Educational Management Information System (EMIS) and its effective use in annual plans; Availability of monitoring structures of different levels – community, sub district, district, State, Centre; Involvement of research and resource institutions at different levels; Periodicity in monitoring; Field-based monitoring; In built and Independent monitoring; Coverage of all aspects: implementation, finance and quality; Inclusion of all facets: supervision, monitoring, evaluation and research; and Provision of feedback and follow-up.

### **Various Dimensions of Monitoring System under SSA**

Various provisions for monitoring of programme implementation under SSA are as follows:

**Joint Review Mission:** An independent Joint Review Mission (JRM) reviews the progress of SSA along with members from State government and external funding agencies on half yearly basis. JRMs are increasingly focusing on quality aspects.

**National and Regional Review Meetings with States:** Half yearly National level Review Meetings and quarterly Regional Review Meetings are held to review progress in quality interventions and exchange of good practices.

**Monitoring Institutes:** 41 National Social Science Institutions have been associated with different States for monitoring of implementation of SSA. These Monitoring Institutes (MIs) make field visits and report on progress of SSA at the ground level on half yearly basis.

**Educational Management Information System (EMIS)**

**Community based Monitoring:** The EMIS incorporates provisions for correlation of school level data with community based information from micro planning and surveys. Besides this, every school has to display data regarding grants, enrolment, attendance, incentives etc. for public knowledge. Panchayat Raj Institutions through its bodies at village, block and cluster; supervise and monitor the elementary education programmes periodically.

**Monitoring by District Based Body:** Provision has been made for the constitution of a District Level Committee comprising local public representative (Members of Parliament, Members of the State Legislature and Members of the Zilla Parishad, elected from those district/and/or urban bodies (as applicable) to monitor the implementation of the SSA programme in the districts.

**State Implementation Societies (SIS):** Representatives of the National Mission for Universalization of Elementary Education and National Level Institutions like NCERT, NCTE, and NUEPA are involved in periodic monitoring and provide resource support to SIS for strengthening monitoring and appraisal.

**Educational Development Index (EDI):** An EDI has been developed to take progress of the States towards Universalization of Elementary Education (UEE).

**National Achievement Surveys:** Pupil Achievement Level Sample Surveys are conducted every three year by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) for classes III, V, VII/VIII. States are also encouraged to undertake independent learning achievement surveys to assess performance of their students.

**Research and Evaluation:** Research studies are conducted at National and State levels to provide feedback on effectiveness of the different inputs, to identify the problem areas in implementation and to provide suggestions for making effective changes in implementation.

**Programme/Impact Evaluation:** Programme/Impact evaluation studies are conducted by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) to evaluate the quality initiatives by the States. Four such studies are in progress in five States.

**Web Portal:** A web portal on implementation of the SSA programme has been developed and launched on 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2008. This is an online district based, MIS system to track progress of the various aspects of implementation across Districts and States.

**Financial Monitoring:** Important dimensions of financial monitoring include: Independent concurrent financial reviews of States and Union Territories (UTs)

commissioned by the Ministry; Quarterly review meetings of Finance Controllers of States/UTs regularly covering reports on release and utilization of funds, capacity building of accounts staff, status of external audit, good financial management practices etc; Audit of annual accounts by Chartered accountant firms and State Accountant General (Audit); and Setting up internal audit mechanism.

**National Resource Group (NRG) of SSA:** The NRG of SSA advise, Central and States Governments on different aspects of quality improvement in elementary education like curriculum, quality and content of text books, in-service training of teachers, and appropriate pedagogic and evaluation practices.

**Monitoring Formats for Management of Quality (2005): A Self Sustaining Monitoring Mechanism for Quality Education**

SSA lays emphasis on improving the quality of elementary education, thereby making education useful and relevant for children by taking steps like improving the curriculum, child centred activities and effective teaching learning strategies. In order to be continually informed about the parameters and issues related to quality of elementary education both at the class room level as well as at the systematic functioning level, the NCERT developed a set of 14 monitoring formats and 3 analytical sheets, popularly known as Quality Monitoring Formats (QMFs), through a nationwide rigorous process of consultations. These formats were rolled out by the Ministry of Human Resource Development in all the 35 States and Union Territories in the country. Information collected through these formats at different levels viz. School, Cluster, Block, District and State is compiled and analysed to undertake corrective measures for quality improvement.

The major quality dimensions for improving quality of elementary education covered under these formats are: Children's Attendance; Community Support and Participation; Teacher and Teacher Preparation; Curriculum and Teaching Learning Materials; Classroom Process; and Learners' Assessment, Monitoring and Supervision.

**Salient Features of Quality Monitoring Formats**

Following are the salient features of the formats:

- *Multi-tiered approach format:* It is a multi-tiered system in which, information is collected and compiled at different levels viz. – School, Cluster, Block, District and State, not only to analyse the progress of the programme

but also to take timely corrective measures.

- *Bottom-up approach* (school level to higher level): In the format bottom-up approach is followed, in which relevant school level information flows up to the national level.
- *Two-way flow of information:* It is a system of two-way flow of information which suggests plan of action for improvement to the preceding level.
- *Recording and reporting* in nature at different levels: Some formats are kept in the institution itself for time to time reference and others are reported to next higher level.
- *Continuous assessment of progress:* These formats facilitate the continuous assessment of progress on various quality dimensions.
- *Diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses:* This continuous assessment helps in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the system.
- *Provision for remedial/ corrective measures:* The diagnosis leads to taking remedial and corrective measures timely at all the levels.
- *Self-sustained feedback system:* These formats further facilitate self-sustained feedback system. The higher level provides feedback to the preceding level for further strengthening the strengths and replicating the success stories as well as for removing the bottlenecks.
- *Principle of subsidiarity:* These formats are subsidiary in nature. The States and UTs take their own course of action as per their local needs and feasibility.

It can be noted that, on some aspects information is collected at every level, that too, on a quarterly basis (e.g. learners' achievement) whereas, on some aspects the information is being obtained at district and sub-district levels (e.g. teaching-learning process) depending upon its type and nature. Moreover, out of 14 monitoring formats and three analytical sheets, which are being implemented at state, district and sub-district levels in a hierarchical manner, are mostly of reporting nature, implying thereby, the information on various quality dimensions is collected, analyzed and reported to the next higher level. A couple of tools are of recording nature, which is kept at the level of data collection itself; for self reference, self appraisal and self improvement (e.g. community perception tool at school level). Through this comprehensive and broad-based monitoring, data on learners' attendance, achievement, teaching learning process, community participation,

in-service training, etc. navigate from school to district level and finally to the NCERT, which design various interventions for providing requisite state-specific academic resource support, over and above, its regular capacity building initiatives.

The quality monitoring formats, also envisage a close partnership of administrative and academic structures at various levels. The formats ultimately seek to rejuvenate the academic resource support structures at the block and district levels, for improvement in classroom processes and pupil achievement levels. The formats also seek to monitor the provisions of quality-related inputs under SSA, like training of teachers, availability and usage of Teaching Learning Materials, availability of textbooks, functioning of academic support groups viz. District Resource Groups (DRGs), Block Resource Groups (BRGs), Cluster Resource Groups (CRGs) etc.

The monitoring for management of quality education has made headway in terms of sensitizing about the quality aspects of elementary education. These formats are being implemented in all the thirty five States and Union Territories across the country; however, they are at different stages of implementation. As a result of implementation of these formats, the self-sustained

monitoring mechanism starting from school/community level to the state level, have been established in all the States and the Union Territories to build an effective education system for the nation .

### References

Dave, R. H. (1980). A Built-in System of Evaluation for Reforming Projects and Programme in Education. *International Review of Education* 24 (4), UNESCO Institution of Education: Hamburg.

MHRD (1986). *National Policy on Education-1986*, Govt. of India: New Delhi

MHRD (2008). *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan - A Programme for Universal Elementary Education - Framework for Implementation* (Amended till 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2008), Govt. of India: New Delhi.

NCERT (2005). *Monitoring Formats for Quality Management under SSA*, NCERT: New Delhi.

G. Ravindra  
Yogesh Kumar  
NCERT, New Delhi, India  
gr\_jdncert@yahoo.co.in

### For further details on ANTRIEP activities contact:

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

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



## News from Member Institutions

(July 2009-December 2009)

### **The Aga Khan University for Educational Development**

*Karachi, Pakistan*

- Conducted ED-LINKS, the first face-to-face component of the fifth and sixth cycle of school leadership programme on June 06, 2009 and June 30, 2009
- Celebrated AKU-IED's 16th Anniversary on July 1st, 2009.
- Conducted the first face-to-face component of the Advanced Diploma in Education-Primary Education programme and a one-week Programme on ICT in Mathematics during the month of July.
- Organized a two week course on educational management and supervision in August, 2009.
- Organized a three-day seminar on 'Reforming Secondary Education in Pakistan: Prospects and Possibilities' under the ED-LINKS project during October 29-31, 2009
- Celebrated the World Teachers' Day and organized a two-day seminar on 'Gender Disparity in Education' in the month of October.
- A five-day research workshop on Early Childhood Education and Development (ECED) was conducted by the AKU-IED in the month of December

### **Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID)**

*Kathmandu, Nepal*

- Initiated the project, "Higher Education and Research in the Contexts of Gender and Development Issues in Nepal and Bangladesh", in partnership with the Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development and the Central Department of Home Science and Women's Studies of Tribhuvan University, Department of Women and Gender Studies of Dhaka University and Liverpool John Moore University. As an important activity of this project, a workshop was organized on December 4, 2009 to share the project experiences and explore the possibilities of expanding networking and partnership.
- Training programmes on Research Methodology was organized from 8-12 January 2010, to

develop research capacity in NGO officials working in remote areas of the country; which will help them carry out action researches for improving their existing practices in the field of Early Childhood Development.

- Recently prepared the Inventory of Non-formal Education Agencies in Nepal, with the financial support of UNESCO Office, in order to facilitate expansion, networking and linking of various organizations providing various NFE in the country.

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

*Dharwad, India*

- Initiated a study on, "Evaluation of Effectiveness of Nali Kali Program (Activities Based Learning)", sponsored by Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan (SSA), Government of Karnataka; which tries to evaluate the program in eight districts of the state in order to know the impact the program has made on the skills and competencies of the students in the 1st and 2nd standards.
- Organized a work shop for various resource persons from the District Institute of Educational Training (DIET) and other professionals, to understand the finer details of the Nali Kali program.

### **Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB)**

*Pahang, Malaysia*

- IAB played a key role in organizing the 17th Commonwealth Conference of Education Ministers (CCEM) at Kuala Lumpur, in June 2009.
- Hosted the 'Training Session of National Commissions and Focal Points of ISESCO English Speaking Member States', in collaboration with the Policy and International Relations Division, MoEM, in August 2009.
- Organized the Education Seminar Malaysia-Oman in October, 2009 on 'Capacity Building Initiatives of School Leaders and Teachers for School Excellence'.
- Jointly organized the 1st Regional Conference on Educational Leadership and Management (RCELAM), with the National Council of Head

Teachers and Principals, in November 2009; to provide a platform for school leaders and officers to provide the latest developments in education management and leadership.

- Director of IAB participated as member of the Asia Leadership Roundtable 2010, held in January 2010, at Hong Kong Institute of Education.

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

*Seoul, South Korea*

- Dr. Tae-Wan Kim, a professor of Keimyung University was sworn in as the 15th president of the Korean Educational Development Institute on October 30, 2009, for tenure of 3 years.
- Organized the Korea-OECD International Seminar in Seoul, on Oct. 16, 2009 on the theme, 'New Millennium Learners and Teachers' to disseminate the results of co-research projects with OECD-PISA, TALIS and NML and to diagnose the current status of Korea's education.
- KEDI, signed MOUs with NIE (National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University), VNIES (Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences), IIE (Institute of International Education, Stockholm University), and ADEA (Association for Development of Education in Africa), during the period from July 2009 to January 2010; enabling collective and concerted systemic efforts to boost more active and effective cooperation to facilitate coordinated activities.

#### **South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation, Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology (SEAMEO INNOTECH)**

*Manila, The Philippines*

- SEAMEO Council President and Minister of Education of Thailand, HE Mr. Jurin Laksanawisit, visited INNOTECH on December 20, 2009, for a dialogue on the Center's program thrusts, leading the start of the 40-day countdown to INNOTECH's 40th Founding Anniversary, in January 2010.
- Formally opened the first fully online flexible learning course called PeaceXCELS, focusing on promoting and exercising a culture of peace and respect for multicultural diversity; designed for Southeast Asian school heads, in December 2009.

- Conducted a series of workshops from 7 to 12 December, 2009 under the SEAMEO INNOTECH LEARNTECH II Regional Education Program (SIREP).
- Officials of the Science Education Development and Empowerment Centre under the Ministry of National Education of Indonesia participated in a three-day study visit program, at INNOTECH in November 2009. Programme provided inputs on good practices and strategies that can be adopted to help improve the quality of science teacher training and development in Indonesia.
- Newly Established SEAMEO Centers officials, Centres for Quality Improvement of Teachers and Education Personnel (QITEP) in Language, Science and Mathematics, based in Indonesia; visited INNOTECH in November 2009.
- Conducted a review of the Basic Learning Needs Providers (BLNs), their programs, and organizational resources, including policy recommendations and action steps that would push EFA initiatives forward.

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

*Shanghai, China*

- SIHRD conducting a research on 'Educational Reform and Development' focusing on eight aspects i.e. the challenges facing Shanghai education, the education reform and development strategy, the solutions of development in various level's education, the future perspectives and aims in long term, as well as the contribution of education. The research will have a positive influence on the 12th Five-Year Planning in Shanghai.
- Completed the project on, 'The Analysis and Policy Proposals on the Wage of faculty in Public Universities and Colleges of Shanghai in the year of 2008', focusing on the wage conditions and relevant policies.
- Conducted the survey on 'Implementation of local public outlay ration standard to Universities and Colleges'. The actual expense of public colleges was analyzed in accordance with the needs of Shanghai higher education by correlation methods. The main cause and

influential extent was investigated, and the new public outlay ration standard of 2010 was drafted as proposals.

- Collaborated with the Development & Planning Department of MOE and UNICEF, for the 'China—UNICEF Education Cooperation Program', in developing the guideline on the County School Construction during 2006—2010 Period.
- Currently carrying out an analysis on the 'Main Conditions of Basic School Construction', investigating 219,000 school buildings. The result of which would become the foundation for decision making on standard school buildings for school safety.
- Organized training for 38 inspectors from 31 provinces and municipalities, during January 7- 8, 2009, for the '2010 National Inspectorate Report on Technical and Vocational Education',

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

*New Delhi, India*

- A national seminar on Maulana Azad's birthday, which is celebrated as the National Education Day, was organised by NUEPA on November 11 and 12, 2009. This two day conference explored the inspirations, influences and ambiguities in Maulana Azad's commitment to modern education. The deliberations brought out

the shifts in Maulana Azad's intellectual evolution over a period of fifty years.

- Organized series of training programme on planning for Secondary Education under the RMSA (Universalisation of Secondary Education) for different region of the states on decentralized planning and methodology of developing secondary education plans.
- A seminar on access and equity in elementary education was organized on August 24-25, 2009 at Madhya Pradesh to share the findings of the researches conducted under CREATE project.
- Organized a seminar on Muslim Minority Education from November 4-6, 2009 to discuss the key issues on Minority Education flagged by Sachar Committee.
- A national level workshop was organized on Planning and Management for institutionalising School safety from December 14-16, 2009 to evolve a model plan of action on School Safety. 35 Teacher Educators and District Education Officers participated in this workshop.
- Conducted Case Studies of twenty eight States, Delhi and Puducherry on best practices adopted in Mid Day Meal Scheme with the overall objectives to identify the Best Practices and to understand the special features introduced by the States in the implementation of the Mid Day Meal Programme. The outcomes of the study have been documented as a National Synthesis Report along with the state specific Case Studies.

## ANTRIEP Member Institutions

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

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