



NEWSLETTER ANTRIEP

Vol. 26 No.2 July- December 2020

Bi-annual

School Governance: Trends and Challenges

The current issue of the newsletter focuses on ‘School Governance: Trends and Challenges’. The articles have been written by various experts and researchers working in this area in the context of different member-countries in Asia-Pacific region such as Australia, China, India, Malaysia, Pakistan and South Korea.

The first article focuses on the major roles and responsibilities of school boards in the context of school governance in Australia. The article also talks about a study conducted in a few independent secondary schools to find out the importance of diversity in school board membership and their role in the school’s financial sustainability. The author has recognised the crucial role of the school board members for improving

student learning and well-being through effective school governance.

The second article is based on the role of school governance in improving the quality of education at all levels, and touching upon every aspect of children in the Chinese education system. According to the author, reformation of evaluation has been the main focus of improvising the education at various levels - kindergarten, school education, vocational education and higher education. The focus of the Chinese administration has, thus, been on nurturing new talents in terms of skilled and applied ones, by using evaluation as a tool at different levels of education.

The third article provides the status of school education system in India along with the challenges that exist in the context of school governance. The article further talks about various policy reforms and new shift in school governance, including the current National Education Policy 2020 which recommends reforms in the structure and process of educational administration at all levels.

The fourth article discusses the Indian context of school governance with special focus on the role of School Management Committee (SMC). Initially, the article provides a brief introduction and structure of the Indian educational governance with special focus on the structures and functions of SMCs in the light of RTE Act. The author has shared the findings of a study conducted to examine social auditing by SMCs in India.

In this Issue...

School Governance in the Australian Context: Trends and Challenges	3
Governance of School Education in China with a Special Focus on Reform of Education Evaluation	4
Governance of School Education in India: Structure, Process and Policy Reforms	5
School Management Committee: An Instrument for Effective School Governance	9
School Governance in Malaysia	11
School Governance: Trends and Challenges in Pakistan	12
Educational Governance in South Korea	13
News from ANTRIEP Member-Institutions	14

The fifth article discusses the transformation and challenges that emerged in the educational system during Covid-19 pandemic in Malaysia. The author has focused on the challenges for the administrators in the school context, and the struggles faced by the workforce under them due to the emergence of digitalisation in teaching and learning process in this country.

The subsequent article explains the present status of educational system in Pakistan followed by issues and challenges associated with school governance such as inadequate resources, untrained teachers, improper accountability, poor examination system, segregation of private and public sectors, etc. The author also talks about the adverse effects of Covid-19 pandemic on education of children which has impacted various approaches of school governance like supervision, monitoring and accountability of school level stakeholders in Pakistan.

The last article focuses on the structure of South Korean education governance which is a two-layered system controlled by central and local government. The

article briefly discusses the roles and duties of these functionaries in the context of developing a policy framework, reform directions, school curriculum, teacher education, etc. The article then talks about the School Governing Body (SGB) which has been established for strengthening school autonomy, and plays an important role in improving the South Korean education governance.

The articles included in this issue of ANTRIEP reflect at the existing status of school governance across different Asian countries. It is observed that authors have discussed different aspects of governance varying from country specific structure, approach and challenges in the light of the education policy and impact of Covid-19 pandemic on school governance.

Madhumita Bandyopadhyay

Editor, ANTRIEP Newsletter

For Editorial correspondence, please contact:

The Editor

ANTRIEP Newsletter

National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA)

(Deemed to be University)

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

Tel:(+ 91 11) 26544800, 26565600, Fax: (+ 91 11) 26853041, 26865180

E-mail: antriep@gmail.com; madhumita@niepa.ac.in Website: www.niepa.ac.in

School Governance in the Australian Context: Trends and Challenges

In Australia, schooling is the joint responsibility of State and Federal Governments. The Federal Government is responsible for national education policies and programmes. State and Territory Governments regulate public and private schools within their jurisdiction. The Australian schooling system is highly privatised compared to other countries with over one-third of student enrolments in non-government schools. The proportion of non-government investment in Australian schools is double the average across OECD countries.

Governance structures vary across and within jurisdictions presenting key policy and practice challenges. Typically, governance in government schools is the remit of centralised education systems although some Australian States and Territories have opted to have school councils or boards with more limited powers in selected government schools to strengthen local strategic decision-making mechanisms. Around 15 per cent of Australian students attend independent schools that are governed by school boards. School board members in Australia generally serve on a volunteer basis and are appointed either from the school or local community. School boards are responsible for setting out the mission and vision of the school and its strategic direction. They also monitor educational programmes, oversee financial decisions, and mitigate risk. The school principal is also responsible for the school's day-to-day functioning and educational programmes. In independent schools, the school principal is appointed by the board which also monitors her/his performance.

Researches undertaken to study the impact of school governance on school improvement over the past two decades have increasingly pointed to the relationship between good school governance and improved student outcomes. This is consistent in the identification of effective practices beyond finance, legal compliance and risk mitigation, that can make a positive difference to

student (and staff) learning and wellbeing. This, in turn, has influenced policy and practice.

Evidence shows that effective school boards can play an important role in driving school improvement when they demonstrate a vision of high expectations for student achievement, generate strong shared beliefs and values about every student's ability to learn, as well as the confidence in the school's ability to address learning needs of students. It is also important for the school board to focus on accountability by devoting time, not only to operational issues but also to developing policies to drive improvement in students' learning. Research shows that school boards need to have a collaborative relationship with the staff and the community, and strong communication structures to inform and engage with internal and external stakeholders in setting and achieving strategic goals. Other important practices of effective school boards include collecting and using reliable data for making strategic decision-making to improving the school functioning and learners' achievement and the need to align resources for professional learning to meet school goals under a strong leadership team.

A recent study of effectiveness of boards conducted in 32 independent secondary schools in Victoria, Australia highlighted the importance of diversity in school board membership. The research showed that diversity of members' professional background, educational levels, industry experience, gender composition and tenure of the board is positively associated with board effectiveness. The study also found that practices of school boards directly drive a school's financial performance thereby reinforcing the important role of the board in ensuring a school's financial sustainability.

In terms of policy focus in Australia, we are increasingly seeing the implementation of more local school

governance mechanisms, including in government schools, through public school councils and boards that provide an avenue for community voice and consultation about educational matters. Governance of government schools is particularly complex in Australia as school councils have shared responsibilities with the principal of the school and the education department that vary across states and territories. In non-government schools, governance arrangements are broader, clearer, and mirror corporate governance structures. Interestingly, the findings of Auditor General reports into the effectiveness of school councils (for example, State of Victoria, 2018) reflect the issues highlighted in the international literature: that school councils operate in a policy and practice framework that is not clearly understood, council members are often not clear about their role and responsibilities and have varying degrees of skills to be able to enact their roles. In addition, rigorous performance reviews of school councils are not

regularly undertaken. These are the key challenges to address, particularly as school council and independent school board members are generally unremunerated volunteers.

The biggest challenge for school councils and boards in Australia moving forward will be identifying a baseline of their current practice, developing strategic goals for their own improvement aligned to the school goals and targets and focusing and monitoring their efforts for their achievement. Regardless of the context, they will need support, clear policy and practice advice and evidence-based frameworks to be effective.

Pauline Taylor-Guy

Centre for School and System Improvement

ACER, AUSTRALIA

Email: Pauline.Taylor-Guy@acer.org

Governance of School Education in China with a Special Focus on Reform of Education Evaluation

Since 21st century, China's education development has achieved a great height by adopting measures like comprehensive implementation of free compulsory education, accelerating the popularisation of high school and preschool education, vigorous development of vocational education, etc. The development of Chinese education is, therefore, entering a new stage that is characterised by the improvement of quality, promotion of fairness and optimization of the structure.

As per the China Education Vision, by 2035, China plans to develop into a cultural and educational power, by taking health, human resource development, sports and social civilisation to a new height. "Reform of education evaluation" is increasingly becoming the important keywords of China's education policy. Its core is to "improve outcome measures, strengthening

process evaluation...and improve the comprehensive evaluation". In order to improve all this, the State Education Commission (SEC) is a multi-functional executive branch of the State Council, which is the supreme administrative authority for the education system in China.

The SEC formulates major educational policies, designs overall strategies for promoting education, coordinates educational undertakings supervised by various ministries, and directs education reform. Education policies are made as per the stage of schooling. These policies lay greater emphasis on primary and secondary stage to enhance the vitality of running a school and giving greater importance to the physical, aesthetic and labour education for the development of quality education. Education policy in China advocates

pre-school education for the masses, relatively low charge, guaranteed quality and managerial norms. Higher education stage emphasises subject fusion, the fusion between production and education.

Behind a series of Chinese policy reform is the idea of transformation in education, which is shifting from the “score-based” and exam-oriented education to the “comprehensive development”. Thus, cultivating comprehensive talents becomes the key to education reform. Chinese governance of education engages greatly on inculcating talent holistically and, thus, places greater reliance on evaluation aspect in education.

In this direction, at kindergarten level, evaluation emphatically focuses on science, health and safety, team construction, etc. For compulsory education, evaluation promotes students’ all-round development, safeguards the rights and interests of students’ equality, leading the teacher’s professional development, and promotes the education and teaching level, and so on. For high school education, evaluation is focused on the implementation of students' comprehensive quality evaluation, student development guidance, optimisation of teaching

resources configuration, pushed further elective class in an orderly way, and regulating the behaviour of recruit students of running a school, etc.

For vocational education, evaluation is focused on evaluation of fusion, production and education cooperation between colleges and students to obtain professional qualification or certificate of professional skill levels, teachers team construction, and so on. For higher education, the emphasis is on the evaluation of different categories of colleges and universities, and explores establishing applied undergraduate evaluation standard; develop the professional ability and practicability. Evaluation, thus, includes comprehensive quality assessment to inculcate talent by following the theory model of talent cultivation, in terms of skilled and applied talents.

Cathy Fu Wei

*Shanghai Educational Research Institute
CHINA*

Email: cathyfuwei@163.com

Governance of School Education in India: Structure, Process and Policy Reforms

Introduction

India represents one of the largest school education systems in the world catering to a wide range of population. The Indian school education system consists of more than 1.5 million schools, nearly 9.5 million teachers and over 260 million students. The governance of education system is marked by diversity on multiple counts. A significant amount of diversity is found in terms of management structure as well as diversity in managing the systems across the states and union territories. Out of the total number of schools, nearly 66 per cent schools are classified as government-managed

schools falling within the jurisdictional control area of both the federal (central) and states governments. The majority of government schools are under the state governments. Very few schools are managed through the agencies of the federal government or registered welfare societies of the organisations or employees of the central government which include central schools, Central Tibetan Schools, Army Schools, Sainik Schools, Railway Schools, Naval Schools, etc. Similarly, high-stake examination and certification are conducted by various boards operating both under the framework of the central government as well as state governments. The schools, other than the ones run by the government,

are managed by various management structures which include religious, social, cultural and educational trusts, philanthropic individual endeavours or private initiatives broadly driven by a business motive. The constitutionally guaranteed cultural and educational rights of minorities provide scope for establishment and management of educational institution of their choices. A large number of schools, established by the minority groups, operate within the framework of autonomy provided to them.

The governance of such a large and diverse system has been one of the major challenges. The challenge of managing such a system gets more complex given the situation of inter- and intra-group disparities in access to schools and effective participation in educational processes. An effective model of governance of the school system in the midst of diversity and disparity has been an equally challenging endeavour. This has been one of the reasons that the responsibility of administration and governance of school education was constitutionally assigned to the states with very little responsibility resting with the union government till 1976. The 42nd constitutional amendment shifted the subject of education from state list to concurrent list thereby mandating the governance of education as the joint responsibility of the union and state governments. This also provided scope for the union government to play a proactive role in the governance of school education. A number of initiatives were taken by the union government to address many-fold challenges of education in its new role of cooperative partnership which has, in turn, impacted the structure and process of governance of school education in India.

Administration and Governance of School Education System

It is important to note that the administration and management of schools in India has largely been operated in the framework of an administrative system inherited from the colonial rule, especially during the initial decades of independence. As a consequence, the

hierarchical-control model of administration, with minor tweaking, was adopted for educational administration after independence. However, ensuring efficiency in educational delivery and maximising the outcome, as a national priority, has shaped the agenda of governance of the education. Since independence, a number of policy reforms have been introduced in the field of education. The basic intent of the policy reforms has been to upscale educational scenario in terms of enrolment, retention, completion and transition of students from one level to another. These have simultaneously been intended to enhance access, equity and quality in education. Similarly, a large number of programmes have followed the policy initiatives in targeted manner. A variety of modes have been adopted for efficient and efficacious educational delivery. The whole gamut of policies and programmes for education attainment and development has, in turn, impacted the structure, process and mode of educational governance too. The change in the mode of delivery of education has also impacted the mode of administration in education. This change is generally captured through the concept of governance.

Governance in global discourse generally stands for a system and process revolving around the idea of efficiency, efficacy and economies of scales in managing the system. A recurring emphasis on maximising the outcome with a minimum amount of input has been the point of departure from the earlier notion of administration and government-centric model of governance. In a more apparent form of reference, governance is understood as a kind of partnership between state, community and market having multiple actors and multiple axis of decision-making and mechanisms of delivery. It is not merely a state-centred basket of rules and boundaries. Emphasis is now on including actors other than state in delivery of services. Shared governance, network governance, etc. are new conceptual categories which also indicate the dynamics of shift from rigid and hierarchical-control model of administration to a more flexible outcome-based governance model. These shifts are not restricted to discourse on governance at the global level, but more

evident in a variety of policy documents and operating context of the education system.

The ensuing sections attempt to map out the changing context of education and major developments in the field of educational policies and programmes that have impacted the mode of governance in India. As indicated in earlier sections, the changing context of education and policy initiatives taken for educational up-scaling have greatly impacted the mode of governance.

Policy reforms, programme initiation and new shifts in governance

A major shift can easily be identified with transfer of education as a state subject to a subject of concurrent responsibility of national concern. In consonance of the shift, the 1980s and following decades experienced numerous interventions through policy and programme for educational development both at the macro-level and micro-level. The most important policy reform in education was the National Education Policy of 1986 and Programme of Action of 1992. The policy started new discourse in education with additional emphasis on decentralised planning and governance. Simultaneous development was 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment which redefined and brought the role of local government at the centre stage of educational planning and governance. The Central Advisory Board in Education's recommendations of 1993 deserve acknowledgement of the discourse in this regard.

Reform processes and their implication for educational governance

Starting from the early 1980s, a number of centrally sponsored schemes and internationally supported programmes for educational development were initiated in the education sectors in the states. Some of these are: Jeevan Jumbish, Shiksha Karmi projects, Andhra and Bihar Education Projects, District Primary Education Programme, Mid-Day Meal Scheme, Sarva Shiksha

Abhiyan, Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan schemes for teachers and teacher education, academic support system, etc. All these programmes had/have components related to implementation of strategies and mechanisms.

The interface of educational administration with the reform initiatives, in states in particular, has been a complex experience. The reform processes have significantly impacted educational administration in states, including the educational administration at the ground level. Implications of the reform process can easily be identified and classified in two major areas: a) change in principles and orientation of educational governance; and b) diversification in structure and process of educational governance. In case of the first, major change may be identified as shift in the conception of administration and governance itself which has already been indicated in earlier sections. As an implication, opening up space for the actors other than state agencies in educational governance is apparent outcome of the reform process. As a result, multiple agencies for educational delivery started functioning. The paradigm of educational delivery also got impacted which put more emphasis on outcome-based governance model. Shift from supply and provisioning-based approach to more demand-based educational delivery marks the distinctiveness of governance. The enactment of Right to Education Act 2009 in the framework of right-based approach to education rather than provision and incentive-based approach has given a new context of educational administration. The right-based approach to education demands addressal of the four components of - availability, accessibility, acceptability and adaptability. This has given a new dimension to educational administration at every level but, more so, at the district and sub-district educational administration as these are the actual actors of implantation at the ground level. This sets in motion a new role and new set of responsibilities for the educational administrators. One of the significant changes has been a shift in approach

from inspectorate mode of administration to leadership mode in line with principle of academic supervision and monitoring. A generic focus of good governance and specific context of enactment of Right to Information Act 2005 has mandated accountability, transparency and responsiveness in educational administration and governance which, in turn, has refined the terms of discourse in governance of education.

Closely linked to the first is the second. One of the important implications of policy reform has been proliferation and diversification of structure of educational governance, especially at the state and sub-state levels. Many a time, concerns relating to parallel structures of educational governance and multiple agencies in educational delivery are raised as one of the problem areas of educational governance. Decentralisation in educational governance has been highlighted as one of the requisites of effective governance. Therefore, decentralised planning and decentralised management have been introduced as important aspects of school education governance. Variety of participatory structures have been introduced in school governance at different points of time which include School Management Committees, School Management and Development Committees, Village Education Committees, Parent-Teacher Association, Mother-Teacher Association, etc. Besides these structures, the role and participation of local bodies have also been mandated through the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments.

The National Education Policy 2020 recognises many persisting problems in the area of educational

governance, and recommends reforms in the structure and process of educational administration at all levels. It recommends reforming the administrative structure in line with unified concern and approach to addressing different problems and issues. It recommends a separation of steering function of secretariat from the executing function of directorate in the states. For effective administration and resource sharing between schools in an area, it recommends creation of School Complexes/ Cluster Complexes as a local level structure of school governance. The realignment of role and responsibilities of district and block level education officers in the new context of structure of school governance becomes a natural corollary.

To sum up, governance of school education in India has experienced a number of shifts in terms of its orientation as well as structure and process. Policy instruments have been used as a tool for reforming the system. However, it is equally important to note that the past experiences also indicate a gap between policy perspective (vision and target) and policy implementation. The role of educational administrators becomes all the more important in bridging the gap for a better outcome in education.

Kumar Suresh
NIEPA, INDIA

Email: kumarnuepa@gmail.com

For further details on ANTRIEP activities, please contact

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)

7-9 Rue Eugene- Delacroix

75116 PARIS, France

Fax: + (33) 1 40728366

E-mail: d.altner@iiep.unesco.org

National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA)

(Deemed to be University)

17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI-110016, India

Fax: + (91 11) 26853041, 26865180

E-mail: madhumita@niepa.ac.in

School Management Committee: An Instrument for Effective School Governance

The Indian nation comprises of 36 States and Union Territories (UTs), signifying diversity in geographical, socio-cultural, religious and linguistic background. This diversity is governed by a fairly intricate administrative structure at state, district, block and cluster levels. These levels are nested within each other, in the same order. The cluster, lowest in the hierarchy, is a conglomeration of 15-25 schools depending upon the density of schools in a region. The Indian scheme of educational governance comprises of both administrative and academic structures at each of these levels. However, academic structures like Block Resource Centres, Cluster Resource Centres, DIETs function more as a support in quality improvement of education. The Indian educational governance has to cater to the second largest school education system in the world. At present, there are about 1.5 million schools at elementary level (Grade I to VIII) and about 0.5 million schools at secondary level (Grade IX to XII) in the country. With a vast and expansive education system, India has experimented with both macro-level and micro-level governance mechanisms, throughout post-independence period.

By the mid of 1970s, it was felt that macro-level programmes and schemes were unable to bring desirable reforms at the lowest level of education system, that is the school. A landmark in this direction came with the Constitutional Amendment of 1976 which placed education in the concurrent list that made it a shared responsibility of the Union and the States/UTs (Provinces). Consequent to this and other reforms (73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments), educational decentralisation paved the way for autonomy at local level institutions to devise appropriate context-based strategies to improve educational environment and outcomes. Further taking into account the bottom-up approach, school began to be considered as the primary unit for improving the learning outcomes of the students. Post-1990s with the strengthening of Panchayati

Raj Institutions, the education system witnessed a paradigm shift in school governance from centralised to participatory, ensuring transparency, accountability and inclusion of all stakeholders at the school level. Structures like Village Education Committees/Ward Committees, Parent Teacher Association were created for area specific educational planning and management.

In this move towards decentralisation, community was accorded a prominent position. To make local level initiatives a success, the school had to move beyond its stand-alone character, engage with the community and parents to collaboratively plan for student learning and learning outcomes. In India, even though communities were actively engaged in the school education since ancient times, it was through the introduction of National Education Policies (2020, 1986, 1968) and reforms for educational decentralisation, that community was established as the most important stakeholder in schooling processes other than the students, teachers and the school head.

The Right to Education Act, 2009, which ensures free and compulsory education to the children of 6-14 years of age, made provisions for involving different stakeholders, especially the community in the functioning of schools. To represent the rights and entitlements of child, the RTE Act, 2009 made it mandatory to establish School Management Committee in each school. It prescribed the structure and functions of SMCs with special emphasis on representation of women and weaker sections of society. The Act stipulates that three-fourth (75 per cent) of its members should be from the community of parents/guardians and that half of the committee's members should be women. The remaining one-fourth (25 per cent) of SMC is distributed across 1/3rd local authorities, 1/3rd school teachers and 1/3rd academicians/students. The functions of SMCs include preparation of school development

plan, hold regular meetings with parents and guardians, and appraise them about the regularity in attendance, ability to learn, progress made in learning and any other information about the child.

In the current international discourses on educational decentralisation, school-based management structures that involve community as a partner are being viewed as a step towards 'Open Governance' in education. Open governance, in brief, rests on the principles of transparency, citizen engagement and accountability of government processes to the public and vice versa. The concept of open governance, when applied to the education sector, can more specifically be termed as Open Education. Within the framework of open education, school-based management structures (SMCs in case of India) are visualised as a mechanism of social audit. It is believed that social audit is an important mechanism which strengthens school governance and its outcomes.

Aligning with the framework of Open Education, a national level study was conducted to examine social auditing by SMCs in India. The study analysed the functioning of SMCs through the principles of transparency, accountability and citizen engagement, as effective cornerstone of open education. The findings of this study revealed that the School Management Committees have been constituted in most of the schools across the country. SMC members have been actively engaged in improving infrastructure and disbursement of incentives like mid-day meal, textbooks, uniforms, etc. Variation in the level of awareness of the members towards roles and responsibilities, as mandated in the official circulars and the RTE Act, 2009, is observed. In a few instances, SMC members were found to be aware and they contributed in augmenting enrolment, monitoring of schools, school development planning and even monitoring of teaching-learning processes. A few studies indicate that transparency in fund flow and utilisation is not shared by schools with SMC members because of the mindset and perception of head teachers that SMC members do not possess necessary competency for monitoring fund flow and utilisation.

Caste and class identities needed to overcome to ensure the actual participation of all members. In many cases, participation of women and disadvantaged groups is limited. One of the encouraging findings is that a training module for the training of SMC members has been prepared but the capacity building of all members has yet to take place. A few studies found that members were inadequately prepared to collaborate on the preparation of the School Development Plan with school functionaries due to ambiguity on their expected role, their heavy work schedule and inadequate training whereas, in a few instances, SMC members were actively engaged in the preparation of school development plan, which is one of the most significant roles of the SMC.

The national-level study undertaken for understanding the functioning of SMCs in India assessed the framework of Open Education on the principles of transparency, citizen engagement and accountability. The study marks an important landmark in capturing the journey of decentralised governance in India that visualises school as the unit of effective governance, public accountability and citizen engagement. The school management committees have an interface of both the school functionaries and citizens. Together as a community of stakeholders, SMCs are entrusted with the responsibility of improving school processes, and ensuring that student learning progress and public trust is retained in the government schools. In the current times of the Covid-19 pandemic, there are many instances in the country, where schools have reported active support from community and SMCs. The schools trusted the SMCs as active partners and engaged them for the smooth functioning of schools. The SMCs too, owned the schooling processes and became involved in collaborative tasks to ensure that education of children did not suffer. However, there is still a long way to go in terms of achieving the goals of Open Education in true sense.

Sunita Chugh

NCSL, NIEPA, INDIA

Email: sunitachugh11@gmail.com

School Governance in Malaysia

The outbreak of the unprecedented COVID-19 pandemic has created barriers in socialising. This situation has propelled humans to innovate and establish borderless communication with the presence of diverse online learning media modes. This has gradually penetrated into the world of education by creating greater space for online mode in continuing the teaching and learning process. With the transformation and improvement adjusted according to the different school contexts, the teaching and learning processes have shifted towards a virtual learning space/environment. This is one major trend and challenge in school governance for leaders to ensure teaching and learning agility to be inculcated in their school workforce. Capabilities like skills, knowledge, accreditation, physiology, environment and mindset may help in mitigating such agility in the workforce. However, the aspect that is most subjective for leaders to deal with is the mindset of people in their respective workforce. As far as leaders and employees are concerned, understanding the mindsets of workforce allows them to quickly assess their status and the way forward, as well as allow leaders to enhance learning, innovation, development and growth in their organisations.

Mindsets are mental lenses that drive thinking, learning and behaviour. Nevertheless, they are idiosyncratic for each single individual in the workforce. Hence, it would be truly challenging for leaders to orient the mindsets of their workforce to correspond their actions and responses towards achieving the demands in the current education scenario. An organisation cannot promote and develop agility if the mindsets of the workforce resist change.

As a result, if leaders want to enhance the agility of its workforce, they need to ensure that their workforce possess mindsets which allow them to view change positively and behave in ways that facilitate effective change.

Leaders play a crucial role to maneuver their workforce onto the right track to be more agile and innovative so as to embrace as well as counteract the challenges of the present days. Nevertheless, leadership is, first and foremost, contextual. Having a clear understanding of their school context and its implications sets the stage for leaders to struggle or thrive better in preparing their workforce effectively to face these global trends and challenges. The obvious paradigm shift in the mindset for teachers and students to embrace and enhance digital literacy should be in congruence with the capacities and capabilities of each individual school so as not to create any stress and anxiety, especially among those who are not too technologically savvy.

In view of the global needs as well as the contextual readiness of each individual school workforce, the aspect and prospect of workforce agility is essential. Nevertheless, for school leaders to embrace the global challenges, it would be pleasant for their respective workforce to start implementing agile workforce planning on a small scale. Starting small does not implicate it is going to take a long while for the process to get heated up. Instead, the process may become quicker and gain its own momentum for the initial cycle of change and transformation to be undertaken. Then, the subsequent cycles of workforce agility escalation will become easier and more comfortable.

***Khaziyati binti Osman &
Bridget Lim Suk Han***

*Institut Aminuddin Baki
MALAYSIA*

*Email: khaziyati@iab.edu.my /
bridgetlim@iab.edu.my*

School Governance: Trends and Challenges in Pakistan

The education system of Pakistan encompasses over 317,000 schools with enrolment of almost 50.3 million students and over 1.83 million teachers. The system is further composed of almost 197,000 public schools and over 120,000 private schools. The public sector provides access to about 28.68 million students to complete their education while the remaining 21.60 million students are catered by the private sector. However, after the 18th Amendments in 2011, education is the responsibility of the provincial governments, and provincial and regional education departments are responsible to manage educational facilities in their respective areas. To maintain effective control and supervision over the working of the educational institutions, there are Directors of Education appointed at provincial and divisional levels as well as District and Sub-divisional Education Officers at district and sub-divisional levels, respectively. Formal schooling in Pakistan begins at the age of four as early childhood education, and age five in the first grade of primary schools. The school education consists of various stages such as elementary education (Primary Grade I-V and Middle Grade VI-VIII), secondary education (Grade IX-X) and higher secondary education (Grade XI-XII).

All national education policies and development plans emphasised on access, equity and quality of education. In spite of these policy provisions, school governance is a serious issue presently. Right from policy formulation to monitoring and implementation of policies, administrative monitoring, equity, location and gender disparities and accountability-related challenges need to be addressed. School governance is facing several challenges, including inequity, inadequate resources, untrained teachers, improper accountability, and poor examination system, segregation of private and public sectors, overcrowded classes, particularly at primary and

elementary levels, harsh behaviour of teachers, corporal punishment and even non-availability of basic facilities. In addition, the Covid-19 pandemic has adversely affected millions of children who have lost access to school. This is indeed an unprecedented situation in the history of the country, as it is for the rest of the world.

The Government of Pakistan has developed several strategies to address this critical situation and apply alternative approaches to ensure continuity in education, particularly school education. Government has taken many initiatives such as provision of free textbooks, revision of national curricula, production of quality textbooks, placement of graduate teachers at primary level, and grant of stipends to girl students. There is an urgent need to reform the school governance system in Pakistan and there has to be sufficient budgetary allocation for education in the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP). There should be quality institutions - from primary to higher secondary levels - for the professional development of teachers. For this purpose, the existing system of teacher education institutions must be provided with funds as well as qualified human resources to run programmes of training for teachers on periodical basis. The system of accountability must be strengthened and all the professionals associated with the system of education should be educated to own their responsibilities on individual and collective basis. In addition, monitoring and controlling mechanisms may be strengthened with consultation of all provincial and regional governments.

Khawaja Sabir Hussain

AEPAM, PAKISTAN

Email: drkhawaja63@gmail.com

Educational Governance in South Korea

Educational governance in South Korea is two-layered, central or national, and local. The central government decides the education policy framework, reform-related guidelines, school curriculum, teacher education programme and the certification, college admission, and number of students for each higher education institutions. The Ministry of Education oversees the national school curriculum, as designated by Article 23 of the Primary and Secondary School Education Law, in order to ensure equal educational opportunity for all and maintain the quality of education. The national curriculum and regional guidelines allow local individual schools and teachers to have some levels of flexibility to accommodate the particular characteristics and objectives of each school.

Local level education affairs are governed by the regional level of offices of education. As of 2021, there are 17 Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education, and 175 District Offices of Education. The governors of 17 Offices of Education are elected positions. Their term is 4-years long, and they can hold the positions for 3 terms in a row. The voices of Education Governors are quite influential in educational affairs at the national level. A District Office of Education serves as a local educational administrative agent that facilitates the implementation of educational policies and supports local schools. The local education offices also review and present to the Korean Ministry of Education (KMOE) about the issues and problems of policies and regulations that are identified in the process of implementation.

The governance at the school level has been increasingly discussed as public attention on decentralisation; local and school autonomy has grown. In response to the criticism on inefficiency of highly centralised education

system, organisations of teachers and parents were established in the late 1980's, which, later became more active. The educational autonomous system was adopted in 1991, and education policies moved forward with deregulation, and increased school autonomy. School Governing Body (SGB) is developed as one of the key measures for increasing the school autonomy. School Governing Body (SGB) was suggested by the '5.31 Education Reform Committee' in 1995. It systematically allows teachers, parents, and community members to participate in school management process. All schools - from elementary to upper secondary levels, and special education schools - are legally required to organise and run SGB. The number of SGB members is to be between 5 to 15 consisting of the representatives of teachers, parents and community members. The SGB provides recommendations on overall school affairs, including school regulation establishment, budget and its allocation, curriculum implementation, textbooks and education materials selection, school meals and organisation of sports teams and their management.

The SGB is considered to be one of the most successful education policies as the institution includes stakeholders' voices in the school management. As the SGB is advisory entity, so more power is still exercised by school principal and regional education offices. Thus, it is argued that efforts are needed to transfer the principal's authority to school members, including teachers, students and parents. The decision-making authority should be given to school members and the community.

Eun Young Kim
KEDI, SOUTH KOREA
Email: kykedi@kedi.re.kr

The next two issues of the ANTRIEP Newsletters (January-June 2021 and July-December 2021) will focus on the themes: **'Impact of Covid-2019 on School Education'** and **'Drop-out Problem in School Education'** respectively.

News from ANTRIEP Member-Institutions (July-December 2020)

Australian Council for Educational Research

Australia

- A webinar entitled '20 years of PISA in Australia' was organised by ACER during November 2020, focusing on the special issue of Australian Journal of Education.
- The Centre for Assessment Reform and Innovation (CARI) at the ACER has developed a combination of skill development frameworks, levels of skill development, and curriculum-orientated assessment and teaching tools focusing the 21st century education on the development of students' skills.

Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee

Bangladesh

- BRAC Climate Change Programme organised a virtual launch of the book titled 'Building Resilience to Climate Change through Craftsmanship'.
- BRAC Urban Development Programme (UDP) organised an Online Seminar on 'Pro-poor, Climate and Disaster Resilient Urban Development: Challenges and Opportunities' on 3 December, 2020.
- BRAC released new data on gender-based violence on 1 December, 2020 in conjunction with 16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence.

Campaign for Popular Education

Bangladesh

- CAMPE organised the 1st Episode of 'Shikkha Shonglap' on Prospects and Challenges of Distance Learning during COVID-19 on 27 October, 2020

for emphasizing on protecting right to education, addressing trauma and continuity of education through distance learning.

National Academy for Educational Management

Bangladesh

- Online Educational Administration and Management Training Course (EAM) for District Education Officers was conducted during 29 November to 3 December, 2020.
- The NAEM Newsletter Volume 13, Issue 76 was published in December 2020.
- Online Educational Administration and Management Training Course (EAM) for Institutional Heads at Secondary Level was conducted during 2-22 December, 2020

International Institute for Educational Planning

Paris, France

- IIEP-UNESCO has published News-Brief – a collection of articles relating to the current state of reopening education facilities on Education for Resilience website.
- IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF have teamed up to offer an online course for educational planners and policy-makers, to master the foundations for planning with a lens for inclusivity held from 28 September to 27 November, 2020.
- IIEP-UNESCO, in collaboration with Education Development Trust, organised a professional development programme for head teachers in Wales, the United Kingdom.

National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration

India

- Sixth Post Graduate Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration (PGDEPA) - VI Phase was held from 13 to 17 July, 2020, at NIEPA, New Delhi in online mode
- Seventh Post Graduate Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration (PGDEPA) - I Phase (field based) was conducted during 1-31 August, 2020, by NIEPA, New Delhi.
- A Discussion Meet on “Achieving Gender Equity in School Education in India from the Perspective of National Education Policy 2020” was held on 30 December, 2020.

Institute Aminuddin Baki

Malaysia

- Respectful visit by Y Bhg. Dato, Director to the Negeri Sembilan NSC Office, was paid on 1 July, 2020. A discussion session was also held with En. Aswanjaya Bin Abd. Karim, Director of MKN Negeri Sembilan.
- The Outstanding Leaders of Educational Institutions Colloquium (PCIP) 2020 was organised from 29 September to 1 October, 2020 at the Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highlands Branch.
- The 27th National Seminar on Educational Management and Leadership was conducted online from 12 to 22 October, 2020. The closing ceremony was held on 22 October, 2020 by Y Brs. Dr. Hj. Ahmad Rafee Bin Che Kassim, Deputy Director General of Education, Malaysia.

Academy of Educational Planning and Management

Pakistan

- AEPAM conducted six workshops of one-week duration on "Educational Planning, Office and

Financial Management" under Canadian Deb for Conversion and CBEM Project from 9 November to 18 December, 2020 at AEPAM Campus, Islamabad.

- AEPAM conducted two (7th & 8th) workshops of one-week duration from 28 December, 2020 to 8 January, 2021 for Education Managers of Federal Directorate of Education on ‘Educational Planning, Office and Financial Management’.

SEAMEO-INNOTECH

Philippines

- On 31 August, 2020, SEAMEO INNOTECH hosted the Multigrade Online Summit: Celebrating Partnerships and Milestones towards a Strengthened Multigrade Programme in Philippine Education.
- The Department of Education and INNOTECH conducted ‘Teacher Motivation Webinar’ to celebrate National Teachers’ Month.

Korean Educational Development Institute

South Korea

- Dr. Adel Adaileh (Ambassador) and Ms. Nadine Bisharat (Consul.) from the Embassy of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, visited KEDI to discuss future cooperation between Queen Rania Teacher Academy (QRTA) in Jordan and KEDI. They shared knowledge of KEDI's model use in the research on digital education and lifelong learning.
- KEDI and UNICEF EAPRO (UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office) organised, during October 2020, a virtual MOU signing ceremony, pledging to work together to strengthen education for children and youth in East Asia and the Pacific region.
- The 2020 UNESCO-KEDI Asia-Pacific Regional Policy Seminar was held on 12-13 November, 2020 with the theme on inclusion and equity in education.

ANTRIEP Member Institutions

1. Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, Taleemi Chowk, G-8/1 ISLAMABAD-44000, 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)
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-12070, Indonesia. (www.kemdikbud.go.id)
4. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), 75, Mohakhali Commercial Area, DHAKA-1212, Bangladesh (www.brac.net)
5. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), 5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, DHAKA-1207, Bangladesh (www.campebd.org)
6. Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), R.S. No. 9A2, Plot No. 82, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Nagar, Near Yalakki Shetter Colony, Lakamanahalli, Dharwad-580004 KARNATAKA, India (www.cmdr.co.in)
7. National Institute of Education (NIE), P.O. Box 21, High Level Road, Maharagama, Sri Lanka (www.nie.lk)
8. Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management and Leadership), Malaysia Education Ministry, Value Education Complex 71760 Bandar Enstek, Negeri Sembilan, MALAYSIA (<http://iab.moe.edu.my>)
9. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 PARIS, France (www.iiep.unesco.org)
10. Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), 7, Gyohak-ro, Deoksan-eup, Jincheon-gun, Chungcheongbuk-do, South Korea (www.kedi.re.kr)
11. National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM), Dhanmodi, DHAKA-1205, Bangladesh (www.naem.gov.bd)
12. National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Sanothimi, BHAKTAPUR-44800, Nepal (www.nced.gov.np)
13. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI-110016, India (www.ncert.nic.in)
14. National Institute of Education (NIE), 80, Preah Nordon Blvd, Phnom Penh-120207, Cambodia (www.nie.edu.kh)
15. National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI-110016, India (www.niepa.ac.in)
16. Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID), Tribhuvan University, G.P.O. Box 2161, Balkhu, KATHMANDU, Nepal (www.cerid.org)
17. Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), Shanghai Academy of Educational Sciences 21 Chaling Road, SHANGHAI, P.R.C.-200032, China
18. South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation - Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, SEAMEO- INNOTECH P.O. Box 207, Commonwealth Avenue, Diliman, QUEZON CITY-1101, Philippines (www.seameo-innotech.org)
19. State Institute of Educational Management & Training (SIEMAT), 25, Sir P.C. Banerjee Road, Allenganj, Prayagraj-211002, ALLAHABAD, Uttar Pradesh, India (www.siematup.org)
20. The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P) 1-5/ B-VII, Federal B Area, Karimabad, Karachi – 75950, PAKISTAN (www.akdn.org/akes)
21. The Aga Khan University - Institute for Educational Development, (AKU-IED), 1-5/B-VII, Federal B. Area Karimabad, KARACHI-75950, Pakistan (<http://www.aku.edu/iedpk>)
22. Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences (VNIES), Centre for Higher and Vocational Education Studies 101, Tran Hung Dao Hoan Kiem District-110001 HANOI CITY, Vietnam (www.vnrv.vnies.edu.in)

Edited by Prof. Madhumita Bandyopadhyay on behalf of the Focal Point, ANTRIEP and published by the Registrar, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016. Processed/ printed by the Publication Unit, NIEPA at M/s Archana Printers, New Delhi-110020, India.