Supervision, Evaluation and School Autonomy

As informed to our readers through the previous issue of the Newsletter, this issue (July-December, 1998) focuses on School Autonomy and Educational Management. The previous issue also informed all our member institutions regarding the Third Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP. This meeting is held on 18 December 1998 at Colombo as a continuation to a seminar on Improving School Efficiency. We had requested authors, who are making contributions in the seminar to provide an article for this issue of the Newsletter. The responses have been prompt and positive. We have received articles from BRAC (Bangladesh), KEDI (Korea), NIE (Sri Lanka), CERID (Nepal), NIEPA (India) and IIEP (Paris). This issue of the Newsletter brings together all these contributions.

The paper by IIEP on Supervision for School Improvement highlights the emerging trends in supervision practices in countries of the Asian Region.

Paper by Bangladesh highlights the supervision strategies adopted by the BRAC in their non-formal primary education programmes. Interestingly, this paper brings out how the focus of supervision is shifting from the administrative dimensions to academic dimensions essentially focusing on evaluation of learners' performance and teachers' activities. In this case too, school management committees play an important role in improving school efficiency and promoting autonomy in its functioning.

The paper on Nepal elaborates the efforts by the country to provide professional and technical support to the teachers through an effective supervision mechanism. The experiences gained in the recent past through the implementation of a number of externally funded primary education projects help the Government clearly articulate and conceptualize the school supervision system in the country.

The paper on Korea shows how institutional evaluation has become an important tool to assess the efficiency in the functioning of schools. School evaluation has become an important part of the school supervision mechanisms in Korea.

The paper on reflections on school autonomy introduces the concept of school autonomy and discusses the trends towards school autonomy in the Asian countries. The paper on Sri Lanka focuses on efforts made by the country towards empowering schools at the local level and the changes brought about by school-based management systems.

A general trend that is seen in all contributions is a movement towards focusing all efforts at the school level to improve the functioning of schools. Local based management of the schools and close interaction with the community in and around the school seems to be the solution to many of the educational problems faced by the primary education system in almost all the countries.

This issue comes at a time when the Third Annual Meeting is being held. It is a very satisfying occasion to see that ANTRIEP has continued its activities successfully for the past three years, and during this period ANTRIEP has developed linkages which are both bilateral and inter-institutional. New member institutions have joined the Network and many more are likely to join. We are happy to see that the Network activities are progressing well. We on behalf of the focal point take this opportunity to express our gratitude to all member institutions for their support and efforts to facilitate the Network activities. It gives us immense pleasure to welcome all representatives of the member institutions to the Third ANTRIEP Annual Meeting. We expect that this meeting will provide us a valuable opportunity to discuss, decide and direct the future activities of the ANTRIEP in the years to come.

We are extremely happy to inform all our readers that one of our member institutions, namely NCERT, New Delhi, has been conferred *"The Excellence in Education Award"* for the year 1998. We congratulate NCERT on their exemplary achievement.

I take this opportunity to welcome Institute Aminuddin Baki, Malaysia as a member of the ANTRIEP family. A profile of the institute is given in this issue of the Newsletter.

We continue to receive encouraging response to the Newsletter from various individuals and institutions. We express our gratitude to the contributors to this issue of the Newsletter and to all the readers for their encouragement.

EDITOR

Supervision for School Improvement

A widespread sense of scepticism on the value of inspection and supervision persisting in many countries has led, to a deterioration of the system of external supervision. Now the service is gradually regaining its importance in its changed form and content. The traditional conception of visualising it as a mechanism of policing the work of teachers, by taking punitive action wherever necessary, is giving way to viewing supervision as an essential component of a support system for the school and the teachers. Some of the trends emerging from the analysis of supervision practices in countries of the Asian region are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The supervision staff in many countries are asked to focus more on giving support to teachers and contributing to their professional development than on controlling and inspecting. The change of terminology in different countries is the first expression of this trend. More importantly, it is recognised that in order to give more attention to pedagogic issues, supervision should become a more comprehensive and frequent exercise. In order to increase the frequency of school visits, there is a need to recruit more supervisors, a suggestion specifically made in, for instance, Korea, Nepal and Sri Lanka. However, probably more fundamental is a reform in structures, bringing supervision and support

staff closer to schools.

The countries in Asia are indeed attempting, in different ways, to decrease the distance between supervisors and teachers and to make supervision a developmental exercise. Two trends can be observed in this regard. In Korea, efforts are being made to curtail external supervision from the ministry and replace it with school-site supervision and support practices. In several countries of South Asia, where schools are often small and unable to develop a school-based supervision mechanism, clusters are being created with resource centres, to serve and support the schools within the cluster. This is particularly evident in the massive basic education projects being implemented in Nepal and India. The Assistant Thana Education Officers in Bangladesh are to function as cluster-level supervisors with the explicit charge of carrying out training programmes and helping the schools in their area of work towards quality improvement. Sri Lanka has the system of master teachers who operate in a relatively small area and act as academic guides to teachers in the primary schools within this area. However, these strategies in South Asia need considerable strengthening as the incumbents are invariably burdened with too large a number of schools and teachers to make a significant impact on quality.

The next step in this process of decentralization is to reinforce school-site supervision and support practice, a trend which can be observed world-wide, including in the Asian countries. Korea, for instance, relies increasingly on in-school supervision and has actually abolished the central department of supervision. Headteachers in Sri Lanka and Nepal have also received growing responsibilities in supervision. While this is much less the case in Bangladesh and Uttar Pradesh. One of the specific suggestions made in the Bangladesh report is that supervisors should allow teachers more autonomy. This reliance on in-school supervision is part of a wider strategy towards increasing school autonomy in different fields. The experiences so far in this area have shown that such reforms are conditioned by important changes, both structural and attitudinal, and that some countries are attempting this reform without giving sufficient attention to these conditions. The same is probably true for strategies that aim to include the community in the supervision process. Several countries, in theory, foresee a role for the community, but for well-known reasons, this role has rarely been more than superficial.

These trends should engender changes in the role definitions of the various actors at each level. The Korean diagnosis offers a detailed proposal in this regard. The central level should: "focus on nation-wide planning and co-ordination and research and development to spread innovative models of supervision; screening excellent personnel; operating in-service training; reorganizing and spreading exemplary cases of supervision; and the provision of the latest information and theories. The decentralized offices of education should adapt their supervisory work to the local needs. Their tasks should include research and development to devise instructional models and teaching methods suitable to the local curriculum; screening and training of the local personnel; helping schools to exchange information on supervisory activities and collaborate; and motivating teachers to participate in various supervisory options by supporting subject matter meetings. Finally, individual schools should extend autonomous supervisory activities."

In almost all the countries, the legitimate role of external supervision has come to be seen, whatever the nomenclature used, as one of improving teaching-learning processes through academic guidance of teachers. Accordingly, the current trend in most countries is still to focus on individual teacher supervision and training. In the short run, this effort is likely to continue. But, in the long run, one can expect that this approach will be replaced by a more holistic perspective of monitoring total school improvement which integrates pedagogic and management dimensions of supervision and support. This is particularly so in countries where many primary schools continue to be small units with relatively poor internal resources, both physical and human. This recent shifting of the focus from individual teachers to the whole school can be observed at least in South Korea and Sri Lanka. There, attempts are made to link this with school development planning or total school quality improvement. With increased emphasis on school-level planning, school performance is seen from a new angle, making self-set goals and targets as the basis for evaluating the performance of a school.

A related trend with an impact on the functioning of supervisors is that of creating an information base at the local level, containing detailed data by school. In different countries of the South Asian region, one can find examples of concerted attempts to carry out school mapping and micro-planning exercises through participatory rural appraisal methods. This approach,

coupled with the increased focus on community participation and decentralized management, is compelling the supervisors to move towards support and improvement based on empirical information instead of merely emphasising adherence to administrative norms. In a project in Sri Lanka on improving the functioning of primary schools in plantation areas, such an information base has become an effective tool for supervisors and resource persons. Indirectly, the indicators developed through the information base also act as a means of assessing and monitoring the performance of the schools in a context-specific manner.

This need for objective information is further strengthened by the growing consciousness that an efficient supervision and support system needs to be flexible and diversified. Schools that function properly with competent and experienced principals and efficient internal control mechanisms, have little need for intensive external supervision and support. On the other hand, poorly functioning schools, with untrained principals and poorly motivated teachers, do need systematic and sustained supervision and support services, of different kinds. The implementation of such diversified services demands the development of a reliable and relevant information system on the quality of schools.

Linked to these different reform attempts, and an essential pre-condition for their success, is a trend towards more transparency. For the moment, this is a transparency mainly within the education community. Supervisors are supposed to hold discussions, during and after their school visit, with the staff they have evaluated. Standard report forms and checklists are available, so that teachers have a better idea of the inspection procedures. In a few places, for instance in Uttar Pradesh, it is expected that supervision and support staff discuss with communities. Visits have lost their surprise character in Korea and Sri Lanka where schools now have to request them. On the other hand, in Uttar Pradesh, a specific category of 'surprise visits' exists, and a number of headteachers, there and elsewhere, prefer visits to be unannounced, in order to help them discipline

teachers. Nowhere yet have inspection reports been made open to the local community or to the public.

In the same vein the accountability of supervisors needs to be rethought. Traditionally, schools are held accountable to the supervisors, who report back to their superiors and are judged on the basis of the number of visits and reports written. A framework is slowly emerging, which places combined accountability with the school authorities and the supervisor and is based on learning outcomes. Many countries in the region have specified, at the national level, a minimum or an essential set of learning outcomes to be achieved at the end of primary education. Correspondingly, regular assessment of learner achievement has gained ground in many countries. In one way or the other, achievement test results are likely to become the main indicators of school performance. At the same time, it is recognised however that performance in external tests cannot fully reflect the health of a primary school and attempts are being made to develop a broadened framework incorporating a larger set of process indicators.

Within this new perspective, the supervision system is bound to be held accountable, jointly with the school authorities, for the achievement of results. This is well illustrated by the moves contemplated in Sri Lanka. The emphasis in the changed set up will be on accountability to parents and students as indicated by learner performance. The supervision system in the case of a group of innovative schools run by an NGO in Bangladesh (namely : Gonoshahajjo Sangstha) also highlights this point: the number of supervisors is not decided based on norms for school-inspector ratio or school-teacher ratio, but on the performance of the students. The basic objective of these approaches is to create a sense of shared responsibility between authorities internal and external to the school, paving the way for integrating control and support functions of supervision and thus solving what is one of the main dilemmas in supervision.

This text is taken from G. Carron, A.De Grauwe and R. Govinda (1998) *Supervision Services in Asia : A Comparative Analysis,* vol.1, IIEP, Paris.

The Supervision Strategy in NFPE of BRAC

Background

Bangladesh is a developing country. It has one of the highest illiteracy rates in the world, it being 43.3% for the population aged seven years and above. Since Bangladesh is also one of the poorest countries in the world, the most basic and cost-effective way of tackling poverty is needed. BRAC (Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee) aims to eradicate poverty and empower the poor by implementing programmes that are operated through RDP (Rural Development Programme), NFPE (Non-Formal Primary Education), HDP (Health and Population Division), Administrative, Technical Support Service, and Revenue Generating Enterprises. BRAC, through its NFPE programme, has been providing primary education to rural children since 1985. Today, after almost 13 years, the number of schools has increased to more than 34,000 and students to 1.2 million.

School Models

There are two basic school models in BRAC : the NFPE model for children between 8-10 years of age and the Basic Education of Older Children (BEOC) for children between the age of 11-14 years. The NFPE curriculum consists of lessons in Bengali, Mathematics, Social Studies; the English Language is taught from the second year, and the Religious Education from the third year of the school. The curriculum is also designed relevant to rural life.

Supervision Strategy at Different Levels

The supervision strategy that BRAC follows right from the beginning is support-oriented. Although the overall responsibility for the programme rests with the Executive Director, NFPE is responsible for developing programme policies from conceptualization and experimentation through implementation. The Regional Manager (RM) in field level management hierarchy is in charge of 7-8 areas. Then come the Area Managers (AM) who are also stationed in the field and have several years of experience in BRAC. An Area Manager has 500-700 schools under his/her jurisdiction. A Team Incharge (TI) is responsible for 80-100 schools and reports to the Area Manager. The Programme Organizers (PO) are the first line supervisors of the teachers and the schools. They may not have much experience in BRAC, but they receive training in effective supervision and also attend some other trainings. A PO looks after an average of 16 schools. The main responsibility of a PO is to visit schools, improve the quality of the schools, arrange parent meetings and select teachers. Each PO has to visit allotted schools at least twice a week.

Major Areas of Supervision

The major supervision areas are basically Learners' performance evaluation and teachers' activity evaluation. All POs make an action plan for the next 6 days for the schools he/she is responsible for, so that he/she can visit allotted schools at least twice a week and also conduct parent's meetings in each school once in every month. A PO evaluates a learner's progress according to the advancement of their studies. He/she notices the responsibilities a teacher is supposed to do in order to run a school effectively. The checklist for this supervision is based on the standard of the schoolroom, the performance of teachers and students. When a PO identifies a problem and is unable to solve it, then he/she brings the matter to the notice of the Area Manager or Team Incharge and it is demonstrated by the Area Manager or Team Incharge.

Interaction with Community

The interaction that takes place with the community is through SMC and parent meeting and also through community participation. Parent and community participation play a critical part in programme design and form an important feature of all BRAC schools. Each school has a School Management Committee (SMC) made up of three representations of parents, a community leader and a teacher, who together are responsible for the smooth running of the school. The community assists with the survey regarding school establishment. It helps to accumulate information about

the children, who are willing to go to school. Moreover, the community takes active part to encourage parents to send their children to school. The community is always prepared to help out with any kind of problems that a BRAC school might face.

Staff Development

There are different ways of developing a staff. At the very beginning after a PO/PA is recruited, he/she is given a 3-day preservice training. Within one and half months of service, he/she gets 15 days' teachers' basic training. Here a PO is sent to the field with a senior experienced PO to see the schools and learn about supervision of schools. A PO also goes through some other trainings like, in-service training and OMC, training for trainers, refreshers training, etc. where he/she gets to know about curriculum management and operation of schools.

A Manager, (Quality Control) is responsible to the Director. He supervises the Material Development Unit (MDU) as well as the Training, and coordinates the work of Master Trainers and Resource Teachers. Quality Managers are responsible for staff development related to pedagogy.

Monitoring Unit

As a programme expands, continual assessment and monitoring of quality is necessary. The 18 NFPE monitoring members carry out inspection to look into students'/teachers' attendance, school infrastructure, classroom discipline, academic achievement of learners, students participation, and evaluation of the teacher. They are also responsible for monitoring the effect of any changes that are introduced, whether in curriculum or in other aspects of school activities.

Research Education

The Research and Evaluation Division (RED) has the responsibility for the dissemination of knowledge and needs for the entire organization. Aside from monitoring and evaluation studies on schools' outcomes of these studies can help to shape a programme. These surely provide a basis for making and planning of next steps.

Shahidul Hasan
BRAC
Dhaka, Bangladesh

Issues in School Supervision System in Nepal

Introduction

Although the supervision concept has undergone several changes since 1951 to make it more as resource service to the teachers by providing professional and technical consultation, there seems to be still a wide gap between the conceptual understanding and actual practice. In conception, supervision is a support system for instructional improvement and professional development, but in practice it has become of a more routine work of checking the regularity of teachers and other school activities.

Besides such regular routine work, the supervisor's involvement in the schools is very limited. Instead, he is drawn more into the administration of the District Education Office. It seems the support aspect and the

monitoring and evaluation aspects of supervision are incompatible for a single person and that in a composite situation, the idea of inspection for monitoring and evaluation seems to weigh more in practice than the other aspect.

The roles and responsibilities of supervisors as stipulated by the regulations include almost every aspect of school education: training, provision of resources and demonstration of model class, monitoring and evaluation of the teachers in the class and outside the class, assessment of the school situation, facilitation in the school development, etc. Examination supervision, recruitment and employment of teachers, curriculum development is also explicitly or tacitly brought in the role of supervisors. By encompassing all that is conceivable, there is confusion in the role of supervisors.

The supervisors would be overloaded beyond their personal capacity if all the stipulated roles and responsibilities were to be undertaken; confusion on the other hand contributed to lack of responsibility and apathy.

The other major problem created by this is the role-conflict of the supervisors: the control and situation appraisal tasks and the development and support functions put most of the supervisors in a dilemma. The supervisors tend to stick to the first one as in the case of the second, there is little they could do. They can only make recommendations. This also applies in the case of their monitoring aspect. In the present situation such recommendations are not very effective. Consequently, supervisors' jobs have become more a ritual — with less promotional activities unless there is a serious problem in the school functioning.

In totality, issues could be analyzed in the following five categories:

Issue of Perception

The problem of early school inspector system was that it was more in the nature of political policing than of educational supervision. It seems, that in the past supervision as the concept of enforcing centralised authority upon the schools was more dominant than facilitation and support.

As the supervision is mainly done by the supervisors of DEOs and they are responsible for teacher recruitment and promotion, there is an element of employer-employee relationship between the supervisor and the supervised. In other words, the supervision function is more of monitoring and inspection. Moreover, there is also an element of trainer and trainee relationship between the government supervisors and the teachers.

This has brought about the issues related to supervisor-school relationship and of intent and ideology differences in the concept of school supervision as practised in Nepal. This could be one of the reasons why the government grant-aided schools are constrained to toe the bureaucratic lines instead of trying to achieve better operation of schools with their own entrepreneurship in management and innovative work in curriculum and instruction. It seems there has been a lack of clarity in conceptualizing the school supervision system and its implementation pattern in the context of Nepalese schools.

Issues of Recruitment

The issue of the school supervision during the implementation of NESP was that most of the supervisors were freshly recruited; they lacked experience in teaching, school administration, and supervisory skills. Consequently, in many cases supervisors were not able to discharge their duties competently and with confidence. In the schools where there were experienced and qualified teachers, most supervisors failed to deal with the school situation tactfully. Some of these problems of school supervision still persist ridden as they are with many issues and technical difficulties that cannot be resolved overnight.

Although the problem is well understood but the ad-hoc recruitment still continues. Political instability in the country and poor socio-economic condition are often blamed for this problem.

Issue of Logistic Support

The main issue of supervision pertains to the lack of effective logistic support to the supervisors. Schools to supervisor's ratio is generally erratic and is considered high in all districts of the country. Mountain and hills constitute about 68% of Nepal where, very often, the only means to reach the schools is by walking, no motorable roads. Food and accommodation are very often a problem in most rural villages.

Issue of Monitoring of the Supervision System

Another major problem of supervision pertains to the lack of motivation in the form of recognition of personal initiatives and hard work. Very often the supervision work is taken as routine work without much implication. Lack of co-ordination between different authorities involved in supervision and support system is highly visible.

Lack of proper monitoring of the activities of supervisors is often pointed out by the community people and school staff. On the other hand, supervisors feel that they do not have authority to bring substantial change.

Issue of Training

Although there were some provisions for in-service training made by MOE, these were highly inadequate. Inappropriate training has often perpetuated the perceptual problems of supervision. Recently, NCED has revised the training curriculum and started the regular

training programme of supervisors. Because of the lack of training and support idea of teacher support never came into functional conception. The supervision environment was guided more by the need to control the teachers and discipline them as perceived by the educational governance. The perception was too narrow and came as a quick-fix.

Future Directions

It is obvious from the above discussions on the problems and the issues of educational management in Nepal that they are rather complex. The crucial aspect with policy formulation that still remains largely un-addressed pertains to effective implementation of specific measures for addressing the ever persisting problems of policy implementation. What is missing in most of the policy perceptions and their implementation is the dynamism that could address the emerging changed contexts of the initial policy implementations.

Very recently, some broad steps have been taken to get into details of the educational development needs and to draw future directions for the development of all levels of education: sub-sector analysis of BPEP has been prepared to generate future directions for basic and primary education development. In the same way, perspective plan for secondary education has also been developed recently.

The future development in education will enhance quality education by improving the mode of programme implementation, supervision, monitoring and evaluation. Further improvement of education will be based on impact analysis of the current programmes. The concept of community participation and contribution to education will be promoted in order to foster people's responsible participation to improve quality of and finance in education. Private sector investment will be further encouraged.

The other major aspects of the future direction in education that the country has considered include the following:

- Extension of BPEP for at least five more years. The focus of this extension will be on the relevance, quality, efficiency and access regarding improvements in basic and primary education. A major preparation has been undertaken to implement BPEP by taking into account the pros and cons of the first phase.

- Development of early childhood education to a greater extent, through community partnership — mobilisation to take initiatives for resources as well as for management.

Recommendations

It is to be noted here that the articulation of the problems and issues and designing good policy guidelines is not as much a problem as the implementation aspect. In this context and on the basis of the above analysis of the education sector, a list of recommendations is presented below:

Policy and Monitoring

- Policies should be formulated to cover wider spectrum of the contextual requirements. However, focus should be laid on specific issues and problems so that a concrete programme could be developed to remove the problem at once.

- Narrowing down the gaps in access to and participation in basic education, (both formal and nonformal) is essential in terms of gender disparities, rural-urban disparities and the disparities in educational opportunities between the advantaged and the disadvantaged social, cultural and language groups. In this connection, there should be specific supporting programmes for the parents of the disadvantaged children to meet their basic needs. Guidance, counseling, income generating training/activities and nonformal education should be given to the parents.

- The policy of decentralisation should focus on development of facilitating environment for participation at the community level. Analysis of the nature of the problem locally and nationally is an important aspect in this regard.

- The performance as well as the efficiency levels of all the public institutions, from pre-primary to tertiary levels, should be monitored by appropriate agencies and mechanisms, indicators and indices should be made available to the general public. Grants-in-aid and public resource allocations to educational institutions should be tied in with performance, not with the mere number of students or teachers.

Financial Aspect

- Existing financing strategies should be modified, especially in terms of developing an effective collaboration with other partners — communities, users and donors. Strengthening this collaboration will require due emphasis on people's participation in planning, curriculum development, management and financing activities of educational institutions.

- Public resources should be invested in the educationally backward districts to strike a regional balance and increase access as well as participation in basic education.

H.R. Bajracharya
B.L. Shrestha
B.M. Dhakal
CERID, Kathmandu
Nepal

Institutional Evaluation System for Primary and Secondary Schools in Korea

The Context

Prior to 1996, primary and secondary schools evaluated themselves on the basis of a self-evaluation system. However, such a system did not lead to improvements in school management and was not endorsed by school evaluation experts.

Since 1996, however, institutional school evaluation has become an important tool for finding out which schools are successfully carrying out their educational responsibilities, meeting the requirements of the school curriculum, and achieving educational standards. In spite of its short, two-year history, school evaluation is regarded as an important supervisory activity at the national and regional level.

There are two systems and levels of school evaluation operating in Korea. One system is administered by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and targets the regional Offices of Education (OEs), while the other is run by the regional Offices of Education themselves and applies directly to individual schools.

Every year, the Ministry of Education evaluates the 16 regional Offices of Education using criteria set by the MOE. Areas of evaluation include educational innovation, school supervisory activities, and financial management. As part of these evaluations, the MOE also visits some primary and secondary schools and the subsequent school evaluations are used to judge the operations of the respective OE. Those OEs which attain a high ranking on the basis of the evaluation receive certain financial incentives from the MOE.

More direct forms of school evaluation are conducted by the regional Offices of Education. The OEs evaluate primary and secondary schools within their respective regions according to their own standards. Through consultation with experts, the OEs develop their own evaluation modules, including areas of evaluation and criteria. In general, most OEs evaluate areas' such as school objectives and plans, curriculum operation, personnel management (e.g. teachers and administrative staff), general school management, and school achievement. The following steps are taken during the evaluation process: (1) preparation step, (2) self-evaluation step, (3) field survey step, (4) comprehensive evaluation step, and (5) feed-back step. However, few incentives are offered to the schools by the OEs after the evaluations are complete.

Problems

1) The research and development (R&D) behind school evaluation is insufficient. Evaluations of primary and secondary schools are undertaken without sufficient research and development in the field and this leads towards bureaucratization. In short, the evaluation areas and criteria are mainly selected on the basis of clerical convenience and opinion, rather than educational effectiveness and efficiency. Moreover, there is little consensus about what 'good' or 'quality' schools are.

2) Schools have to spend a lot of time when preparing for evaluations and they are required by the evaluation team to prepare many documents within a short period of time. Teachers consider such preparatory activities as being sundry duties and it leads to teacher's complaints.

3) Curriculum specialists, teachers, parents and managerial specialists are not fully active in the evaluation process. Consequently, the needs of the consumer are not being fully rejected in the evaluations.

4) The duration for evaluation in each school is very short. After each school prepares the pre-evaluation documentation, the evaluation team visits each primary and secondary school for only 3 or 4 hours in order to confirm the pre-evaluation documentation.

5) There is a lack of fairness and objectivity in the evaluations. Each evaluation team consists of only 4 or 5 members. These numbers are not suitable for evaluating the diverse aspects of schools and their operations. Moreover, due to lack of a proper reference, these evaluations are mainly based on subjective judgements or opinions.

6) The final evaluation results are not open to the public, which could be a important method for stimulating follow-up educational activities in schools. In addition, a follow-up management system is not established for the improvement of school evaluations.

Prospects and Recommendations

The new schools evaluation system has yet to be fully evaluated and there is considerable disagreement about the evaluation areas, criterion and the process, etc. However, it is clear that schools are attempting to upgrade their operations, including areas like organizational effectiveness. Previously, most attention was given to academic achievement but now evaluations are seen as being essential for raising educational accountability and competitiveness.

Similarly, the OEs consider school evaluations to be an important mechanism for increasing their accountability in school management.

The following recommendations are made for the improvement of institutional evaluation in Korea.

1) A long-term system for research and development (R&D) in evaluation criteria and a continuous monitoring system for the school evaluation system should be established.

2) Pre-service and in-service training for principals, teachers and supervisors should be strengthened in preparation for school evaluations.

3) Teachers and supervisors must adopt a positive and active attitude, rather than a negative and passive attitude, about school evaluations.

4) The intended outcomes and utilization schemes for school evaluations and their findings must be clearly defined. School evaluation has to start with the goal of improving school management and expanding the utilization of the evaluations.

5) An appropriate level of financial support for school evaluation should be secured and greater emphasis should be given to administrative preparedness.

Yu Hyun-Sook
KEDI, Seoul,
Korea

For Editorial correspondence please contact:

The Editor
ANTRIEP Newsletter
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
(NIEPA)
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110 016 , India
Fax (91 11) 26853041, 26865180
E-mail: niepa@del2.vsnl.net.in
niepa@hotmail.com

Reflections on School Autonomy

Introduction

The management of the educational system has been a major focus of reform processes in most of the countries in the recent past. A recurring trend in all these reform efforts is a move towards greater decentralization of educational management. The concept of 'school autonomy' as put forth in the recent past in many countries is essentially located in this larger discourse on decentralization. Autonomy to the school does not mean that the school would become a fully self-administering unit completely free from external authority and influence. Autonomy implies deciding the 'locus of control' with respect to specific roles and functions of different units of administration. Thus, there is no scope for an absolutely autonomous school. An attempt is made in the following paragraphs to review the global scenario with respect to policy and practice of 'school autonomy', and highlight the issues involved in applying these policies and practices to the school systems in Asia.

Understanding the Concept of School Autonomy

A review of literature on school autonomy reveals that the concept and its operational manifestation has come to be referred to in a variety of ways such as school site-based management, school-based management, and school self-management. It may also be noted that the concept of 'school autonomy' is not new. It has been there in educational literature at least for the last three decades. It has only recently, however, become the centrepiece of the movement for reform of school management. School autonomy has been promoted in different countries with different connotations and with varying rationale.

Following are some of the basic factors that characterize the meaning and rationale adopted in promoting school autonomy. (a) School autonomy as part of the decentralization process; (b) School autonomy as a value or only as a means to an end increased efficiency and accountability; (c) School autonomy and reduction of state control; (d) Freedom to parents for school choice; (e) Forms of autonomy: Who decides what and at which level; and (f) Individual school as the primary unit of improvement

Critical Issues in Implementing School Autonomy

A review of the experiences of initiating school autonomy in different countries highlight some of the following issues. (i) School autonomy and community participation; (ii) Changing role of head teachers; (iii) Critical role of 'school improvement plans'; (iv) Changing framework for Supervision in the context of School Autonomy (v) School autonomy and professional capacity building; (vi) School autonomy and improved efficiency of school functioning : Does it improve? (vii) Autonomy and innovativeness : Are autonomous schools more innovative? (viii) School autonomy and the question of equity : Will this not be negatively affected? (ix) Autonomy in the context of small schools.

Some Lessons to Note

Increased decentralization of educational management, though with different variations, is the direction in which almost all countries are currently moving. Within this broader framework, reforms leading to school based management or school autonomy are taking concrete shape in many countries. Even though critical analysis of empirical experiences in implementing school autonomy are not abundant, the literature does point out to some lessons in this regard.

1   There is no clear cut basis for determining the optimal locus of decision making in education. Nor is it possible to view individual schools as totally

independent organizational units; they will continue to be part of a larger public education system. In fact, intermediate levels of decision making may have to be retained between the state and the school but with new role definitions. This is particularly relevant to the hierarchically structured education systems operating in many Asian countries.

2   Merely changing the rules and regulations by transferring power and authority to the school management bodies will not suffice. School autonomy demands a changed mind-set among all concerned. This is not easy to achieve in places where people have been nurtured to act only on the dictates of higher authorities. Developing new habits of self-determination is a slow and arduous process which has to be tackled with adequate provisions for capacity building and orientation.

3   It is necessary to examine the question of linking school autonomy with local community control within the local political and developmental context. While school governing council or village education committee can become the apex body for for decision making with respect to general management issues, questions of academic and professional management has to be independently dealt with.

4   School autonomy demands a radical transformation of the organizational culture of the public education management system. Greater involvement of the local community demands that the higher authorities agree to give up certain powers hitherto enjoyed. Also, school control by local stakeholders brings greater pressure on the school authorities to promote transparency and shared perspective with parents. Accountability to local masters is not something many school authorities are familiar with.

5   Public accountability at the system level cannot be forgotten by giving greater autonomy to the school. Depending on the specific systemic parameters, each country will have to work out indicators of assessing school performance. This has to be done in such a way that while the state and national decision makers receive meaningful feedback on the functioning of the school system, it does not tend to destroy the variety and identity of the individual schools.

6   It is inevitable that efforts towards quality improvement in education focus more on building on the strengths of individual schools rather than finding uniform cross-country solutions. In this context, 'school improvement planning' has emerged as an effective tool for setting a vision for development of each school.

7   School based management requires a new framework of personnel selection and management. The current practice of appointing teachers to the system and not to an individual school that is prevalent in many countries needs reconsideration. Also, it is necessary to evolve new framework for teacher career prospects under the framework of school based management

8   Often school autonomy is projected as a means reducing government control. It is difficult in many countries to expect that government control will significantly come down. In such contexts, school autonomy measures have to be designed innovatively to accommodate freedom for action at the school and community levels within the framework of a state managed system.

R. Govinda
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
New Delhi, India

Move Towards School Autonomy in Sri Lanka

Introduction

Sri Lanka's education system is unique in its efforts to introduce new innovations. In 1945 a free education scheme from the kindergarten to the university was introduced. This was followed by the adoption of mother tongue as the medium of instruction. In the 1940s a special category of schools, named as Central Schools' were established in distant cities to enable deserving students from the villages to receive an equally better education as the privileged. In the late 1950s and 1960s, science teaching was extended to secondary grades of better developed schools in the rural areas which was until then limited exclusively to a few privileged urban schools. In early 1960s practically all private schools were taken under the state control. To move away from the academic curriculum, island-wide reforms were introduced in 1972. Life skills were inducted in 1984 and continuous assessment in 1986. The Cluster School System was introduced in 1981 and School Development Boards in 1993. The country also introduced several welfare measures at regular intervals, some of which are : scholarships to children from lower income families, free text books to all, free mid-day meals to all, a free uniform to all once a year and subsidised bus fares. Though some of the innovations did not last long, the efforts have to be admired.

Empowering Schools

Even in educational administration, as far back as 1979, the country had realised that schools can do better if not imprisoned in a uniform set of national standards. The Report of the Education Reforms Committee - 1979, "Towards Relevance in Education", has emphasized the need to devolve not only responsibility but also authority to the school level and strongly stressed the need to let principals exercise discretion.

In the light of the 1979 recommendations, "Education Proposals for Reform (1981)", widely known as the Whitepaper proposals, recommended that school clusters be introduced in the country. A group of schools within a defined geographical area were made a cluster for better organization, management and development. The cluster was a full-fledged administrative unit, having a leader of its own (principal of the core- school) with delegated powers to administer the unit for the achievement of certain identified goals.

The next occasion where recommendations were made for substantive delegation of power to the principals was announced in 1984. The Report on Management Reforms in the Ministry of Education (1984) very strongly viewed principals as first-line managers of the MEHE and recommended that adequate authority in personnel and financial management is delegated to them. The reforms suggested that the principals be held accountable for educational development activities of the schools.

Though the role of the principal was to be transformed from that of a representative of a government department to that of a dynamic leader, it did not happen in most schools. The principals continued the way they were used to. All Committees recommended measures towards a faster movement towards school autonomy.

The Recent Reforms in School Management

The country has taken noteworthy steps towards decentralization of educational administration with a view to upgrading operational efficiency. The process of decentralization has been gradual, and mainly concerned with establishing layers between the central ministry and the school with the view to bringing management closer to the school. Though the geographical units of administration have shifted from the central to the middle levels, the pattern in which schools function have almost remained unchanged.

The Reforms in General Education (1997) stress the need to adopt School-Based Management to make schools functioning more effective. The Reforms also suggest that equitable allocation of resources should be assured

by giving a grant to the schools based on the unit costs. In order to alleviate disparities in the allocation of resources, a grant would be calculated as per-student rate. The transfers of teachers will be effected only at the beginning of the academic year and the concurrence of the principal of the school should be obtained before the transfer letters are issued.

The SBM Movement in Sri Lanka

The emergence of SBM in Sri Lanka has to be viewed, firstly, within the overall package of reforms that are introduced in the Sri Lankan education system; secondly within the broader context of socio-economic and political changes that are taking place at the national level; and thirdly within the international SBM movement. Sri Lanka is one of the first countries in the Asian region to introduce SBM. It is also one of the first developing countries that has braved herself to do so.

Efficiency and productivity have become over-riding priorities for Sri Lankan institutions and schools are no exception. Restructuring the education system in order to improve public spending by monitoring outputs against inputs has become the need of the day. To improve the quality of education it is necessary to move from the 'classroom teaching level' to 'school-organization level'. It is only then that the schools may be able to engage in 'school-based curriculum development', 'school-based staff development', 'school-based student counseling', 'in-school supervision', and 'in-school performance appraisal', etc.

The need for School-Based Management in Sri Lanka springs form several factors:

1 The individual school is submerged in an all-island set of general macro programmes. The principal and the staff do not seem to make a conscious effort to diagnose their organization and initiate essential organizational changes. In spite of the decentralization measures taken, most schools yet blindly follow the script sent from the center. The principal yet remains a representative of the zonal or divisional office. There is the need to get the school to design and develop its long-term and short-term plans to achieve school objectives and deliver them.

2 Most schools have not identified the reservoir of potential energy, both human and physical, and hence these resources go unutilized. Schools do not attempt to solve their problems, develop infrastructure or generate resources. These are passed on to the hierarchy. Schools need to take more autonomy to make decisions on the generation, allocation and utilization of resources.

3 The country has a predominant rural sector. The varied climatic conditions and diverse geographical variations enrich it. This provides diverse employment opportunities and in addition to the plantation settlements there is a vast fishing sector. Lack of curricula diversification at local level in the Junior Secondary or Senior Secondary levels has created a widening mismatch between education and the world of work. There is the need to ensure academic independence for the school from minor regulatory bodies.

4 There is enough research evidence to show that school improvement is related with the community factor. The in-school staff is often planted from outside and the support and encouragement of the parents and community leaders motivate the in-school staff and in fact most initiatives need to come from the community. SBM guarantee the involvement of the community in school planning and in resource management.

5 In Sri Lanka during the last two decades, both long-term and short-term teacher courses and training programmes are mushrooming. But this has only a marginal impact on school development. The programmes focus more on individual teacher's development than on school development. Under SBM each school will have a budget for staff development and it will be possible to establish congruence between staff training and school needs.

The following steps have been completed in order to introduce SBM to a group of selected schools :

1 Running of several workshops on the theme SBM.

2 Development of a Handbook for Principals on SBM.

3 Development of a Training Manual for training of Principals for SBM.

4 Training of Provincial Trainers to train Principals for SBM.

5 Initiate work on the revision of circulars to facilitate

SBM.

6   To examine the pre-conditions necessary for successful implementation of SBM.

In addition, the following steps which will facilitate SBM, will also be made operational :

1   Performance of every teacher will be appraised at school level annually.

2   Preparation towards the reorganization of schools on a two-tier basis, namely Junior Schools having classes from Grade 1 to 9, and Senior Schools having classes from Grade 10 to 13.

The main objective of SBM is to improve the performance of schools. It is based on the underlying assumption that autonomous schools offer a clear vision for the future and are prepared to release the energies of their staff by empowering them to take professional responsibility for raising educational standards. At a workshop held in the NIE (July 1997) on SBM, the participants identified several weaknesses in the present Sri Lankan education system. These are :

•   The closed nature of the system which made it unresponsive to local needs;

•   Administrative and management procedures which were outdated;

•   Emphasis on schools complying with minor administrative matters whilst not developing strategies to improve the quality of learning and pupil performance;

•   An inability to accept, or to encourage, innovation in curriculum practice;

•   Inefficient use of manpower throughout the education system which results due to under utilization of professional expertise at all levels;

•   Poor teaching quality due to lack of relevant training and development opportunities being available to the individual teacher.

The participants endorsed that the introduction of School-Based Management would offer a practical solution to many of the presumed shortcomings in the existing education system. They emphasized the need to grant autonomy to schools in such areas as whole-school development planning, increased expenditure approval, minor staffing matters, etc. This would release considerable professional potential of the principal and staff. The external layers that over-ride the authority of the principals rather than complement their professional educational work, need to be phased out. Schools must be encouraged to adopt staff appraisal systems.

Conclusion

Education is a social process. SBM as a reform has to accompany other reforms as well. SBM is not an end in itself but a means to reach greater human aspirations and achievements, which will only be possible with a change in our values and attitudes. Some elements in the Sri Lankan education system are inherently conservative and often resist change. On the other hand education is a subject on which most people tend to voice strong opinions, but education being a very amorphous subject, these opinions are often vague and unrealistic.

The implementation of SBM in Sri Lanka will not be achieved without some difficulty. There will be significant changes in both role and orientation at every level of the existing education system.

Wilfred J. Perera
National Institute of Education
Colombo, Sri Lanka

New Member Institution
Institute Aminuddin Baki
A Profile

Background

Institute Aminuddin Baki (IAB), formerly known as the Ministry of Education Staff Training Institute (MEST), was established in 1979 to improve the planning, implementation and management capabilities of Educational Managers and other education and professional staff in Malaysia. The Institute grew quickly to become the National Institute of Educational Management and Leadership (NIEML) in 1985 when it moved into its own campus which was constructed on a 121 acre-site on Genting Highlands. In 1988, the Minister of Education renamed the institution as Institute Aminuddin Baki (IAB) in honor of Mr. Aminuddin Baki, Malaysia's first Chief Education Advisor, which is equivalent to the present day Director General of Education.

The functions of IAB includes, Training, Research, Consultancy, Public and Think Tank.

Mission

The Mission of the Institute is to strengthen the Human Resource Capacity of the nation. To achieve the mission the following objectives are slated:

Objectives

a) To enhance management skills of Educational Managers in the country.

b) To disseminate knowledge on Educational Management to our clients through direct learning, outreach programs and distance learning, publications and through the electronic media.

c) To undertake research work in management so as to enhance our understanding of Educational Management phenomena, and to bring such knowledge to bear on our training programmes, and also to disseminate such understanding locally and internationally.

d) To contribute to the growing corpus of useful and universally acceptable principals in Educational Management, focusing on the indigenous perspective of the discipline which can effectively help meet challenges in the field.

e) To provide consultancy services to educational organizations in the area of organizational development (OD) and human resource development (HRD).

f) To publish and disseminate information on relevant information on education.

g) To function as a "think tank" for the Ministry of Education in articulating issues, facilitating innovations and influencing policy formulation.

Activities

IAB's clientele includes all officers of the Education Ministry who have a managerial role. These are officers from the various divisions of the Ministry, the State Education Departments, District Education Offices, Teachers' Training Colleges and schools. The primary focus of IAB's training programmes is for school principals, headmasters and their senior assistants. Nearly 6,000 educational functionaries of the country participate in the training programmes every year.

IAB also runs courses for international clientele based on requests from the respective organizations.

International Programmes

IAB has been conducting courses for participants from the ASEAN countries as well as the Pacific Islands. School Principals from the Republic of Maldives, Sri Lanka, Brunel Darussalam and Thailand have already attended IAB's training courses. The Institute has organised joint programmes with UNDP, IIEP, The World Bank, INNOTECH, SEA PREAMS etc.

The IAB conducts courses in Educational Research, the Management of Training, Creativity in Management, Policy Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation, Community Education, Instructional Supervision, Educational Planning, Programme Evaluation, Testing and Measurement, Pedagogical Management, Computers for Management, Advanced Consultancy and Project Management, Financial and Administrative Management, and Human Resource Management.

In the area of consultancy, IAB officers, including the Director himself, have been invited on several occasions to provide input in various educational projects at the international level, including those in Botswana, The Philippines, Cambodia, South Africa and Qatar. At the national level, IAB provides consultancy services to government agencies within and outside the Ministry of Education as well as to private sector agencies.

IAB presently operates on a main campus in Genting Highlands in the State of Pahang and a branch campus in the northern State of Kedah. The main campus has 55 professional (academic) staff members and 92 support staff while the northern campus has 16 professional and 15 support staff members. Academic staff members are degree holders including Bachelor's, Master's and Ph.D. levels in various disciplines. The whole organization of IAB is headed by a Director supported by a Deputy Director and nine Heads of Department. The northern campus is headed by a Principal who is also under the Director of IAB. The Principal of the northern campus is assisted by three Heads of Department.

Contact *Address :*
Institute Aminuddin Baki
(National Institute of Educational Management)
Ministry of Education, Malaysia
Sri Layang, 69000 Genting Highlands
Pahang Darul Makmur, Malaysia.
Fax No. 60-3-210 3344
Tel.No. 60-3-210 2422

IIEP Publication on Supervision Services in Asia

G. Carron, A. De Grauwe and R. Govinda; *Supervision Services in Asia : A Comparative Analysis, Volume I*, Paris, UNESCO, IIEP, 1998.

This publication reports on the results of a research project, which was undertaken in five Asian countries: Bangladesh, the Republic of Korea, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the State of Uttar Pradesh in India in a co-operation between six ANTRIEP member institutions:

* The National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM) in Bangladesh,

* The Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI)

* The Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID) in Nepal

* The Department of Educational Planning and Management (DEMD) within the National Institute of Education (NIE) in Sri Lanka

* The State Institute for Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT) in Uttar Pradesh, and

* The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris.

The five national institutions undertook a diagnosis of the supervision and support system in their country. The edited texts of these diagnoses have been published in **Supervision Services in Asia. Volume II: National Diagnoses**. Paris, UNESCO, IIEP, 1998. Copies of the volumes are available from IIEP, Paris,