

NEWSLETTER

# ANTRIEP

VOL. 5 NO. 1, January - June 2000

Bi-annual

## Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads

As informed to our readers through the previous issue of the Newsletter, the next ANTRIEP seminar will be held at the Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), Shanghai, China from 19-21 September 2000. As in the past, this will be followed by the Network meeting on the next day (22 September).

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

***Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads*** 1

***Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads at Basic Education Level in Indonesia*** 3

***Challenges in Capacity Building Among the School Heads in Nepal*** 6

***New Tasks for School Principals in Korea*** 10

***Role and Functions of School Heads and Challenges for Their Capacity Building in India*** 12

***Better School Management: The Role of the Headteacher*** 16

***News from Member Institutions*** 19

***ANTRIEP Member Institutions*** 20

The theme selected for this year's seminar is "Better School Management: The Role of the Headteacher". A write-up on the seminar is included in this issue of the Newsletter. (see page no. 16).

We are happy to inform all the readers that the national diagnostic studies on "role and status of headteachers" initiated as part of the first phase of the collaborative research project of the ANTRIEP on "Improving School Management in Asian Countries: Capacity Building of Headteachers" are now being carried out by our member institutions. The findings of these diagnostic studies will be valuable input to the seminar and will be presented at the seminar.

We have received encouraging response to the seminar from our member institutions, national governments, international and bilateral agencies and many individual experts. We hope that this, like the previous seminars, will be an important event in strengthening the network activities. The past experience has shown that the Network seminars provide a good opportunity for extending and establishing linkages with agencies and institutions beyond the member institutions. One such rewarding experience of Victoria, Australia is presented in this issue (see the box) of the Newsletter.

As announced, the theme for this issue of the Newsletter is "Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads." We had requested the member institutions to contribute articles on the theme based on the existing status and practices in respective countries. The responses have been positive and prompt. We have received articles

from KEDI (Korea), CERID (Nepal), and Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Indonesia) and NIEPA (India).

The paper from KEDI, Korea presents the changing role and functions of the school heads in implementing decentralised and school based management practices. The diminishing power and authority on the one hand and increased expectation and responsibilities on the other make the role of school head very challenging. The short pre-service training before selected as principals could not equip the principals to handle the complex and changing situation in the school management.

The paper on Nepal examines the role and responsibilities of headteachers. The paper raises some important issues related to recruitment policies and capacity building practices of headteachers. The paper highlights important problems related with training of headteachers like the duration, relevance of content and design of the present training programmes.

In Indonesia decentralisation of education focused more on school-based management, which implies capacity building of heads of schools as a priority. The recruitment of headteachers is based on ranking system. Though management training for the school heads is a part of quality improvement programme, it only covers headteachers in urban areas and Java Island. The challenges related to capacity building of headteachers include developing managerial skills to take decisions at school level.

The paper on India elaborates the different functions and responsibilities of heads of schools. It also presents the process of recruitment of heads of schools at different levels. The article comprehends various efforts and strategies adopted for their capacity building.

The papers indicate that in many countries, the recent reforms in education have focused on decentralisation particularly taking to the level of school in the form of school based management, school autonomy etc. for improving the school effectiveness. The power and authority of school heads have dwindled if not increased but the responsibilities and accountability of heads of schools have significantly increased. However, the norms of recruitment of school heads remained conventional. The analysis of role and functions of school heads indicate that they require several competencies in different areas of school management. The required competen-

cies vary for different levels and types of schools. In the absence of pre-induction training or in-service training the school heads are handicapped to cope with fast changing role. In most of the countries the capacity building programmes are limited and they have inherent problems related to duration, adequacy, relevance, frequency and coverage. One of the common problems across the countries is that the capacity building institutions themselves face the problems of lack of adequate and suitable staff, infrastructure facilities and budget provisions. The experiences of different countries reveal that in recent past importance is accorded for capacity building of school heads particularly under various educational projects

We continue to receive encouraging responses 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. Hope to see you all at Shanghai in September.

**Editor**

For Editorial correspondence please contact:

*The Editor*  
*ANTRIEP Newsletter*  
*National Institute of Educational*  
*Planning and Administration*  
*(NIEPA)*  
*17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg*  
*New Delhi- 110 016, India*  
*Fax: (91 11) 6853041, 6865180*  
*E-mail: ksujatha@vsnl.com*

# Challenges in Capacity Building of School Heads at Basic Education Level in Indonesia

## Background

Since the enactment of the Law No. 22 on decentralisation by the Government of Indonesia in 1999, the decentralisation of education has focused more on school-based management. This implies that empowerment of heads of schools as the first priority in the basic education sector. Currently, there are two major constraints which may have to be considered if the empowerment is to be intended to improve the managerial skills of the heads of schools. First, the long period of centralised planning and management practices has made the school heads to depend too much on the central government. The headteachers are, therefore, lacking initiatives and creativity as how to manage the schools. The second constraint relates to the current pattern of distribution of school heads across geographical regions and between the sub-sectors of the education sector. In 1998-99, total number of headteachers of primary and junior secondary schools in Indonesia was 166,565, out of which 87.48% were heads of primary schools and 12.52% that of junior secondary schools. These headteachers were distributed across 26 provinces, consisting of 12 thousand islands. Furthermore, in 1998-99, 2.89% of the total number of primary schools and 0.47% of the total number of junior secondary schools did not have headteachers. Similarly, 3.43% of public primary schools and 5.85% of private primary schools did not have headteachers. On the other hand, 100% of junior secondary schools in Indonesia had headteachers in 1998-99. In the private sector, 0.93% of junior secondary schools had no headteacher.

In this brief write-up, the attempt is to discuss the challenges of capacity building of heads of schools at basic education level. According to the Education Law No. 2 of 1989, the term 'basic education' in Indonesia refers to six years of primary schooling and three years of junior secondary schooling.

## Recruitment and Training

Public and private schools adopt different mechanisms for recruitment of headteachers. Given the autonomous status, the recruitment system in private schools is largely determined by the decisions of the management. Government intervention in the process of recruitment of headteachers of private schools is the least. However, more than 90% of headteachers in both public and private schools are recruited from among the existing teachers. On the other hand, the recruitment system in public schools is based on ranking system, i.e., on the basis of the years of work experience. In other words, the recruitment system of headteachers in these schools is based on general administration criterion. As per the general administration criterion, promotion of government officials is decided on the basis of years of job experience.

Lack of management skills among heads of primary and junior secondary schools is one of the critical problems of capacity building of these teachers. Yet, managerial skills may not always be considered as one of the criteria for selecting headteachers of public schools. Survey data from four provinces of Indonesia show that about 40.7% of the primary school heads, and 26.4% of the junior secondary school heads, for example, had not undergone any management training before they were recruited as school heads. This means that around one-third of all headteachers of primary and junior secondary schools had not undergone any management training at the time of their recruitment.

The management training for the school heads has always been a part of the quality improvement programme in Indonesia. The programme is funded from the development budget. The training of school heads include such areas as supervision and school management. Due to limited budget, the training can most likely reach only the heads of schools in the urban areas and in Java Is-

land. Provinces in Java Island are the most developed, and around 60% of population live in this island. The central government is also located in this island. In such a situation, the participation rate of the school heads from the east (i.e. Pupua, Maluku, East Nusa Tenggara) and central part (i.e. Central Sulawesi, South East Sulawesi) of Indonesia in the training programmes is relatively low compared to that of heads of schools from other provinces. In general, training programmes for the school heads need further improvement in terms of the frequency and duration of the programmes.

### **Supervision System**

Supervision system in Indonesia is still considered inadequate for two reasons. First, it is not conducted on a regular basis. This is especially true for schools located in rural areas. Secondly, even if the schools are supervised, it is most likely that the supervision activities emphasise on administrative aspects but not on school management aspects. As a consequence, both teachers and the school heads consider supervision not helpful enough in improving the effectiveness of school management and teaching-learning methods.

In addition, supervisors are still lacking professional competencies in such areas as school management due to lack of training and recruitment system of the supervisors. It is a common impression that the supervisor position is considered as “escape from retirement”, since majority of those applying for supervisors posts are administrators who are close to their retirement.

### **Characteristics of School Heads**

Survey Data in four provinces show that most of the headteachers are males. About 70% of the heads of schools at basic education level are males and only about 30% are females. These figures are similar to that of the survey conducted in 1993 by the Centre for Policy Research in 10 provinces of Indonesia.

So far as the educational status is concerned, majority of female and male headteachers have Strata 1 education level\*, while about 38% of them have diploma programmes. Although, there are still about 20% of headteachers having lower than higher education level, but their percentage has been decreasing since the Fifth Five Year Plan (1990/91 – 1994/95) as the government

policy encourages them to have at least higher education level. Although it is not required, yet some school heads also have completed graduate programmes (Strata 2). The opportunity to take Strata 2 programme is wide open for the headteachers and teachers, since many higher education institutions began to offer graduate programmes from early 1990s.

The average experience as the headteacher is 9.19 years among the male headteachers and 8.84 years that of female headteachers.

### **Management Practices**

Even today, the impact of centralisation in education management can still be seen in the practice of school management in Indonesia. The heads of schools tend to hesitate to articulate the curriculum decided by the central government in order to be suitable to the students in their schools. Likewise, the heads also hesitate to replace their teachers, who are, for example, not performing well, since the recruitment and promotion of teachers are decided by the central government.

In practice, the headteachers in primary schools work as one-man management. They have to help teachers in solving their problems, prepare school annual plans, and also maintain discipline among students. They perform all these duties themselves because they do not have vice-heads and administrative staff. This typically happens in public and private schools. This is not the case, however, in the junior secondary schools. The headteachers in these schools have administrative staff which manages school budget, prepares school annual plans, as well as recapitulate such data on student drop-outs, student absenteeism and other administrative matters. In large-size schools, some headteachers are most likely to have vice-heads whose tasks are to help the heads in supervising teaching-learning process and helping teachers, if they have problems in disciplining students or articulating curriculum.

---

\* 1. Strata 1 also called Sarjana degree equals to Bachelor level.

2. Strata 2 equals to Master level.

3. Diploma is a non-degree higher education programme.

Although the headteachers are not required to teach, in reality, they also teach. The headteachers take classes in schools where there is shortage of teachers or when teachers are absent. In primary schools in isolated areas, like in Central Kalimantan or Irian Jaya (Papua), there are cases where the headteachers have to teach one or even two classes every day.

So far as the job descriptions are concerned, there are no formal guidelines which the headteachers can refer to in managing their schools. But in early 80s, the Directorate of Primary Schools had developed Primary Education Quality Improvement Project (PEQUIP). One of the objectives of this project was to improve the management skills of the heads of teachers in primary schools. It included skills in management of school budget, management of teaching-learning process, management of educational facilities, and encouraging community participation. This project was piloted in some of the primary schools in ten provinces in Indonesia.

Based on the PEQUIP model, School Principals' Forum was established in each school cluster. Each cluster typically consists of one core-school and 10 to 12 member schools. The core-school serves as resource school to which member schools consult. The result of evaluations show that PEQUIP system could improve management skills of the school headteachers, yet there has not been signs from the Ministry of National Education that the PEQUIP system will be nationally adopted as model for empowering schools and improving the school headteachers' management skills.

The current economic crisis has adversely affected the education sector in Indonesia. The crisis in education is manifested in the decreasing of net purchasing power of parents which in turn has affected parents' financial support for their children's education, and the decreasing of the government's capacity to provide budget for its education system. This has even further worsened by the demands of the teachers and school headteachers for higher salary. The economic crisis and the shift towards more democratic political atmosphere are among factors, which encourage teachers and the school headteachers to stand up and demand for better quality of life. They have been unequally treated for about 30 years, i.e., during the New Order Regime.

The economic crisis is also accompanied by the demand for decentralisation in virtually all public sectors. In edu-

cation sector, decentralisation has temporarily been interpreted as a school-based management scheme. This then significantly affects the mode of the training programme for the headteachers. The training may not only focus on the improvement of their managerial skills, but also to train them to be more autonomous. The latter concept is certainly a new one. It, therefore, requires a reorientation of the school management strategy.

## References

Center for Policy Research (1993). *A Study of the Characteristics of School Managers and Management in Basic Education Level*. Jakarta: Office of Educational Research and Development, Ministry of National Education.

Center for Policy Research (forthcoming). *A Study of School Based Management at Basic Education Level: A survey in four provinces*. Jakarta: Office of Research and Development, Ministry of National Education.

Centre for Informatics (1999). *Primary and Junior Secondary Education Statistics 1998/99*. Jakarta: Office of Research and Development, Ministry of National Education.

*Bambang Indiriyanto  
Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research  
Jakarta, Indonesia*

# Challenges in Capacity Building Among the School Heads in Nepal

## Introduction

Improvement of the quality of school education has been one of the major concerns of all the national development plans and programmes in Nepal as the school inefficiency and ineffectiveness are the persistent issues. According to the Nepal's National Assessment of Education for All (MOE, 2000), the student repetition in Grade 1 and Grade 5 is about 42% and 21% respectively. The dropout rates in Grade 1 and Grade 5 are 23.1% and 15.1% respectively. Survival rate from Grade 1 to 5 is 44%. The coefficient of efficiency of Grade 5 stands at about 40%. The report on the national achievement of Grade 5 students shows that the national level mean score at Grade 5 in Mathematics is only 27%. In Nepali and Social Studies, the figures are 51.46% and 41.79% respectively.

Some of the issues and problems related to poor performance of schools are disproportionate teacher-pupil ratio, teachers and students absenteeism, lack of proper management of classroom hours and activities, mismatch between curriculum requirements and the classroom delivery mechanism, and misconception in timing and management of student evaluation and the methods of examinations. These problems obviously indicate the need for improving the school education system, especially school management. Towards this the need for enhancing the capacity of the headteachers becomes a priority.

The role of the headteacher is to implement the educational policy guidelines and programmes at the school level. The Education Regulation BS 2049 (AD1992) lists 30 different roles and responsibilities of a headteacher, covering almost all the aspects of management of a school.

## Responsibilities and Functions

The responsibilities are categorised into seven areas as:

1. *Personnel management*: The Ministry of Education and Sports sanctions the posts of the teachers at different levels. The Teacher Selection Committees at the Regional and District Levels recruit teachers on permanent

basis for secondary and primary levels respectively. However, if a school needs extra teachers and if it has the funds, the headteacher through the School Management Committee (SMC) can appoint the required teachers. Moreover, the non-teaching staff is also appointed by the SMC. The headteacher is solely responsible for the management and administration of these teachers and staff including designating duties and responsibilities to individuals.

The headteacher is also responsible for the evaluation of teachers in order to recommend to the District Education Officer (DEO) and the Managing Committee for transfer, promotion and rewards. The maximum punishment a headteacher can give is to withhold the salaries for up to one week.

2. *Curriculum management*: The headteachers have to implement the school curriculum developed by the Curriculum Development Centre. The headteacher prepares the operation and management plan of school schedule, as well as supervises and monitors teaching-learning and classroom activities. The headteacher makes provisions for students' admission, conducting examinations and certification.

The headteachers have to conduct teachers meetings at least once in every month to discuss about school functioning and to keep record. It is also their responsibility to foster co-operation of teachers, students and parents.

3. *Financial management*: Financial management, including resource mobilisation and record keeping of income/expenditure and their audit reports, is the responsibility of the headteachers. The headteachers are authorised to spend money within the limits of the approved budget. The bank accounts are operated on the joint signatures of the Chairperson of the SMC and the headteacher.

4. *Management of materials and resources:* The headteacher must prepare the budget for the upcoming academic session and obtain approval from the SMC. Education materials and other contingencies must be purchased according to the financial rules and within the limits of the approved budget. The headteacher and SMC are jointly responsible for the security of the school properties.

5. *Information management:* Records and files of all the important events in the school and other related information, including personal records of the teachers and staff, should be maintained by the headteacher and provide these to DEO, Supervisor and the Managing Committee if asked.

6. *General management.* The headteachers should call the meeting of the School Management Committee regularly in consultation with the Chairperson and they have to record the decisions and execute them. They should also organise parents day, school day, cultural programmes and extra curricular activities to inform the parents, community people and others concerned about the school activities.

7. *Teaching responsibility:* Keeping in view their management responsibilities, headteachers are required to take limited number of classes.

The functions listed above are quite exhaustive and demand both managerial skills and capacity of the headteacher to accomplish them. The question is that whether the headteachers effectively perform the expected functions as envisaged by Education Regulation. Does the anticipation from a headteacher tally with the current realities? These are some of the crucial questions that will be discussed further in the following sections. Prior to that it is important to look at the background of the headteachers.

### **Academic and Training Background**

Currently, there are 23,446 school headteachers (MOE, 1997), out of which 17,383 are primary school headteachers, 2,740 are lower secondary school headteachers and 3,169 secondary school headteachers. There are 153 higher secondary school headteachers. There is a lack of gender balance in the existing number of the female headteachers, their percentage being 20.4

at the primary level, 12.5 at the lower secondary level, 7.9 at the secondary level and 7.2 at the higher secondary level. This is also a simple reflection of the lower percentage of the female teachers in schools, e.g., at primary level the female teachers constitute only about 30%.

The minimum requirement for a headteacher at the primary level is School Leaving Certificate (SLC), at the lower secondary level it is Proficiency Certificate Level (PCL) or higher secondary graduates, at the secondary level it is the Bachelor's degree and at the higher secondary level it is the Masters degree. There is no pre-service training requirement.

Most of the headteachers have only the minimum qualifications required for teaching at the particular level of school. About 73% headteachers at the primary level, 69% headteachers at the lower secondary level, and 88% headteachers at the secondary level have just the required minimum academic qualifications to become the headteachers. At the higher secondary level 87.58% do not have even the minimum required academic qualifications. This is because of many schools being upgraded recently into higher secondary level and these schools could not find a new headteacher with the higher level of academic qualification.

### **Recruitment and Training**

At the primary school level, the District Education Office (DEO) recruits the headteachers. At the secondary level the Regional Education Directorate (RED) appoints the headteachers based on the recommendations of the DEOs. The headteachers are selected from among the school teachers. As per the Education Regulation 2049, the DEO with the recommendation of the District Teacher Selection Committee appoints one of the permanent teachers of the school as the headteacher. The criteria for recommendations include work experience, minimum qualification, additional qualification, training, and leadership quality. The DEO may seek the recommendations of the SMC in this respect.

The tenure of the headteachers is of five years that could be renewed at the end of each term. However, the headteacher could be removed by the DEO in case if he/she does not perform the duties and the responsibilities satisfactorily as a headteacher. The data shows that at the primary level most of the headteachers are found working in the post for at least five years or more rang-

ing up to 42 years. At primary level, the average tenure of the headteachers is 9.6 years. The average number of years as headteachers at lower secondary and secondary levels are 14.3 years and 7.4 years respectively. It shows that the headteachers are working for quite a long time with only minimum academic qualifications.

Considering that only about 46% of the primary school teachers have ever received some training, it could be anticipated that the headteachers with teacher training background could be of the same proportion. However, it is important to note here that this training is a regular teacher training rather than the training focused on school management. Those who have received management training are fewer. At primary level out of the total primary headteachers, about 4,659 (27%) have received one month school management training provided by the National Center for Educational Development (NCED). NCED has a provision of training a maximum number of about 1,000 primary school headteachers per year. However, this year 550 primary headteachers were enrolled for the training.

At secondary and lower secondary levels about 2,500 (42%) of the headteachers have received management training provided in Secondary Education Development Programme (SEDP). The training consists of three phases: 5 days instruction at Secondary Education Development Units (SEDUs) followed by 8 weeks practice in the school and again 5 days follow-up programme at SEDU for the lower secondary level headteachers. For the secondary level headteachers, the duration at SEDU at the first and the third phases is of 3 days each. There is provision for training of about 625 lower secondary and secondary levels headteachers. However, there is no specific training programme for the headteachers at the higher secondary level.

Recurrent training is another important aspect, particularly in an environment where the headteachers are working in the same post for a long time. The age of the headteachers varies from early 20s to 60 years. The mean age lies at 40 years at the primary level and 43 years at the secondary level (including lower and higher secondary levels).

## **The Motivation and Incentives**

The major incentives regarding school teachers including the headteachers pertain to the salary. In the case of headteachers, although the work list is exhaustive, their salary is not much different from that of a same level teacher. The extra remuneration varies from Rs.50 at the primary school with Grades 1 to 3 to Rs.500 at the secondary school level. This amount ranges from about 2% to 10% of the salary of fellow teachers of respective levels.

The government has formed different levels of services for the teachers to keep them motivated. Accordingly, teachers are grouped into three categories based on academic qualifications, experience and performance indicators. Besides this classification, there is no special classification or other incentives for the headteachers. Such a lack of incentives has made many headteachers to just fulfil the basic minimum requirements rather than work proactively.

## **The Challenges Ahead**

The challenges ahead are how to make school level management effective, and make efforts to develop and sustain schools as centres for gainful learning. There are basically three aspects to the challenges in capacity building of the headteachers, i.e., access, quality and motivation.

### *(a) Access*

Limited institutional facilities for capacity building of headteachers is a major problem. In view of the large number of headteachers who have not received any management training, it is obvious that it will take several years to provide training to all the headteachers. This problem will be compounded further as the headteachers are replaced by the new headteachers in every 5 years.

### *(b) Quality*

The issues related to the contents of training of the headteachers are of two types. Given the short duration of the training programmes, it is not feasible to cover the entire training curriculum. Secondly, the management



training is developed in the form of training packages that preconceive certain entry-level requirements. Given the circumstances that most of the headteachers are recruited with minimum academic qualifications only, the preconceived requirement may not be fulfilled. For example, the one-month training for the primary level headteachers consists of several concepts of the management, education psychology, community and resource mobilisation. Whether such concepts and skills will be understood by the people with academic qualification of just SLC remains a question.

As the duration of the training is too short, it is difficult to design a comprehensive training programme on concepts and skills of school management. The other dimension of headteachers' skills is to mobilise all the resources available in the school and community for the better management of school. How to incorporate these in the training curriculum in a practical way remains a subject of study.

#### *(c) Motivation*

Motivating the headteachers for becoming self-actualised and dedicated is a great challenge. Keeping in view the meagre additional monetary reward for being a headteacher and the work load they have to bear, many a times primary school teachers do not want to be the headteacher. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, many of the headteachers are not trained. Hence, they do not have necessary skills to run the school in better ways. This causes lack of confidence on their part to become proactive, and in turn makes them less motivated.

### **Policy and Future Directions**

The Government of Nepal is committed to build the capacity of headteachers on priority basis. For this, several activities and programmes are run by the government. The government is making efforts to strengthen the teacher support system, and provision of relevant manuals and guidelines for headteachers in addition to organisation of training programmes for them. Besides the development of the training programmes, regular monthly meetings of the headteachers and formation of school cooperatives are some of the examples of the initiatives taken at the school level.

### **References**

Ministry of Education (2000). *Education for All- Year 2000 Assessment*. Nepal Country Report. Kathmandu: His Majesty's Government of Nepal.

Ministry of Education (1997). *Education Statistics*. Kathmandu: Op. Cit.

Ministry of Education (1949). *Education Regulation 1994*. Kathmandu: Op. Cit.

Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (2000). *Preparation of Higher Secondary School Teachers*. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University

Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (1999). *An Evaluation Study of In-Service Training of Lower Secondary and Secondary Teachers*. Kathmandu: Op. Cit.

Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (1999). *The Management of Teachers: Improving Primary Teacher Provision Through Better Management*. Kathmandu: Op. Cit.

*Hridaya R. Bajracharya  
Bijaya K. Thapa  
Naresh Man Shrestha  
Prayag Man Shrestha CERID  
Kathmandu, Nepal*

# New Tasks for School Principals in Korea

## Introduction

During the last decade, Korea's school principals confronted challenges of unprecedented scale that demanded them to adjust themselves to a new terrain of educational environment. Emergence of new influential actors necessitated redistribution of authority in school administration, unavoidably altering the traditional function of the principals, who were then called upon to develop professional capacity that could meet the larger society's new expectations for education as well as the unfamiliar administrative environment. This article focuses on the nature of the new challenges and the kind of professional capacity required of the school principals.

During most of the latter half of the twentieth century, school principals in Korea had quite limited power that seemingly corresponded to their narrow range of duties. Although they possessed decision-making authority in the general affairs of school management and functioned formally as representatives of schools, the principals had at their discretion few important decisions when the central Ministry of Education prescribed school curricula accompanied by detailed instructions for the entire nation. The principals were required to make decisions only on selecting elective courses, which were few in number, choosing after-school activities and miscellaneous school events. Still, school principalship had been a fairly respected position in the society due to the unique Korean valuing of education combined with veneration for the elderly.

But the 1990s presented two important challenges to the conventional role of the principals. The first challenge had the effect of diminishing the power of the principals in school management. Legalisation of the teachers unions, establishment of the School Council (or, School Management Committee), and the new rule for setting retirement age of the principals shook their already weak status. The second challenge was felt in effect by the entire domain of Korea's education. On response to the long demand for decentralised administration of schools and to the rising call for an overall reform of Korea's

education system, the government initiated a series of reform measures designed to delegate more authority to local bodies and schools.

## Recruitment and Training

In 1999, provincial and city offices of education have gained greater autonomy in selecting and appointing school heads based on the criteria they set. Generally speaking, candidates for school principals are required to take pre-service training courses, which in themselves are the sorting processes. After finishing the courses, the candidates are asked to submit a proposal for school management to appropriate evaluation committee of the local offices of education. The evaluation committee reviews the proposal and takes a final decision.

Agencies in charge of school heads' pre-service training are the Korea National University of Education and the Seoul National University, both of which are national institutions. The duration of the training is 180 hours and it takes place during vacation time over a one-month period. This pre-service training makes applicants eligible to become principals. Similar training does not occur after appointment to the post of school principals.

During the pre-service training, information books are provided to the trainees. These books contain general instructions on administrative details of managing a school. More systematic and specialised version of the instruction material for school heads is being developed now, as part of the larger effort by the Ministry of Education for "Comprehensive Measures for Teachers' Professional Development."

## Diminishing Weight of the Tradition

It has been observed that the 1990s saw weakening of the principals' power and authority, both in administrative hierarchy and in school culture. School teachers were enabled to voice their opinions more actively and effectively through their union-based collective actions.

As such they no longer had to obediently follow orders from the school heads. With the establishment of the School Council designed to absorb actively the voice of the educational consumers, that is, the parents and the local community, the principals were required by law to consult their clients and respect their opinions in managing school affairs. In other words, the conventional hierarchy of administration at school level with the principal at the top had been demolished. The principals had to adapt themselves to a new environment in which they no longer ordered and directed, but were required to exercise leadership in forming a consensus among the teachers, the parents, and the School Council. It was the leadership among equal members that hinged upon the political ability of persuading, negotiating, and consensus building, which the principals of the old days had hardly been accustomed to.

### **Increased Responsibilities**

Weakened authority in practice was not necessarily accompanied by diminished range of duty and responsibility, since the emergence of School Council signalled the shift of leadership in school administration from the Ministry of Education to individual schools. The community-centered approach of School Council ironically entailed that the principal was the leading figure in determining a substantial portion of school curriculum, managing school, and evaluating student-achievement. The Ministry launched a policy aimed at supplying more customer-oriented education, by emphasising diversity and autonomy in local educational practice and limiting its own function to setting the basic rules and coordination. The Sixth and the Seventh Curricular Revisions officially announced by the Ministry confirmed the decentralising tendency, by dramatically increasing the quantity of school activities that could be decided at school level. In Korea, each level of schools has its own organisation of school heads. Also, private schools have their own network. These organisations play the role of interest groups, lobbying behind education policy-making. Many of them are reported to employ the means of computer-based communication, such as emails for easy communication among their members. At the same time, the portion of school managing fund under the control of individual school rose substantially, allowing more leeway for the principals in managing school activities without permission from the higher offices. Besides, the school heads possess a decision-making power in pro-

moting vice-principals and are responsible for filling up teacher vacancies.

### **Discrepancy between the Goals and Reality**

Despite the formal progress in the central Ministry's sharing of its traditional authority with the local and school levels, the central control and intervention persist within the essentially centralised administrative framework. The Fundamental Law of Education, preserved intact, declares that the central and the local governing bodies possess the power and authority to direct and supervise schools. This legal mandate, still is faithfully guarded by the inspection and evaluation authority of the central and local offices of education, which tends to reinforce the traditionally rigid and bureaucratic control over schools. In view of the half a century of highly centralised state dominance over Korea's school system, it is not surprising if the redistribution of the central administrative authority takes many complicated steps, and a long time. In the meantime, the very slow process of decentralisation restricts the school principals' independent initiatives in opening up a new path for the locally tailored, consumer-friendly school programmes. At any rate, many argue that Korea's principals are not yet adequately prepared to take the new responsibilities demanded from the new era.

Thus, the Ministry of Education, in its turn, has implemented several measures to improve and maintain the quality of the principals. Since 1996, a new policy of appointing school principals, based on ability and experience, was launched as a pilot practice, as opposed to the traditional practice of seniority-based appointment. At the same time, a new legislation in that year enabled the 'honorary retirement,' or spontaneous early retirement of the principals, thereby promoting generation shift among the school heads.

### **Qualities Required of the Principals**

Besides the tenacious continuity in the centralised control over school administration, one of the most serious obstacles that the principals have to overcome is the fact that not many school principals in Korea are familiar with their new job tasks. This problem is further compounded by another fact that there exists no clear designation of the leading actor in the changed environment

of local school administration. Therefore, the school heads are now required to acquire new capacity and quality for tough tasks in an unfamiliar environment. One can argue that the conditions in the latter two areas, that is the nature of tasks and the environmental setting, could be ameliorated by government assistance. However, it is evident that the principals cannot ignore the new capacity and quality expected from them by a new era.

Among the new requirements, the principals, first, should possess the leadership ability, particularly when the authority in school-level management is shared by multiple parties and their cooperative working is absolutely necessary for uninterrupted supply of school education to children. Second, the principals are required to communicate actively with the society outside of their schools. More than ever, their sociability and communicative skills are needed in making this transitional period proceed smoothly, based on effective collaboration among school staff, local community, and regional and central offices of education. In their interaction with the consumers of education, the principals take on the function of coordinating different perspectives of education, one held by school and the other by secular society. Third, the principals are expected to possess professional capacity not only in education but also in management.

The management capacity includes: the leadership as a lead-manager of a school; the ability to empower the teachers; and open-mindedness to create a school atmosphere in which free communication and information sharing among staff members is possible.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, the start of the new millennium indeed poses many tough challenges to Korea's school heads. The central and local authorities in education should help the principals in equipping themselves with the capacity to cope with these challenges, which will most probably take quite a while. The Education Ministry's efforts for supplying a new generation of principals are expected to make the process of capacity building less troublesome. But above all, it is crucial that the principals themselves have to be the active agent in enhancing their capacity and ability in the broad context of ongoing reforms of Korea's education.

*Suk Hoon Han KEDI  
Seoul, Korea*

## **Role and Functions of School Heads and Challenges for Their Capacity Building in India**

### **Introduction**

School education in India has four stages namely, primary, upper primary, secondary and senior secondary. However, the structure of these stages of education varies among different states but at each state level a uniform pattern is found. The primary level of education covers grades I-V in 15 states and 4 union territories and grades I-IV in 10 states and 3 union territories. The upper primary level of education comprises grades VI-VIII in 14 states and 4 union territories and grades V-VII in 8 states and 3 union territories. The secondary level of education comprises grades VIII-X in 10 states and 3 union territories and grades IX-X followed in 15 states and 4 union territories. The senior secondary level comprises of grades XI-XII in the entire country.

India has one of the world's largest school education system. There are 0.6 million primary schools, 0.19 million upper primary schools and 0.1 million secondary schools (Selected Educational Statistics, 1998-99). The schools exhibit large variations in terms of student strength, number of teachers, catchment area, physical facilities, extent of resources available and type of management.

### **Recruitment**

At primary stage normally the senior most teacher in the school heads the school. In some states, primary school teachers are promoted as headmasters based on seniority criterion. The headmasters carry forward their posi-

tion in case of transfer whereas in the case of headteachers this does not happen. In terms of role and functions, there is no difference between a headteacher and a headmaster. The headteachers receive a meagre additional amount as allowances for headship but the promoted headmasters have the benefit of higher salary scales in some states. In some other states, a group of 10 primary schools with low student strength and with one or two teachers are attached to the nearest high school and work under its headmaster. The headmaster of the high school is incharge of the cluster schools. However, if the school has two teachers, one of them is designated as a headteacher for organising and monitoring the day-to-day school management. In some states, the small schools function under the high school forming a school complex.

At upper primary and secondary stage, the headmasters are promoted on the basis of their seniority and prescribed educational qualification. However, in some states, a proportion of the headmasters (around 15 per cent) is directly recruited on the basis of merit.

## **Role and Functions**

The role and functions of headmasters can be divided into four categories namely, academic, administrative, financial and community related. But a degree of difference is found in the role and responsibilities of headteachers at various levels of school education.

### *(a) Academic*

The academic functions of heads of schools are: preparation of school plan, timetable, allocation of classes to various teachers, teaching, managing multi-grade teaching, supervision of teaching-learning process, classroom monitoring, student evaluation and conducting of tests. Preparation of teaching aids and implementation of educational projects and programmes are also integral part of the role of headmasters. In terms of academic responsibilities, the upper primary and secondary school headmasters have the extra function of allocating classes and number of periods to subject specific teachers. Conducting remedial teaching, organisation of co-curricular activities including games and sports are the other functions of the headmasters.

### *(b) Administrative*

Admitting the students is an important function in all schools. The head of a primary school has to conduct household survey, identify school age children and enroll them. Issuing of school completion and transfer certificates and maintenance of school records are the other administrative functions. In addition to maintenance of school records and registers, the headmaster also supplies school data and information periodically to higher authorities. Conducting annual examinations, forwarding of leave applications, sanctioning of casual leave are the other responsibilities of the heads of secondary schools. The secondary school head has to carry out a few other tasks such as managing personnel records, staff development, staff welfare, organisation of staff meetings and dealing with teachers' association/union.

### *(c) Financial*

The financial power of school headmasters varies according to the level of the school education. Collection of admissible fees according to the rules and regulations and management of school funds is the responsibility of the headmasters. Collection of salaries of staff and its distribution is done by the headmaster at the primary level while the preparation of salary bills and disbursement of salary is part of the functions of upper primary and secondary school headmasters. Management of school development fund and purchase of teaching-learning aids are the other two areas where the headmaster uses his/her discretion. The headmasters of upper primary schools have slightly more authority and power compared to that of the primary school headteachers. Under the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), certain contingency amount has been provided to the school heads to enable them to develop local specific teaching-learning materials.

Management of student's incentives is another area where the headmaster has to play a significant role. The headmaster has to distribute the scholarships, incentives and implement other benefit schemes meant for the students from the weaker sections of the society.

### *(d) Linkages with Community*

In terms of community related functions, the primary school head has larger and broader role. The headmaster helps in the formation of the Village Education Committee (VEC), acting as its ex-officio secretary. The head-

master as the convenor, also coordinates Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and School Committee meetings. Mobilisation of community resources is another area of concern for primary school heads.

During the last two decades, some innovative and important centrally sponsored schemes have been implemented to improve participation and quality in primary education, viz. Operation Blackboard (OB), Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL), Mid-Day Meal Scheme etc. Though launching of these schemes have increased the workload and responsibilities of primary school headmasters manifold. This makes the job of the headmasters more challenging, but with limited power and authority.

## Training

The Education Commission (1966) had recognised the importance of training for the headmasters and recommended regular in-service training for them. However, there was hardly any worthwhile attempt made to realise the recommendation and neither pre-service nor in-service training was provided for heads of schools. One of the studies (Mukhopadhyay, 1990) identified 54 competencies covering academic, administrative, personnel and financial management required for the headmasters to effectively manage the schools. The Teacher Training Institutes (TTIs) constituted to provide training to the primary school teachers are either too small in number to address the needs of a huge teacher community or they are too busy in their own problems of imparting pre-service pedagogical training. Further, they do not have the expertise or infrastructure to bring a qualitative change by concentrating and providing management training to primary school headmasters.

The National Policy on Education (1986) and Revised Policy and Programme of Action (1992) have strongly advocated for the in-service training of the headmasters. The Programme of Action (POA) has categorically stated that it is essential for the headmasters to have a basic idea about the school management practices. The POA has identified areas of training like financial, personnel, programme planning and data management in addition to curriculum management. The important institutions striving for capacity building of headmasters in the country are:

### *(a) National Level Training Institutions*

National level institutions, like the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) are providing training to school heads at all levels of education. NIEPA organises regular training programmes on institutional planning and management for the school heads both at national and state levels. NIEPA also conducts training for master trainers from the state and district level institutions.

### *(b) State Level Training Institutions*

Each state in India has a State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) which is also responsible for training of school heads. However, they are presently more concerned with curriculum and textbook development and various other pedagogical aspects. In recent years, 5 states in the country have set up State Institutes of Educational Management and Training (SIEMATs) which are also making efforts for capacity building of school heads. However, these institutions are not fully functional and need to be further strengthened.

### *(c) District Institute of Education and Training (DIET)*

As a follow up action to the National Policy on Education (1986), District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) are being established in all the states of India in a phased manner. Apart from pre-service teacher training, one of the main functions of DIETs is to provide in-service training to primary school teachers and school heads. Accordingly, the DIETs have a Planning and Management Branch.

Establishment of the DIETs is a major breakthrough in providing decentralised local level in-service training. DIETs provide in-service training to teachers on pedagogical aspects and on institutional management to heads of schools. DIETs are also playing a very important role in imparting training to heads of primary schools in implementation of different educational projects. Some of the DIETs have been training school heads on community mobilisation also.

However, the capacity of DIETs vary widely in terms of staff strength, quality of staff and various infrastructural facilities. As DIETs are being established in a phased way, uniformity of standard could not be achieved and in many areas DIETs have not been established so far.

Therefore, DIETs at present are playing limited role in providing training to school heads in various aspects of management. There is need to build capacity of Planning and Management branch of DIETs for strengthening them in training of school heads.

### **Decentralisation of Training**

During 1994-95, the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) was initiated in a number of districts. One of the objectives of this programme is capacity building of teachers for improving the school effectiveness. As a measure, decentralised institutional arrangement and network has been adopted at block and cluster levels. At present, there are 414 block and 5,224 cluster level resource centres functioning in the country. The block and cluster training centres draw resource persons from DIETs and the local schools. The resource centres are provided with an opportunity to organise rigorous and recurrent training for primary school teachers, including primary school heads. However, these programmes are more concerned with instructional and material development, curriculum transaction and to some extent cover areas of managing records and registers and community mobilisation. But in view of the complex and multi-dimensional functions of heads of school, there is still a long way to go in capacity building and providing training to school heads.

### **Challenges of Capacity Building**

One of the major challenges of capacity building of heads of schools in India is their large number. Given the resource constraints, it is practically not feasible to train all the heads of schools in all levels in the country through conventional training programmes. Similarly, in view of variations among the schools their training needs are different. Since the recruitment policy of headteachers has not been revised for quite a long time, as such in the absence of flexible and effective recruitment policy, it has become very difficult to recruit efficient teachers to head the schools.

As the seniority is being the criterion for appointing headteachers, a large number of them are at the fag end of their service period and are about to retire. It is not only difficult for them to adapt to new management approaches but also, even if they acquire the management training, there is little time left with them to implement.

Capacities of the training institutions at state, district and block levels needs to be strengthened in terms of physical resources and competencies of faculty members.

In spite of all these challenges, in the last decade several innovative strategies and approaches were adopted to increase the pace of capacity building process both in terms of coverage, quality and relevance. Since early nineties, the educational reforms are focusing on improving school effectiveness. It has been increasingly recognised that the head of the school plays a crucial role in efficient and effective functioning of the school. Accordingly, different educational reform programmes are giving relatively more importance to the capacity building of school heads.

### **References**

- Government of India (1966): *Report of Education Commission - Education and National Development*. Ministry of Education, New Delhi.
- Government of India (1986): *National Policy on Education*. Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi.
- Mukhopadhyay, M. and Narula, M. (1990): *Managerial Task Analysis of Heads of Schools: A Project Report*; NIEPA, New Delhi, mimeo.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (1995): *Sixth All India Educational Survey*. New Delhi.
- Panda, B. K., (1996): *A Study of Capacity Building Programmes Undertaken for the School Headmasters in District Institutes of Education and Training*. Project Report; NIEPA, New Delhi, mimeo.
- Panda, B. K., (2000): *Nothing but the School: What the Head Can Do! – A Proposition for the Developing Countries*. Anamika Publishers, New Delhi.

B.K. Panda  
NIEPA  
New Delhi, India

# Better School Management: The Role of the Headteacher

An ANTRIEP Seminar: Shanghai, China, 19-21 September 2000

## Background

Throughout the last several decades, governments in Asia have increasingly shifted their attention from widening access to education to improving the quality. Impressive programmes were set up in, for example, school construction, teacher training, curriculum development and the provision of textbooks. Their records, however, were to some extent disappointing, as students continued to show low achievement standards and schools seemed unable to change that situation significantly for the better. Several reasons have been brought forward for this poor record. Two deserve stressing. Firstly, the reform programmes and projects focused too strongly on improving the quantity and the quality of inputs into schools, but did not have an impact on the way in which these inputs were used (or not used) in the schools. In other words, the teaching-learning process underwent very little change. Secondly, these system-wide projects were more oriented to the standard type of urban, relatively well-staffed and well-supervised schools, but in many countries very few schools, especially in the rural areas, resemble that sort of schools. For projects to be more helpful to schools, they have to be more flexible, allowing for adaptation by all the individual schools.

It is now better realised that improving the quality of education in the final instance means assisting schools to improve what goes on in the schools and in the classrooms. The teaching-learning process in the classroom is influenced very strongly by the way schools are managed. Many research studies, in both developed and developing countries, covering urban and rural schools and private as well as public ones, have shown that the headteachers stand central to good school management. It has indeed become an article of faith that the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly mediated by the quality of the leadership provided by the headteacher.

During recent years, the role of the headteacher has gained in importance due to two complementary developments. The first relates to the emphasis laid on

decentralisation. In some countries of the Asian region, this has already been translated into reality, while in others, policy makers and planners are actively engaged in designing modalities of decentralisation which invariably affect internal school management and the role of the school-head. The second development is a gradual move towards school-based management and enhanced autonomy of schools. This trend, which may or may not go together with an overall decentralisation policy, automatically implies more responsibilities entrusted upon the educational institutions and demanding better and non-traditional managerial skills from the headteachers. Studies have also revealed the importance of community participation as a means of strengthening school management and the role that can be played by school boards or other representative bodies.

The way in which headteachers manage and lead their schools and teachers is influenced, of course, by their capacities and skills. But such capacities cannot be taken for granted and are a result of several factors, including

- the recruitment and selection procedures used to identify strong potential headteachers;
- the training, in particular induction training, given to newly appointed school principals;
- the posting and transfer rules and practices;
- the ways in which headteachers are evaluated, supervised and supported, and
- the provision of incentives, such as an attractive career ladder.

This implies that, in order to strengthen the role of the headteachers, it is not sufficient to examine the way in which they manage their schools, but one also needs to look at the efforts made by national authorities to develop head-teaching into an attractive, autonomous profession.

It is against this background that ANTRIEP decided to organise its fourth policy-seminar around the theme of *Better School Management: The Role of the*



*Headteacher.* The seminar will take place in Shanghai, from 19 to 21 September 2000. The local organisation will be looked after by the Shanghai Institute for Human Resources Development. Participants will include staff from member institutions, experts from international agencies and senior policy-makers.

## Objectives

The seminar's overall objective is to identify policies and strategies that will improve the quality of schools by strengthening the leadership and management capacities of headteachers. It will have three more specific objectives:

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

## Themes

The seminar will be organised in three stages.

In a first stage of **stock-taking**, ANTRIEP member institutions will offer an overview of the situation of headteachers in their respective countries, and will highlight the following issues:

- Some basic facts and figures about headteachers (e.g. total numbers; distribution by qualifications, experience, age and gender);
- Government policies concerning the management of headteachers;
- The main problems encountered by headteachers;
- The major innovations and reforms.

During the second stage, the seminar will analyse in detail the **current strategies and promising avenues** to improve school management, which focus on strengthening the leadership role played by headteachers. Within this stage, participants will examine two complementary themes. The first theme, on the **management of headteachers by national authorities** will look into the following questions:

- What recent changes have been introduced in the job-description of headteachers? What has been the impact on their autonomy?
- What innovations have been implemented regarding the recruitment and posting of headteachers?
- What career prospects are open to headteachers? Are efforts being undertaken to develop attractive career ladders?
- How is the accountability of headteachers organised? How and by whom is their performance being evaluated?
- How are headteachers being prepared for their job? What kind of training do they receive? How is it organised and by whom?
- How to develop and promote the use of a relevant information system, for better school management?

The second theme on the management of schools by headteachers will be the main point on the agenda of this seminar and the issues addressed will include:

- The characteristics of effective school principals and conditions in which they can play a leadership role.
- The roles and responsibilities of the other members of the school senior staff in an effective school.
- The different tasks of headteachers and the ways in which they and other senior staff reconcile administrative with pedagogic duties.
- The potential of institutional planning to improve school functioning (through school development plans and school self-evaluation programmes).
- Role played by external supervision and support services to improve school management by principals.
- Innovative strategies that have succeeded in mobilising and organising community support.
- The way the headteachers use information and data to improve the management of their school.

Throughout this second stage, the discussions will give specific attention as to how to address the characteristic needs of small and remote schools.

The seminar's third and concluding stage will draw a number of conclusions from the preceding sessions for **the strengthening of capacity-building programmes for headteachers**. The professionalisation of school heads has to be conceived in a holistic manner covering the various aspects of management and the different actors involved in it.

Important aspects to be discussed will include:

- The relative weight of pre-service and in-service training of school principals
- The major components of successful capacity-building programmes
- The way they balance leadership training in contrast with technical management skills
- Organisation of effective and innovative capacity-building programmes. Who has been involved in their planning and delivery?
- In addition to training, other strategies that can be relied upon for headteacher's development.

The role which the ANTRIEP network and its member institutions can play in order to reinforce headteachers

development programmes in the region, will form an integral part of the discussions.

### **The ANTRIEP Meeting**

The seminar will, as is now traditional, be followed, on 22 September 2000, by a one-day meeting, which is restricted to ANTRIEP members. The meeting will be hosted by the Shanghai Institute for Human Resources Development. It will examine the progress made and the activities undertaken by the Network since the preceding meeting in December 1998 in Colombo, Sri Lanka. The main point on the agenda will be a discussion on the implementation of the ANTRIEP project on *Improving School Management in Asia: Capacity-Building for Headteachers* and the role and responsibilities of the different member institutions in this regard.

*IIEP, Paris*

## **Links and Connections A Reflection on the ANTRIEP Seminar**

The ANTRIEP Seminar on *Improving School Efficiency* in Colombo in December 1998 was my introduction to this educational network. To be honest, when I was contacted by the IIEP and asked to present a paper on the approach to whole school evaluation and accountability in the State of Victoria, I was not quite sure what to expect. I had not been to Sri Lanka before and my knowledge of the issues facing education systems and educationists in most of the nations represented at the conference was sketchy at best.

I am fairly certain that the ANTRIEP people were not sure what to expect either. They had learnt about our accountability framework by visiting our web-site and our only contact had been by email.

At the conference, two things emerged fairly quickly. The first was how similar are the issues faced by education systems in different countries. The scale of the problems might be different, as might be the capacity to provide appropriate levels of resources, but the need to drive up standards of achievement and to build the capacities of teachers appear to be common to all countries. The second is something you discover at education conferences all over the world, that when you put a group of educators together, their passion for education binds them together in a powerful commitment to a common cause.

The outcomes of the conference were important but, for me, so was what happened afterwards. Several of the people I met in Colombo have maintained email contact during the past year or so and we have had an opportunity to 'chat' about issues of common interest. Several countries have organised visits to Victoria to look at what we are doing here and we have been invited to attend several conferences in a range of countries.

The school education system in Victoria is now conducting a review of our approach to school self management, which was a major theme of the Colombo meeting. We are asking again many of the fundamental questions with which ANTRIEP is directly concerned. What is the appropriate role for governments in the delivery of school education? How can we best involve our local communities in a partnership to improve the educational outcomes achieved by our children? How do we achieve the best mix of available teachers in our schools to ensure that the needs of the students are met?

These are almost timeless questions. Questions that need to be asked again and again and perhaps most urgently when you think you've found the answers.

*The ANTRIEP seminar and the exposure to the experiences of other countries in the region have enabled me to approach these questions with a slightly fresher perspective and a renewed enthusiasm for the 'common cause'.*

*Bill Griffiths  
General Manager  
Office of Review Victoria  
Australia*