

**National Seminar**  
**On**  
**The role of private actors in education:**  
**An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity?**  
**(19<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> October 2011, New Delhi, INDIA)**



**REPORT**



**National University of Educational  
Planning and Administration**  
New Delhi, INDIA



**Asian Network of Training and  
Research Institutions in  
Educational Planning (ANTRIEP)**



## PREFACE

The National Seminar on *The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity?* was organized from 19-21 October, 2011 in New Delhi, India. The workshop was designed for participants from ANTRIEP member institutions and other invited countries/ institutions of Asia. The nominated participants from all the countries were requested to prepare a country status paper on various issues revolving around the role of private actors in education in their respective country.

The seminar attempted to review the nature and extent of the involvement of non-public actors in education. The seminar also attempted to examine the impact private sector on widening access, on improving quality and on decreasing disparities. During the seminar, the nominated participants from their respective countries presented papers broadly revolving on these issues in their respective country.

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris has provided academic and technical support in organizing the workshop. I am grateful to Mr. Anton De Garuwe, Head, Technical Assistance and Sector Planning, IIEP, Paris for his cooperation and collaboration in organizing the Policy seminar. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to all the participants from their respective countries that actively participated and made the workshop successful.

My sincere thanks are also due to our Vice Chancellor, Prof. R. Govinda, for his valuable guidance from time to time. I appreciate and thank faculty members from NUEPA who were involved in chairing the sessions and Ms. Charu Mallik, Ph.D Scholar for rapporteuring. Last but not the least, my earnest thanks are due to the administrative staff, project staff and all the students of NUEPA for extending their support.

**K. Sujatha**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page No.</i>
01 Background	7
02 The ANTRIEP Seminar	7
03 Content of the Seminar	8
04 Working Methods	9
05 Programme Management	9
06 Date and Venue	9
07 Summary of Seminar Proceedings	10-14
08 Valedictory Session	15
09 Abstracts	19-45
10 Programme Schedule	47-53
11 List of Participants	55-70



## **The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity?**

(19<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> October 2011, New Delhi)

### **Background**

Providing education to all citizens is recognized as a priority, if not a duty, by all states in Asia. In many cases, this is inscribed in the constitution and international agreements reflect this commitment. The translation of this principle into policies, however, leaves much space for interpretation, both around the meaning of the term "education" (e.g. does the government's commitment cover only basic education?) and about the actual role that the state is expected to play.

The debate around the role of the state has always been a contentious and controversial one; its relevance remains great in present times, when many states are confronted with a paradoxical situation: on the one hand, they have pledged to provide education of high quality to all their citizens; on the other hand, the potential for the state to respect its commitments and respond to the public demand is constrained in terms of finances and arguably management capacity.

Therefore, increasingly, many public education systems are seeking to consolidate or to strengthen the role that non-state actors can play. Parents also count at times on private actors, either to school their children or to obtain extra tutoring, in order to improve their school results. These governmental and parental strategies raise a series of interrogations that this policy seminar will discuss.

### **The ANTRIEP Seminar**

The Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP) is constituted of twenty institutions from countries in South, South-East and East Asia, and regularly organizes a major policy seminar. This year the seminar was hosted by the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), from 19 to 21 October 2011. The participants included senior decision-makers from ministries of education, directors and senior staff from ANTRIEP member institutions, representatives from international and

regional organizations, and experts in the seminar's theme. List of participants in Annexure.

### **Content of the Seminar**

The respective role of public authorities and private actors in education is a complex matter and can lead to a wide range of discussions. The seminar will organize these discussions under three headings. A first series of questions revolves around the nature and the extent of the involvement by non-public actors. A key issue is: who are these actors? Are they private companies with commercial interests at heart? Are they non-governmental organizations who work towards the public interest? Are they faith groups who want to transmit a specific set of values? Equally important is an examination of the area in which they are involved. Much discussion in this regard focuses on private schools, as an alternative to the public school, but private actors are involved in other areas and services, such as school management, quality assurance or extra tuition. A third point concerns the groups on which they focus: Do they reach out to all parents or do they focus on a specific group, maybe the better-off or even those out of school? It is important to remember in these discussions that many different scenarios exist, influenced strongly by a country's history.

A second set of questions concerns the impact which the involvement of private actors has on widening access, on improving quality and on decreasing disparities. Around each of these three objectives, hypotheses can be formulated, each of which needs serious testing. Private actors may help increase access to education, in particular when they develop schooling models which are more appropriate to out-of-school groups than what public schools offer. The impact on quality may be more difficult to assess and changes depending on the characteristics of the private schools. The impact of private tutoring on the children who receive it, is generally positive. However, its influence on the quality of what takes place within schools deserves deep examination: the existence of such extra tuition may lead to public school teachers neglecting parts of the curriculum. The possible impact on disparities is what raises the most concern about the role of private actors: because private education and tuition generally come at a cost, it seems almost unavoidable that its benefits will go principally to the better-off groups. It is precisely this last point that emphasizes the importance of control and regulation

of the private actors by the public authorities. The third set of questions relate precisely to this: what control should be exercised? What instruments does the state have at its disposal? What sanctions are available? And how can such control best be exercised without damaging the potential benefits of private involvement in education?

### **Working Methods**

The seminar's preparation was ensured by the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) in New Delhi, which was also the host, and the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP). The seminar is being financed jointly by IIEP and NUEPA. The seminar sessions were primarily revolved around discussion and exchange of experiences among the participants, by way of plenary sessions and working groups.

### **Programme Management**

Mr. Anton De Garuwe, IIEP, Paris and Prof. K. Sujatha were programme Directors and responsible for organization of the seminar. Dr. Sunita Chugh and Dr. V.P.S.R. Raju helped in coordination of the programme. Ms. Charu Mallik, Ph.D scholar, NUEPA, was the rapporteur for all the sessions and helped in preparation of the programme report. NUEPA Administration and Training Cell extended cooperation for logistical arrangements. Mrs. Kiran Kapoor provided secretarial assistance and the project staff and students helped in day to day organization of the programme.

### **Date and Venue**

The seminar' was formally inaugurated on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2011 at 10.00 a.m. Dr. Amarjit Singh, Joint Secretary (Elementary Education) Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India who delivered the inaugural address. The seminar was closed on Friday 21 October. Mrs. Anshu Vaish, Secretary (School Education & Literacy), Ministry of Human resource Development, Government of India has delivered the valedictory address at 12.00 noon. An exclusive meeting of ANTRIEP members was organized on the afternoon at NUEPA.

The preceding section provides summary of seminar proceedings

## **Summary of Seminar Proceedings 19<sup>th</sup> October, 2011**

Professor R. Govinda, Vice-Chancellor, NUEPA began with reflections on the origins of the ANTRIEP, which began in a discussion in 1994 during a regional workshop in Katmandu, Nepal and emerged as a largely voluntary and informal network in 1995 in a regional meeting held at NUEPA. Professor Govinda reiterated how an idea that emerged in 1994 got whole-hearted support from IIEP, which has continued to anchor all its activities, and the biannual meetings as well.

Professor Govinda's introductory remarks were followed by introduction of IIEP's focus by Mr. Anton De Grauwe, IIEP. He emphasised a need for strengthening capacity in educational planning which is gaining importance given the trends visible in the form of decentralisation, community participation and other forms of crucial educational interventions. He observed that national institutions working in the field of education in member countries have their unique strengths and weakness but often lack expertise on problem solving, which may point to the fact that the institutions are not sharing as much. Hence such a platform is required in bringing institutions together so that they can be strengthened individually. He emphasized that the present seminar on the role of private actors in education needs to engage with and test the arguments for private education, a phenomena that is common to many countries.

Dr Amarjit Singh, Joint Secretary (Elementary Education) highlighted many characteristics of the elementary education system in India and the role of private actors in providing education services. Considering the large presence of private sector in education, he said that both the public and private sectors need to work in a manner, which is collaborative, and this arrangement has to be such that strengths are built up from both the sides. Dr. Singh said that public private partnership would be encouraged only if it helps in reducing inequities in education and addresses the issues of equity and inclusion. Such a partnership should also lead to cost effective use of resources. The focus would also be on continuing professional development of teachers and strengthening of teacher learning resources. There are a number of areas where the public sector needs to collaborate with the private sector, such as providing equitable access, finding means for marginalised children to learn optimally, to address inclusion, in faculty

development, in anchoring resource centres at cluster level in good private schools etc. He observed the need for a cell in the MHRD to monitor and facilitate the public private collaborations and norms for judging their effectiveness. Prof. Sujatha delivered the Vote of thanks for the session. She observed the critical need for engaging with PPP in coming five year plan. She said that ANTRIEP has travelled a long way over the years, and thanked the group for agreeing to meet in India, for the present conference.

During second session, Mr. Anton de Grauwe, IIEP, spelt out the key questions for the policy seminar such as :

- What do we actually mean by non-public/private actors?
- What are the areas in which they are actually involved?
- What is the impact of involvement of the non-public actors on quality and the equity of the system?
- How do governments respond to the involvement of non-public actors?

This was followed by a round of discussion by the participants. Observation was shared on the need to look at the nature of PPP in various ANTRIEP member countries. Some observations brought out the fact that discourses on private participation are often shrouded in the mistrust of anything outside the fold of the state, limiting a deeper study of the nature and motives of their involvement. An important aspect similar to both the public and private sector was observed by agreeing to the fact that just as the non-public sector is not a homogeneous, monolithic construct so is the case with government sector that is also not uniform as there are different levels and types of governance involved in school related issues. More importantly, the nature of private providers and their presence is also related to the political will or the political context of the state.

The theme for the next session was focused on identifying the non-public actors in education. Presentations were made by Mr. Samir Ranjan Nath, Programme Head, Educational Research Unit, BRAC Mr. Ramchandra Rao, UNICEF, Dino Varkey, Senior Director, Operations, GEMS Education. This was followed by country presentations by Korea, Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, Phillipines, Nepal and Vietnam.

**20<sup>th</sup> October, 2011**

### **The Involvement of Private Actors and the implications for equity**

Dr. R.V.V. Ayyar (Retd. Secretary Education, MHRD) spoke at length on the emergence of private sector in education. According to him, while there has been a spectacular growth in the low fee private unaided schools over the past decades in India, the state has been in a state of denial in acknowledging their existence and expansion. Within the private sector, there exist a large majority of both recognized and unrecognized schools at all levels on school education, more so at the primary level. There are many types of private unaided schools from the 'elite' catering to the needs of the rising middle and upper classes and low fee private unaided schools for the lower income groups. He emphasised on a two-track approach in government policies which focus more rigorously on quality and learning outcomes and that covers all schools - whether government or private schools. The policies must focus on the development of the education transactions in the schools and not only on providing physical resources. Incentives must be offered to students belonging to low income and socially disadvantaged groups.

Le Thu Huong from UNESCO, Bangkok asserted that the role of non-state actors can be understood in addressing exclusion. The services provided by them can be often used for meeting the demands of low income groups in urban areas, by taking care of an excess demand that is a result of perceived low quality government provision etc. However, these actors do not address all excluded groups, but may provide alternative service delivery models for hard to reach groups.

She defined modalities for non-state engagement through -

- 1) Voluntary contribution - resources contributed , not necessary provide the services
- 2) Private finance and provision - non-state actors both finance and provide education services - trade unions, private business houses
- 3) State purchase of services

In response to the two presentations it was observed by Professor Govinda, the chair for the session, that one cannot lose the sight of the fact that the

government has to realize its responsibility for providing education and cannot remain indifferent to improving its own schools or opening new. The government needs to spend more on education, and this is possible in a fast growing economy that the country is experiencing. The state has to take up an increasing role in educational ventures and not entirely depend on private initiatives or private partnerships.

If universal primary education is looked at from a rights-based perspective, it is all the more important that state provides for elementary education, as free and compulsory education cannot be left to the market forces that are discriminatory. Prof. Govinda also highlighted that private initiatives in education must be primarily philanthropic and charitable as against profit oriented.

The following session saw Professor Mark Bray said that the shadow systems of education are primarily driven by financial gains and have emerged as supplementary to the provisioning of mainstream schooling. Tutoring has also taken many modes of teaching, from traditional one-to-one contexts to large numbers being taught in big classrooms. E-tutoring has also emerged as a widely preferred form of tutoring. The shadow industry is complex and difficult to regulate. It also amounts to huge financial investments by households, maintains and exacerbates social inequalities and is a backwash on mainstream schools. It is important to understand that the shadow education system only exists because the mainstream exists. It is important for governments to confront with the challenges posed by the shadow system of education.

It was also observed by Ms Sue Thomson, ACER, from Australia's experience, that private schools do not always provide counter intuitive success stories. Citing school data from 16 OECD countries and 10 other partner countries, it was revealed that there was a slight advantage to private schools as compared to public schools which was probed further. It is well evident through many researches that private schools are able to attract better students in terms of socio-economic advantaged groups. Observed performance differences between public and private schools is as much a factor of what goes on in school but also of children's socio-economic background. Private schools do not reduce disparities, certainly not for low SES students. Students in private schools have more books at home, they have more positive attitude towards schools and teachers in general, for these and many other

reasons private schools end up doing better and so would the public schools if they were to have all the resources.

Mr. Colin Bangay, DFID questioned if competition can ever make public schools better. There is very little research on how does competition drive quality teaching. Also, why should the private providers improve the quality of schools when they are constantly working on the assumption that a slight difference from the state school in quality can anyways ensure success? Thus usually there is no incentive for them to work towards creating models of excellence in the low fee charging sector. Private schools end up appearing better but not necessarily so. We need to address these concerns. Private education does not always solve our problems. Most remote areas have not been reached by the private schools as they do not get economies of scale in these regions. Private schools/providers are not and cannot be panacea for everything. How does the government manage the quality and equity concerns for all students in schools and those outside as well is a question to engage with in the coming times.

Administrators should think like parents and be concerned about needs of children in schools today. It is important for us to go beyond the plain rhetoric on 'public good and private bad'. "Publicness" could be considered in terms of whether it serves the public interest, not whether it was delivered within publicly or privately owned schools.

State apathy of schools does not logically imply need for abdicating the responsibility to private system. If the private sector does not respond to issues of equity and quality, then we need to keep reasserting the role of the state to fulfill its constitutional responsibility.

The Group Discussions between member countries, on the second day focused on three themes:

- What impact does involvement of private actors has on education system
- How do Governments respond to the involvement of non-public actors?
- What policy suggestions can be made to ensure that private actors involvement benefit education?

## **21<sup>st</sup> October : Valedictory Session**

Mr. Anton de Grauwe, IIEP started the valedictory session by summing up the key issues that emerged out of the seminar on the role of private actors in education. He said that various countries have different experiences with the private sector in education; there are countries where both recognized and unrecognized private actors exist in education, whereas a country like Sri Lanka does not in principle recognize private schools. He said that private presence in the education system has primarily emerged because of a gap between demand and supply, a demand that has not been effectively addressed by the government through public provisioning. A large private sector in education has detrimental impact on equity as the private sector might impact on access (by providing its services) but is usually less affordable mainly by the disadvantaged sections of society. While the access to schooling increases through private providers, it may negatively impact the accessibility of a wide section of society. There are wide social, economic and geographical disparities in educational development in many countries. Sometimes, private actors in education have benefitted from these disparities, for instance, if economic disparities are reflected in geographical disparities in a particular location, the existence of more number of private actors can negatively affect the equity concerns of the disadvantaged. It is also well researched that pupil composition in private schools, most often, impacts its quality standards. Rather than accusing the 'wrong' actor, it is important for the governments to respond to such a situation, by regulating the private education system. The focus should also be on what we can learn from successful schools – private or public. The private sector has its own strengths such as their management, teacher accountability and maintenance of performance standards.

Mr. Anton highlighted that education is a right and not a privilege; it is a right which costs money unlike other rights, such as right to religion. In order to make the education system more equitable, the governments should take their role more seriously and provide an accessible and an 'alternative' good quality education that can help build social integration. As far as regulations on the private actors are concerned, governments should specify minimum quality norms.

He reflected on some of the possible government responses to the private sector in education. The government must see to it that the overall policy objectives are

achieved by involving the private sector. First, there is a need for better information database to strengthen the role of private sector, so that regulatory mechanisms are easily worked out. Second, there must be continuous consultations at all levels, at the national level down till the school management committee level of both the sectors. The government must also think of building taxonomy of where private providers can or cannot intervene. For example, curriculum remains a public responsibility and other activities such as providing meals, or keeping schools clean can be leased to the private sector.

Ms. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, GOI, spoke about the need of more schools for the underserved areas given the mandate of Right to Education 2010, and discussed briefly some of the provisions of the Act with respect to laying down norms for establishing the quality parameters. She observed how already in the 12th five year plan approach paper there is a talk of opening up higher education sector to for-profit private providers. She said it would not take too long before such propositions would be raised about school education. The presence of private sector is fast becoming a reality and the change is inevitable; the government cannot miss the opportunity to manage this change where overall education scenario is to be benefitted.

She also observed that despite the fact that Right to Education is anchored in equality, social justice, equity and inclusion for quality elementary education for all there are serious misgivings with regards to provisions like no screening at the entry level of school as well as the No Detention clause: there is misgiving among both government and the private sector. Court case filed by private school organisations has argued that Right to Education provisions in several cases are non-constitutional. These were some of the challenges that are posed by the private sectors. However, the existence of private actors cannot be wished away and there is a need to mutually collaborate between the public and private sectors.

Prof. Govinda explained how private sector coexisted with the public sector in education even half a decade back, but its importance has grown dramatically in the wake of government withdrawing from investing in education. For the last few years, educational discourse has been full of debates that talk of private sector in education and its implications, as its presence has grown manifold in the education scenario. He said that state bears a moral responsibility for providing basic and

secondary education. Schools are institutions that are trusted by parents belonging to all sections of society; it is a moral institution as compared to other public institutions. Also that private sector does not exist independently, it occupies public space. While deliberating on the growth of private sector, he hinted at a neo-liberal agenda that seems to have become a predominant state ideology, leaving education at to be governed by the market forces. He said that public private partnership is welcomed but at the same time the state should not withdraw from its commitment to provide for elementary education

Some issues were raised by developing partners. The European Union representative observed that it is important for us to engage with private sector in education; engaging would mean that we build a partnership rather than aim for policing. The representative from World Bank observed that a good deal of pragmatism is needed to engage with the private sector. The efforts should be directed towards creating better schools and should not be against public or private schools. The link between inputs and good quality outcomes is not obvious and definitely cannot be manipulated easily, for instance monetary input to a school would not directly lead to better outcomes/performance of students if class sizes are non-optimal. Even the issue of teacher management needs to be closely looked at; there is a need to change teachers' behaviour in government settings. Hence, the challenges are many but a common point to both the sectors must be the focus on providing quality education- and that quality is not a fixed point and systems must continually improve.

\*\*\*\*\*



# **ABSTRACTS**



## **Achievement and Equity in Public and Private Education: Evidence from PISA**

***Dr Sue Thomson***

Director

Educational Monitoring and Research

Australian Council for Educational Research

Melbourne

In addition to a moral obligation to ensure that all students are provided with an adequate education, governments have other reasons to ensure equity. In a competitive global economy, a country needs to have a well-educated population from which it is able to draw to provide the necessary skills for continued development. To allow some groups in the population to not fulfill their potential could lead to a shortfall in the level of skills available in the future. However while governments recognize these obligations there are also increasing financial constraints, and, often, private education is seen as making general education more cost-effective.

In Australia, 40 per cent of schools are classed as private schools, defined by PISA as "schools managed directly or indirectly by a public education authority, government agency, or governing board appointed by government or elected by public franchise." In comparison, just two per cent of schools in Shanghai - the highest performing economy in PISA 2009 - were private schools. At face value then, the proportion of private schools in a system and system-level performance are not related.

However, examining outcomes in PISA, one finds that in 16 OECD countries and 10 partner countries and economies (including Australia and Shanghai), the average private school student outperforms the average public school student, with an advantage of around 30 score points (the equivalent of about three-quarters of a year of schooling). Around ten per cent of this advantage is the result of competition for students and higher levels of autonomy enjoyed by private schools, but more than three-quarters of the score difference can be attributed to private schools' ability to attract students with higher levels of socioeconomic advantage. An "all things equal" analysis found that the private school advantage was not

evident in 13 of the 16 countries which showed a private school advantage (including Australia and Shanghai).

The OECD argue that:

school systems in which all students, regardless of their background, are offered similar opportunities to learn; socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged students attend the same schools; and students rarely repeat grades or are transferred out of schools because of behavioural problems, low academic achievement or special learning needs – are more likely to perform above the OECD average and show below- average socio-economic inequalities. (Vol. IV, p. 27)

This paper uses data from the most recent PISA study (2009) to examine the distribution of achievement in Australian public and private schools and in public and private schools in other PISA participating countries in the region. It also examines access to these schools and the influence of socioeconomic background, both at the student level and at the level of the school, in order to examine the impact that the involvement of private schools has on widening access to education, improving quality, and decreasing disparities.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Role of Private Actors in Education: Bangladesh Perspective**

**Prof. Shamsur Rahman**  
Director General, NAEM  
Dhaka

Bangladesh is one of the most densely populated countries in the world with about 150 million people within an area of 1,47,570 sq. km. Its vast population is one of the major resources but the problem lies in transforming the potential people into a productive force in the line of quality education. Education, therefore, has been recognized as a priority sector by all governments since her independence. There

has been a remarkable development in education in the last thirty years and the rate of participation has increased steadily at all levels. There are about 72,600 educational institutes from primary to higher education levels. The education system in Bangladesh is characterized by the co-existence of three separate streams. The mainstream is based on secular education carried over from the colonial past and others are religious education and English medium institutions. The mainstream education system in Bangladesh is structured as follows:

**Primary Stage:** Primary Education has been made compulsory for children aged 6-10 years by an Act (1990). Compulsory primary education includes five years schooling imparted mainly in government and non-government primary schools. Pre-primary education for one or two years is imparted in private schools/kindergartens, and schools run by NGOs informally in govt. primary schools. A total of 81,508 institutions are imparting primary education of which 43,836 (53.78%) are run by non-government/private actors. NGOs-run schools differ from other non-government private schools. The private schools are operated like private enterprises often guided by commercial interests, while NGOs operate schools mainly in areas not covered either by the government or private schools, essentially to meet the educational needs of the vulnerable groups in the society. They usually follow an informal approach to suit the special needs of children from these vulnerable groups.

**Secondary, Higher Secondary Stage:** On completion of primary education, students (11+) are enrolled for junior secondary education in 3,494 non-government institutions that spans 3 years. After the end of this phase, some students switch over to join the vocational stream where 947 (79.31%) private technical education institutes are run privately in Bangladesh offered at Vocational Training Institutes and Technical Training Centers run by the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Labor and Employment respectively. While students in the mainstream continue their education in government 317(1.66%) and non-government secondary schools 18,766 (98.34%) for secondary education. A total of 71,40,582 (97.06%) students are enrolled at private secondary general schools (2009 academic year). There are 9,475 (99.96%) non-government *Madrasahs* at grade 6 to 16 but

only 3 (0.03%) governments (kamil) *Madrasahs* are here in Bangladesh. A sum of 20,67,590 (99.99%) students are studying in private *Madrasahs*.

After 10 years of schooling students (16+) who succeed in passing the SSC have the option of joining 2 years higher secondary education. A total of 1,907 (78.71%) non-government intermediate institutions support to continue study of 4,41,015 (90.90%) students all over the country. There are 6,188 (92.44%) institutions for computer teaching privately in Bangladesh.

***Tertiary stage:*** There are 1,440 graduate education institutions which offer for 3 to 5 years degree to 18+ students of them 1,212 (84.17%) are private institutions. Bangladesh has 31 (37.8%) public and 51(62.20%) private universities with 2,26,986 (58.59%) students (BANBEIS 2009). National University has the largest enrolment. Bangladeshi universities are accredited by and affiliated with the University Grand Commission. It is remarkable that of the Medical colleges 30 are (62.50%) privately funded with 6,964(43.9%) students. There is also an Open University established under Act 38 of 1992. Moreover, Bangladesh National University is responsible for controlling bachelor and master's affiliated Honours-Masters Colleges. A total of 54 public primary training institutes and 85 (85.85% %) secondary teachers training Institutes are there in Bangladesh.

***Coaching Centers in Bangladesh:*** A recent phenomenon in Bangladesh education sector is the development of Coaching Centers to provide organized private coaching to the students. The coaching centers generally provide the following four types of coaching –(i) Admission Coaching (ii) Academic Coaching (ii) Job Coaching (iv) Special Coaching (Spoken English, TOEFL, IELTS, GRE, GMAT, SAT etc.)

Private actors including NGO's involvement in education with a view to increasing school participation, reducing dropout rates greatly benefit to the mass people. This points out that besides purely privately funded and managed schools, all kinds of partnerships exist between governments and private agents. These public-private partnerships will be the enterprise of our analysis of private interventions. Their number along with their importance has increased dramatically over the last

twenty years. So, Bangladesh needs a dynamic and sustainable education to meet the challenges of poverty reduction and increased competition in an emerging outward market economy. So, GO and NGO initiatives are inevitable in education.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **The Challenge of Shadow Education: The Expansion and Implications of Private Supplementary Tutoring**

**Mark Bray**

Director

Comparative Education Research Centre

The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Private supplementary tutoring is widely known as shadow education because much of it mimics mainstream schooling. As the size and shape of the mainstream change, so do the size and shape of the shadow.

Shadow education has long been very visible in much of East and South Asia, and is expanding in other parts of the world. In China, India and South Korea, for example, over half of senior secondary students received supplementary tutoring. In Bangladesh and Hong Kong the figure is more like 75%. Some tutoring is provided on a one-to-one basis, some in small groups, and some in large classes. In addition, tutoring is increasingly provided at a distance through the internet. In some societies, teachers in the public schools are permitted to provide extra private lessons for the students for whom they are already responsible during regular hours.

ANTRIEP has devoted some attention to the topic, and further consideration is very desirable within the context of the 2011 Policy Seminar to identify the roles of tutoring providers and the ways in which they interact with public providers of education. UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) has also taken a lead in analysis of this theme. The presentation will draw on the

author's book *confronting the Shadow Education System: What Government Policies for What Private Tutoring?*. The presentation will comment on the scale and nature of shadow education around the Asian region and beyond. It will consider its impact on equity and on teachers' workloads, and will also consider the backwash effects of tutoring on regular schooling. The presentation will then turn to the implications for policy makers and planners. In most countries, the first need is to secure more and better data on the phenomenon. The questions then include whether and how governments should endeavor to regulate the sector. Instructive lessons can be learned from comparison of what has and has not worked, and why.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Engaging Non-state Actors in the Policy Implications of the Involvement of Private Actors in Education**

**R. V .Vaidyanatha Ayyar, IAS**  
Retd. Secretary  
Ministry of HRD  
Government of India

Till about a decade ago, educational policy discourse in India proceeded on the premise that the magnitude of unrecognised and recognised private unaided schools is too small to merit attention, and that the government need not bother about them while formulating policies for educational development as they cater to the needs of 'ever-rising ambitions of middle class parents who can afford to pay high fees for such types of schools', and are lured by the English medium such schools offered. With the spectacular growth of private unaided schools charging low fees , or *saivents* as I would like to call them, at all stages of schooling, in rural as well as urban areas, and in almost all states, mainstream educational discourse has moved from a stage of denial to acknowledging the growth of private unaided schools and expressing concern about increasing dualism of the school system; sceptics continue to insist that 'the choice of private schooling is not an option for most low caste and poor households' , and that reliance on private schools is a quick fix that ought to

be avoided. In contrast to the past however, the discourse has not been one sided. The quick fix denunciation itself is a response to the increasing articulation of the view that low cost private unaided schools offer a better solution to the challenge of universalisation of elementary and secondary education, and that government should encourage parents to choose better schools through grant of vouchers. Protagonists in the policy debate look at the government and private schools in binary, Manichean terms reminding one of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* ; one side is bleating 'private good, public bad' while the other side is bleating the exact opposite.

Private schools differ in many respects, not merely whether they are recognised or unrecognised, and not merely whether they receive grant from government or not. One needs to differentiate between boarding and day schools. Another axis of differentiation is the board to which a school is affiliated, international schools being higher in the pecking order than All India Boards like CBSE and the ICSE, which in turn outrank state boards. Another axis of differentiation is whether a school is a stand-alone school or part of a network which could be local, national or international. According to the *Select Education Statistics 2008-09*, there were in all 176,952 private unaided schools of all kind. Barring about 15,000 schools, the rest are *saivents* , which if recognised, are generally affiliated to the state boards, and though they themselves are quite heterogeneous, most of them charge fees negligible in comparison with those affiliated to International or All India Boards, and cater to lower middle class and the poor. In terms of growth in numbers and enrolment, they seem to be the most dynamic segment of the school system. Their remarkable growth covers all stages of schooling including primary and upper primary levels. The statistical trends based on available data from different sources establish that the growing importance of private unaided schools is not a flash in the pan. Over the last fifteen years when the flagship programmes of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA) had facilitated huge investments in elementary education and promoted quality improvement programmes, considerable additional enrolment took place in private unaided schools which were not covered by programme interventions of DPEP and SSA . This reality gives lie to the proposition that the expansion of private schools is due to the retreat of the State from its obligation to provide basic education. Further, the neo-liberal policies or the structural adjustment of early 1990s did

not trigger the growth of private unaided schools of all types. The 1990s and 2000s actually witnessed the continuance of trends that began in the late 1970s. Another trend is no less significant. The expansion of private aided schools was co-eval with the decline of private unaided schools. From a historical perspective, the decline of private aided schools marks the end of an era of modern education in India.

Central Government policies have generally ignored private schools with two significant exceptions: first, *the requirement in The Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009* requiring that private unaided elementary education institutions should earmark twenty five percent of their seats to children from weaker sections, and secondly, conferment of minority status on private schools. It would appear that measures for regulating institutions affiliated to foreign bodies like the International Baccalaureate are on the anvil. These exceptions apart, the elephant in the room continues to be ignored. State governments have elaborate provisions for regulating almost every aspect of running private unaided institutions, but their enforcement reminds one of the saying that in erstwhile Soviet Union where it used to be said that workers pretended to work, and managers pretended to pay. Managements pretend to comply, and governments pretend to enforce regulations. Both central and state governments have been acting on the belief that what matters for educational development are government schools only. And what all needs to be done in respect of private schools is to regulate them so that they do not cheat parents and consumers. With clear evidence that more and more poor parents and their children are opting for *saivents*, the extant policy approach is untenable. In my lecture, I would briefly outline the policy changes needed.

It is axiomatic that policy has to be evidence-based. Conflicting views about State and markets are reminiscent of theological disputes; however, reasonable men can draw reasonable conclusions if adequate, reliable data were available. The lack of detailed data on private schools validates the saying of Bertrand Russell that the most savage controversies are about those matters for which there is no good evidence. We need to have detailed information of the different varieties of private schools, where they are located, the socio-economic profiles of students and parents, their financing modalities, fees charged, facilities they possess, and their learning outcomes; and this information needs to be collected with reasonable

frequency so that it is possible to gauge the trends, and assess the factors underlying the trends. Needless to say *Select Education Statistics*, All India Education Survey, DISE, and SIMES should gather and report data on private schools on par with government schools. And the collection of such statistics should be supplemented by periodic and nation-wide micro-studies which bring out the ground reality underlying statistical trends.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Provision of School Education: Is it State Vs Market? Reflections from Karnataka State in India**

**Professor Vinod B. Annigeri**  
CMDR, Dharwad , India

The discussion presented touches upon the role and importance of education in achieving economic development. The focus of the discussion is on the present pattern of provision of school education with different options therein. A model of Public Private Partnerships in education has been presented which considers pure public provision and pure private provision at the two extremes. In between there are host of options for the provision of education with the active partnership of both government and non government players. The existing scenario of provision of school education is presented with the latest available data. In the next section an attempt is made to throw light on the Grant-in -Aid system in the state of Karnataka. This system provides financial support to private schools. A peep is made to see the effect of such a system on the equity considerations.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Engaging Non-state Actors in Education in Asia: Challenges and the Role of Government**

**Le Thu Huong**  
UNESCO, Bangkok

The development of education, and especially the realization of the goal of quality basic education for all, requires a plethora of human, physical and, of course, financial resources. While the funding and provision of basic education remain primarily the government's responsibility, other non-state actors, such as community groups and the private sector, also play an increasingly important role. Who are non-state actors? What is their role? What is the nature and extent of their involvement in education, and what types of regulation are in place? The presentation provides an overview of non-state actors and the experiences of Asian countries engaging effectively with non-state actors in education - including public private partnerships. These experiences are drawn mainly from the joint UNESCO Bangkok-World Bank pilot survey on System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER) in 2010 and UNESCO Bangkok on-going policy research programme on education management and finance. Preliminary findings reveal some emerging trends that countries have towards engaging with non-state actors, but the nature and extent of regulation remain diverse and leave much room for improvement. These experiences add nuance to our understanding of the nature and extent of the involvement of non-state actors in education, especially from the Asia region and the role that government should play in facilitating the involvement of non-state actors

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Financing Education in Indonesia: The Role of State and Private Actors**

**Anwar Alsaïd**

Head of Education Unit  
UNESCO Jakarta

The Regional Government law 32/2004 assigned responsibility for "management of provision of education" to district governments. The Central-Regional Financial Balance law 33/2004 provided financing arrangements to enable district governments to fulfill their obligations under the Regional Government law. The Planning law 25/2004 established a series of plans which must be produced at both the central and regional levels.

The package of laws on finance, law 17/2003 concerning National Finance, law 1/2004 concerning the National Treasury and law 15/2004 concerning Inspection of Management and Responsibility for National Finance reorganized the entire budgeting process – and MOF as well. The format of government budgets was brought into line with international (United Nations) best practice as well as the requirements of the Central-Regional Financial Balance law.

Since the mid-1990s, Indonesia has built an upward trend in government expenditure on education. Education expenditures increased again by 12.8 percent in 2005, and the budget for 2006 shows an even higher increase of close to 30 percent.

Two ministries responsible for supervision of education provision are Ministry of National Education (MoNE) & Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA).

Both MoNE and MoRA schools have large numbers of students being served by private sector education providers who are more (MoNE) or less (MoRA) closely regulated by the respective ministry.

Private schools – both MoNE and MoRA – are owned and operated by legal bodies called "foundations" (*yayasan*) which may be responsible for single or multiple schools and may operate in limited geographical areas or nationally.

Private schools teach the same curriculum as government schools and their students sit for the same exit examinations to graduate. Religious organizations may establish foundations to operate private schools. All MONE and MORA, government and private, schools use the same basic curriculum (although *Madrasah* schools add extra religious subjects).

The National Education Standards Agency in 2006 has issued regulations specifying the content of curriculum at the primary level, as one of the national education standards required by the National Education System Law. The government issues graduation certificates to students from all four types of schools. Graduation is based on passing a national exit examination at the end of each level.

Graduation from a given level, as evidenced by possession of a graduation certificate, does not guarantee admission to a specific school at the next level. Individual schools, both MONE and MORA, government and private, have the right to set their own admission standards. Textbooks are produced by the private sector. Schools are permitted to choose from a list of textbooks which have been vetted by MONE.

Teaching-learning equipment and media are produced by the private sector. Donor funded projects purchase these in the market and provide them to schools, which can also purchase in the market from their own school budgets.

MONE, district education offices and MORA procure from the market under government procurement guidelines

**Privatization in 3 forms:**

1. Private Provision: Education can be provided by private agencies. Private schools owned and managed by foundations ("yayasan"), religious groups, for-profit entrepreneurs, charities. The production and printing of textbooks, teaching-learning equipment and media are produced by the private sector.

2. Private Funding: Education can be funded by private individuals/agencies
3. Private Regulation: Education can be monitored by those who receive the services directly, i.e. the students and their families

Private expenditure makes up a large percentage of total expenditure on primary to post-secondary, non-tertiary education in Indonesia higher than relatively affluent countries like Japan.

In Indonesia, more than 90 per cent of pre-primary education expenditure and more than 56 per cent of lower secondary expenditure is from private sources.

**Private Actors include:**

1. For-profit companies
2. NGOs
3. United Nations, Donor Agencies
4. Faith-based organizations
5. Civil Society
6. Private Individual/Family

Postiglione and Tan (2007) reported that private schools in Indonesia have provided educational alternatives for the poor and those living in more remote areas and are sometimes the only option for these students.

**Regulations on private actions in education in Indonesia**

The National Education System Law mandates one accreditation system for all types of schools (government and private; MONE and MORA).

Management of the provision of educational services in *MONE schools* - is the responsibility of the district government, directly for MONE government schools and indirectly, through licensing and regulation, for MONE private schools; this responsibility is exercised through the District Education Service (Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten or Dinas Pendidikan Kota).

*MORA schools* - is the responsibility of the vertical hierarchy of MORA in the regions (MORA Provincial offices/Kanwil and MORA District offices/Kandep), directly for MORA government schools and indirectly for MORA private schools.

MoNE encourages non-state providers – including for profit, non-profit and community-based organization to expand the provision of early childhood education through a block-grant subsidy system. In Indonesia, government provides funding for more than 65 per cent of 'private' primary schools.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Private Sector Role in Education: Complementing the National Agenda**

**Dr. Jamil. BinAdimin**

**Mr. Lew Yeok Leng**

Institute of Aminuddin Baki,  
Malaysia

The National Education Policy in Malaysia has evolved and strengthened since Independence. While ensuring that public education in a democratic society should benefit all segments of the population, providing them with knowledge and marketable skills, the government also has welcomed the role played by the private sector in furthering education over the past two decades, seen as an integral component in national development. This paper, intend to look at the private education from preschool to advanced level education. Research was carried out on private education in Kuala Lumpur, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah and Labuan. The areas being looked in intend to address two key questions of the conference: (1) What impact do private actors have on widening access, on improving quality and on decreasing disparities in education in its specific ecology of learning? (2) How can public authorities better regulate private education in education without damaging its potential benefits? The papers suggests ways that the private schools can develop channels for input into the broader educational landscape through becoming in effect 'spaces of educational experimentation and pedagogical outreach'. i.e. 'catalysts for innovation' rather than 'barriers to equity'. Private schools can, as

'model laboratories', strive to share new ideas for curricular upgrading and change, and help develop pedagogies and curricular approaches and content that are more indigenous. They can strive in new ways to contribute to teacher development in the the surrounding area, offering workshops for teachers. These initiatives can build a framework of 'dynamic mutual connectivity' with the broader public educational system, thus ensuring that private actors and their spaces do not become 'enclaves of privilege'.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **The Role of Private Actors in Education: Experiences of Nepal**

**Dr. Narendra Phuyal**  
CERID, Nepal

Government, business sector and civil society are the three actors in democratic society. The government is fundamentally power oriented. So it has a tendency to control the other two sectors. Business sector is profit oriented sector. In such situation, the private actors(Civil society) has to try to contain both government and business sector taking the side of the people in order to protect people's rights and interests. The private actors include class organizations, educational organizations, non-profit non-government organization (NGOs) and press. If the private actors are strong, the government will try to become more democratic and oriented to people's welfare. Similarly, the business sector will also become more responsible and sensitive.

Private actors are always together with democratic society. The mission of private actors should be to provide service to the most vulnerable section of the society to make them empowered, capable and organized, so that they become able to defend their right and to enhance their quality of life and living standard. In the context of Nepal, private actors need to go where the government has not satisfactorily reached and where the government has not paid adequate attention.

## **Nature of Private educational actors in Nepal**

District level private actors involve the executive bodies of the local organizations (schools, CBO, and NGOs) who frequently act as community leaders of their locality. Most of the local private actors are found involved in party politics of their locality and some are found as national level politicians.

Some of the appreciable innovative experiences in Nepal are :

***Teacher training:*** Rato Bangala School located at Patan which is a private school conducted a teacher training program for teachers of a remote district i.e. Dailekh. 400 teachers of Dailekh district were trained and more are being trained as a continuous program and expanding to other districts as well. It is the first case that a private school of the best quality has shared its educational experience with schools from remote area of Nepal and thus happens to be an innovative work of private actor.

***Educational access to disadvantaged children:*** Samata School operated in Jorpati, Katmandu took an innovative lead to increase educational access to disadvantaged children in Nepal. Local resources and funding was collected and school was opened for disadvantaged that increases access of disadvantaged.

***Child friendly school:*** BASE/UNICEF/ local club funded the program and parents themselves work to give quality education. Parents held meeting and identify the needs of school and children then fulfill the requirement by themselves. Providing direct facilitation to children in school as well at home and thus creating a favorable environment to study.

***Education in mother tongue through use of multi language:*** DANIDA and Finland funded program and DOE gave short course training to teachers and SMC. After that teachers and SMC collaborated with local community and developed curriculum and text book themselves based on their local environment and then approved it by CDC and DOE. Then the program expanded to other local school in initiation of those schools without any

funds required further. This helped children to learn easily and interestingly proving the program a complete success.

**Reading camp for Tharu children:** BASE and World Education with involvement of the local club started the program. Once a week a local volunteer teach curricular as well as extracurricular activities for both the school going and non going children of the community gathered at same place. Volunteer take required materials and help from parents through a parents committee. Thus this program helps exchange of knowledge between children of different school as well as the non school going children. Now the program is running on local initiation without any funding.

**Open school:** for dropout and disadvantaged communities DOE provides the funding and the program is run by public school. It worked for providing education to dropout and educationally disadvantaged group utilizing the fund.

**Kisori Education :** Banke Mahila Arthik Swabalamban Sanstha ( BMASS) and World Education developed Our Learning Center. The center works on providing education to young girls both school going and non going, like non formal education.

**Kamalaries education:** Kamalaries are girls who work as bonded labour. Nepalese Youth Opportunity Foundation (NYOF) and local club started the program to educate them using community resource as well as government resources available to them.

**Water and sanitation in Tanahun :** Initiated under the collaboration of Unicef and run by local school comittee,local club and child club. In this program local people were made to involve to clean their village. In Tanahun district children ran program themselves for water sanitation and control of open field defecation with assistance of a single school teacher. Then the program expanded and the whole VDC became open defecation free zone.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **The Role of Private Actors in Education: An Opportunity of Innovation or a Barrier to Equity?**

**Laxmi Ram Paudel**  
Executive Director  
NCED, Nepal

Public and private sectors are two main drivers in meeting the public expectation for better educational services to the citizens. The public sector is a part of the state that deals with the production, delivery and allocation of goods and services by the government to its citizens. On the other hand, the private sector is referred to as the citizen sector, which is run by private individuals or groups, usually as a means of enterprise for profit, and is not fully controlled by the state.

Based on this understanding the paper deals about:

- Privatization in education in Nepal.
- Different forms of privatization.
- Impact of private sector involvement in education both as an opportunity for innovations and a barrier to equity.
- Issues and challenges in the roles of private actors in education.
- Suggestion framework for modernization of private sector contribution.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Private Sector Support in School Improvement Specific Interventions in Sri Lanka**

**Dr. Wilfred J Perera**  
Education Consultant  
The Finance Commission  
Colombo, Sri Lanka

In Sri Lanka, those outside the school have taken a keen interest to help schools in different ways towards school improvement. In the last decade the private sector support has increased. The paper highlights three ways by which private sector support is growing.

- (i) The PSI (SBM) movement and how it has given momentum for private sector support;
- (ii) The direct role played by the private (business) sector in the improvement of schools; and
- (iii) The role of old pupils in drawing private sector support.

**(i) The PSI (SBM) movement**

In order to carry out school activities efficiently and effectively the government of Sri Lanka initiated, the "Programme on School Improvement" (PSI) in all the schools. PSI is led by the School Development Committee (SDC). The SDC consists of Teacher/ Parent/ Past Pupil representatives and a representative of the Education Authority. These stakeholders are able to seek support from the private (business) sector to support schools and it is encouraged to do so. The SDC is empowered to obtain financial and material support from well-wishers, hire school premises when not in use, plan projects to earn money. Of course these are to be done on voluntary basis and the money earned has to be used under given financial regulations.

**(ii) The direct role played by the private (business) business sector in the improvement of schools**

Nearly 30 percent of Sri Lanka schools are small schools with less than 100 students on role. Some of the schools among them have taken several initiatives and have employed good practices that are unique. Such schools are adopted by business organizations and are helped in numerous ways to do better. The paper presents few specific examples of such interventions.

**(iii) The Old Pupil support in School Improvement**

Along with the small schools Sri Lanka also has a number of large schools with well over 4000 students. These schools have old pupil associations. These associations have taken priority to support the schools by way of infra-structure development, support for co-curriculum, teacher

development etc. The paper highlights some methods where old pupils support schools.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Socialization in Education – Some Initial Experiences in Vietnam**

**Dr. Chu Hồng Thanh**

General Director of Legal Department  
Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training

In recent 10 years, since Vietnam Government issued Resolution No. 05/2005/NQ-CP in 2005 about promoting socialization in education, number of private schools in the national education system increased very fast at all levels and qualifications. Vietnam Government considers socialization in education, including development of private schools, neither the ad-hoc nor temporary solution and not only for the purpose of financial mobilization for education to support for the state budget which is insufficient. The more important purpose is to establish and promote a learning society in which each individual have different choice to pursue their learning, upgrade their qualification and their profession, improve their skills and nurture their talent.

In school year of 2009 – 2010, private schools in Vietnam enrolled 1,6 million early child-care pupils (counting for 51% of total early child care pupils of the system), 4,8% students from K1 to K12, 22,2% professional students, 12,7% students of colleges and universities. In Hanoi, number of private schools counts for 21% of total, enrolling 11% students. There are more and more private schools with good and modern infrastructure. The appearance and development of private schools not only responses the increasing and diverse demands but more importantly, it brings about a new education model which is more flexible, dynamic and effective. Quite several private schools are becoming more and more competitive with the public schools, creating a comparison of the effectiveness in education, becoming a motivation for the movement of the education.

Socialization in education in Vietnam makes a change in the awareness of the society about the role of education. In the central planned economy, people considered education to be the task of the government. And now, it is confirmed that investing in education is investing for development. Education is the course of every body, whole society, of all organizations, offices. Vietnam Constitution and Education Law identify education is the 1<sup>st</sup> national priority, the momentum for the development of socio-economics. The investment for education increases year by year, including sources from state budget, individual finance and organizations. From 2007 up to now, each year, Vietnam Government spend 20% state budget for education. Many provinces, cities of Vietnam the unit cost per student, especially Hanoi, in 2011, the unit cost increases times compared with 5 years ago and becomes the city with the highest investment for education. Up to now, spending for learning needs has become a major part of family expenditure in Vietnam. Total spending for the learning of people counts for about 25% total social spending.

Socialization in education is not only to increase the money investing in education but also to expanse and improve the quality of curriculum & programs implementation, school management and the accountability of schools with the society and registration. Socialization in education means that schools are completely autonomous in developing curriculum, lessons and accountable for their quality, schools have the right and responsibility in enrolling students, organizing examinations and granting degrees, certificates, recruiting teachers; autonomous in finance and mobilizing resources for school development. Each school has its own discipline, own feature and own culture and these should be respected and the difference should be accepted by letting the school management board decide their own teaching and learning method and their internal issues. The government and Ministry of Education and Training concern about issuing policies and legislatures, managing the training quality, supervising and evaluating to classify schools fairly, objectively and transparently so that the society and parents, students have credible information for their selection of appropriate education service. Beside the socialization in education, the Government still need to have financial support for private schools in different education levels and training qualifications because the state budget for education all come from the contribution of the people.

One more issue in socialization in education is to facilitate private schools so that they have enough land to build their schools. Land for school construction should not be considered commercial land, but the national public land for education purpose. In Education Law and in national policy, Government have specific proportion of land in the land planning for education purpose. Land which is given to or rent by private schools to construct schools, implement education activities, is tax-free. At the same time, people are encouraged to contribute land for school construction.

Socialization in education request the Government to pay more attention to the policies for schools, to have good welfare for people working in education sector, especially teachers, in term of insurance, welfare, salary and professional allowance... and not distinguishing public teachers and private teachers.

Resolution No.05/2005/NQ-CP of the Government dated 18/4/2005 on promoting socialization in education identifies two big goals for socialization: firstly to promote the intellectual and physical potential in the crowded population, mobilizing the whole society in taking care about the education course; secondly to create conditions so that all society, especially the targeted and poor persons, can benefit more and better education achievements. In one hand, Government continue to increase the spending for education, ensuring the budget for compulsory education; focusing investment in key tasks, national targeted programs; training human resources for key industries or the careers that are difficult to mobilize the contribution from society; give investment priority for disadvantages areas, areas with ethnic minority people; In another hand, push up the mobilization resources from society, social - economic organizations, individuals for the development of education. Socialization in education means to increase the relationship between schools and families; mobilizing the intellectual, resources of the whole education sector, whole society in innovating the content and curriculum of education, implementing holistic education and high quality focused training. Resolution No. 05 /2005/NQ-CP of the Government set the target of 80% early childcare pupils, 70% pre-school pupils, 40% upper secondary students, 30% professional students, 60% vocational students and 40% of higher education students are enrolled in private education institutions.

Together with the socialization in education and the development of private schools, Vietnam Government encourage the cooperation and joint venture in education with advanced foreign training institutions; encourage to open quality and prestigious education institution in the form of 100% foreign investment; encourage scientists and educationist with high qualification from overseas to participate in teaching in Vietnam.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Access and Financing: Efficiencies of Profit Education**

**Dino Varkey**

Senior Director, Business Operation

GEMS Education

Dubai, UAE

**Education Gap:** Depending on the numbers that one chooses to look at, the education gap is typically defined by universal access to basic primary education (MDG 2), and that number today stands at approximately 75 million.

However, what about those children who may be sitting in a classroom but the teacher is asleep or absent, forcing school administrators to put classes together that number 70 or 80 students per class just so that children have a teacher standing in front of them. If we start to look at these factors, and start to define the education gap as not just about universal access to education but universal access to a minimum standard or QUALITY of education, then the gap that we are actually looking at is in the hundreds of millions.

If we then add the sheer weight of demand, driven both by -

- Parents that believe that governments globally are struggling to cater to their ambition and aspiration for their children's education -
  - Moray survey in the UK that found that 54% of parents would move their children from public school if there was an affordable alternative

offered by the private sector because of the general dissatisfaction with the public education system; moreover, this is a global phenomenon.

- And accelerating population growth statistics in emerging markets -
  - If one looks at the BRIC countries alone, just to keep pace with population growth, approximately, 10,000 schools would be needed Every year to cater to the demand.

In the face of such a requirement, increasingly, it becomes apparent that either private sector will be required to step in outright OR in partnership with governments in order to provide the quality of education that communities around the world increasingly desire.

### **Challenging the perception of "for profit education" - "private education"**

The most common challenge – how can one be allowed to make money through the provision of education? To address this, one has to answer - what does for profit in education really mean?

Quite simply – adopting private sector principles in education allow us to create schools or education systems that are sustainable, that are self-sufficient, and ultimately provide the financial freedom and capacity to build an education solution at scale.

The second misconception regarding private sector education is that it is the domain of the wealthy; some have even classed them as "elitist". However, if one looks at the work undertaken by Professor James Tooley (one of the foremost proponents of privatization in education) he has found examples of private schools in parts of India where education is provided for as little as \$3 a month. According to the IFC in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, and Uganda private school enrolment is up to over 40 percent now. This education is delivered, in the main, through low cost low fee schools and it is astonishing how very poor families are prepared to make considerable sacrifices to send their children to non-state schools.

However, there is a caveat: the education sector globally should be seen as the building of critical infrastructure that will secure the future of a nation. Consequently, like all infrastructure, in order to be successful, the education sector

needs to attract capital/investors that are truly long term. Unfortunately, the majority of the capital that is finding its way into the education space is still fundamentally short term in their outlook - essentially financial investors (PE or venture capital).

**Efficiencies of for profit education:**

- **Standards and efficiency** - "For the same per-pupil cost, how much more achievement would one get in private than in public schools?" The answer ranged from **1.2 times** (Philippines) to a massive **6.74 times** more achievement (Thailand) in the private than in the public schools {*World Bank study of achievement in language and mathematics in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Tanzania, and Thailand*}.
- **Equity**

**How? The simple answer is ACCOUNTABILITY** - will elaborate during session

**New solutions:**

Encourage private sector participation in the education sector either through:

- PPP/Contracting out model - a state school has some or all of its educational functions contracted out to the private sector under accountability guidelines established by the local and/or central government where all of the educational functions—pedagogy, curriculum, school management and improvement are taken over by the private company.
- Unaided (for profit) private schools - government support of private education providers entering a new country/market rather than typical negative or dis-incentivizing policy response driven by short term political considerations.
- Given the stigma attached to "for profit" principles in education there is a huge onus on private education providers to ensure that they are dedicated, socially responsible corporate citizens. Leverage this requirement to encourage sustainable partnerships between Government/Private/NGO to create solutions to close the education gap.

\*\*\*\*\*



***ANNEXURE I: PROGRAMME SCHEDULE***



**Wednesday 19 October, 2011**

09.15 - 10.00 a.m.	<b>Registration of participants</b>	
<b>Seminar opening</b>		
10.00 - 11.00 a.m.	<p><b>Opening session</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcoming speech by Prof. R. Govinda, Vice Chancellor, NUEPA, ANTRIEP Focal point institute</li> <li>• IIEP Role in ANTRIEP, Statement by Mr Anton De Grauwe, IIEP</li> <li>• Keynote speech by Dr. Amarjit Singh, Joint Secretary (Elementary Education) Ministry of HRD, Government of India Release of Modules on "Making School Successful"</li> <li>• Vote of Thanks by Prof. K.Sujatha</li> </ul>	<b>Plenary session</b>
11.00 - 11.30 a.m.	<b>Tea break</b>	
11.30 a.m. - 1.00 p.m.	<p>Presentation by participants</p> <p>Introduction to the seminar theme and program, by A. De Grauwe, IIEP</p> <p>Brief discussion on seminar theme</p>	<b>Plenary session</b>
1.00 - 2 p.m.	<b>Lunch break</b>	

<b>Theme 1: Who are the non-public actors?</b>		
2.00 – 3.30 p.m.	<p>The role of NGO's in education: the case of Bangladesh and its wider implications, by Mr. Samir Ranjan Nath, BRAC</p> <p>Reflection on the role of non-public actors, by Mr. Ramkrishana Rao, UNI CEF, India</p> <p>The role of a private school network: the example of GEMS Education Services, by Mr. Dino Varkey, GEMS Education.</p>	<b>Plenary session</b>
3.30 – 4.00 p.m.	<b>Tea break</b>	
4.00 – 6.00 p.m.	<p><b>Country presentations</b></p> <p><b>Group 1:</b> Presentations by Bangladesh, Korea, India, Malaysia and Sri Lanka</p> <p>Discussions</p>	<b>Group Work</b>
	<p><b>Country presentations</b></p> <p><b>Group 2:</b> Presentations by Indonesia, Nepal, the Philippines and Vietnam</p> <p>Discussions</p>	<b>Group Work</b>
Evening 7.30 pm	<p>Dinner hosted by the Secretary School Education &amp; Literacy Ministry of HRD, Govt. of India</p> <p>Venue: India Habitat Centre</p>	

**Thursday 20 October, 2011**

<b>Theme 2: The involvement of private actors and the implications for equity</b>		
9.00 – 10.30 a.m.	<p>The policy implications of the involvement of private actors in education, by Dr. R.V. Vaidyanatha Ayyar (Retd Secretary , Ministry of HRD Govt. of India)</p> <p>Engaging non-state actors in education in Asia: Challenges and the role of government, by Ms. Le Thu Huong, UNESCO Bangkok</p>	<b>Plenary session</b>
10.30 – 11.00 a.m.	<b>Tea break</b>	
11.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.	<p>The Challenge of Shadow Education: The Expansion and Implications of Private Supplementary Tutoring, by Prof. Mark Bray, University of Hong Kong</p> <p>Achievement and equity in public and private education: evidence from PI SA, by Ms. Sue Thomson, ACER</p> <p>Private Sector: equity vs efficiency and the challenge to ensure continuous quality improvement for all, by Mr. Colin Bangay, DFID India</p> <p>Discussion and preliminary conclusions</p>	<b>Plenary session</b>
1.00 – 2 p.m.	<b>Lunch break</b>	

<b>Theme 3: Government responses to the involvement of non-public actors in education</b>		
2 – 2.30 p.m.	Introduction to the theme and to the group discussions, by Prof. K. Sujatha, NUEPA	<b>Plenary session</b>
2.30 – 3.30 p.m.	The groups will discuss the following questions: - What impact has the involvement of private actors on quality and equity in the education system? - What control should be exercised by the state? What instruments does the state have at its disposal? - How can such control best be exercised without damaging the potential benefits of private involvement in education?	
	<b>Group 1: Discussion</b>	<b>Group Work</b>
	<b>Group 2: Discussion</b>	<b>Group Work</b>
3.30 – 4.00 p.m.	<b>Tea break</b>	
4.00 – 5.30 p.m.	<b>Group 1</b> Discussions and preliminary conclusions	<b>Group Work</b>
	<b>Group 2</b> Discussions and preliminary conclusions	<b>Group Work</b>
Evening 7.00pm	Cultural Programme hosted by NCERT Dinner hosted by the Vice-Chancellor, NUEPA Venue: NCERT/NUEPA	

**Friday 21 October, 2011**

<b>Seminar conclusions</b>		
9.00 – 10.30 a.m.	Reminder of preliminary conclusions from theme 1 and 2 Reports from groups 1 and 2 Discussions	<b>Plenary session</b>
10.30 – 11.00 a.m.	<b>Tea break</b>	
11.00 a.m. – 12.00 p.m.	Reflections by participants Final discussion and conclusions	
12.00 – 1.00 p.m.	<b>Closing session</b> Valediction address by Ms. Anshu Vaish Secretary School Education & Literacy, Ministry of HRD Government of India	
Friday afternoon	Restricted meeting of ANTRIEP member institutions Venue: NUEPA	



## **ANNEXURE II: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**



## COUNTRIES

### AUSTRALIA

1. Dr. Sue Thomson  
Director of Educational Monitoring and Research  
Research Director, National Surveys Program  
Australian Council for Educational Research  
19 Prospect Hill Road, Camberwell VIC 3124  
AUSTRALIA  
Tel : +61 3 9277 5727  
E-mail: [thomsons@acer.edu.au](mailto:thomsons@acer.edu.au)
  
2. Mr. Peter Mc Guckian  
Director of International Development  
Australian Council for Educational Research  
19 Prospect Hill Road, Camberwell VIC 3124  
AUSTRALIA  
Tel: +61 3 9277 5509  
E-mail: [mcguckian@acer.edu.au](mailto:mcguckian@acer.edu.au)

### BANGLADESH

3. Mr. A.S. Mahmud  
Joint Secretary and PS to the Hon. Minister  
Ministry of Education  
Building #6, Floor #17th & 18th  
Bangladesh Secretariat  
Dhaka - 1000, Bangladesh  
Tel: +88 155 237 2520  
E-mail: [as.mahmud@yahoo.com](mailto:as.mahmud@yahoo.com)
  
4. Prof. Shamsur Rahman  
Director General  
National Academy for Educational Management  
Ministry of Education  
New Market, Dhaka-1205  
Bangladesh  
Tel: 8802-8650338  
Mobile : 01911972267  
E-mail: [info@naem.gov.bd](mailto:info@naem.gov.bd); [srahman13bd@yahoo.com](mailto:srahman13bd@yahoo.com)

5. Dr. Md. Lokman Hossain  
Associate Prof. and Training Specialist  
National Academy for Educational Management  
Ministry of Education  
New Market, Dhaka-1205  
Bangladesh  
Tel: 01711 35 81 32  
E-mail: [drlokmanhossain@yahoo.com](mailto:drlokmanhossain@yahoo.com)
  
6. Md. Shariful Islam  
Training Specialist  
National Academy for Educational Management  
Ministry of Education  
New Market, Dhaka-1205  
Bangladesh  
Tel: 1678135281  
E-mail: [sharif\\_1956@yahoo.com](mailto:sharif_1956@yahoo.com)
  
7. Mrs. Tuhina Rahman  
Guest Research Fellow  
National Academy for Educational Management  
Ministry of Education  
New Market  
Dhaka-1205, Bangladesh  
Tel: 8802-8650338  
E-mail: [srahman13bd@yahoo.com](mailto:srahman13bd@yahoo.com)
  
8. Mr. Samir Ranjan Nath  
Programme Head, Educational Research Unit  
Research and Evaluation Division  
BRAC Centre, 75 Mohakhali, Dhaka 1212  
BANGLADESH  
Tel: 9881265 (ext. 2703)  
Mobile: 01714 091 485  
E-mail: [nath.sr@brac.net](mailto:nath.sr@brac.net)
  
9. Ms. Tasneem Athar  
Deputy Director  
Campaign for Popular Education  
5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur  
Dhaka, 1207, Bangladesh  
Ph: 88-02-9130427, 8155031-2  
E-mail : [tasneem@campebd.org](mailto:tasneem@campebd.org)

## **BHUTAN**

10. Mrs. Karma Choden  
Offtg. Chief Programme Officer  
Private Schools Division  
Department of School Education  
Ministry of Education  
1-7, Wogmin Lam  
Namgaychholing, Thimphu, Bhutan  
Tel: 975-2-323237  
Mobile: 77660099/17474057  
E-mail: [kcemssd@gmail.com](mailto:kcemssd@gmail.com)

## **CAMBODIA**

11. Mr. Lim Sothea  
Director of Planning Department  
Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport  
80 Preah Norodom Boulevard  
Sangkat Chey Chum Neas  
Khan Daun Penh, Phnom Penh 12206  
Cambodia  
Tel : 855 (0) 23 219284-5  
E-mail: [sothea9992000@yahoo.com](mailto:sothea9992000@yahoo.com)

## **CHINA**

12. Dr. Xiuhua Dong  
Director of Institute of Human Resource Development  
Shanghai Academy of Educational Sciences  
21 Chaling Road (N.), Shanghai 200032  
P.R. China  
Tel : 86 21 34604364  
Mobile: 13916582284  
E-mail: [xiuhua\\_dong@126.com](mailto:xiuhua_dong@126.com)
13. Prof. Mark Bray  
Chair Professor of Comparative Education  
Director, Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC)  
Faculty of Education  
The University of Hong Kong  
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, CHINA  
Phone: (852) 2219 4194  
E-mail: [mbray@hku.hk](mailto:mbray@hku.hk)

## **FIJI**

14. Mr. Brij Lal  
Permanent Secretary for Education  
Ministry of Education  
Marela House  
Suva, FIJI  
Tel: 3220404 or 9905424  
E-mail : [brij.lal@govnet.gov.fj](mailto:brij.lal@govnet.gov.fj)

## **INDONESIA**

15. Mr. Anwar Alsaid  
Education Programme Officer  
UNESCO Office Jakarta  
Galuh II no 5  
Kebayoran Baru, Jakarta  
DKI Jakarta 12110  
Indonesia  
Tel: 62 21 7399818 Ext. 843  
E-mail: [a.alsaid@unesco.org](mailto:a.alsaid@unesco.org)

## **SOUTH KOREA**

16. Ms. Juah Kim  
Korean Educational Development Institute  
Baumoe 1rd. 35  
Seocho-gu, Seoul 137-791  
Korea  
Ph: 82,234,600,194  
E-mail: [juah@kedi.re.kr](mailto:juah@kedi.re.kr)

## **LAO PDR**

17. Mr. Houmphanh Keo-Ounkham  
Academic Officer/International Coordinator  
Ministry of Education  
Dept. of Private Education Management  
Lanexang Avenue  
P.O. Box 67, Vientiane Capital  
Lao PDR  
Tel : (856-21) 212120, Mobile : (856-20) 222 02965  
E-mail: [hphanh@hotmail.com](mailto:hphanh@hotmail.com)

## **MALAYSIA**

18. Dr. Jamil Bin Adimin  
Deputy Director for Training  
Institut Aminuddin Baki  
Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia  
Ministry Of Education Malaysia  
Sri Layang, 69000 Genting Highlands  
Pahang Darul Makmur, Malaysia  
Tel : +603 6105 6104, Mobile : +6019-2257277  
E-mail: [jamil@iab.edu.my](mailto:jamil@iab.edu.my)
  
19. Mr. Lew Yeok Leng  
Senior Head of IAB Sabah Branch  
Institut Aminuddin Baki  
Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia  
Ministry Of Education Malaysia  
Sri Layang, 69000 Genting Highlands  
Pahang Darul Makmur, Malaysia  
Tel: 60361056104  
Email: [yllew@iab.edu.my](mailto:yllew@iab.edu.my)
  
20. Ms. Rohaila Yusof  
Deputy Dean of Academic and Student Affairs  
Faculty of Management & Economics  
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris  
35900 Tanjong Malim Perak  
Malaysia, Tel: 6054506280  
E-mail: [rohaila@fpe.upsi.edu.my](mailto:rohaila@fpe.upsi.edu.my)
  
21. Mr. Mohd Zarar Bin Mohd Jenu  
Head, Centre for Electromagnetic compatibility  
Faculty of Electrical and Electronic Engineering  
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia  
86400 Parit Raja, Batu Pahat Johor,  
Malaysia  
Ph: 74537353  
Email: [zarar@uthm.edu.my](mailto:zarar@uthm.edu.my)

## **MALDIVES**

22. Mr. Ahmed Shafeeu  
Director General  
Policy and Planning and Research Section  
Ministry of Education  
Gazy Building, Malé 20-05, Maldives  
Tel: 9603341100, Mobile: 9 607 774 642  
E-mail : [shafeeu@gmail.com](mailto:shafeeu@gmail.com), [shafeeu@moe.gov.mv](mailto:shafeeu@moe.gov.mv)

## **NEPAL**

23. Mr. Narendra Phuyal  
Associate professor of CERID  
CERID  
G.P.O. Box 2161  
Balkhu, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Tel: 977 9841202780  
E-mail: [npphuyal@yahoo.com](mailto:npphuyal@yahoo.com)
24. Mr. Laxmi Ram Paudel  
Executive Director  
National Centre for Educational Development  
Sanothimi, Bhaktapur  
Nepal  
Tel: 977 1 6635133, Mobile: 977 1 9851132035  
E-mail: [lrpaudel@yahoo.com](mailto:lrpaudel@yahoo.com) ; [raspaudel@yahoo.com](mailto:raspaudel@yahoo.com)

## **PARIS**

25. Mr. Anton de Grauwe  
Head of Technical Assistance and Sector Planning  
IIEP  
7-9 rue Eugène-Delacroix  
75116 Paris  
Tel: +33 1 45037744  
E-mail : [a.de-grauwe@iiep.unesco.org](mailto:a.de-grauwe@iiep.unesco.org)

## **PAKISTAN**

26. Mr. Muhammad Siddique Memon  
Secretary, Education and Literacy Department  
Ministry of Education  
Government of Sindh  
Karachi, Pakistan  
Tel : 00-92-21-99211225  
Mobile : 00-92-21-99211238  
E-mail : [edusindh@gmail.com](mailto:edusindh@gmail.com)
27. Ms. Ayesha Hameed  
Project Director  
Literacy and Non-Formal Basic Education Department  
Government of Punjab  
Lahore  
Pakistan  
Tel : 0333-6417578  
E-mail : [ayeshah.hameed@gmail.com](mailto:ayeshah.hameed@gmail.com)

## **PAPUA NEW GUINEA**

28. Mr. Arnold Kukari  
Senior Research Fellow and Program Leader  
Universal Basic Education Research Program  
National Research Institute  
P.O. Box 5854  
Boroko, NCD  
Papua New Guinea  
Tel: (675) 326 0300  
E-mail: [akukari@nri.org.pg](mailto:akukari@nri.org.pg), [ajkukari@gmail.com](mailto:ajkukari@gmail.com)

## **PHILIPPINES**

29. Mr. Benito Espena Benoza  
Manager, Business, Planning and Partnerships Office  
SEAMEO Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology  
Commonwealth Avenue  
UP Diliman Campus  
Quezon City 1101, Metro Manila  
The Philippines  
Tel: (+63 2) 928 7348 / 351 7064 / 924 76 81 to 84  
Fax: (+63 2) 921 02 24, Mobile: (+63) 0917 507 9908  
E-mail: [bennet@seameo-innotech.org](mailto:bennet@seameo-innotech.org)

## **SRI LANKA**

30. Mrs. Kanthi Tilaka Wijesinghe  
Director-Department of School Management of CELD  
National Institute of Education  
P.O. Box 21  
High Level Road  
Maharagama  
Sri Lanka  
Tel: 94775437654  
E-mail: [kanthi.wijesinghe51@gmail.com](mailto:kanthi.wijesinghe51@gmail.com)
31. Mr. Wilfred J. Perera  
Education Consultant  
The Finance Commission  
48, Vajira Road  
Colombo 4  
Sri Lanka  
Tel: (0094)773109898  
E-mail : [wilfredperera@yahoo.com](mailto:wilfredperera@yahoo.com)

## **THAILAND**

32. Ms. Le Thu Huong  
Programme Specialist  
UNESCO Bangkok  
Mom Luang Pin Malakul Centenary Building  
920 Sukhumvit Road  
Prakanong, Klongtoey  
Bangkok 10110 , Thailand  
Tel: 66 2391 0577 Ext.303  
E-mail: [l.huong@unesco.org](mailto:l.huong@unesco.org)

## **VIETNAM**

33. Mr. Chu Hong Thanh  
Director of Legal Affair  
Vice Chairman of Editing Committee on Higher Education Law  
Ministry of Education and Training  
49 Dai Co Viet  
Hanoi, Viet Nam  
Tel: +884 907328999  
E-mail: [chthanh@moet.edu.vn](mailto:chthanh@moet.edu.vn); [chthanh@moet.gov.vn](mailto:chthanh@moet.gov.vn)

## **UNITED ARAB EMIRATES**

34. Mr. Dino Varkey  
Senior Director, Business Operations  
GEMS Education  
Volvo Showroom Building  
P.O. Box 8607  
Dubai, UAE  
Tel: 971 4 347 7770  
E-mail: [dinovarkey@gemseducation.com](mailto:dinovarkey@gemseducation.com)

## **INDIA**

35. Dr. R. V. Vaidyanathan Ayyar  
C-1305, Ramky Towers,  
Near Rolling Hills  
Gachibowli  
Hyderabad 500032  
E-mail: [rv\\_avvar@yahoo.com](mailto:rv_avvar@yahoo.com)
36. Mr. Shankar Narayan IAS  
Secretary  
General Education  
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala
37. Prof. R. Govinda  
Vice-Chancellor  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [r.govinda@nuepa.org](mailto:r.govinda@nuepa.org)
38. Prof. J.B. G. Tilak  
Professor & Head  
Department of Educational and Finance  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [jtilak@nuepa.org](mailto:jtilak@nuepa.org)
39. Prof. K. Sujatha  
Professor & Head  
Department of Comparative Education and International Cooperation  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [ksujatha@nuepa.org](mailto:ksujatha@nuepa.org)

40. Prof. Pranati Panda  
Professor  
Department of Comparative Education and International Cooperation  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [pranaitpanda@nuepa.org](mailto:pranaitpanda@nuepa.org)
41. Dr. Sunita Chugh  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Comparative Education and International Cooperation  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [sunitachugh@nuepa.org](mailto:sunitachugh@nuepa.org)
42. Dr. Vetukuri P.S. Raju  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Comparative Education and International Cooperation  
NUEPA, New Delhi  
Email: [vpsraju@nuepa.org](mailto:vpsraju@nuepa.org)
43. Prof. Poonam Aggrawal  
Head  
Department of International Cooperation  
NCERT, New Delhi
44. Prof. R. S. Sindhu  
Head  
International Relations Division  
NCERT, New Delhi  
Ph: 9968139916  
Email: [sindhurs87@gmail.com](mailto:sindhurs87@gmail.com)
45. Mrs. Kirti Gautam  
Additional Director/Director  
State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT)  
Allahabad, INDIA  
Email: [gautamkirti@rediffmail.com](mailto:gautamkirti@rediffmail.com), [kirtigautam01@gmail.com](mailto:kirtigautam01@gmail.com)
46. Mr. Prabhat Mishra  
Lecturer  
State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT)  
Allahabad, INDIA

47. Mr. Vinod B Annigeri  
Associate Professor  
Center for Multidisciplinary Development Research (CMDR)  
R S No. 9A2, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar  
Near Yalakki Shettar Colony  
Lakamanahalli  
Dharwad 580004 - Karnataka state  
Phone +91 836 2460 453 fax +91 836 2460 464  
Email: [vinodann@yahoo.com](mailto:vinodann@yahoo.com)
48. Mrs. Ameeta Mulla Wattal  
Principal  
Springdales School  
Pusa Road  
Upper Ridge Road Junction  
New Delhi – 110005  
Ph: 25743248, Fax: 25728428  
Email: [sdales@nde.vsnl.net.in](mailto:sdales@nde.vsnl.net.in)
49. Mr. Michael Latham  
Regional Director - CFBT  
5-9-19 First Floor  
Siemens Building  
Saifabad, Hyderabad 500063  
India  
Tel: 040-23230931  
E-mail: [mlatham@cfbt.com](mailto:mlatham@cfbt.com)
50. Mr. Mukesh Kumar Shrivastava  
Associate Fellow  
Council for Social Development  
53 Lodi Estate  
New Delhi – 110003  
Ph: 011-24615383, 24611700 , Fax: 24616061  
Email: [mukesh@csdindia.org](mailto:mukesh@csdindia.org)

## INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES (INDIA)

51. Mr. Colin Bangay  
Senior Education Adviser  
DFID India  
British High Commission  
B28, Tara Crescent  
Outab Institutional Area  
New Delhi - 110016  
Tel: : 011- 4279 3354  
E-mail: [c-bangay@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:c-bangay@dfid.gov.uk)
52. Ms. Sangeeta Dey  
Education Adviser  
DFID India  
British High Commission  
B28, Tara Crescent  
Outab Institutional Area  
New Delhi - 110016  
Tel: 91 11 4279 3116  
E-mail: [s.dey@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:s.dey@dfid.gov.uk)
53. Mr. Sandeepa Sahay  
Education Adviser  
DFID India  
British High Commission  
B28, Tara Crescent  
Outab Institutional Area  
New Delhi - 110016  
E-mail: [s-sahay@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:s-sahay@dfid.gov.uk)
54. Ms. Ragini Raghunandan  
DFID India  
British High Commission  
B28, Tara Crescent  
Outab Institutional Area  
New Delhi - 110016

55. Mr. Tobias Linden  
Lead Education Specialist  
South Asia Education (SASED)  
The World Bank - New Delhi Office  
70 Lodi Estate  
New Delhi 110003  
Tel: (+91 11) 2461 7241, extn 158  
E-mail: [tlinden@worldbank.org](mailto:tlinden@worldbank.org)
56. Dr. Shabnam Sinha  
Senior Education Specialist  
The World Bank  
70, Lodhi Estate  
New Delhi 100003  
Tel: (91-11) 41479445  
E-mail: [ssinha5@worldbank.org](mailto:ssinha5@worldbank.org)
57. Dr. Shankar Chowdhary  
Head, Education  
UNESCO  
B5/29, Safdarjung Enclave  
New Delhi - 110029  
Ph: 011-26713000  
E-mail: [s.chowdhary@unesco.org](mailto:s.chowdhary@unesco.org)
58. Mr. Ramakrishna Rao Begura  
Educational Specialist  
UNI CEF  
73 Lodi Estate  
New Delhi 110 003  
Ph: 91 11 2469-0401, 2469-1410  
Fax: 011 2462-7521, 2469-1410
59. Ms. Manisha Solanki,  
Development Cooperation Section,  
Delegation of European Union to India,  
65, Golf Links  
New Delhi
60. Ms. Shagun Mehrotra  
Lead Educationist  
Delegation of European Union to India,  
65, Golf Links  
New Delhi

61. Dr. Renu Singh  
Senior advisor  
Save the Children, INDI A  
3rd Floor, Vardhaman Trade Centre,  
9-10-11 Nehru Place, New Delhi -110 019

**AUSTRALIAN HIGH COMMISSION**

62. Ms. Nerida Rixon  
First Secretary Education  
Australian High Commission  
New Delhi  
Tel: 91 11 4149 4361  
E-mail: [nerida.rixon@dfat.gov.au](mailto:nerida.rixon@dfat.gov.au)
63. Mr. Peter Nolan  
Counsellor (Education)  
Australian High Commission  
New Delhi, India  
Phone: +91 11 4149 4356  
Fax: +91 11 2687 3172  
Mobile: +91 9650 10153  
Email: [peter.nolan@dfat.gov.au](mailto:peter.nolan@dfat.gov.au)
64. Ms. Anu Jain  
Senior Advisor (Education)  
Australian High Commission  
New Delhi, India



## GROUP PHOTOGRAPH

