

# NEWSLETTER

# ANTRIEP

VOL. 7 NO. 2, July - December 2002

Bi-annual

## The Fifth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting

The Fifth Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions was held at the Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highlands, Malaysia, on 5 of July 2002. The proceedings of the one-day meeting started at 1000 hrs. Representatives from 16 member institutions, i.e. NAEM and BRAC (Bangladesh), Balitbung Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Indonesia), KEDI (Korea), CERID and NCED (Nepal), AKU-IED and AEPAM (Pakistan), SEAMO INNOTECH (Philippines), NIE (Sri Lanka) and IIEP (Paris) participated in the meeting.

Professor B. P. Khandelawal, Director, NIEPA, the Focal Point, opened and chaired the meeting as Mr. Jiang Minghe, Director of the SIHRD, the Chairperson of the Network could not unfortunately attend the meeting. The Chairperson of the Network changes at every Annual Meeting, and as per the convention, the head of the institution hosting the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network till the next Annual Meeting

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

<i>The Fifth Annual ANTRIEP Meeting</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Report on ANTRIEP Activities</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Meeting at IAB, Malaysia</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Seminar on School Evaluation for Quality Improvement</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>News from Member Institutions</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>ANTRIEP Member Institutions</i>	<i>16</i>

takes place. Accordingly, Dato' Dr. Wan Chik Rahman Wan Din, Director, Institut Aminuddin Baki, took over as the new President of the Network and presided over the proceedings of the ANTRIEP Meeting thereafter as its Chairperson.

On behalf of the Focal Point, Prof. K. Sujatha, NIEPA, New Delhi, presented a detailed report of the ANTRIEP activities during 2000-2002, which was circulated among the members. The report highlighted the activities of the Network and identified areas of priority action in the coming years. The report explored various initiatives to promote closer interaction between the members, like the Newsletter and other institutional publications, exchange programmes, workshops, training programmes, study visits and collaborative research projects. Completion of the studies on "School Evaluation", which formed the important input for the preceded seminar on "School Evaluation for Quality Improvement", was also reported in the meeting.

The report underlined the need for closer interaction between member institutions and the policy-making authorities in the respective countries, initiating more bilateral arrangements among member institutions in the areas of research and training. It emphasized the need for initiating steps for bringing larger number of institutions to the Network as associate members, especially from those countries, which have many member institutions, and also bringing new member institutions from countries, which are not represented in the Network. The complete text of the report is published in this issue of the Newsletter.

This was followed by discussion on the report and future activities of the ANTRIEP. Themes for future issues of

the Newsletter and developing a web site for ANTRIEP were discussed. Improvement in bi-lateral cooperation and facilitation of inter-institutional interaction by means of exchange and collaboration were also discussed. A summary of the discussion of the Fifth Annual Meeting is also published in this issue of the Newsletter.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks proposed by the Focal Point, appreciating the contributions made and continued support extended by the member institutions to activate the Network.

The Annual Meeting was preceded by a Seminar on

**School Evaluation for Quality Improvement.** The seminar was organized in collaboration with the Colombo Plan Secretariat. The funding support, provided by the Colombo Plan Secretariat, has helped to have largest participation in so far in the seminar this time. This issue of the Newsletter carries a report on the seminar.

We wish **A Very Happy New Year** to all our member institutions and readers.

*Editor*

## Report on ANTRIEP Activities\*

Recognition of education as one of the key factors for socio-economic development and quality of life has a tremendous effect on the growth of educational system all over the world and more so in developing countries. Education system in the developing countries has experienced continued growth even in the closing decades of the previous century. The growth and expansion of the system has put great pressure on governments to plan and manage the system effectively. It is in this context that new strategies and planning processes have been adopted.

One of the recent reform strategies adopted in many countries to overcome the management challenges is decentralisation of the education system. Decentralisation becomes successful only when planning and management competencies are developed at the local levels. Similarly, the recent move towards school autonomy has brought the focus again on the issue of enhancing planning and management skills to implement academic and non-academic activities at the institutional level. In other words, expansion of the system, accompanied as it is by the decentralisation process and school autonomy, has increased the number of actors involved in the planning and management of education. As such, the demand for capacity building in educational planning and management has increased manifold in all countries, especially in Asia. However, institutional arrangements to facilitate capacity-building on a large

scale in all the required areas do not exist in many of the countries of the Asian region.

In most of the countries, there has been considerable emphasis on expansion of pedagogical training facilities. However, such facilities are not readily available in the area of educational planning and management. Very often, the number of institutions providing training in educational planning and management has not increased proportionately with the increase in the number of educational planners and managers. This has resulted in the lack of capacities in educational planning and management in many countries. Paradoxically, in the phase of decentralised planning and management, whatever limited number of capacity building institutions is available, they are situated at centralised locations thereby impeding the very process of decentralisation. Therefore, there is an immediate need to diversify and expand the institutional arrangements for capacity building of educational functionaries.

Many countries of the Asian region have organisational arrangements, though limited for developing capacities of educational functionaries at various levels of the education system. These institutions have long-standing experience in assisting their respective governments in strengthening planning and management capacities. All these institutions were functioning, till very recently, in isolation and they rarely got a chance to meet among

\*Report presented at the ANTRIEP Meeting in Kuala Lumpur on 5th July, 2002

themselves to share their experiences and expertise. Moreover, there used to be very limited interaction among similar institutions situated either within the country or in other countries of the region. There was no mechanism for exchanging and sharing ideas and experiences on a regular basis. With this backdrop, the idea of a Network of Educational Planning and Management Institutions situated within Asian region was rightly conceived.

The idea of developing a Network in this region took a concrete shape at a workshop in Kathmandu in December 1994 and became a reality at the workshop in New Delhi in December 1995 when 12 institutions from eight Asian countries formed the ANTRIEP Network. Since then the number of member institutions has increased to 18, including IIEP, Paris. The overall objective of the Network is to create and develop co-ordination among the member institutions located in different countries of the region with a view to sharing experiences and ideas towards realising the growing demand for capacity building in various aspects of educational planning and management. The Network thus ensures regular exchange of technical information among the member institutions; and it facilitates continuous upgrading of knowledge and skills among the professionals of the participating institutions through learning from each other's experiences and in launching co-operative research and training activities in areas of common interest. The Network also brings out a bi-annual Newsletter which

carries articles on selected themes that help to share and understand experiences of respective countries, and disseminates information regarding various activities of the Network.

### **Organisational Arrangement**

Any training and research institution in the region involved in educational planning and management can become a member of the Network. To be a member of the Network, the institute has to address its request to the Focal Point expressing willingness to become a member. No fee is charged for joining the Network. It was decided unanimously in the First Annual Meeting held in New Delhi in 1995 that the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris, would provide special and continued support till the Network became self-sustaining and self-directed; that the National Institute of Edu-

cational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi, would act as the Focal Point of the Network; and that the president of the Network would be on rotation basis. The Network is successfully functioning under the academic guidance and necessary support from the International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris. The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, continues to function as the Focal Point. Any member institution continues as a member of the Network by its active contribution to the activities of the ANTRIEP.

Since the Presidentship is by rotation, normally the host of the Annual Meeting becomes the President of the Network, which changes at every Annual Meeting. The current Chairperson of the Network is Director, Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), Shanghai, China, that hosted the Fourth Annual Meeting. The role of the Chairperson is to preside over the Annual Meeting, examine the applications for the new membership, if any, and give suggestions to the Focal Point for better facilitation of the Network activities.

As mentioned earlier, the Network at present has 17 member institutions from 10 countries of Asia, in addition to the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris. Of the 17 institutions, four are from India, three from Bangladesh, two each from Nepal and Pakistan, and one each from China, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Republic of Korea, and Sri Lanka. The Network keeps on requesting its member institutions to contact and encourage similar institutions in their

respective countries to become member of the Network, as it also did at the Fourth Annual Meeting. We are glad to inform that after the 2000 Annual Meeting, Institute for Educational Development - The Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan, has joined the ANTRIEP as a member. There were also some preliminary enquiries by some institutions from some countries about the possibility of their becoming member of the Network. Several countries in the region, which do not have ANTRIEP member institutions, have participated in the just concluded seminar. We are sure new members from some of these countries of the region would join the Network soon.

### **ANTRIEP Activities During 2001-2002**

#### *Annual Meetings*

The vitality and dynamism of the Network are well evidenced by the regularity of Annual Meetings it holds and which have become a convention. The Annual Meetings provide an opportunity for the member institutions to have intensive and intimate interaction and exchange of ideas and experiences on a regular basis. Further, making these meetings an integral follow up part of a seminar on a selected theme enhances the value of the Annual Meetings. So far, the seminar has been initiated by the IIEP. This approach creates an opportunity for the member institutions to attend the Annual Meeting without financial obligations. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Network was held at SIHRD, Shanghai, as a follow up of a Seminar on Better School Management: The Role of Head Teacher. The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Network has also been organised as a follow up of the Seminar on School Evaluation for Quality Improvement. We are grateful to IAB, Malaysia, for its keen interest and initiative in organising the Fifth Annual Meeting of the ANTRIEP.

The discussions during the Annual Meetings encompass ANTRIEP activities and also consider scheduling of the next Annual Meeting. The IIEP provides significant proportion of funding for the Annual Meetings. However, for the first time, ANTRIEP has been successful in developing partnership with a regional organisation, Colombo Plan Secretariat located in Colombo, in holding the just concluded Seminar and the present Annual Meeting. The Colombo Plan Secretariat has funded 25 participants comprising representatives from 7 member institutions, 13 from different countries in South Asia and Asia Pacific and 5 persons from Malaysia. In fact, it is the first time that such a large number of countries other than ANTRIEP members participated in the seminar. First time participant countries included Maldives, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Mongolia. However, in some cases the funding support for the member institutions is also mobilised directly by the Focal Point and member institutions. For instance, some of the participants from India have been funded by the European Union. This is a good trend that needs to be further explored in other countries also.

### ***Newsletter***

It was decided in the First Annual Meeting that the Focal Point would bring out a Newsletter bi-annually. The Newsletter was thus started from 1996. The Network is successfully bringing out the Newsletter for the last six years regularly. More importantly, the Newsletter has helped greatly to share the experiences of different countries on selected themes, especially on planning and management of primary education. The themes for the various issues of the Newsletter are discussed during the Annual Meetings. The Newsletter brought out immediately after the Fourth Annual Meeting was devoted

to reporting about the Annual Meeting itself. This was followed by three other issues, which focussed on **Teacher Management: Issues and Innovations; Role of Non-Formal Education in Achieving Education for All; and Financing of Education: Issues and Innovations**. The member institutions were prompt and positive in their responses for contributing to the Newsletter themes. As a normal practice, 10 copies of the ANTRIEP Newsletter are sent to each of the member institutions so that they can send them to other institutions of their choice. All efforts are being made to adhere to the publication schedule of the Newsletter and overall it has been published regularly without delay. However, contribution of papers from some of the member institutions is not forthcoming.

As per the suggestions made in earlier Annual Meeting, the Newsletter has incorporated a feature on Institutional News, covering research and training activities. The brief information on the completed researches, training activities of the member institutions and forthcoming programmes are found useful by the members. However, such information from some of the member institutions is not yet forthcoming.

The Newsletter is widely distributed and with each successive issue it is gaining more and new reaches. In addition to the member institutions and distribution by member institutions to other agencies within the respective countries, it is also distributed among individuals, other relevant institutions, agencies and partners at the international levels. Several encouraging responses have been received which demonstrate an ever increasing interest in the publication. The articles in the Newsletter are also known being used as references for comparative studies.

### ***Publication of Seminar Proceedings***

During the Third Annual Meeting of the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning held in Colombo in 1998, most of the members suggested that the proceedings of the preceding Seminar might be brought out as an ANTRIEP publication. Following this suggestion, the proceedings of the Seminar entitled "School Effectiveness: Asian Experiences" have been published as an ANTRIEP publication. Similarly, the proceedings of the Seminar held at Shanghai are being published. During the Shanghai Seminar, the member institutions had presented country study reports on "School Management: Role of Head Teachers". The study reports have been finalised. The country reports and a synthesis report along with the seminar proceedings are under publication by IIEP. Very soon the publi-

cation will be sent to all the member institutions and widely disseminated. The Indian study on "Role of Head Teachers" conducted by NIEPA, has been finalised and printed by European Commission who funded the study. This is the first time that one of the member institutions has taken the initiative to print the national study conducted under ANTRIEP umbrella. The study will be widely distributed.

In the last two Annual Meetings, many members felt that the Network has reached a stage when it needles to develop an ANTRIEP logo. Although, there were some discussion during the last meeting, the ANTRIEP logo is yet to be finalised. It would be discussed and finalised in the present meeting in Malaysia. Similarly, there is a need to revise the ANTRIEP brochure in view of joining of new member institutions and increased activities of ANTRIEP. Institutional information also requires to be updated by adding more details about the areas of priority and list of important publications of member institutions.

### ***Exchange of Documents and Information***

Exchange of documents and information related to different activities of member institutions was visualised as means of keeping informed and knowing about the developments in member institutions. Accordingly, in all the Annual Meetings, it has been emphasised that the member institutions should exchange information among themselves. Compared to earlier, the bilateral exchange of documents and information seems to have increased. It is found that some individual member institutions do request other member institutions for relevant research or reference materials pertaining to the interest areas of their research work. The Focal Point has received feedback from many of the member institutions indicating that as and when such requests are received, these have been responded positively by sending the requested documents to other member institutions. Similarly, some of the member institutions sent research documents brought out by them to the member institutions. A few member institutions have set a positive trend by sending the information about their regional and international training programmes to all the member institutions as a regular feature. However, still some of the member institutions continue to send the materials and research reports to Focal Point. While few others neither share nor respond to other's request. In earlier Annual Meetings, it was pointed out that in such cases, perhaps the reason for not exchanging the documents regularly was the language constraint, as many of these institutions do not bring out the documents in English. However, it is also true that most of the institutions do

bring out some of their documents in English. Therefore, it seems there is an immense scope for further improving the exchange of documents and information more on regular basis. There is thus a need to work out modus operandi for institutionalising the exchange of documents, both bilaterally and also sharing among others.

### ***Visits and Exchange Programmes***

The period following the previous Annual Meeting saw many visits materialising. These included visits to NIEPA by the Director, Deputy Director and Faculty of IIEP, Paris. Director IIEP also visited IAB. Mr. G. Carron from IIEP visited the Focal Point and had several rounds of discussions on the implementation of the UNESCO sponsored collaborative training programmes on Monitoring of EFA for the E-9 countries. Faculty members and in-charge Focal Point from NIEPA, Director INNOTECH (Philippines), faculty member from KEDI (Korea) visited IIEP. A team from CERID (Nepal) visited IIEP to discuss cooperation in 'formative research'.

The exchange programmes are aimed to establish and strengthen organisational linkages and relationships. Frequent and close interaction among the academics working in the same area is essential for developing collaborative research and training. During the last two Annual Meetings, this aspect was discussed in detail and some of the institutions offered to facilitate the visits by providing free boarding facilities. During 2000-2002, a positive trend has emerged as some of the member institutions have set the tradition of exchange visits and formalised collaborations in organising training.

Although not under the Network, many study visits among the member institutions as part of sponsored programmes by international agencies also took place. For instance, NIEPA faculty and Director - SIEMAT (Allahabad) visited NIE, Colombo, along with other state government members as a part of a study visit sponsored by the European Commission to Sri Lanka. Similarly, members of CERID visited NIEPA and NCERT as a part of their study visit in India; NAEM (Bangladesh) faculty visited INNOTECH as a part of study visit and for attending training programmes sponsored by different international agencies; representatives from CERID and IED, Aga-Khan University (Karachi) visited BRAC (Bangladesh); Staff of NIE, Colombo visited NIEPA. Probably many more staff members might have visited different member institutions of which the Focal Point does not have information.

There is already an MOU existing between CERID (Nepal) and KEDI (Korea). NIEPA faculty had an occasion

to visit KEDI in Seoul to attend PROAP sponsored workshop. In view of the collaborative project taken up under the Network, we hope that in the coming years, there would be more bilateral exchange programmes.

Some of the institutions are in the process of preparing proposals for having formal exchange programmes. NIEPA has made provision in its budget for collaborative comparative research studies and visiting fellowships. However, there is a need for the member institutions to initiate dialogue with bilateral and multilateral international agencies to explore possibilities of providing funding support for exchange programmes. For instance, the European Mission Office in India is considering to support some of the Network activities, particularly bilateral visits of professionals and functionaries between India and other member institutions. There is a need to evolve more systematic and a common framework for exchange of personnel among the member institutions.

### ***Workshops and Training Programmes***

Annual Meetings alone may not be enough to sustain the Network and make it more effective. In addition to the Annual Meetings, regular interaction and collaboration through mutual participation in training programmes among the member institutions are also essential. This will not only reinforce the Network activities but also help the member institutions in internal capacity building. Three of the member institutions made a beginning in this direction during 2000-2002. In fact some of the member institutions are organising regional programmes and programmes for functionaries from other countries. In 2000-2001, NIEPA organised specific programmes for Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, apart from its regular programme of International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration. UNESCO, New Delhi has requested IIEP and NIEPA to jointly organise a series of training programmes for E-9 countries as a follow-up to Dakar Declaration 2000. As a part of this, NIEPA and IIEP have organised a training programme in Delhi and another one shortly in Bangladesh. IIEP has organised a workshop on reforming school supervision in collaboration with IAB, Malaysia. The participants for this programme included the ANTRIEP member institutions, such as CEMD (Sri Lanka), IAB (Malaysia), CERID (NEPAL), Balitbang Dikbud (Indonesia) and INNOTECH (The Philippines). CERID and NCED will be involved in a capacity-building programme which the IIEP has been asked

to undertake by DANIDA in Nepal. Within the same programme, there is a strong collaboration between NIEPA and IIEP.

These programmes are generally not organised by the Network. However, the institutions and participants are from the member institutions of Network. Similarly, KEDI (Seoul) in collaboration with PROAP (UNESCO), Bangkok, has organised a regional training programme on Planning and Management of Educational Policies, where some of the participants were from the member institutions of the Network, including NIEPA. The IIEP is launching a distance-training programme on sector analysis, in which many ANTRIEP institutions have been invited to participate. IIEP and INNOTECH have jointly worked on a research study on loan schemes for higher education. NIEPA and IIEP are also conducting a collaborative study on Secondary Education. Other such programmes include study visits and training programmes of faculty from NAEM (Bangladesh) at INNOTECH. We do not have information from other member institutions on such training programmes or workshops conducted by them where the participants might also have been from the member institutions of Network.

Thus, a number of training programmes are being organised by the member institutions and some of the participants attending these programmes are invariably from Network member institutions.

There is immense potential for developing such collaborative training programmes. The challenge ahead for the Network member institutions is to develop close interaction with their respective governments. Most of the recent educational reforms and social safety net programmes in the region are according importance to invest more on capacity building. As a part of capacity building programmes, study visits and training programmes are sponsored by the funding agencies in different countries. In fact some of the members of the Network are also engaged in organising training programmes and study visits on the request of respective governments or funding agencies. However, the Network is hardly involved in these programmes. Therefore, there is a need to make concerted efforts through close interaction with the governments of respective countries and also with the international funding agencies that sponsor such programmes to make the Network as the medium to facilitate training activities. If partnership is developed among the member institutions in designing and

organising the training programmes, it would not only help to strengthen the quality and relevance of the training programmes on educational planning and management but also would help build the capacities of many member institutions in their gap areas. This can also help some of the member institutions, which at present are not conducting any regional or international training programmes to gain experience and exposure.

There can be several ways of collaboration, from helping to improve the capacities of member institutions to convergence of expertise from different member institutions in designing and conducting the training programmes. This aspect was persistently envisaged right from the beginning of the Network but has always been difficult to materialise. In view of the increased inter-institutional visits and participation in training programmes, it is imperative to develop concrete collaborative training programme proposals. It is also important to explore possibilities of getting funding for such collaborative programmes from international agencies and especially with Colombo Plan Secretariat, which has already developed partnership with ANTRIEP through sponsoring the preceded ANTRIEP seminar. In fact the Network could extend the training facility to other countries in the region, which are not ANTRIEP members but are covered under the Colombo Plan. Although individual member institutions should follow their own strategies, it is equally important to have a common framework and perspective plan for developing collaborative training programmes and also to act proactively to develop close linkages with the respective governments of member countries. We may need to prepare a concrete plan of action with future perspective for the next two to three years.

### ***Collaborative Research Projects***

For mutual benefit and sustained inter-institutional linkages, collaborative research becomes an important impetus. During the Third Annual Meeting held in Colombo, the participating member institutions emphasised initiating collaborative research projects in the area of improving school management. Taking into account that very little empirical research has been conducted in the Asian region on the role of head teachers and their impact on school improvement, a collaborative project was initiated on **Improving School Management in Asian Countries: Capacity Building for Head Teachers**.

The project consists of a series of research studies, workshops and training activities spread over a period of 3 years and to be carried out in a collaborative manner by the member institutions of ANTRIEP.

The research part of the project has two components. The first component comprising preparation of national diagnoses on head teachers has been completed. The second component which concentrates on specific case studies on current practices and innovations, workshops and training programmes in school management, is yet to be initiated.

Considering school evaluation as one of the important aspects for school improvement, a study on school evaluation for quality improvement has been initiated under the umbrella of ANTRIEP. Member institutions have carried out country specific studies on school evaluation. The theme for the just concluded seminar was based on these status studies. These papers form a valuable input of the seminar organised under ANTRIEP.

### ***New Members***

Institute for Educational Development, Aga-Khan University, Karachi (Pakistan), expressed keen interest to become a member of the Network. We had requested them to send a brief profile of their institution. The profile was received, edited and published in the July-December 2001 issue of the Newsletter.

### ***Changes in Heads of Member Institutions***

Heads of some of the member institutions have changed after the Shanghai Meeting. New Directors have taken charge in NAEM, Bangladesh; KEDI, Korea and NCED, Nepal. It gives us special privilege to welcome all the new heads of these member institutions to the ANTRIEP Seminar and Meeting.

### ***Future Perspective Action***

In the next 2-3 years, the major focus of ANTRIEP will be on operationalisation of the collaborative project, which includes research and capacity building activities on improving school management. In this context, the emphasis, nevertheless, could be on the need and importance of developing close interface with the national and provincial governments and policy makers of the respective countries of the member institutions. The effective implementation and institutionalisation of capacity building activities will largely depend on the support and acceptance received from the decision makers and policy planners. This implies that the member institutions are required to initiate dialogue and discussions with their respective governments.

It will also be a priority to finalise, consolidate and prepare composite report of the status studies on school

evaluation. It is necessary for ANTRIEP to identify the priority areas in research and training for countries to facilitate collaboration accordingly. However, the capacities of member institutions vary sharply in terms of professional expertise and resource base. In this context, it would be more beneficial to have bilateral collaborations, so that common programmes can be devised and training activities can be jointly organised. Bilateral collaborations not only save time and resources but also help to avoid duplication of efforts. More importantly, the bilateral arrangements will help to exchange the professional support and also to improve the institutional capacities of member institutions and thereby the quality of capacity building activities. Exchange of expertise and resource persons can be more meaningful and effective at bilateral level.

While efforts will continue for mobilising funding support for the collaborative project, attempts are also needed to mobilise resources at individual member institutions. In many of the member countries, external funding projects are in operation and international, bilateral, and multilateral agencies are providing funding for different education projects related to quality improvement in which capacity building is the major component. Efforts to develop close interaction with respective governments and initiate dialogue with the funding agencies by the member institutions are essential to obtain local funding. In this context, India has been successful in mobilising funding from the European Commission. Other member institutions in other countries need to emulate this model for resource mobilisation. The Colombo Plan Secretariat has been the co-sponsor of the concluded seminar by funding the representatives of member institutions attending the Fifth Annual Meeting and also participants from other countries for the seminar. The Focal Point has begun a discussion with the Colombo Plan Secretariat to consider providing funding for some of the ANTRIEP activities. We expect to further strengthen the collaboration with the Colombo Plan Secretariat and expand activities of ANTRIEP in the region.

The member institutions may need to incorporate some of the ANTRIEP activities in their annual budget under development programmes. This arrangement may facilitate to have regular collaboration among the member institutions at bilateral and regional levels. Similarly, the member institutions perhaps may like to consider the proposal of working out a common frame in which the host country may subsidise the boarding arrangements

and the respective countries to meet local transportation and travel funding. In fact, NIEPA has such an arrangement with some of the institutions abroad and has signed MOUs in this respect. We are sure that many of the member institutions may be having such arrangements in their own way. Such provisions will facilitate increased and frequent bilateral interactions. The Focal Point will welcome information about these arrangements whenever such bilateral exchanges take place.

The collaborative endeavours emphasise on bottom-top approach in organising the training activities. However, the existing member institutions may not be in a position to reach out to larger areas in their respective countries. It was already felt during the Fourth Annual Meeting that the Network has reached a stage when we may have to think in terms of country-based local Networks.

In other words, each member institution in its respective country needs to play a leadership role in organising the Network activities, more particularly in operation of the collaborative projects. Developing a sub-Networking system by the member institutions would immensely help in local capacity building and launching the training activities for the head teachers who are in large numbers. Despite the importance of such Networking, the member institutions have yet to make a headway in this regard. The ANTRIEP Newsletter can become a forum for exchanging information and sharing experiences of the sub-Network members.

On behalf of the Focal Point of ANTRIEP, may I take this opportunity to thank IIEP, the President of the Network and all the member institutions for their invaluable guidance and persistent support to the Network activities, which kept the Network alive and active all these years. We would like to convey our special thanks to the Colombo Plan Secretariat for their positive response and generous support to ANTRIEP seminar and annual meeting.

*K. Sujatha  
On Behalf of the Focal Point*



## ANTRIEP Meeting at IAB, Malaysia

The Fifth Meeting of the ANTRIEP member institutions was held on 5 July 2002 at the Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highlands, Malaysia. As per past practice, a Seminar was also organized preceding the meeting. The theme of this year's Seminar was "School Evaluation for Quality Improvement". Representatives from 16 out of the total 18 member institutions participated in the meeting.

The agenda for the meeting included: presentation of the report of the Network activities, followed by a discussion on the report and its approval by member institutions; discussions on the probable themes for the subsequent issues of the Newsletter; strengthening bilateral relationships; and implementation of the ANTRIEP project. The meeting ended with a formal vote of thanks by the Focal Point. A resume of the discussions is given in the following paragraphs.

The ANTRIEP meeting is traditionally opened with an introductory address by the Chairperson of the Network. However, the Chairperson of the Network, Mr. Jiang Minghe, Director of the SIHRD, China, could not unfortunately attend the meeting. Professor B.P. Khandelwal, Director of NIEPA, the Focal Point of the Network, was requested to open and chair the meeting. His opening remarks were followed by a presentation, by Professor K. Sujatha, on the ANTRIEP Activities, on behalf of the Focal Point. According to the practice established by previous Network meetings, the Chairperson of the Network changes at every meeting and normally the host institute of the ANTRIEP meeting assumes this responsibility until the Network's next meeting. The Chairperson of the meeting, Professor Khandelwal, called upon Dato' Dr. Wan Chik Rahmanh Wan Din, Director, Institut Aminuddin Baki, to assume the responsibility of the Chairperson of the ANTRIEP. Dr. Wan Chik thereafter chaired and conducted the proceedings of the meeting.

The participants were very happy with the progress made by the Network and the report of the Network activities presented by the Focal Point. The report was adopted by the representatives of the member institutions. Dis-

cussions on the report were followed by a discussion on the probable topics for the forthcoming issues of the Newsletter. As per the practice, it was decided that the next (December 2002) issue of the Newsletter will focus on the ANTRIEP seminar and meeting. Several topics were suggested for the subsequent issues of the Newsletter, which included: (i) Professional support to teachers; (ii) Role of public examinations in improvement of quality of education; (iii) School based evaluation; (iv) School based management; (v) Decentralisation of educational management; (vi) School quality and community participation; (vii) Private tuition, etc. Since there were quite a number of suggested topics, it was left to the Focal Point to choose some of these in consultation with the IIEP and announce them in the subsequent issues of the Newsletter, as per past practice.

There was a good discussion on the probable themes for the next ANTRIEP seminar. The themes suggested include: (i) Role of public examinations in school improvement; (ii) School community linkages; (iii) Role of schools in shaping the future, and (iv) Local school financing. The CERID in Nepal followed by member institutions in Pakistan and Bangladesh expressed their eagerness to host the next ANTRIEP meeting. The Network activities always endeavour to forge a good linkage between the seminar theme, the areas identified for research and the topics selected for the successive issues of the Newsletter. It was felt that the Focal Point would take into account the various suggestions that were put forward, while finalizing the theme for the forthcoming seminar.

Discussions on the implementation of the ANTRIEP project "Improving School Management: Capacity Building of Head Teachers" brought out eagerness by many member institutions to be active partners in the implementation process. It was, therefore, felt that there was a need to identify areas of research and specify the role of different member institutions. It was also felt that some institutions, based on their expertise in specific areas of the project, could play a leading role in coordinating certain spheres of research. The details on project imple-

mentation, however, need to be discussed directly with member institutions and will depend upon the availability of funds for the project.

The report on the ANTRIEP activities, presented by the Focal Point, showed an increasing number of bilateral collaborative activities organized by the member institutions. All participants were highly appreciative of this development. It indicated the growing strength of the Network. It was considered that bilateral co-operation should be further encouraged and promoted. The improvement in the communication system in the ANTRIEP institutions has helped better interaction among them. Now, all member institutions have E-mail connections and an electronic Networking system which help to promote bilateral co-operation. The Focal Point reported on the efforts made towards developing a Website for the Network and it will discuss the progress made in this direction with the member institutions. Some more institutions have become new members of the Network. However, it was felt that all member institutions need to continue their efforts and encourage other institutions, es-

pecially from countries, which are not represented in the Network, to become members.

The participants appreciated the efforts made by the Focal Point to mobilize funding support from the Colombo Plan for the ANTRIEP seminar. Other institutions have also tried to get funding support for their participation in the seminar. Thanks to such efforts that the Network could have the largest participation so far in the seminar this time. Equally important are the trends in bilateral activities, which are also the results of various member institutions to mobilize funds for their visits and participation in the programmes. All these developments point to the good progress made by the Network and the contribution of each member institution towards the expanding activities of the Network. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chairperson and member institutions by Professor K. Sujatha.

*N.V. Varghese  
IIEP, Paris*

## **ANTRIEP Seminar on *School Evaluation for Quality Improvement***

*The fifth international seminar organised by ANTRIEP in Kuala Lumpur focussed on the issue of "School Evaluation for Quality Improvement". The choice of this theme inspired a series of interrogations. Evaluation can and does serve several purposes: control, accountability and quality improvement. How can we ensure that such evaluations do not simply strengthen the control over schools, but can be used by schools in a process of improvement? What different school evaluation mechanisms exist, and what criteria are used in each of them? Do these criteria reflect the overall quality of the school? The following article presents a summary of the discussions and some of the conclusions.*

### **Why do we need to evaluate schools?**

Education policies are increasingly preoccupied with the issue of evaluation. International achievement tests, which reveal variations in student performance across countries, are commented upon on the front-pages of newspapers. League tables of schools based on their examination results have also become popular information for journalists, decision-makers and parents

alike. The reasons for this interest are varied and include the concern for improving quality; the need to prove, in a competitive international environment, the superiority of its human resources; and a stronger demand for accountability in the public service. This focus on evaluation thus seems well justified, but the question still needs to be asked as to why focus on evaluating schools, rather than teachers or the system as a whole? "Evaluation" can indeed cover different dimensions: it can be focussed on students (examinations being a prime example), on teachers (through the traditional teacher appraisal), on schools (through league tables, external audits or self-evaluation by the school) and on the education system as a whole (through, for example, the publication of indicator reports or thematic studies on topics of specific concern).

The interest in school evaluation finds a first justification in the present trend towards school autonomy. Recently, in many countries around the world and on the Asian continent, schools are receiving more freedom in making decisions in fields as crucial as the curriculum,

staff management and budget. This greater autonomy has provoked equally greater demand for accountability at school level and for evaluation procedures which should allow central governments to guarantee standards of quality and equity across the system. A second explanation lies in research findings, which have highlighted the role that the “school” as an institution plays in improving and assuring quality of teaching and learning. The way the teacher interacts with the students in the classroom evidently is crucial, but that interaction is influenced and shaped by the way the school functions, by the leadership of the principal, the relationship with the parents, the support received from other teachers and the overall “climate” of the school. Consequently, a growing number of countries are developing tools to assess the quality and performance of the school as an institutional unit. There is a third reason for ANTRIEP’s interest in school evaluation: previous seminars explored themes such as school efficiency and school management. Those discussions highlighted that all countries of the Asian region are strengthening and diversifying their school evaluation mechanisms.

### ***How to evaluate a school?***

Three tools are at the disposal of education policy-makers to evaluate schools. External Inspection is a common tool. It is generally undertaken by the traditional inspection or supervision services, although increasingly specific bodies are set up to “audit” the schools. Such bodies have been existing for ten or more years in several Australian States and in New Zealand. In the countries participating in this seminar, no such a separate service exists as yet, although some Indian States are reflecting on its creation. Malaysia has gone a little further; it is reorganizing its inspection system to allow supervisors to undertake institutional school reviews. A presentation by the Malaysian Chief Inspector at the seminar explained its purpose to cover the whole operation of the school (all aspects of resource management; appraising the quality of teaching and learning through classroom observation; investigating the relationships with parents and the wider community). Its aim is to present to the school and to its community a report on the school’s performance, with precise recommendations. The main challenge is not to reform the structure of the service, but its culture. Inspectors will be asked to work in groups and to give up on their direct control over teachers for a more distant relationship.

Internal School Evaluation is the second tool that can be

an authentic self-evaluation process, when all members of staff examine their own performance and where they all together evaluate the school. Or it can be a project undertaken only by the school principal with some small help of the senior staff. It can be the school’s own initiative or it can be an obligation imposed by the Ministry. Several countries are demanding schools to do some form of self-evaluation, generally as part of the preparation of a school improvement plan. The justification is that, for schools to change character and direction deeply, external pressure needs to combine with internal conviction of the need for such change. Nepal for instance is one of the many countries in the region where all schools are expected to prepare their own development plan.

Examinations and Tests form the third tool. Examinations are no longer used simply to distinguish the “able” from the “not able” students. Student results by school become a judgment on the school’s performance. In a growing number of countries, “league tables” of schools, especially at secondary level, are published in newspapers, as information to the public, to allow parents to choose a school. Ministries might promote such ranking of schools, as an incentive to schools to improve. Evidently, such listing is useful only to those parents who have the opportunity of choice and seems to benefit the school with good results much more than the weaker ones. But the seminar expressed a greater worry with the use of examinations. Examination results can be very useful information to teachers, to give them insights into the weaknesses and strengths of their students and therefore their teaching. It demands, however, that the responses are analysed and that specific feedback is given to teachers. Few countries so far have asked their examination units to refocus interventions from the preparation and administration of examinations to analysis and feedback to teachers.

The findings and outputs of these three tools are the potential sources of a database, which in turn can become a tool to monitor and evaluate schools. The challenge is to include in such a base not simply the easily collected quantitative data, such as examination results or pupil/teacher ratios, but also the more qualitative information, taken from inspection or self-evaluation reports on, for instance, relationships within the school or the leadership of the school principal.

### ***Using school evaluation for quality improvement***

The seminar acknowledged that the evaluation of the school as a unit is slowly becoming more prevalent in various Asian countries. Examinationinations are the most popular tool, if not the only one in some countries. External inspection exists but is not commonly used for quality improvement. Moreover, it seems to take place mainly in those schools, which are functioning fairly efficiently and less in those which might need most such an internal assessment of strengths and weaknesses. School self-evaluation is yet to take off.

It became evident that school evaluation can serve several purposes. Two are particularly important: accountability (schools should prove that they spend public money wisely); and quality improvement (the identification of a school's strengths and weaknesses as a crucial step in an improvement process). At present, in many countries, school evaluation is meant to serve mainly the accountability purpose. In developed countries, where the practice of evaluating the school as an institutional unit started, all schools receive sufficient resources and thus making them accountable for the use of these resources, makes sense. This is also supposed to make them conscious of the need to improve their quality. But in developing nations, where many schools are under-resourced, it might make less sense to judge schools on how they use those resources and make them responsible for using resources which they do not have. In such a context, school evaluation should focus much more directly on quality improvement.

The objectives of "school evaluation" have an impact on the choice of instruments to be used. A school evaluation strategy, which concentrates on accountability, relies mainly on examination results and on external school audits. The agenda for such evaluation is being set by the ministry of education and increasingly reflects the concerns of the wider "public", interpreted by politicians and the media. In many cases, teachers feel as victims rather than the beneficiaries of such an evaluation.

Where school evaluation aims at quality improvement, school self-evaluation and supportive supervision are the appropriate tools, while teachers and the school's close community have to be allowed a say in the agenda.

As such, the transposition of the concept of school evaluation from the developed countries, within the context of a demand for greater public accountability, to developing countries and to under-resourced schools, can have adverse effects. The school evaluation strategy which is often being promoted is not appropriate to such schools. They need support, not simply pressure, a closer involvement with their communities and better relationships among staff. The challenge is not to choose between accountability and quality improvement, but to find the right balance between these aims, between internal and external evaluation, between the criteria set by the central authorities and those set by the school staff itself, between the demands of the "public" and the needs of the professional community.

### *Some details*

This fifth ANTRIEP seminar took place in Kuala Lumpur, from 2 to 4 July 2002. It was followed by a one-day meeting of the staff of ANTRIEP member institutions, on 5 July, at the Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB). Both events were organized through a collaboration between the IAB, in charge of the local organization, the NIEPA, the ANTRIEP Focal Point, and the IIEP, responsible for the thematic preparation. Financing for the seminar came from the IIEP, for the first time, from the Colombo Plan Secretariat, which funded 20 international and 5 national participants and the European Union in India. As a result, the number of participants was higher than at previous meetings and they came from a larger number of countries: some 60 people from 18 countries. Several top level ministry representatives included DG or Secretary from the countries in the region; 16 of the 18 ANTRIEP member institutions were represented, so were 3 UNESCO offices in the region.

The presentations and debates in the seminar would be turned into a report, and would be published on behalf of ANTRIEP by the IIEP.

*Anton De Grauwe  
IIEP, Paris*

## News from Member Institutions

### **The Aga Khan University (AKU) - Institute for Educational Development (IED)**

*Karachi, Pakistan*

- Organised 8<sup>th</sup> Annual School Improvement Conference on “Dissemination – Lessons Learned from School Improvement Programmes” in Entebbe, Uganda from November 8 to 10, 2002. Educational planners and practitioners from Aga Khan Development Network and its collaborating institutions working in South Asia, East Africa, Central Asia and Geneva took part in the conference
- Initiated a research project on **Conceptualising the Notions of ‘Citizenship’, ‘Conflict Resolution’ and Human Rights** in the context of Pakistan. The study envisages to disseminate relevant understanding of these concepts for educating teachers and students. The study has adopted both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The nation-wide survey has been done and the data analysis is in progress.

### **National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM)**

*Dhaka, Bangladesh*

- A training programme on “Educational Management and Administration” was organized for District Education Officers during July, 2002.

### **Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM)**

*Islamabad, Pakistan*

- A regional seminar on “Gender Mainstreaming in Social Science Research” was organized with the support of Islamic Educational and Scientific Cultural Organisation (ISESCO). Delegates from Yemen, Bangladesh, Egypt, Morocco, Iran, Libya, Indonesia and Pakistan participated in the seminar.
- A research study has been conducted on **Impact Evaluation of the Secondary School Science Education Project in Pakistan**. The research findings shows that Science Education Project is

successful in achieving its physical targets; development of new science curriculum and training of the master learners and teachers. However, the study did not find any evidence of significant impact of the science project on students’ achievements in secondary school certification examination.

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

*Kathmandu, Nepal*

- A workshop on “Access to Education for Special Focus Groups” was organized to assess the educational status and access to education of disadvantaged groups, to work out the measures for improvement and the access to fulfil the targets of enrolment and retention. District Education Officers, members of District Development Committees and Village Development Committees attended the programme.
- Organized a programme on “Mobilizing Teachers in Combating Child Labour in Nepal” in December, 2002. Teachers, teacher associates, representatives of ILO, Ministry of Education participated in the programme.

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

*Seoul, Korea*

- KEDI organized a joint seminar and study tour on “Early Childhood Care and Education” in collaboration with UNESCO (Bangkok) from December 2 to 7, 2002. Six countries’ representatives from China, Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam participated in the seminar. Experts from KEDI, UNESCO (Bangkok) and National University of Singapore also participated in the seminar.
- An “International Conference on Textbook Improvement with a View to Enhancing Mutual Understanding Between Countries” was organized in October 16, 2002. The objectives of the conference are to offer an opportunity to exchange knowledge, ideas and experiences with regard to

textbook cooperation for international understanding. Scholars from Asia and Europe participated in the conference.

- A research study on **Developmental Levels of Primary and Junior High School Students in Korea: The Cognitive and Affective Dimensions** was conducted. The study attempted to measure school students' language, cognitive, and social abilities as well as affective characteristics with development indicators. With the exception of affective abilities and social abilities, there was significant positive correlation between grade level and students' language and cognitive abilities. In case of social abilities, it was found that students' moral judgment increased as the students' grade become higher, but their moral behaviors didn't show significant grade level effect.

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

*Pahang, Malaysia*

- Training programme on "School Management and Leadership Course for Secondary School Principals and Primary School Headmasters" was organized during August and September, 2002

#### **State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT)**

*Allahabad, India*

- Completed a research study on **Disabled Children's Problems in Primary Schools: Perception of Teachers and Parents**. The findings of the study revealed that disabled children availing inclusive education did not have any problem in their educational attainment. The teachers also did not face any problems in handling these children as there were sufficient physical resources available in the schools which were of great help in the integrated education.

#### **National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)**

*New Delhi, India*

- National Consultation on "Value Education in Indian Schools – Experiences and Strategies of Implementation" was organized during August 2002. Teachers, teacher educators, educational planners, administrators, heads of state level institutes and representatives from Government and non-government resource agencies attended the meeting.
- Conducted a research study on **Status and Emerging Trends in Science Teaching at the Elementary Stage**. The findings of the study suggest that there is a big gap in "academic understanding between practitioners (teachers) and administrators (principals), which makes science teaching more dogmatic, content-based and non-stimulating activity in schools.

#### **National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA)**

*New Delhi, India*

- Organised a two-week training programme on "School Supervision and School Management" for the Zonal Directors and Deputy Provincial Directors from Sri Lanka during July-August, 2002.
- The XIX International Diploma programme in Educational Planning and Administration will commence from February 1, 2003 at NIEPA, New Delhi. About 30 trainees from Asian, African, East European and Latin American countries are likely to take part in this programme.
- Signed a MOU with the DANIDA in 2002 to provide technical assistance to implement decentralized educational planning in Nepal.

#### **For further details on ANTRIEP activities contact:**

International Institute for Educational  
Planning (IIEP)  
7-9 Rue Eugene - Delacroix  
75116 PARIS  
France  
Fax: +(33)1 40728366

National Institute of Educational  
Planning and Administration (NIEPA)  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, NEW DELHI-110 016  
India  
Fax: +(91 11) 26853041, 26865180  
E-mail: ksujatha@vsnl.com, ksujatha@niepa.org,  
niepa@vsnl.com