NIEPA-NEPAL PROJECT

Training Programme on Methodology of District Planning in Education for the Planning Teams of Five Pilot Districts of Nepal

(Kathmandu, Nepal: September 08-20, 2003)

REPORT

National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-16, India
Website:www.niepa.org

PART I

GENERAL REPORT

Training Programme on Methodology of District Planning in Education for the Planning Teams of Five Pilot Districts of Nepal

(Kathmandu, Nepal: September 08-20, 2003)

1.   Introduction

Over the last four and half decades of planned interventions, Nepal has made remarkable progress towards development of basic and primary education. Literacy rate in Nepal has steadily increased from 5 per cent in early 1950s to around 48 per cent in late 1990s. However, low enrolment of girls and children from disadvantaged groups, high dropout rate, especially in grade I, high repetition rate, and low internal efficiency of the primary education system still continue to be some of the major development concerns. For example, in the late 1990s, approximately 10 out of hundred children enrolled in grade I could complete primary cycle without repeating at least one grade.

By the end of the Ninth Five-Year Plan (1998-2002), the targets, therefore, were to raise the literacy rate to 70 per cent (60 per cent for women and 80 per cent for men); to enroll 0.78 million out-of school children; and to reduce the dropout rate at primary level (grades I-V) to below 25 per cent. Towards the development of basic and primary education, the Government of Nepal also implemented a major externally aided project called the Basic and Primary Education Programme (BPEP) in 1991. The Phase I of this project continued up to 1997. The BPEP (Phase II) was then implemented in 1998, which aimed at addressing many development issues of basic education. Decentralized planning and governance, which was adopted as a major strategy to implement the education reform programmes in the 1990s, became a major strategy of the BPEP. Implementing community-based school improvement planning was in fact a major challenge at the beginning of the BPEP (Phase II).

Since 1980s, the Government of Nepal has been emphasizing on the growth-augmentation role of the education. Development of basic and primary education is considered critical for eradication of human poverty in Nepal. Accordingly, development of basic and primary education was one of the priority areas for intervention during the Eighth and Ninth Five-Year Plan period. The Tenth Five-Year Plan (2003-2007) also confirms the renewed commitment of the government towards poverty reduction, and to bring about reforms in the education sector. Decentralization of planning and management has been adopted as one of the major strategies to implement economic and education sector reforms. Several enabling conditions to facilitate decentralization in planning and management of reform programmes have been created since early 1990s. These initiatives have been made to create and strengthen local level governments, including Village Development Committees (VDCs), District Development Councils (DDCs), School Management Committees (SMCs), etc. In fact, the Decentralization Act of 1982 gave the basis for designing reform

programmes in the economic and social sectors in Nepal. Most importantly, the Decentralization Act (1982) gave decision-making authority to District Education Councils (DECs) and School Management Committees. However, the Decentralization Act remained a mere rhetoric, and could not be effectively implemented till the early 1990s. The Local Self-Government (LSG) Act (1999) and the 7th Amendment of the Education Act (2002) gave further impetus to the process of decentralization in Nepal. The LSG Act, 1999 provides for constitution of local bodies for the development of local systems of self-governance, and the 7th Amendment of the Education Act, 2002 places emphasis on empowering the School Management Committees, thereby facilitating the process of bottom-up planning and management of education.

In the above context, during the BPEP (Phase I), efforts were made to delegate more responsibility to the District Education Offices to initiate decentralized community-based planning and management exercises. Unfortunately, decentralized planning did not happen during this period. Therefore, BPEP (Phase II) called for community capacity-building and the creation of around 4,000 Village Education Committees. The basic objective was to make the efforts towards decentralization in the education sector more meaningful and sustainable. However, lack of capacity to plan and implement reform programmes in a decentralized mode (i.e. taking district as the lowest viable unit for planning in the basic and primary education sub-sector) was recognized as a major constraint. Later, as one of the institutional arrangements to facilitate capacity building in decentralized planning and management, a Working Group for Decentralization (WGD) was constituted. One of the primary responsibilities of the WGD is to create and sustain the necessary planning and management capacity at various decentralized levels.

Over the years, the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) has been focusing its attention on creating and strengthening planning and management capacity at the sub-national, national and international levels. The Institute has played a significant role in facilitating decentralized planning and management in general, and planning and management of some of the major externally funded basic education development programmes in India like the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), the Uttar Pradesh Basic Education Project (UPBEP), the Bihar Primary Education Project (BPEP), the Andhra Pradesh Primary education Project (APEP), etc in particular. Currently, the Institute is also playing an important role in facilitating development and appraisal of the district level elementary education plans under the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA)* of the Government of India.

Keeping in view the experiences of the Institute, and as part of the efforts towards capacity building in decentralized planning and management of basic and primary education, the MOES (DOE), Government of Nepal and DANIDA signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi (INDIA) in May 2003. The MoU was in fact an outcome of the findings of several Missions of the NIEPA Team to Nepal to understand the process of decentralization, and to

identify the areas for capacity building in order to facilitate decentralized planning in education in Nepal. After May 2003, this was the third in the series of training programmes conducted by NIEPA as part of the capacity building activities in Nepal. The two-week training programme was focused on the capacity building of the members of the Planning Teams of the five pilot districts of Nepal, namely Chitwan, Syangja, Jhapa, Bardiya, and Dadeldhura in the area of planning and management, who in turn are now supposed to act as Master Trainers, and also develop perspective primary education plans at the district level.

2.   Outcomes of the Training Programme

At the end of the two-week training programme, the members of the Planning Teams of the five pilot districts of Nepal now:

(i)   Have a better understanding of the current educational reform initiatives, institutional arrangements, processes and constraints for decentralized planning and management of education in general and basic and primary education in particular in Nepal;

(ii)   Have a threshold level of skills required for analysis of educational and related data and information available at various decentralized levels (i.e. diagnosis of the existing educational situation) in Nepal, and the use of education development indicators and projection techniques in formulating district primary education plans; and

(iii)   Become familiar with the methodology for developing the district level perspective plans for primary education, and acquire other necessary technical skills for formulating district education plans in Nepal.

3.   Themes

At the beginning of the training programme, emphasis was on sharing experiences on decentralized planning and management in education, particularly in Nepal and India. The discussions in the initial sessions were also focused on conceptual clarifications, and contextualisation of these concepts in the light of the existing level of decentralization in Nepal. In particular, the following themes were covered in the training programme:

(i)   Concepts and forms of decentralized planning in education;

(ii)   Decentralised planning and management of education in Nepal;

(iii)   School Improvement planning in Nepal;

(iv)   Developing EMIS in Nepal and its use in the formulation of DEP;

(v)   Norms and financial parameters for developing DEP in Nepal;

(vi)   District planning in education: An Indian experience;

(vii)   Information needs for developing district primary education plans;

(viii)   Diagnosis of educational situation at the district and sub-district levels and the use of indicators of educational development;

(ix)   Setting plan targets: Techniques of population and enrolment projections;

(x)   Methodology of plan formulation at the district level;

(xi)   Planning for implementation;

(xii)   Computer applications in educational planning;

(xiii)   Concept and methodology of micro planning; and

(xiv)   Concept and methodology of school mapping.

The thematic report is presented in the following pages. In addition, a few presentations made by the Resource Persons from DOE, Nepal is also annexed.

4.   Training Methodology

The training methodology consisted of classroom lectures and discussions, followed by group work and practical exercises. Besides a couple of introductory sessions on decentralized planning in education, discussions on the status and issues of decentralization in Nepal, and participatory process in educational planning, the classroom lecture–discussions were focused more on the technical aspects of plan formulation at the district level. As the programme was mainly skill-oriented, a major share of the time was spent on the group work.

A *"Simulation Exercise on District Planning in Education"* focusing on various steps and techniques involved in developing primary education plan at the district level was developed specially for the present programme. The participants worked on this exercise for more than five days. Five groups, one each for five pilot districts were formed for this purpose. Broadly, the group work was focused on diagnosis of the education system; identification of issues and constraints relating to universalization of primary education in the district, including data limitations; projection of school-age population and enrolment; setting enrolment targets; specification of intervention strategies and translation of these strategies into programmes and projects; estimation of schooling requirements, and teacher requirements; planning for incentives to disadvantaged groups; costing the plan interventions; planning for implementation; and designing specific intervention programmes (viz., in-service teacher training programme).

The training schedule is given in Annexure I.

5.   Participants

The training programme was organized for the officials of five pilot districts of Nepal. About 32 officers from district levels, who are member of the planning team at the district level, participated in the programme. Largely the participating officers were the teachers, resource persons, school supervisors etc. In addition, one representative each of the seven non-project districts also participated in the programme. The Section Officers in case of pilot districts also participated in the training programme. The Section Officers are expected to play an important role in helping the planning teams in formulation of district plans. Five members of the Working Group on Decentralization also participated as facilitators in the training programme. They are expected to provide all necessary help to district planning teams in developing district plans and would liaison with the team and will also take stock of the progress of plan formulation from time to time.

The list of participants is given in Annexure II.

6.   Resource Persons

The Resource Persons were mainly drawn from NIEPA, New Delhi and DOE/MOES, Nepal. Mostly, the faculty of the Educational Administration, Sub-National Systems, Educational Planning, and Operation Research and Systems Management (ORSM) Units of the NIEPA interacted with the participating officers. The Members of the WGD, Nepal have also interacted with the participants.

The list of the Resource Persons is given in Annexure III.

7.   Reading Material

A set of reading materials covering all themes of the training programme were supplied to all the participants. Besides, materials for practical exercises and group works were also provided.

The list of the reading materials is given in Annexure IV.

8.   Programme Management

The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi has organized the training programme. A taskforce under the Chairmanship of Prof. B. P. Khandelwal, Director, NIEPA provided the overall guidance for the smooth conduct of the programme. A Programme Advisory Committee consisting of Professor B. P. Khandelwal, Professor Marmar Mukhopadhyay, and Dr. R. Govinda provided necessary academic guidance from time to time for the conduct of the training programme.

A Programme Management Team consisting of Dr. Najma Akhtar (Task Manager), Dr. Arun C. Mehta, Dr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, and Dr. K. K. Biswal from NIEPA and Mr. Prahlad Aryal, Section Officer, DOE/MOES and other members, in particular Shri Ram Balak Singh of the DOE/MOES, Nepal carried out the day-to-day management of the programme.

9.   Venue and Date

The venue of the programme was the Training Institute for Technical Instructions (TITI), Sanothime, Nepal from 8th to 17th September 2003 and Hotel Blue Star, Kathmandu during 18th to 20th September 2003.

10.   Opening Session

The opening session was held at 1000 hrs on 8th September 2003 details of which is presented below:

Welcome: Mr. J. Nepal, Director, Primary Division, Department of Education, MOES

Remarks by: Mr. Jensen Karsten, Chief Technical Advisor, ESAT

Introduction to NIEPA-NEPAL Project: Dr. Najma Akhtar, Senior Fellow, NIEPA

Introduction to NIEPA: Dr. Arun C. Mehta, Fellow, NIEPA

Introduction to Programme: Dr. S. M. I. A. Zaidi, Fellow, NIEPA

Address by: Mr. Satya Bahadur Shrestha, Director General, DOE, MOES

Vote of Thanks: Ms. Shanti Basnet, Director, Secondary Division, MOES

Chairman's Observation: Mr. Punya Prasad Neupane, Director, Planning Division, DOE, MOES

11. Programme Evaluation

With a view to evaluate the methodology and organization of different training programmes conducted by NIEPA, the participating officers are generally asked to give their comments about different aspects of the programme. Their comments were also obtained in the present programme. The summary of their responses is briefly presented below:

I.   Expected Outcomes of the Training Programme

As has been mentioned above that the present programme has three main expected outcomes.

Achievement of the outcomes

Outcome	Very much	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all
1.	10 (28.57)	22 (62.86)	2 (5.71)	0 (0.00)
2.	8 (22.86)	22 (62.86)	4 (11.43)	0 (0.00)
3.	17 (48.57)	16 (45.71)	1 (2.86)	0 (0.00)

II.   Methodology

(i) Lectures/Discussions

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
15 (42.86)	17 (48.57)	3 (8.57)	0 (0.00)

(ii) Simulation Exercises/Group Work

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
18 (51.43)	16 (45.71)	1 (2.86)	1 (0.00)

(iii) Group Work on Diagnosis of District Specific Data

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
6 (17.14)	22 (62.86)	7 (20.00)	0 (0.00)

III.   Reading Materials

Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
26 (74.29)	9 (25.71)	0 (0.00)

IV.   Organizational Arrangements and conduct of the Programme

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
9 (25.71)	23 (65.71)	3 (8.57)	0 (0.00)

V.   Duration of the Programme

Sufficient	Just Right	Rather Short
9 (25.71)	21 (60.00)	5 (14.29)

VI.   Overall Rating of the Programme

Very Effective	Effective	Less Effective	Not Effective
13 (37.14)	22 (62.86)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)

VII.   Suggestions

The suggestions given by the participants are summarized below:

- duration of the programme be extended to at least three weeks

- more time should be devoted on exercises for better practice

- duration of a day in training should be reduced as it is quite long (0900 to 05.30)

- exercise on universal achievement should also be given alongwith the simulation exercises

- such training be given to all the 75 districts of Nepal

- NIEPA should monitor the work of planning and implementation in the pilot districts

- innovative practices and researches conducted in primary education should be shared with them from time to time

- all reading material in Nepali should be given

- the simulation exercise should be based on real data of a district of a Nepal and

- the participation should be evaluated at the end of the programme to know how much they learnt.

12.   De-briefing Meeting

A de-briefing meeting was held under the Chairmanship of Mr. Bidyadhar Mallik, Secretary, Education, MOES on Sunday, September 21, 2003 details of which is presented below:

> Welcome and introduction to NIEPA-NEPAL Project: Dr. Najma Akhtar, NIEPA
>
> Report of Training Programme: Dr. S. M. I. A. Zaidi, NIEPA
>
> Programme Evaluation Report: Dr. Arun C. Mehta, NIEPA
>
> Developing DEPs: Concerns & Expectations: Dr. K. K. Biswal, NIEPA
>
> Remarks by: Mr. Karsten Jensen, ESAT
>
> Observations by: Mr. Satya Bahdur Shrestha, DOE
>
> Address by: Mr. Bidyadhar Mallik, MOES
>
> Vote of Thanks: Mr. Ram Balak Singh, DOE

The meeting was followed by Lunch hosted by NIEPA at Hotel Yak & Yeti, Kathmandu.

PART II

THEMATIC REPORT

DECENTRALISED PLANNING IN EDUCATION: CONCEPT & SCOPE

Planning is a process of intervention by the public authorities. The intervention by the state can either be for perfecting market forces or for seeking alternative solutions to those provided by the market. When market fails the state is requested to intervene. There are many examples of such state intervention to perfect the market forces. Many a times state intervention can also be seen as an alternative to market forces. This generally happens in centrally planned economies and in such case all major decisions regarding the economy are based on planning process and are arrived at by the planning bodies.

Planning is also seen as an exercise of optimization of resources. It attempts to maximize output within the given resources and ensures that the benefits are distributed more equitably among various sections of population. Since planning activities attempt to indicate what is to be taken up first and what is to be taken up at a later stage, it is also seen as an exercise in prioritizing the activities to be undertaken. Though priorities of a plan are decided by the planning bodies, the prioritization is a part of planning process itself.

It may further be noted that educational planning attempts to facilitate an equitable development of education and efficiency of the delivery mechanism. Educational planning deals with allocative efficiency and internal efficiency. Allocative efficiency deals with the amount of resources to be allocated for education whereas internal efficiency deals with the optimum use of the resources already allocated to a particular activity.

Planning can be defined as "a process of taking decisions for future actions in order to achieve pre-determined objectives by optimum utilization of available resources in a limited time frame". Thus a pre-condition for planning is the existence of certain objectives which need to be achieved and constraints in this respect are time and resources. Here resources include all the three types of resources namely physical (or material), financial and human resources. It is said that we plan because we have limited resources and we have to achieve our objectives within the constraint of these limited resources.

The term "planning" is very frequently used in daily life and every person without exception does some planning at individual level when one has to accomplish some work. Households plan for monthly expenditure. When planning is undertaken at the individual or household level decision for future actions are taken by individuals. However, if planning is to be undertaken for a system e.g. planning for education, the important issues to be addressed are : who (and at what level) will decide about the goals, objectives, allocation of resources and time frame which are important and essential components of planning. At the systems level these decisions are taken at various hierarchical units. This concept of availability of various hierarchical units for decision making for

planning is called the multi-level planning framework. It means the existence of hierarchy of levels of planning with clearly defined territorial jurisdiction. Under this framework planning is possible at national, provincial, district, sub-district and village level. In India planning particularly in the field of education is carried out at the national, state and in a limited way at the district level only. However, in Nepal serious efforts have been made during the last 3 to 4 years to operationalise district planning in education.

Under Local Self Governance Act (LSGA) the District Council (DC), District Development Committee (DDC), District Education Committee (DEC) have been created in all districts of Nepal to facilitate district level planning in education. Further in order to adopt bottom up approach to formulate district education plans it is envisaged to develop School Improvement Plan (SIP) at institution level and Village Education Plans (VEP) at Village level. It is now also considered that Resource Centre may be recognized as a sub-district unit for disaggregation of data to facilitate district planning in education.

It is in the context of multi-level planning framework that we use the concept of centralized and decentralized planning as also the terms like macro and micro planning. The decentralized planning denotes the planning carried out at a level, which is below the centre. However it is rather difficult to define what is the centre. If we take national level body as a centre then even state level planning is a decentralized planning but when we consider state as a centre then the district level planning will be termed as decentralized planning and in the same way we can go upto the village level in case village is considered as the smallest unit of planning. This clearly means that centralization and decentralization are only relative terms. Whether planning carried out at a specific level is centralized or decentralized depends upon the level from where we are looking at it. Thus, province, district and sub-district level planning can be termed as centralized as well as decentralized planning. However, the national level planning carried out in a country can only be termed as centralized planning and village level planning can only be termed as decentralized planning in case this is the lowest possible unit of planning in the country. The planning thus carried out at the highest possible level is termed as macro planning whereas the planning carried out the lowest possible level is known as micro planning. It is therefore clear that macro and micro planning are not in relative terms; these are rather in absolute terms unlike centralized and decentralized planning.

Decentralization refers to the transfer of powers of national government to the regional and local authorities. In fact centralization is in response to the need for national unity where as decentralization is in response to the demand for diversity.

Decentralization: The Meaning

Many a times the decentralization term is confused with de-concentration. It may be noted that <u>de-concentration</u> is an initial but only limited form of decentralization. It merely shifts responsibilities from Central government officials in the capital city to those working in regions, provinces and districts. The de-concentration is the transfer of decision-making power from central government to its own local agents whereas decentralization is the transfer of decision-making power to organizations or people elected by local population.

<u>Delegation</u> is more extensive form of decentralization. In delegation the central governments transfer responsibility for decision making to the semi-autonomous organizations not wholly controlled by the central government but ultimately accountable to it. The Government delegates responsibility when they create public enterprises or corporations or special project implementation units.

In <u>Devolution</u> the central government transfer authority of decision making to quasi-autonomous units of local government with corporate status. Devolution usually transfers responsibilities for services to municipalities that elect their own representatives, raise their own revenues and have independent authority to make investment decisions. Decentralization through devolution makes it possible for inhabitants of a town, a department or a region to settle their affairs through their elected representatives. An important factor of decentralization by devolution is the desire to respond to regional aspirations, which reflects the awareness of a community of interests at this level and the desire of citizens to participate in the management of their affairs.

With respect to the decentralized planning it is to be noted that a plan is called decentralized only when (i) lower units are given authority to fix its own targets and evolve strategies to achieve them, (ii) lower units are given authority to mobilize resources and re-allocate resources already allocated by the higher level, and (iii) lower units participate in planning exercise with higher units on more equal terms.

It is generally felt that one of the reasons of the failure to achieve the basic goal e.g. Universalisation of Primary Education in Nepal is that the plans have been formulated at higher levels and these are quite distant from the grassroots realities. Thus there is a wide gap between those who plan (at higher level) and those who implement it (at the local level). This gap can be reduced by planning at the lower levels and lower the level or units of planning smaller will be the gap between planning and implementation. This is one of the strongest justification of decentralized planning. There are many advantages of decentralized planning. These are (i) local needs can be taken care of more effectively and efficiently at the lower level, (ii) plans are expected to be more effective because of the homogeneity of the unit, (iii) it helps to overcome local specific problems in a

better way, (iv) flow of information / data will be quick which is very crucial for planning and (v) there are more chances of successful implementation of plans as the implementers will be partner in planning process.

One of the issues in any planning process is to clearly specify the unit for initiating planning process and effect planning decision. In Nepal since 1990s, it has been accepted that district is the most viable unit for initiating decentralized planning. Therefore, decentralization of educational planning in Nepal in the present context implies district level planning in education.

DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR FORMULATING DEP

There are many stages of planning but diagnosis or stocktaking is the most important one. It has got twin objectives of identifying educationally backward areas and focus and target groups, which need immediate intervention. The diagnosis exercise may also result into identification of a variety of problems and issues that a particular district is facing. Without a detailed diagnosis exercise, no meaningful planning can be undertaken at any level.

The success or failure of any programme largely depends upon how effectively diagnosis exercise is undertaken. Diagnosis exercise plays the role of a doctor. With the help of data and information, the problems in the system are diagnosed that help the planner to prescribe medicine in the form of new programmes and interventions. If the diagnosis is not proper and it is not based on the present status of the educational development, the existing information is not adequately utilized and the past trends not studied, then the failure of the programme is ensured. It is the diagnosis exercise through which problems of the districts can only be known. It is rather dangerous to prescribe solutions to educational problems without undertaking a rigorous diagnosis exercise.

The diagnosis has twin objectives of identifying educationally backward areas and focus and target groups that need immediate attention and intervention. Diagnosis exercise helps in identifying educational backward areas/pockets in the district. The diagnosis exercise may also result in identification of a variety of problems that a particular system is facing. All these problems vary from district to district and within the district vary from resource center to resource center and also vary from VDC to VDC. The problems identified may be of different nature, such as low participation in primary classes, high dropout rate, teachers absenteeism, availability of only a few primary graduates, inadequate number of teachers who can teach mathematics and science, low percentage of trained teachers and non-availability of female teachers. Diagnosis is always undertaken in relation to the objectives and norms. More specifically the main objectives of the diagnosis exercise are to:

- Identify the educationally backward areas/pockets in a resource center/district;
- Identify focus group/target groups that need attention of planners because of which the goal of universal enrolment has not yet been achieved in the district;
- Identify major problems and limitations in the education system; and
- Help the districts adopt realistic targets on different components of universal enrolment.

The entire diagnosis exercise can be divided into two parts, namely, General Scenario and Education Scenario. Population, administrative structure, number of villages and inhabited houses, climatic conditions, employment opportunities, main crops, industries, geographical map of the district vis-à-vis other districts, location of resource centres etc, should form part of the general scenario. The education scenario should focus on the educational development in the district in general and ECD, literacy and primary education in particular. Indicators relating to different components of UPE, such as universal enrolment, access, retention and quality of education should be analyzed to know the status of educational development in the district and also to identify major problems and issues. Both the quantitative, as well as, qualitative variables should be analyzed so as the cross-sectional and time-series data. All possible sources of educational data that give minutest information should be explored and used. This may include data generated through the research studies, household survey, census publications and EMIS. It may quite possible that information on a few variables required for diagnosis may not be available from the secondary sources. For that purpose, primary data is collected either on the sample or census basis. The district planning teams should identify such data gaps and try to collect information on these variables before the plan formulation exercise is initiated (for details see Annexure).

All the villages in a district should undertake the diagnosis exercise, which in turn is then integrated to take stock of the overall situation first at the resource center level and then at the district level. At the village level, the VDC/Village Education Committee should undertake the exercise. The diagnosis exercise at the village level may be divided into two parts, namely, school related information and village related information. While School Improvement Plan will contain school related information, Village Education Plan will contain village related information generated through the household survey, such as, total number of children up to the age 11, out of school children, reasons of dropouts and never been enrolled should be analyzed adequately and be linked with the SIP to develop an overall Village Education Plan. The School Improvement Plans would be an important input to develop Village Education Plan. The school related information would be used to assess the existing facilities, problems and additional facilities that would be required in the school. In addition, it may also

contain planning for quality improvement, classroom transactions, use of teaching learning aids etc. All the schools including the high and senior secondary schools having primary sections should be considered for this purpose.

At the district level, the District Education Committee should undertake the diagnosis exercise. In fact, the members of the District Planning Team should be entrusted to undertake the exercise. All those who are interested in the development of primary education (village/resource center/district) should be involved in the diagnosis exercise so as to take a comprehensive view of the educational development in the district. The problems and issues identified during the diagnosis will be an input to plan formulation and will also help to fix the targets. All these require a careful selection of members of both the VEC/Committee on Village Education Plan as well District Planning Team who can rigorously undertake the diagnosis exercise. The prime objective of the diagnosis exercise is to bring forth (with the help of indicators) the real picture of educational development in the district and not to hide the real situation.

Effective diagnosis exercise need information on a variety of variables. The data in its original form (raw) is of limited use and it cannot serve as a decision support tool. Therefore, the raw data needs to be converted in the indicator form with the help of simple statistics like averages, percentage, rate and ratio and index numbers. The following variables may be analyzed during the diagnosis exercise:

1. Background Information

1.1 Socio-economic background of the district- i.e. including the history, geophysical features, location map of the district, infrastructure facilities, socio-economic characteristics, number of villages, VDCs, SMCs, RCs, demographic structure, administrative and management structures, other special characteristics of the district, etc.

2.2 Educational institutions: number of educational institutions (pre-primary, primary, non-formal, lower secondary, secondary, senior secondary, colleges, universities, if any for the last two to three years.

3.3 Data on literacy rates for males and females and for Dalits for the last two census years.

4.4 Schooling facilities and access to primary schooling, i.e. number of villages having access to primary and lower secondary schooling facilities as per the norms of the NEPAL Government for the latest year.

5.5 Number of primary and lower secondary schools in the district by type of management by RC for the latest year.

6.6 Physical facilities (buildings/number of instructional rooms/drinking water/toilets) and teaching learning materials available in primary schools by RC for the latest year.

7.7 Teacher training institutions and facilities available in the district.

8.8 Structures and mechanisms for supervision and monitoring of the basic and primary education in the district.

2.   Demographic Data

1.1 Total population of the district by sex and by RC for the last two census years.

2.2 Age-specific population (6 year olds, 6-10 years and 11-13 years) of the district by sex and by RC for the last two census years, and for the latest year.

3.3 Average annual growth rates of total population and 6-10 and 11-13 age group population in the RC and district and in the country as a whole between the last two census years.

3.   Data on Enrolment

1.1 Enrolment at primary level of education (grades I-V) by sex, ethnic group, VDC, and RC for the last three years.

2.2 Grade-specific enrolment and repeaters in the district by sex and RC for the latest two years.

3.3 Enrolment at lower secondary education (grades VI-VIII) by sex, grade, VDC and RC for the last three years.

4.4 Enrolment in non-formal and alternative primary schooling centres for the last three years.

5.5 Age-specific enrolment at primary level (grades I-V) in the district by sex and by RC for last three years.

6.6 Out-of-school children in the age group 6-10 and 11-13 in the district by sex and RC.

7.7 Basic indicators of educational development in the district, i.e. the GER, NER, dropout rate, repetition rate, and percentage share of overage and underage children at primary level of education (grades I-V) by sex for the last three years.

8.8 Grade-to-Grade promotion, dropout and repetition rates for boys and girls at VDC/RD/District levels.

9.9 Retention and completion rate at the primary level at the national and district/RC levels for the last three years.

4.   Data on Teachers

1.1 Teachers at primary and lower secondary level of education in the RC and district by sex, training status for the last three years.

2.2 Teacher-pupil ratio, norm for providing teachers at the time of opening a primary school having 5 grades, and the norm for providing additional teacher at the primary level.

3.3 Percentage of female teachers and institutional arrangements for teacher training at the national and district level.

5.　　Existing Norms and On-going Incentive Schemes

1.1 Various existing norms relating to establishment of new schools, construction of additional classrooms, provision of teachers, including additional teachers, teaching-learning materials, etc.

2.2 On-going incentive schemes in the district at the primary level of education, viz., free textbooks, uniforms, scholarships, other incentives, and the unit cost of such schemes (In Rs.).

3.3 Average monthly salary of primary and lower secondary school teachers, and non-formal centre instructors (In Rs.).

4.4 Average cost of establishing a formal primary school, and also for opening a non-formal centre or alternative schooling centre (In Rs).

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Diagnosis is done on basis of certain indicators. Indicators denote the information or data on any item which helps us in making judgement about relative achievement/progress made in any field. Here it is necessary to draw a distinction between data/information and an indicator. Though all indicators are in terms of data but all data are not necessarily indicators. This is because each set of data or each information does not necessarily help us to make judgement on any items in terms of achievement/ progress made in the system. Taking an example from the field of education, the number of literates in any area in absolute terms give an information about the literates but it does not give any impression about the achievement of the area in terms of literacy. This is simply because number of literates in absolute terms is a raw data. However, if we have information on literacy rate of the area it becomes an indicators. Literacy rate is an indicator because it shows the achievement of the area and also enables us to compare this achievement with the achievement made 5 or 10 years earlier or even compare the achievement of this area in literacy with some other area for the same period of time.

While developing district plan for primary education the focus is always on achieving the goal of Universalization of Primary Education (UPE) However UPE has four important components, which are namely universal access, universal enrolment, universal retention and universal achievement. The indicators of education with respect to UPE will therefore be the indicators showing access, enrolment, retention and achievement. Thus if we are interested to plan for Universalisation of Primary Education for a district we need to know what is the

present status of the district on these basic components. Understanding the present scenario by showing the past progress made in the area on various items is known as diagnosis of the situation. One has to diagnose on the items like access, enrolment, retention and achievement if one has to plan for UPE. The diagnosis for Universalization of Elementary Education can be done on the basis of certain indicators. This is the reason that in the field of education, we categorize indicators into three groups viz. INPUT indicators, PROCESS indicators and OUTPUT indicators. Broadly speaking the access and enrolment are inputs, retention is a part of the process and achievement is an output of education system with respect to the Universalisation of Primary Education.

The INPUTS to education systems are schools (i.e. educational institutions), buildings, infrastructure, teachers and students. So the INPUT indicators of UPE are namely the access indicators, building and infrastructure indicators, teachers and enrolment indicators. In this regard the most commonly used access indicator is the Gross Access Ratio (GAR) which shows the percentage of habitations served by educational facilities. However even the percentage of rural population served by primary/elementary schooling facilities is also an indicator of access. Similarly percentage of schools having building (with various types of buildings) and having building of one, two, three or more rooms are also the indicators of building. The teacher-pupil ratio and teacher grade ratio are input indicators as far as the teachers are concerned. Lastly the 'Enrolment Ratio' is an input indicator of coverage of relevant age group population.

For diagnosing the educational situation, as far as the UPE is concerned, 'Enrolment Ratio' is one of the important indicator. The Enrolment Ratio can be defined as the ratio/percentage of relevant age group population attending schools. In order to plan for Universalisation of Primary Education 3 types of Enrolment ratios are used. These are: (i) Level-wise Enrolment Ratio which shows the coverage of relevant age group population by primary/upper primary schools or their alternatives: (ii) Grade-wise Enrolment Ratio which shows the grade-wise coverage of relevant single year age population by schools and (iii) Age-specific Enrolment Ratio which represents the ratio of single year age population attending schools. Here the level and grade-wise enrolment ratios are of two types namely Gross Enrolment Ratio(GER) and Net Enrolment Ratio(NER). The GER is the ratio of relevant age group population to the number of children attending a specific level (say primary or elementary level) of schools. Here all children who are studying in primary/elementary schools/sections are taken into account irrespective of their age. This is the reason that many a times the enrolment at primary/elementary level exceeds the relevant age group population and GER exceeds 100 percent. However for computing NER we take the ratio of relevant age group population with the number of the same age group children attending schools and over-age/under-age children are not counted for. In order to develop educational plan it is always advisable to use Net Enrolment Ratio rather than Gross Enrolment Ratio.

The PROCESS of education system includes inspection and supervision, educational administration and the actual teaching-learning process that goes on in the classroom. With respect to UEE an important PROCESS indicator is the students flow in the system. As a result of the process of teaching-learning children learn some basic skills related to e.g. literacy and numeracy and are accordingly promoted from one grade to another grade. The students flow analysis helps us to even measure the efficiency of schools in particular and that of education system in general. The flow of students into the system is measured in terms of Admission Rate or Entry Rate. The students flow through the system is measured in terms of flow rates like promotion rate, repetition rate and drop-out rate. These rates show the efficiency of schools and in order to achieve the goal of UEE, the promotion rate is supposed to be 100 percent whereas repetition and dropout rates are to be reduced to zero. This means that retention is to be 100 per cent. However, the necessary pre-condition is that Admission or Entry Rate should be 100 per cent. The students flow through the system is measured in terms of Transition rate. In order to achieve the goal of UEE the transition between primary and upper primary level is supposed to be 100 per cent. All these indicators are helpful to clearly assess the progress made in the system, the current situation and the constraints of the system.

The achievement of children is one of the most common OUTPUT indicator. In order to achieve the goal of Universalisation of Primary Education it is expected that there should be 100 per cent achievement. This actually means that all children completing primary schooling should have achieved the minimum levels of learning prescribed for that level of schooling. The OUTPUT indicators are generally seen as indicators of quality. Some of the more commonly used OUTPUT indicators are graduation rates, examination results i.e. pass percentage, percentage of first divisioners/distinction holders and percentage of students selected at public examinations, National Testing Services and various competitive examinations etc. However, the levels of learning are the most reliable outcome indicator of education system. In order to measure the levels of learning specially developed achievement tests are administered.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS & TARGET SETTINGS

Once the outcome of the diagnosis exercise is known, at the next stage of planning a variety of population and education variables need to be projected. This will help planning team members in setting reliable targets on different aspects of universal primary education. Broadly targets are to be set on enrolment ratio, retention rate, entry rate and future values of grade-to-grade promotion, repetition and dropout rates. Diagnosis exercise with focus on disaggregated analysis of data at the VDC and RC levels will help planning team members to set RC-specific realistic targets on different aspects of UPE. It may also be noted that annual as well as targets in the benchmark years need to be set out separately in case of boys and girls. All this cannot be handled efficiently

unless projected population and enrolment both at the RC and District levels is available. Therefore, for developing reliable education plans, information on future population and enrolment at different levels is non negotiable. For this purpose, detailed population and enrolment projection exercises needs to be undertaken.

The projection techniques can be of grate help in fixing targets on enrolment and retention. It would help planner in setting out realistic targets. The outcome of the diagnosis exercise would play decisive role in adopting targets on enrolment and other transition rates. Needless to mention that targets should be based upon the immediate past trends and they should be realistic one and should always be based upon the present status of educational development in the district.

Depending upon the availability of data on repeaters, grade-ratio or grade-transition method is applied. In the first exercise, assuming that all the rates/indicators would remain constant in years that follow, grade-specific enrolment should be projected. Once the total enrolment at the primary level in different years is projected, the next step is to project the GER and Retention Rate in different year. The projected GER and Retention Rate would indicate the likely values based upon the assumption that no improvement would take place and the existing values of entry, dropout, promotion and repetition rates would remain constant in years that follow. This exercise would indicate whether at present rates, the goal of UPE in the district is achievable, if yes then by which year. In case, if it indicate that the goal is not likely to be achieved in the near future; thus meaning that without improving the existing rates, the goal will not be achieved.

METHODOLOGY OF PLAN FORMULATION

In a multi-level planning framework in Nepal the immediate concern of policy makers, planners and administrators is to ensure that "district" becomes a viable unit of planning. In the field of education it is expected that district educational plans may be formulated. It is heartening to note that in Nepal some efforts were made to develop District Education Plan in 1999 and the focus was on universalisation of primary education. However, due to some technical problems these district plans could neither be approved nor implemented. Fresh efforts have been made to develop district education plans by adopting bottom up approach. To begin with the DEPs are to be developed in 5 pilot districts namely Bardiya, Chitwan, Dadeldhura, Jhapa and Syangja. It is expected that these DEPs focusing on primary education will be for a period of five years i.e. 2004-05 to 2008-09. These DEPs once developed will be appraised and approved by appropriate authorities before being implemented in the districts.

The District Education Plans (DEP) to be formulated by the district planning teams are expected to broadly present the background of the district, district

educational scenario, planning process adopted, problems and issues of primary education, objectives and targets, intervention strategies, costing of activities and developing implementation schedule. The details to be presented in the district education plan documents on important items are presented below:

District Background

Any plan developed for a specific area should first of all present the background of the area. The introduction section of the District Education Plan should contain the background of the district. This may include geographical features, cultural characteristics, socio-economic features of the district. The district background may present the administrative structure of the district also. This includes the number of Resource Centres, VDCs, inhabited villages etc. The RC/VDC-wise number of villages and habitations may also be given to present the administrative structure of the district. Detailed demographic structure of the district must be presented which may include male, female, rural, urban, Dalit population for the latest census alongwith the growth rate of population, density of population, sex ratio, percentage of urban population and percentage of Dalit population. However it is desirable to present the demographic data disaggregated at the RC/VDC level so as to show the inter-RC/VDC variations on all these parameters of population. In addition to demographic features the district background may also present the literacy scenario and that again should be given RC/VDC-wise for male, female and Dalit population for the latest census. However it may be better to show the progress of literacy in the district over-a-period of time.

District Educational Scenario

The district educational administrative structure may be given to show how education system is managed in the district. The objective of this section may be to present the details of educational facilities available as well as the utilisation of these educational facilities by the people. Though the document is specifically concerned with primary education it should present the educational facilities for lower secondary, secondary, higher secondary and even higher, professional, technical education also. However on primary education detailed information on all educational indicators may be given. While presenting the primary education scene of the district it is important to include the private aided and unaided recognised schools as well as the Non-Formal Education Centres and Alternative Education Centres which are in operation in the district. All information on primary education should be presented RC/VDC-wise which may help to identify educationally backward and advanced RCs/VDCs.

The district educational profile should contain information on number of schools imparting primary education. The RC/VDC-wise access position on primary

educational facilities should be presented. The schools may preferably be presented management-wise i.e. number of schools under the categories of government, local bodies, private aided and private unaided. Further, detailed data on the number of teachers in primary schools working in the district should be presented. The number of posts and vacancies as well as the training status i.e. trained and untrained teachers as also the teacher pupil ratio disaggregated at RC/VDC level may be presented to show the position of teachers availability in the district.

The enrolment scenario at primary level in the district is a very important aspect of district educational profile. However the enrolment in absolute figures alone will not meet the purpose that is why it is desirable to present figures on enrolment ratio at primary level. While calculating and presenting the enrolment ratio the enrolment in private schools, NFE centres and Alternative Education Centres should also be taken into account. Further the enrolment ratio over a period of time, if presented, may show the progress on enrolment in the district. The enrolment at primary level may be presented grade-wise and preferably for at least 2 or 3 consecutive years.

The data on indicators such as dropout rate, repetition rate and transition rate is important while presenting the district primary education scene. RC/VDC-wise dropout and transition rates should be presented. These data are important for diagnosing the educational situation in the district.

The district educational scenario should contain information of building position and infrastructure facilities in primary schools in the district. These figures should also be presented RC/VDC-wise. The number and percentage of schools having building with type and condition of building, percentage of schools having facilities like black board, drinking water, electricity, compound wall, urinals, toilets, teaching-learning material etc. will help to identify the RCs/VDCs and schools where these facilities are lacking. All these information provided on infrastructure have implications for planning that is why it is necessary to present it in the district educational profile.

Target Setting

Targets are translation of objectives in clearly defined quantitative terms. What the plan intends to achieve during the plan period when specified in quantitative terms is known as target. Targets are statements which state clearly and unambiguously what is to be achieved and are in measurable terms and have definite time frame. In order to develop district education plan the targets may be set for access, enrolment, retention and achievement level of children. However it is desirable to undertake the target setting exercise in a disaggregated manner which means that in district plan document the targets should be set RC/VDC-

wise. This is important because different RC/VDC have different levels of e.g. enrolment or retention and so targets for these RCs/VDCs may also be different. Secondly in a perspective plan of 5 years the targets should be set in a phased manner which means that targets should not only be set for the total plan period but should also be set for all intervening years. This may not only help to see the progress of implementation of the plan on year to year basis but may also facilitate in reviewing the implementation strategies and perhaps revising the targets for the coming years.

The gender and social disparities in the field of education are common features in India. These disparities may be in enrolment, retention or even in achievement also. One of the important objective in the District plan will be to reduce these disparities. It is therefore important to set the targets on enrolment and retention separately for boys and girls as well as for Dalit population. Over a period of time the gap between boys and girls and between Dalits and others may be reduced. The target of reducing this gap may depend upon the gap that exists between these categories in the base year of the plan.

The goal in District Education Plan is to universalize primary education, which means universal access, universal enrolment, universal retention and universal achievement. This means the ultimate target is 100 percent access, enrolment, retention and achievement. But while setting the target on these parameters it is important to look at the present status of the district on these components and then accordingly set the targets which are realistic and are achievable. However, it is important to keep in mind the national targets set in EFA core document of Nepal.

Intervention Strategies and Activities

Evolving intervention strategies to achieve the targets is another important aspect of plan formulation. However it is to be noted that the strategies evolved will have to address the identified problems and issues of elementary education in the district. While evolving the strategies important points to keep in view are: (i) in a decentralised planning any single strategy may not be uniformly operational or applicable in different areas and that is why probably for addressing a single problem one may have to envisage a set of strategies for a given context. (ii) Many a times a single strategy may not be enough to address an issue or a problem and there will be a need to work out multiple strategies for addressing a single problem. (iii) All the problems and issues identified during the planning exercise must be tackled and intervention strategies should be worked out accordingly and there should thus be a linkage between the problems/issues identified and the intervention strategies developed for addressing them.

Translating the strategies into programmes and activities is the next step in the plan formulation. It is to be kept in view that a specific intervention strategy may require a number of programmes to make it operational and effective. However a programme may be an aggregation of various activities. It is therefore necessary to translate each and every strategy into activities and tasks. For example for improving access the strategy can be 'opening of new primary schools'. However one of the activity under the strategy of opening new primary schools may be 'construction of school building'. But the activity of construction of school building has many tasks that are to be undertaken. These tasks may be (i) identification of school-less habitations; (ii) identification of habitations qualifying for opening schools; (iii) listing and prioritisation of habitations; (iv) deciding about the number of schools to be opened; (v) identification of habitations where schools are to be opened; (vi) deciding the location/site of the school; (vii) acquiring site/transfer of land; (viii) identification of agency for construction and supervision; (ix) actual construction work; (x)monitoring and supervision of construction work and (xi) finishing and furnishing of school building.

Next step in plan formulation is the sequencing and phasing of these activities and the tasks. It may be noted that some activities / tasks can be undertaken only in a sequential manner whereas some activities/tasks can be started simultaneously. For example, construction of school building and recruitment of teachers are the activities which can be undertaken simultaneously while actual construction of school building can not be done before deciding the site of the school, acquiring site, transfer of land and identification of agency for construction and supervision.

Costing and Financial Requirements

An important step in the plan formulation exercise is the costing and estimation of financial requirements to implement the plan. Translating the physical inputs into financial requirements is essential for funding purpose. Various steps that are involved in estimation of financial requirements are: (i) listing of all the activities to be undertaken (ii) classifying all these activities into two categories i.e. activities having cost implications and activities which do not have cost implications; (iii) classifying the activities which have cost implications into recurring and non-recurring heads; (iv) working our the average cost of recurring activities and unit cost for non-recurring activities (v) estimation of costs separately under the recurring and non-recurring heads.

While estimating the financial requirements for the District Education Plan the recurring costs estimation may be on items such as salaries, training, maintenance of building, equipment, furniture, infrastructure etc.; travel costs; stationary and consumables, contingencies, rents etc. Similarly the non-recurring cost estimation may be on items such as: construction of school building,

additional classrooms, toilets, compound wall, equipments, furnitures; infrastructure; vehicle etc. The aggregation of costs of all the activities and tasks under various strategies will give the total financial requirements of the plan.

Allocation of resources to education is based on the budgets. Budgets are prepared annually to facilitate the resource allocation process. This implies that these activities are to be classified according to the year of beginning and completion of the activities. This may help in preparing the annual budgets. The budget should correspond to the activities indicated to be completed in that particular year.

While estimating the cost requirements for the plan it is of utmost importance to keep in view the financial parameters fixed by the national government i.e. DOE/MOES with regard to District Education Plan. The costing of the district must adhere to the ceilings prescribed by DOE/MOES on various items as these are part of guidelines issued by the Department of Education/Ministry of Education and Sports.

MICRO - PLANNING: CONCEPT AND METHODOLOGY

Planning at the lowest spatial unit can be termed as micro level planning. In the Indian context micro level planning can mean planning carried out at the village level or even at the habitation level. While selecting unit for micro planning one has to consider the availability of educational facilities like a school or a non-formal education center. In other words, while we try to conduct micro level planning in education we may have to select a unit centering around an educational institution. This may be a school or its alternative which is already existing or planning to be opened.

The objectives of the micro level planning are: i) to mobilize local community to prepare village level plans; ii) to provide a support system to the schools and teachers so that schools become more functional; iii) to ensure that all eligible children from the locality attend the schools. The major objective of the micro-planning exercise is not on issues pertaining to allocation of resources but on issues pertaining to better and efficient use of resources which are already allocated to a particular locality, area or schools.

Micro planning should not be seen as a one shot exercise. It is a continuous process and it unfolds itself in the process of implementing and operationalising plans prepared either at the local level or at the higher levels. Micro planning focuses more on the operational details of achieving a specified plan target.

Micro planning exercise can be undertaken by local people. In fact the object and subject of micro planning is local people. How to make schools community based? How do we ensure accountability of the schools to the community it serves? What is the mechanism to channelise social forces towards education? These are important questions addressed in micro planning exercise.

Micro planning exercise involves less of technical skills and more of social skills. How to interact with the community for a common cause? How to bring them together on a common platform? How are we going to deal with the existing social hierarchy in a given locality? These are the issues which make a micro planning exercise successful or failure.

The steps involved in operationalising a micro planning exercise are as follows :

i) *Understanding the Village* : This may be a first step to identify the problems faced by the village so that basic intervention strategies can be clearly understood.

ii) *Preparation of a Village Map* : A Village may be having many facilities and educational facilities may be one among such facilities. It may be better if these facilities are plotted on a map so that people of the locality will be able to visually observe their village and allocation of the facilities in their village. A discussion based on such a map may be a meaningful exercise.

iii) *Identification of Non-enrolled and Dropout Children* : Normally household survey become a part of micro planning exercise. Household survey provides details about the children to be enrolled, retained in the school or dropped out from the school. This will be a very useful information to initiate activities under the micro planning efforts.

iv) *Village Education Register* : Based on the household surveys, one can develop a village education register clearly indicating the households which are not sending children to the schools. This will help us to adopt corrective measures to encourage the parents of these households to send their children to schools.

v) *School Related Factors* : The village may have a school. If the village has a school then one has to relate the efforts made during the micro planning exercise with the facilities available at the school level.

vi) *The Preparation of Village Education Plan* : Once the community inputs and the school inputs are identified then it is possible to prepare a village education plan focussing on the specific educational problems faced at the household level and at the school level. Preparation of such plans and monitoring of activities thus identified in a village plan

make micro planning exercise an effective tool in making the best use of the resources available at the local level.

One of the major questions in micro planning is: who will initiate a micro planning exercise? Unfortunately, there cannot be a single answer to this question. The pattern may be varying in different localities, given their specific feature. The co-operation from the elected representatives, functionaries and people at large are essential. Therefore the organizational arrangements need to evolve locally rather than super-imposed form outside the village. A common pattern found in areas where micro planning exercises are seriously initiated is to form a core group consisting of different segments of population of the village, orient them to the idea and help them in the initial stages, to organize some of the activities under the micro planning exercise.

Concept and Methodology of School Mapping

Elementary education in Nepal is predominantly funded and managed by the government. Therefore, investment decisions by the public sector determine the pattern of expansion of educational facilities. Over a period of time, it is noticed that certain areas are more endowed with schooling facilities, which leads to regional inequities arising from the investment policies of the public authorities. School mapping, a norm based local level planning technique, incorporates spatial and demographic dimension into the educational planning process. School mapping helps eliminate regional and social inequalities in access to schooling provisions, and in the process makes the best use of the available resources.

 The major question answered by the school mapping exercise is where to locate educational facilities. Location of educational facilities depends on the norms and standards developed by the public authorities. Even within the norms and standards, many geographical areas may be eligible for opening of new schools. School mapping technique help us to identify the most appropriate location of schools or their alternatives so that more number of children can be benefited from the same level of investment. It also helps to rationalize facilities across the existing and new schools.

The major objective of the school mapping is to create equitable educational opportunities by leveling out the existing disparities in the distribution of educational facilities. This technique is useful to plan all levels of education. School mapping is not confined to locating formal schools; location of alternatives to formal schools is a part of the school mapping exercise. The methodology of school mapping envisages specification of norms; diagnosis of the existing educational facilities; projection of future population; deciding the location of schools or their alternatives; and estimation of facilities required in all the (existing and new) educational institutions.

One of the steps in school mapping is to select a unit for the exercise and diagnose the educational development in that area. The school mapping exercises help identifying the most ideal locations to open schools. Given this primary purpose, school mapping exercises cannot be undertaken for one village or habitation. A cluster of villages or a cluster of Village Development Committees can be an ideal unit for school mapping activities. The term 'diagnosis' in education refers to analyzing the present status of education in an area/region to identify strengths and weaknesses of the system. These weaknesses and strengths of the system are identified with the help of certain performance indicators.

For diagnosing the educational situation, it is better to collect data on the selected items during the previous 4-5 years or a decade. We may require demographic data, literacy data, data regarding enrollment, teachers, building, flow rates of students, infrastructure, etc. The demographic data are very important in school mapping exercise. Data on total population by sex, caste and age group for at least two points of time are minimum requirements. We may also need to have data on population on age group 5-10 and10-13, if we are projecting population for the primary and lower secondary levels.

For diagnosing educational situation, data on important indicators like literacy rate, enrollment ratios, and retention and dropout rates are required. The present status of teachers' position is important, and in this respect, data on number of teachers by qualification, experience, training and sex is required. Similarly, teacher-pupil ratio is also important to assess the present situation. Another set of information required is on buildings and infrastructure facilities. Information on the condition of building, number of rooms, type of building and on other facilities in schools like blackboard, water, toilet, electricity, playground, etc. are useful to prepare school specific plans.

The next step in school mapping exercise is to assess the number of children to be enrolled. This estimate is to be made on at the school level, by taking into consideration the catchment area concept, and it requires projection of total and school age specific population in the catchment area of a school. There are various methods of population projection. Methods of population projection are classified into three categories, namely Mathematical, Economic and Component methods. Keeping in view scant demographic data at the VDC and district levels, it is not possible to undertake detailed population projection exercises at the catchment area level. Therefore, growth rates and ratio methods of population projection are more commonly used at the district and sub-district levels.

Enrolment projections are important to decide on the opening of new schools, up-gradation of existing schools, and to estimate the number of teachers required. The techniques of enrolment projections can broadly be classified into two: mathematical and analytical methods. Mathematical methods require aggregate

enrolment data at least for five to ten years, and only total enrolment can be projected. On the other hand, analytical methods require promotion, dropout, repetition and apparent entry rates. There are three simple methods of enrolment projections, namely, rate of growth, enrolment ratio and grade transition methods. The application of a particular method depends upon the requirements and the availability of data. At the lowest level, cohort method for grade-wise enrolment projection is more desirable. However, at the local level many information required to make reliable projections are not available. Therefore, one may have to depend on the most probable approximations. For example, the projection method used to derive school age-group children in this exercise is based on the assumption of a fixed proportion of the total population.

The next step in the exercise is to specify norms, standards and catchment area. Opening of new schools or their alternatives are based on the norms regarding threshold population, which indirectly defines the potential number of children to be enrolled in a given locality. In India the norm that is followed is to open a primary school in areas which have a population of 300 and above in plain areas and 250 or above in the remote or tribal areas. Similarly, after the 1986 policy, the norm adopted for the number of teachers is a minimum of two teachers in all the primary schools irrespective of the type of the enrollment. In Nepal, the norms for establishing a new primary school is the walking distance which can be covered in half an hour by children in the age group 5-10. In Nepal, there is no norm relating to the minimum threshold level of population to be served by a new formal school.

The other important norm is regarding the maximum permissible distance a child has to travel from home to school. This is the school mapping terminology means definition of catchment area of a school. The catchment area of a school is the geographical area served by a school. It is defined as the maximum acceptable distance a child can travel from home to school. Normally catchment area is measured in terms of area of a circle or hexagon.

In India, especially in the remote areas, the settlement is in habitations. One may frequently come across situations in remote areas in India where one may not find any household for a long distance. And where habitations are located, it may have a cluster of households. Given this, pattern of population settlement in India, we have not adopted the traditional catchment area concept. What we have adopted alternatively is a distance matrix method whereby the distances between habitations are measured. Therefore, number of habitations and their distances from the school are taken into consideration to decide the catchment area of the school. It is easy to develop distance matrix. The only information required to develop such a matrix is the distances between habitations or villages. The distances are to be measured from the locations within villages or habitation where households are concentrated. These details can be obtained through a survey.

It is easy to locate schools based on the distance matrix method. As mentioned earlier, location of schools is based on the norms and resources available. If the public authorities have resources to open schools wherever they are required, then prioritization is a less meaningful technique. However, schools are opened only in some selected locations. The norms form the basis to prioritize such decisions. Based on the distance norms and resources available, decisions regarding opening of new schools, if any required, can be arrived at.

As part of the school mapping exercise, one may have to assess the requirements of facilities in schools. While the facilities to be provided in the new school can be easily assessed, the same in the existing schools need to be based on an assessment of the existing facilities in there schools. Based on the population growth and potential growth in enrollment, additional infrastructure facilities may be required in the existing schools. It may be important to incorporate not only the infrastructure facilities but also other requirements of teaching learning materials to be purchased in the school. Based on these requirements cost estimates can be made and proposals can be prepared for funding. The outcomes of the school mapping exercises in a particular district should be reflected in DEP of that district.

Planning for Implementation

Planning for implementation is one of the important stages of developing a perspective plan for universal primary or elementary education at the district level. A district education plan document is incomplete if it does not contain a detailed plan for implementation of the programmes and projects that make up the plan. In other words, planning for implementation should be in-built into the DEP. Planning for implementation mainly focuses on scheduling and controlling of planned interventions. In other words, an implementation plan translates all the planned interventions into an operating time table (i.e. scheduling) and specifies institutional requirements and responsibilities (i.e. controlling). The implementation schedule also serves as an important tool for monitoring and formative evaluation of implementation of various interventions.

Generally, a failure to achieve plan targets in the education sector can largely be attributed to lack of detailed planning for implementation, particularly not accounting for the uncertainties in the process of implementation of social development projects like education. Planning for implementation serves two basic purposes: (i) it facilitates the process of implementation of programmes and projects by providing a sound mechanism of monitoring (i.e. in the form of an implementation schedule); and (ii) it increases the efficiency of the system by minimizing the costs of implementation of given programmes and projects of a district level education plan. Planning for implementation makes it possible to critically analyze the activities of a given educational programme of the DEP, and

to develop an implementation schedule of the programme, which can be used to monitor the progress of implementation.

Specifically, the necessary steps in planning for implementation of educational programmes/projects are:

- Listing of activities that make up the programme;

- Thinking through each of these activities;

- Establishing inter-relationships between these activities;

- Establishing a network;

- Setting activity durations;

- Determining material, equipment/tools and human resource needs;

- Deciding about time duration for implementation of each activity;

- Identifying critical activities of the programme, which cannot be overlooked without affecting the duration of the programme implementation and resources invested in it; and

- Thinking about organizational arrangements for carrying out programme activities.

Besides allocation of resources to individual programmes and projects that make up the DEP and institutional arrangements, scheduling forms the most important exercise in the planning for implementation. Scheduling refers to the process of converting an educational plan into an operating timetable, which establishes start and completion time of all the activities of the programme/plan. There are several ways of preparing implementation schedules, such as the most commonly used Bar Chart Method. However, an effective implementation plan makes use of the network-based techniques such as the Programme/Project Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) and the Critical Path Method (CPM).

An educational programme network is the graphic flow diagram of the interrelationships, interdependencies, and sequence of all activities and events that must be accomplished to complete the programme. The PERT is a network-based procedure that facilitates planning, scheduling and controlling of education programmes and projects. It provides methods for measuring actual progress of the programme against expected progress, for comparing consequences of proposed alternative strategies, for predicting future programme status, and for optimizing utilization of resources.

Listing of all possible activities of the programme is a key step in planning for implementation of the educational programme. The second step is to gather

information about predecessors of each activity. One way of doing this is to identify the immediate predecessors of each activity. Third, on the basis of this information, the PERT network for the programme/project can be developed.

Fourth, once the PERT network of the programme is developed then the need is to obtain information on the time required to complete each activity. Fifth, this is followed by three alternative time estimates (i.e. optimistic activity time; most probable activity time; and pessimistic activity time). These three activity time estimates help the planning team to make the best guess of the expected activity time. In this way, uncertainty can be expressed by providing estimates ranging from the best to the worst possible time for completing individual activities. Finally, the PERT network for the given educational programme or project is drawn on the basis of the above information.

Once the PERT network is drawn, the next step is to estimate the critical path in the network. This is done by using both forward-pass and backward-pass methods. This helps establish early start and latest finish times of each activity. Also, activity slack is estimated by using early start and latest finish times.

Activities having no slack are termed as critical activities, and the longest path on the PERT network is identified as the critical path. The time required to traverse the critical path becomes the programme or project implementation period. All these information, when put in a tabular form, becomes the implementation schedule of the educational programme or project under consideration.

Preparation of an implementation schedule facilitates smooth implementation of various activities indicated under the plan. However, drawing up of a schedule by itself may not facilitate implementation. It requires close monitoring of activities and adjustments to be made in the schedule, if there are delays in the implementation of any particular programme or project or activity. Review meetings are to be held periodically to ascertain the progress in the implementation of the plan. Regular review meetings close monitoring and readjustment of implementation schedules, if necessary, will ensure achievement of plan targets within the stipulated timeframe.

District Planning in Education: An Indian Experience

India has a five-tier system in the multi-level planning framework. There is a possibility of decision making in the field of education at five hierarchical units namely national, state (or provincial), district, block and village. These are the units at which well-developed administrative machinery is available and they have a clearly demarcated geographical jurisdiction. The country has a history of planned development for more than half century as the first Five Year plan was

launched in 1950-51. The planning exercise has generally been carried out at the national level and at the state level during the initial periods. However, from the fourth Five Year Plan onwards emphasis has been laid on decentralized planning at the district level. Thus, the conceptualization of district planning in education is more than three decades old in the country. Despite this conceptualization the district planning of education could not be operationalised till late 1980s.

The experience of district planning in education is of not more than one and a half decades in India. The Total Literacy Campaigns (TLC) launched by National Literacy Mission were the first of its kind in which in late 1980s plans were formulated and implemented at the district level. In addition to TLCs some projects and programmes related to primary and elementary education were implemented in several states of the country in late 1980s and early 1990s which were district based and the exercise of district planning of education was undertaken in these projects and programmes. These projects are namely Andhra Pradesh Primary Education Project (APPEP), Bihar Education Project (BEP), Uttar Pradesh Basic Education Project (UPBEP) and District Primary Education Programme (DPEP).

As mentioned above though conceptualization of district planning in education was made in late 1960s the operationalisation could be done only in late 1980s, which means a gap of about two decades between conceptualization and operationalistaion. Why the district planning in education could not be operationalised earlier? There were three main constraints in this regard. These are (i) The resource decisions continued to be centralized at national and state levels and district level authorities were not given power to either mobilize or reallocate resources, (ii) There was no organizational mechanism to facilitate district planning in education. The districts have no counter part of National Planning Commission or State Planning Boards so as to carry out the planning exercise and (iii) There was hardly any planning competencies available at the district level and the district level education authorities had no technical know-how about planning.

Two major programmes related to primary and elementary education as a result of which district level planning of education could be operationalised in real sense in India are District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA). The experiences and lessons learnt from developing and implementing District Education Plans in India under these two major programmes as discussed below.

District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)

The programme started in its first phase in 1994. The three constraints in district planning of education were addressed in DPEP by (i) Giving a ceiling of Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 millions to each district by the Central Government so as to enable the

districts to develop their district primary education plans within that ceiling (ii) District Planning teams were constituted which are represented by district education officer, faculty members of District Institute of Education and training (DIET), block level officials, teachers etc. (iii) The district planning teams were given orientation about various aspects of planning at the national level by National Level Resource Institutions.

The basic features of the programme (DPEP) were additionality and sustainability. This means that the amount sanctioned to each district (with a ceiling of Rs. 400 million) under the programmme is in addition to the resources being allocated by the state government for elementary education in the district. Secondly, the efforts made under the programme and the activities undertaken and structures created in the districts would have to be sustained by the respective state governments after DPEP comes to an end. On these two aspects an agreement was reached between the Central Government and the State Governments before DPEP was implemented in selected districts of the respective states.

The programme started in 1994 in 42 districts of 7 major states. These states include Haryana (4 districts), Assam (4 districts), Maharashtra (5 districts), Madhya Pradesh (19 districts), Karnataka (4 districts), Kerala (3 districts) and Tamil Nadu (3 districts). However, in its four phrases DPEP now covered more than 250 districts of the country which are from 18 major states. Barring Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir and smaller states from North-Eastern India and Goa, all states were covered under the programme though only in selected districts.

Though the programme had a major goal of Universalisation of Primary Education (UPE) in the districts more specifically it had the following objectives in terms of targets set for the districts (i) The target of access and enrolment was 100 per cent i.e. universalisation of access and enrolment (ii) Increasing retention of children at primary level to 90 per cent (iii) Reducing all kinds of disparities specially gender and social disparities to 5 per cent and (iv) Increasing the achievement level of children in primary classes to the extent of 25 per cent over and above the base line achievement level. The districts had to achieve the targets within a period of 5 to 7 years for which district plans were developed.

As mentioned above each district covered under DPEP had to develop a plan within the budget ceiling of Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 million. The amount of budget sanctioned to each district was to be made available jointly by the Government of India and the respective State Government in a ratio of 85:15. The states were expected to maintain the investment in elementary education to 1990-91 level in real terms. Further, to ensure that proper emphasis is given on activities related to quality improvement in primary education ceiling of budget on management cost and civil works activities was prescribed to the extent of 6 per cent and 24 per cent respectively. However, after implementation of the programme for 3 to 4

years the ceiling on civil works was raised from 24 per cent to 33 per cent of the total approved budget

Programme Management

In order to manage the programme at various levels management structures were created at various levels. In order to oversea the activities and monitor the progress of implementation of the programme at the national level, DPEP Bureau was created within the Central Department of Education, Ministry of HRD. At the state level, each state created State Implementation Society (SIS), which was an autonomous body, created under Societies' Registration Act. For day-to-day management of the programme State Project Office was established which was headed by a full time State Project Director who was in charge of the state implementation unit. Further, at the district level which was the unit for planning and implementation of the programme District Project Offices were constituted with a full time district project coordinator appointed as the in charge of the district implementation unit. The DIET was also deeply involved in the programme for quality related issues.

At the sub-district level management structures created under DPEP are Block Resource Centre at block level and Cluster Resource Centre (CRC) at the cluster level, which covers 10 to 15 primary schools. However, at the grass root level Village Education Committees (VECs) were constituted to ensure proper implementation of the programme at micro-level. Certain activities under DPEP were to be undertaken through Village Education Committees only and thus it was mandatory to constitute such committees in the districts at the Village/School level.

Planning Process

It was expected that the district plans will be developed through participatory process and in this exercise the stake holders of education will be involved at district, block, cluster and village levels. This was to ensure the community/peoples' participation in planning which is necessary to operationalise decentralized planning of education.

In order to develop district plans under DPEP the guidelines issued from the national level suggested that the districts adopt the following steps.

- Identification of Planning Group/Team at the state and district level
- Orientation/Training of Planning teams
- Initiating participatory process (consultations at various levels)
- Initiating pre-project studies and surveys

- Preparation of draft plans
- Workshop for further orientation of planning teams for revising the draft plans
- Completion of studies and surveys and sharing workshops
- Preparation of next draft plan
- Pre-appraisal of plans by Government of India team
- Revision of plan in the light of suggestions given by pre-appraisal team
- Finalization of plans
- Plan appraisal by Government of India team
- Approval of plan and release of funds

Lessons learnt from DPEP implementation

The district primary education programme implemented in various districts in the country has been supervised, monitored and evaluated at different levels. In this regard as a result of the experience of implementing the programme some important lessons learnt in the country are as given below.

- District planning of education operationalised in the country in a real sense as a result of the DPEP implementation.
- It was generally felt that failures in achieving the goal of UPE is due to lack of resources. This myth was broken by implementation of programme.
- The district level capacity was developed for planning for the first time under DPEP.
- The sub-district structures namely Block Resource Centres (BRCs) and Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs) were created in the district that have a very important contribution towards quality improvement.
- As compared to other districts faster progress was seen in enrolment and retention of children at primary level in DPEP districts.
- Substantial improvement in the quality of primary education was observed.
- Educational Management Information System (EMIS) was established and operationalised.
- The sustainability of the programme which is to be ensured by the state governments is a real concern and many states are finding it difficult to sustain the DPEP activities after the programme is over.

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA)

The latest programme launched in India in 2001 with a broad objective of Universalisation of Elementary Education (UEE), known as Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, is yet another district based programme. It is important to note that this programme envisages covering all the districts of the country unlike previous

programmes in which the coverage was limited to a few districts. This programme has the following objectives:

- All children in schools by 2003
- All children complete 5 years of primary schooling by 2007 (i.e. UPE by 2007)
- All children to complete 8 years of elementary schooling by 2010 (i.e. UEE by 2010 (i.e. UEE by 2010)
- Focus on elementary education of satisfactory quality with emphasis on education for life
- Bridge all gender and social category gaps at primary level by 2007 and at elementary level by 2010
- Universal retention by 2010

Distinct Features of SSA (from DPEP)

The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme has some distinct features from earlier programmes such as DPEP. However, this programme is conceptualized by taking into account all the experiences of earlier programmes related to elementary education. Some important features of the SSA programme which are different from DPEP are as follows.

1. Unlike DPEP the SSA programme is based on a policy of sustainable financing. The sharing between GOI and States was 85:15 during Ninth Plan (i.e. upto March 2002), it is 75:25 during Tenth Plan (i.e. upto March 2007) and it will be on 50:50 sharing thereafter. Thus it ensures a long term financing of the programme from Central Government.

2. The coverage of SSA is universal in terms of districts as all 595 districts of the country are covered under this programme. On the other hand the coverage in SSA is of total elementary education rather than only the primary education.

3. The SSA envisages a very well defined pre-project phase. In order to undertake pre-project activities in the districts each district was allocated budget to the extent of maximum Rs. 5 million. However, the maximum amount sanctioned to a district in the country was Rs. 3 million

4. SSA prescribes a bottom up approach in planning and it is expected that the exercise will involve developing the habitation plans, cluster plans and block plans on the basis of which the District Elementary Education Plans (DEEPs) are to be formulated.

5. Almost all other elementary education programmes are expected to be merged under SSA. Even DPEP also comes under the broad umbrella of SSA.

6. Unlike DPEP, which was managed by parallel structures created at State and District level, the SSA envisages that the programme will be managed by the mainstream educational administration. This was recommended to tackle the problem of coordination between the new management structure created under DPEP and the existing education administration in the states.

Planning Process under SSA

Some of the important features of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme in connection with the planning process to be adopted are as given below.

- Each district has to develop District Elementary Education Plans up to 2010 and Annual Work Plans and Budget every year.
- Habitation to be a lowest Unit of planning. This virtually means a knock on every door.
- Special focus on capacity building for decentralized planning.
- Special role for process based committees at district, block, cluster and school levels.
- Norms for planning and financial parameters prescribed which are to be adhered to in developing DEEPs.
- Role of National, State and District level Resource Institutions defined for planning.
- Clearly defined pre-project phase with focus on (i) Household and School surveys (ii) Developing Information System (iii) Conducting relevant studies (iv) Community mobilization (v) School based activities and (vi) Support to Education Offices.

Experience & Lessons from SSA Implementation

It is important to note that the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme is only two years old and in many states and districts even now it has not been implemented in a proper way. However, there are a few districts where the programme has been implemented for about 2 years now. On the basis of experiences some important points of the programme are as follows. These are generally related to planning process.

-

- Giving ceiling to the districts on the total amount to be made available remained a dilemma.

- Operationalisation of bottom-up approach in real sense, as prescribed under SSA, is a challenge.

- Mainstream educational administration is not still fully geared up to efficiently plan and implement the programme.

- Many states are finding it difficult to contribute their state share of 25 per cent in Tenth Plan period.

- Planning for upper primary education still a weak area even in DPEP districts.

- Appraisal of all Plans at the national level is a difficult and tedious task.

ANNEXURES

Annexure I

Training Programme on Methodology of District Planning in Education for the Planning Teams of Five Pilot Districts of Nepal (Sanothime, Nepal: September 08-20, 2003)

Training Schedule[1]

Session N°	Time (In hrs)	Theme/ Speaker/Facilitator
September 08, 2003 (Monday)		
1.	0930-1100	**Opening session**
2.	1130-1300	Decentralized planning in education: Concept and scope *S. M. I. A. Zaidi*
3.	1400-1530	District planning in education: An Indian experience S. M. I. A. Zaidi
4.	1600-1730	Decentralized planning of education in Nepal *Shri Ram Balak Singh*
September 09, 2003 (Tuesday)		
5.	0930-1100	Information needs for developing district primary education plans *Arun C. Mehta*
6.	1130-1300	Diagnosis of educational development at district and sub-district levels and indicators of educational development *S.M.I.A. Zaidi*
7.	1400-1530	Use of projection techniques in educational planning *Arun C. Mehta*
8.	1600-1730	Methodology of plan formulation *K. Biswal*
September 10, 2003 (Wednesday)		
9.	0930-1100	Methodology of plan formulation *S.M.I.A. Zaidi and K. Biswal*

---

[1] Tea breaks were from 1100 to 1130 hrs and 1530 to 1600 hrs respectively in all programme days. The lunch break was from 1230 to 1330 hrs every day.

10.	1130-1300	Planning for implementation *K. Biswal*
11.	1400-1530	Computer applications in educational planning *Arun C. Mehta*
12.	1600-1730	Norms and financial parameters for developing DEP in Nepal *Ram Balak Singh &* Mr. Lava Deb Awasthi
September 11, 2003 (Thursday)		
13.	0930-1100	School Mapping: Concept and techniques *K. Biswal*
14.	1130-1300	Concept and methodology of micro planning in education *S.M.I.A. Zaidi*
15.	1400-1530	School improvement planning in Nepal *Prahlad Aryal & Beda Raj Parajuli*
16.	1600-1730	Developing EMIS in Nepal and its use in district plan formulation *Shailendra P. Sigdel*
September 12, 2003 (Friday)		
17.	0930-1100	Introduction to the simulation exercise/group work on district planning in education *K. Biswal*
18.	1130-1300	Group work on district planning in education (Diagnosis of educational development) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
19.	1400-1530	Group work on district planning in education (Diagnosis of educational development) ……. *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
20.	1600-1730	Group work on district planning in education (Diagnosis of educational development) .... *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 13, 2003 (Saturday)		
21.	0930-1100	Group work on district planning in education (Population and enrolment projections) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*

22.	1130-1300	Group work on district planning in education (Population and enrolment projections) .... *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
23.	1400-1530	Group work on district planning in education (Target setting and evolving strategies and interventions) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
24.	1600-1730	Group work on district planning in education (Target setting and evolving strategies and interventions) ……. *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 14, 2003 (Sunday)		**Holiday**
September 15, 2003 (Monday)		
25.	0930-1100	Group work on district planning in education (Estimation of schooling provisions and teacher requirements) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
26.	1130-1300	Group work on district planning in education (Estimation of schooling provisions and teacher requirements) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
27.	1400-1530	Group work on district planning in education (Cost estimates) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
28.	1600-1730	Group work on district planning in education (Cost estimates) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 16, 2003 (Tuesday)		
29.	0930-1100	Group work on district planning in education (Cost estimates) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
30.	1130-1300	Group work on district planning in education (Cost estimates) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
31.	1400-1530	Group work on planning for implementation (Planning for in-service teachers' training) *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
32.	1600-1730	Group work on planning for implementation (Planning for implementation of in-service teachers' training) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*

September 17, 2003 (Wednesday)		
33.	0930-1100	Preparation of group reports *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
34.	1130-1300	Preparation of group reports … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
35.	1400-1530	Presentation and discussion of group reports *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
36.	1600-1730	Presentation and discussion of group reports … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 18,2003 (Thursday)		
37.	0930-1100	Group work on diagnosis of educational situation in the pilot districts *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
38.	1130-1300	Group work on diagnosis of educational situation in the pilot districts … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
39.	1400-1530	Group work on district specific interventions in the primary education sub-sector (i.e. prioritization of areas for intervention) of the pilot districts *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
40.	1600-1730	Group work on district specific interventions in the primary education sub-sector (i.e. prioritization of areas for intervention) … … *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 19, 2003 (Friday)		
41.	0930-1100	Preparation of group report on district specific diagnosis and interventions *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
42.	1130-1300	Preparation of group report on district specific diagnosis and interventions *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
43.	1400-1530	Presentation and discussion on group reports and deciding about the timeframe for developing the draft DEP in five pilot districts *K. Biswal, A.C. Mehta, S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Najma Akhtar*
September 20, 2003 (Saturday)		

44.	0930-1100	Issues related to quality primary education in Nepal S. K. Sapkota
45.	1111-1300	Group Work Continues
46.	1400-1530	Closing Session (Programme Evaluation and Valediction)

Training Programme on Methodology of District Planning in Education for the
Planning Team of the Five Pilot Districts of Nepal (TITI, Sanothime, Nepal: September 8-20, 2003)

Report

Annexure II

List of Participants

S.NO.	Name of the Participant	Post/Designation	Organization/District
1.	Mr. Indra Bahadur Kunwar	School Supervisor	DEO, Dadeldhura
2.	Mr. Pushkar Prasad Bhatta	School Supervisor	DEO, Dadeldhura
3.	Mr. Prem Singh Ayer	Resource Person	DEO, Dadeldhura
4.	Mr. Ratan Bahadur Sharki	Representative	NGO/DEO, Dadeldhura
5.	Mr. Maha Dev Bhatta	Resource Person	DEO, Dadeldhura
6.	Ms. Bimala Kumari Gurung	Resource Person	DEO, Bardiya
7.	Mr. Jaymal Tiruwa	Representative	NNDSWO/DEO, Bardiya
8.	Mr. Suresh Kumar Joshi	School Supervisor	DEO, Bardiya
9.	Mr. Krishna Prasad Sigdel	School Supervisor	DEO, Bardiya
10.	Mr. Ishwori Prasad Subedi	Section Officer	DEO, Bardiya
11.	Mr. Hem Narayan Chapagain	School Supervisor	DEO, Syangja
12.	Mr. Bishnu Prasad Koirala	School Supervisor	DEO, Syangja
13.	Mr. Ghan Bdr. Basnet	Resource Person	DEO, Syangja
14.	Ms. Nirmla Pandey	Resource Person	DEO, Syangja
15.	Mr. Bikram Thapa	Resource Person	DEO, Syangja
16.	Mr. Gopal Prasad Kandel	Section Officer	DEO, Chitawan
17.	Mr. Chandra Bdr. Khadka	School Supervisor	DEO, Chitawan
18.	Mr. Krishna Bdr. Rana Bhat	Resource Person	DEO, Chitawan
19.	Ms. Kaushila Adhikari	Teacher	DEO, Chitawan
20.	Mr. Mukti Nath Bhandari	Ex. Head Teacher	DEO, Chitawan
21.	Mr. Surya Prasad Subedi	School Supervisor	DEO, Jhapa
22.	Mr. Harihar Ghimire	School Supervisor	DEO, Jhapa
23.	Mr. Dinesh Kumar Neupane	School Supervisor	DEO, Jhapa
24.	Mr. Mohan Prasad Oli	Resource Person	DEO, Jhapa
25.	Ms. Kamala Basnet	Resource Person	DEO, Jhapa
26.	Mr. Padam Raj Joshi	School Supervisor	DEO, Kanchanpur
27.	Mr. Thaneswor Ghimire	School Supervisor	DEO, Shurkhet
28.	Mr. Suka Dev Nepal	School Supervisor	DEO, Nawalparasi
29.	Mr. Sharad Kumar Bhandari	Section Officer	DEO, Kavrepalanchok
30.	Mr. Shatrughna Yadav	School Supervisor	DEO, Dhanusa
31.	Mr. Geha Nath Gautam	School Supervisor	DEO, Dhankuta
32.	Mr. Tek Nath Regmi	School Supervisor	DEO, Illam
33.	Mr. Ghan Shyam Aryal	Section Officer	DEO, Syangja
34.	Mr. Yub Raj Pandey	Section Officer	DEO, Jhapa
35.	Ms. Sunita Shakya	Technical Assistant	Department of Education
36.	Mr. Tap Raj Pant	District Education Officer	DEO, Dadeldhura
37.	Mr. Nava Raj Paudel	Section Officer	DEO, Bardiya

Annexure III

List of Resource Persons

NIEPA, New Delhi

1.   Professor B.P. Khandelwal
      Director, NIEPA, New Delhi (E-mail: bpkhandelwal@niepa.org)

2.   Dr. Najma Akhtar
      Senior Fellow
      Educational Administration Unit (E-mail: najamakhtar@niepa.org)

3.   Dr. Arun C. Mehta
      Fellow and In-charge, ORSM Unit (E-mail: arunmehta@niepa.org)

4.   Dr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi
      Fellow, SNS Unit (E-mail: smiazaidi@niepa.org)

5.   Dr. K. Biswal
      Associate Fellow
      Educational Planning Unit (E-mail: kkbiswal@niepa.org)

DOE (MOES), Nepal and ESAT (DANIDA), Kathmandu Office

6.   Mr. Satya Bahadur Shrestha, DG, DOE/MOES

7.   Mrs. Shanti Basnyat, Director, DOE/MOES

8.   Mr. Punya Prasad Neupane, Director, DOE/MOES

9.   Mr. Janardan Nepal, Director, DOE/MOES

10.   Mr. Karsten Jensen, CTA, ESAT/DANIDA, Kathmandu Office

11.   Mr. Ram Balak Singh, Deputy Director, DOE/MOES

12.   Mr. Lava Deb Awasthi, Under Secretary, MOES

13.   Mr. Sailendra Sigdel, Section Officer, DOE/MOES

14.   Mr. Prahlad Aryal, Section Officer, DOE/MOES

15.   Mr. Beda Raj Parajuli, Section Officer, DOE/MOES

NCED, Kathmandu, Nepal

Mr. Shiva K. Sapkota, Section Officer

WGD Facilitators/Other Officials of DOE/ESAT

1. Mr. Bidyadhar Mallik, Secretary, MOES
2. Mr. Satya Bahadur Shrestha, Director General, DOE
3. Mr. Punya Prasad Neupane, Director, DOE
4. Mr. Janardan Nepal, Director, DOE
5. Ms. Shanti Basnyat, Director, DOE
6. Mr. Karsten Jensen, CTA, ESAT/DANIDA
7. Ms. Mariane Berner, Education Advisor, ESAT/DANIDA
8. Mr. Takendra Bahadur Karki, Sr. Programme Officer, ESAT/DANIDA
9. Mr. Raja Ram Shrestha, Deputy Director, DOE
10. Ms. Neera Shakya, Deputy Director, DOE
11. Mr. Harka Shrestha, Deputy Director, DOE
12. Ms. Suneeta Shakya, Technical Assistant, DOE
13. Mr. Krishna Prasad Pangeni, Technical Assistant, DOE

Annexure IV

List of Reading Materials

Behrman, Jere R. et al. (2002) *Conceptual issues in the role of education decentralization in promoting effective schooling in Asian developing countries.* ERD Working Paper No 22, Asian development Bank, Manila, Philippines.

Biswal, K. (2002) *Decentralization of educational planning in India: Current trends and issues.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Lauglo, Jon (1995) "Forms of decentralization and their implications for education." *Comparative Education* 31 (1).

Mehta, Arun C. (2003) *Module on projection techniques: Population, enrolment and teachers.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Mehta, Arun C. (2003) *Information requirement for formulating district elementary education plans.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Mehta, Arun C. (2003) *Module on indicators of educational development: Concept and definitions.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Menon, Pramila (2000) *Community participation and educational planning.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Mohanty, N.K. and Biswal, K. (2002) *Developing a district plan for UPE: A practical exercise.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Varghese, N.V., ed. (1997) *Modules on district planning in education* (A set of 12 modules). New Delhi: NIEPA.

World Bank (2001) *Nepal: Priorities and strategies for educational reform (Executive summary).* Washington, D.C., Human Development Unit, South Asia.

Zaidi, S.M.I.A. (2001) *A note on concept and process of district planning in education.* New Delhi: NIEPA, mimeo.

Annexure V

Reproduction of Presentations made by WGD Members, Nepal

Norms and Financial Parameters for Developing District Education Plan (DEP) in Nepal: Mr. Ram Balak Singh and Mr. Lava Deb Awasthi

1. Definitions and Vocabulary:

Baselines, Indicators, Benchmarks, Milestones, Standards, Targets, Norms

There is frequently ambiguity over the use of these terms. In this paper, we suggest that this or a similar convention be adopted throughout; we have adopted the following conventions:

- a baseline provides a picture of the starting point, usually for a program;
- an indicator is a summary measure of status;
- a benchmark is a standard (e.g. 40 pupils per teacher ratio);
- a milestone is a step on the way to a target and from where one is starting;
- a standard is a benchmark;
- the target is the hoped-for value of the indicator;
- a norm is an agreed rule, principle, standard

2. Stages

- Input – physical or human resources
- Activity – e.g. classroom teaching
- Process e.g. teacher actually teaching
- Output – immediate consequences of process (e.g. number of children taught in school that day, number of students who completed the course)
- Outcome – what children have learnt
- Impact –final outcome in terms of quality of life

3. Targets of the Education For All (EFA) Program

	Indicators	**2001**	**2008/09**	**2015**
1	Gross Enrolment Rate of Early Childhood / Pre School	13	51	80
2	Percentage of New entrants at Grade 1 with ECD	08	60	80
3	Gross Intake Rate at Grade 1	141	110	102
4	Net Intake Rate at Grade 1	53.7[a]	95	98
5	Gross Enrolment Rate	123	104	105
6	Net Enrolment Rate	81	96	100

7	Percentage of Gross National Product channelled to Primary education sub sector	1.7[b]	2.3	2.5
8	Percentage of Total Education Budget channelled to Primary education sub sector	55.6[b]	60	65
9	Percentage of teachers with required qualification and training	15	99	100
10	Percentage of teachers with required Certification		99	100
11	Pupil Teacher Ratio	39	37	30
12	Repetition Rate:			
12.1	Grade 1	39	10	10
12.2	Grade 5	09	3	3
13	Survival rate to Grade 5	66	85	90
14	Coefficient of Efficiency	60	83	90
15	Percentage of Learning Achievement at Grade 5	40	60	80
16	Literacy Rate			
16.1	Age Group 15-24	70[c]	82	
16.2	Age Group 6+ years	54[c]	73	90
17	Adult Literacy Rate (15+ years)	48[c]	76	75
18	Literacy Gender Parity Index (15+ years)	0.6	0.9	1.0

4: Norms and standards:

	Norms / Standards	Financial Parameters
1.	**Access to schooling:** ▪ Approval to establish and run ECD and Pre-primary schools by VDC/Municipality ▪ Application to DEO prior two months of academic year with recommendation from VDC / Municipality ▪ Approval by DEO prior 30 days of academic year in case of primary schools ▪ Approval by RED prior 30 days of academic year in case of Lower Secondary and Secondary schools ▪ Approval by HSEC in case of higher secondary schools ▪ Population of habitation for establishing a primary school ……? ▪ Walking distance of primary school from a habitation………….? ▪ Minimum classroom……?	

		Norms / Standards	Financial Parameters
2.		**Alternative Schooling:** • Out of school facilitator remuneration • Outreach facilitator remuneration • Flexible facilitator remuneration	1500 *13 months 1500 *13 months 1500 *13 months
3.		**Non-formal:** • Literacy class for 25 illiterate persons • Community Learning Center……?	1000*6/9 months 10,000 per year

4.		*ECD*
		 ▪ Establishment cost per ECD center
		 ▪ Matching fund for the community
		 ▪ Remuneration for a facilitator
		 ▪ Education Materials for each ECD center
		  a. Breakfast……?
		  b. Health care…..?
			▪ 1,000
			 ▪ 9,000
			 ▪ 6,000
			 ▪ 3,000
			 ▪ 10 per day
			 ▪ 100 per month

5.		Student Teacher Ratio: 1:40, 1:45, 1:50 for mountain, hill and tarai/ valley districts	
6.		▪ Class size: 1:40, 1:45, 1:50 for mountain, hill and tarai/ valley district ▪ Additional teacher……?	
7.		Length and Breadth and Verandah	▪ 7 meter X6 for tarai ▪ 7.5X4.5 hill ▪ 7X4 mountain

8.		1. Classroom: 0. 75 Sq meter for per primary and 1.0 / 1.2 Sq meter for per secondary student
		
		 2. Rehabilitation of a classroom
		
		 3. Maintenance of a school…..?
		 4. School external environment improvement
		  ▪ Drinking Water
		  ▪ Toilet
		  ▪ Compound wall/ fence/ play ground
		  ▪ Furniture
		
		  ▪ Resource Center
		  ▪ RC furniture
			▪ Material support ie steel trust and NRs. 80,000 per class
			 ▪ 25,000 per class
			
			 • 20,000 per school
			
			 ▪ 6,000
			 ▪ 15,000
			 ▪ 10,000
			 ▪ 12,000 per classroom (at least 15 sets)
			 ▪ 10,00,000
			 ▪ 35,000

9.	10 days recurrent training for every teacher (5,00 per teacher for preparing educational materials)	Training allowance by level (per participant) ▪ Central: 300 ▪ District: 125 ▪ RC : 75 ▪ 500 per person per day for all kinds of residential training Trainer allowance by level (per Resource Person per session) ▪ Central: 500 ▪ District: 200 ▪ RC : 125 Training Allowance by level (refreshment per eprson) ▪ Central: 25 ▪ District: 20 ▪ RC : 20 Training allowance by level (materials per person) ▪ Central: 40 (50 for more than one week) ▪ District: 40 / 50 ▪ RC : 40/50 ▪
10.	• One female teacher in one school • At least 1, 3, 4, and 5 teacher/s for each pre-primary, primary, lower secondary and secondary school • Grant for each higher secondary school • Administrative grant for each school per annum	Salary as per HMG norms and decisions ▪ Equivalent to 1/2 teacher/s ▪ 11,000 for primary ▪ 13,000 for lower secondary ▪ 20,000 for secondary

11.	6 days management training for HT, SMC Chairperson and one woman or *Dalit* member of SMC	Same as above
12.	Inclusive education for special needs children • Survey • One month training for integrated education • 10 days training for inclusive education, as per above norms	• 10 for each household • 3,000-5,000 per class for materials
13.	Scholarship for every *Dalit* and Girl child per annum	250
14.	Free text book per annum: Grade I Grade II Grade III Grade IV Grade V	• 63.20* number of children • 87.20 * no. of children • 93.60* no. of children • 152.80* no. of children • 172.0* no. of children
15	Administrative grant for every school	11,000, 13,000 and 20,000 for primary, Lower Secondary and Secondary
16.	School Improvement Plan / Village Education Plan	• Per child per annum: 150,170,200 for tarai/valley, hill, mountain • Partnership budget 20,000 per VDC/VEC per annum • Grade one reform: 9,000 per annum
17.	Grant for higher secondary	Equivalent to one / two teacher salary

18.	▪ Diagnostic study ▪ Base line achievement survey ▪ Increase in girls/dalit enrolment ▪ Improved SLC result	
19.	Learning outcomes 80%	
20.	Regularity of student and teacher: 90%	
21.	School opening days: 180 - 220	
22.	• Strengthening each Resource Center • Supervision and monitoring…..?	5,000 per annum
23.	Incremental cost (salary of RPs, Overseers and Engineers and other operating cost)	

5. **Process:**

   ▪ Formation of District Planning Team
   ▪ Formation of District Advisory Team
   ▪ Capacity building
   ▪ Preparation of training manual and guidelines
   ▪ Roles and responsibilities of various agencies
   ▪ Preparation of the plan
   ▪ Appraisal of the plan
   ▪ Approval of the plan
   ▪ Funding of the plan
   ▪ Monitoring and reporting mechanism including auditing and evaluation of the plan

Participatory Process in Educational Planning, Focus: Primary Education: Mr. Ram Balak Singh

I. Rationale for participation
- To initiate a new vision of basic education
- To focus on basic learning needs
- To broaden the scope of education to cover a wide range of groups
- To mobilize additional government and community resources
- To enhance the environment for learning

II. Why Local Participation?
- For greater educational quality and effectiveness
- For greater relevance to local conditions and needs
- For greater acceptability of and demand for education
- For more resources and facilities

III. Defining Community Participation
- A community is generally viewed as a group of people residing in a defined geographical area, who have common interest and work together.
- They may also have a feeling of belongingness
- All communities may not be homogenous

IV. Community Participation aims at…..
- Involvement of the people in planning and management of educational programmes
- Eliciting their contribution to development programmes
- Their sharing the benefit of these programmes
- To build up social capabilities of all segments of community in terms of awareness, utilization and improvement of their present position and status

V. Community Partnership in Basic Education
- Communities contribute labour or local materials or provide cash with some involvement in allocation decisions
- Community/ parents participate in operating decisions through mechanisms as PTA's or school community associations
- Community participates together with the government or an NGO on actual planning of educational activities

VI. Types of participation
- Spontaneous participation
- Coercive participation
- Persuasive or induced participation

VII. Process of planning
- Participation by the different departments involved with the delivery of education
- Participation by the people who have to own and implement the programme
- Creating conditions for initiating efforts at local level

VIII. Participatory planning at micro level
- Understanding a community in terms of its needs, resources and constraints
- Prioritizing their needs

- Involving them in the planning process
- Subsequently in monitoring and evaluation

IX. Preparing a participatory plan
- Information gathering
- Environment building and community participation
- Formation and work of Core Team/ Group
- This team will develop the village map, collect household information, school information and prepare village education register
- The proposal is ready

X. Task of the block Team
- Environment building exercises
- Formation and training of core team
- Consolidation of village details
- Consolidation of village proposals for the block
- Documenting the entire exercise

XI. Tasks of Village Education Committee
- Collecting information about the community
- Identifying the factors that hinder the progress of education
- Discussing the plans with other departments
- Mobilizing the community to achieve the goals
- Keeping the community up to date on progress and problems

XII.   Basic features of SSA
- Community ownership of the school system
- Participation of community in the management of schools
- Accountability and transparency to the community

XIII.   Monitoring Framework envisaged under SSA
- Community based monitoring monitoring system
- Provision for correlation of school level data with community based information
- Reports to be sent to block and district levels
- Reporting formats to be simple
- Transparency of information

XIV.   SSA- Pre Project phase
- School community based activities like *Bal Melas, Kala Jathas*, and sports activities
- Process based constitution of committees at village/cluster and block level
- Representation/participation of women and disadvantaged sections in the planning process
- Preparation of habitation level plans through community mobilization

XV.   Preparatory activities
- All children in the relevant age group to be covered through micro planning and school mapping
- Preparation of village education registers on the basis of household surveys
- Opening of bank accounts of village education committee/school management committee/gram *panchayat* education committee

■Training of community leaders
XVI.　Expected outcomes of preparatory activities
■To initiate a process of institutional development
■Capacity building for professional management of elementary education
■Focus on community based data collection
■Willingness to allow the local community to manage schools
XVII.　Continuance of local participation
■Frequency of meetings of VEC/PTA
■Evidence of retention registers and pupil progress cards
■Utilization of school grants
■Utilization of teacher grants
■Retention of out of school children
■Effectiveness of community based monitoring at the local level
XVIII.　The Context of Decentralization in Nepal
■The Local Self Governance Act of 1999
■The Seventh Amendment of the Education Act
■The Tenth National Plan with its focus on community empowerment
■The commitment to Education for All (EFA) by 2015
XIX.　The Nepal Plan of Action for EFA
■Specifically notes that "the implementation of this programme will establish and promote
■Partnership with VDC's and SMC's
■Ensure the universalization of primary education and….
■Contribute to making community based ECD effective."
XX.　Present scenario
■A great potential for partnerships at all levels
■Current moves indicate that the main focus will be at district and VDC or school
■Need for capacity building at all levels
■At community level there is great potential within local groups
XXI.　Present focus of School Improvement Plan
■Improving learning achievement
■Increasing daily attendance
■Reducing dropout and repetition
■Improving teacher quality
■Improving physical facilities
■Enhancing community participation and contribution in school management
XXII.　Participatory process in plan formulation…
■District Education Plans were prepared but with a limited participatory approach
■Stakeholder participation at lower levels not evident
■In the absence of a well defined unit of planning in the bottom up approach the the felt needs and priorities at the lowest level remain unaddressed
■

XXIII. Future directions
- Potential for partnerships at different levels and with different agencies should be fully explored
- Core groups may be identified for preparing Village Education Plans
- Guidelines regarding the formation, composition and functions of VEC may be developed
- Capacity building programmes for community leaders be taken up on priority basis

XXIV. Benefits of Participatory Development
- Greater demand for services
- Changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills and the distribution of power
- More useful, successful, and sustainable services

XXV. Benefits at individual and community level
- Cognitive changes-greater knowledge and awareness, better practice
- Psychological-greater self confidence, self reliance, pride and responsibility
- Greater control over information and technologies
- Formation of alliances and networks
- More effective management of local resources

XXVI. Society at large
- Lower Development costs
- Greater equity of benefits
- More utilization, continuity, maintenance, and sustainability of development programmes

School Improvement Planning in Nepal: Prahlad Aryal

School Improvement Plan
- School Improvement Planning- an institutional level planning focusing on the issues of retention and quality concerns
- Participatory process involving stakeholders
  - as individuals (parents,students and teachers)
  - as institutions-(SMC/PTA/CBOs/local NGOs/RCs)
  - as Government (VDC/Municipality, DDC)

The Objectives
- To transform schools into effective and functional institutions
- Characteristics of effective schools
  - Guided by a shared and commonly owned vision aligned with high expectation of children and teachers' performance.
  - Clear roles and responsibilities with commitments
  - High time on task
  - Enhanced pupil outcomes
  - Continuously assessing school working culture
  - Shared control over implementation
  - A blend of participation and support by community
  - A sustained staff development
  - Maintaining momentum during periods of turbulence
  - Monitoring and evaluation its process, progress, achievement and development
  - Per child expenditure

Involvement
- Diagnosis
- Developing a vision
- Identification and prioritization of needs
- Defining activities
- Programming and budgeting
- Action plan with timeline
- Implementation
- Monitoring and auditing
- CEMIS: a modality for community participation

Village Education Plan (VEP)
- A micro-level planning carried out at the VDC level for deciding directions of the future course of actions to achieve the educational objectives with optimal use of available resources
- Objective:
  - Ensuring universal access to education for all
  - Managing ECD for 3-5 children
  - Achieving Literacy

Scope of planning:
- Planning for additional physical facilities to accommodate out of school children in formal schools
- Planning for establishing and managing ECD
- Planning of non-formal education (literacy, updating skills, development of sports, continuous learning opportunities)
- Planning for community mobilization, awareness and advocacy

Issues

- Conceptual clarity: free education? Whom? Who is responsible to ensure freeship?
- Accountability
- Participation and involvement
- Generation of resources at local level—lack of regularity framework
- Monitoring and auditing
- Assimilation of VEP to DEP to NEP
- Capacity development
- Dissemination and flow of information

School Improvement Plan (SIP): & Beda Raj Parajuli

What is Bottom-up Planning ?

-   Planning 'with' and 'by' the community and schools instead of "for" them.

    Why ?

-   Sustainable development

-   Feeling of ownership

-   Specific and practical

-   Consolidate mutual understanding

-   Minimum in put maximum out put

-   Need base quality education

-   Local resource mobilization

    How ?

-   Involvement

-   Interaction

-   Identification (Problems and Resources)

-   Prioritization

-   Implementation

-   Joint monitoring

What is SIP ? SIP is a,

- school level plan.

- time-base plan of action.

- meaningful participation of local community and local government institution.

- comprehensive micro-planning exercise.

- need base and demand base planning.

- bottom up planning exercise.

- prepared by all schools stakeholders.

- integrated model.

- focus on school and children.

- capacity building at local levels.

- block grant on the basis of SIP.

- communities take responsibility and co-operation.

- partnership with different stakeholder.

   (SIP mean planning "with" and 'by' the communities and schools instead of "for" them.)

Objectives

- to involve community and school members to make SIP.

- to encourage school and community to take responsibility for improving education.

- to bring the school closer to the community.

- to create active child learning environment.

- to get high-learning achievement.

- to improve quality education.

Basic Principle for SIP

1. Bottom up

2. Honest

3. Open dialogue

4. Specific and practical

5. Prioritization

6. Decentralization

   - Responsibility (Authority, Ownership)

   - Accountability

   - Transparency

Possible Activities for SIP (Quality)

   - Teacher training

   - Teaching materials

   - Pre school (4-5 yrs. children)

   - Interaction meeting.

   - Test item development and test administration, student achievement analysis.

   - Counseling for parents and student.

- Teacher/student attendance analysis and improvement.

- Extra-activities and innovative works.

- Continuous evaluation.

- Monitoring/supervision

- Promotion/repetition drop-out.

- Grade 1, focus.

- Workshop seminar.

- Scholarship for talent.

- Prize for good performance.

VEP (Access)

- Construction and maintenance.

- ECD (3-5 yrs. children)

- Scholarship (Dalit + Poor)

- Awareness activities

- Literacy for adult

- Work-shop seminar

- Training (awareness)

- Monitoring

- Evaluation

- Innovative work

- In come-generation

- Communication

- Recording (population with age group)

- GER, NER, out of children

- Household survey

SIP Present Status

100% SIP developed districts -21

70% to 95% SIP developed districts-10

50% to 69% SIP developed districts-8

30% to 49% SIP developed districts-11

10 to 95% SIP developed districts-11

SIP not developed districts -7

not available information districts-7

Estimated number of schools which developed SIP-24943 (60%)

SIP Implementation Strategies

- To build up local level capacity

- To give training for HT/SMC/VEC

- To involve all stake holder to develop SIP.

- To manage facilitators center/resigns/districts and Resource Center level

- To utilize local level experience and expertise for develop SIP.

- To transfer delegate authority and responsibility at local level.

- To provide funding on the basis of SIP.

Developing EMIS in Nepal and its Use in District Plan Formulation: *Shailendra P. Sigdel*

Definition of EMIS

➢ An overall system for providing relevant and timely information to decision makers

➢ A systematic process that transforms input in the form of raw data into output comprising mainly of timely and useful information

➢ A systematic process of transforming education data to reliable valid and timely information which can be used for decision making in the educational planning and policy development process.

➢ A systematically organized group of information and documentation services that collects, processes, stores, analyses and disseminates information for educational planning and management and aids in the use of such information.

Systems approach to educational management information

EMIS in Nepal

Following agencies are responsible for collecting, compiling and disseminating educational information

➢ School level EMIS - DOE
➢ Higher Secondary - HSEB
➢ Technical Vocational - CTEVT
➢ Higher education - University Grants Commission
➢ Non formal Education - NFEC

Roles and Responsibilities

School
➢ Recording and reporting of educational data to RC

Resource Centers
➢ Distribution of school data collection form to schools, collection of data collection form from schools
➢ Provide training and other necessary technical support to schools
➢ Disseminate Educational Statistics at Resource Center level

District Education Office
➢ Printing and distribution of school data collection form to RCs
➢ collection of data collection form from RCs preparation and reporting of district levels statistics to the RED and other data requesters
➢ Disseminate educational statistics at RC level

Regional Education Directorate
➢ Collection of educational data from districts
➢ Preparation and publication of regional statistics
➢ Reporting of regional statistics to the DOE and other data requesters

Department of Education
➢ Finalization of all types of data collection form, collection of statistics from REDs by district
➢ Processing and analysis of educational statistics by district, publication and dissemination of educational statistics to different users.
➢ work as focal center for school level EMIS and coordinate with other agencies, assist in developing EMIS related policies and plan and implement EMIS activities, development, management and maintenance of computerized database

Ministry of Education
➢ Responsible for coordinating EMIS activities in the country.
➢ Its mandated to coordinate all sub sectoral EMIS centers

Strength
➢ Stated from 1962
➢ Use in development plans and annual plans for targeting and monitoring
➢ Easy to collect
➢ Formal organizational arrangement
➢ Routine task
➢ Used by different agencies

Challenges
➢ Need of improvement in two way data flow
➢ Timeliness
➢ Quality/Reliability
➢ Data storage and retrieval system is weak at district and sub district level
➢ Purpose wise data collection

Information generated by EMIS
➢ General information of schools
   o name, address of schools
   o approval and permission date

- Physical
  - ownership, number and type of school buildings
  - condition of school building
  - dimension of classrooms
  - educational and physical facilities available in the school and its condition

- Type of school and class running
  - public schools receiving HMG grant
  - Community school (utilizing local resources)
  - Private boarding schools

- School opening days (Month wise)
  - No of school opening days
  - No of days conducted class

- No of students of previous academic year
  - preprimary and primary level
  - lower secondary
  - secondary
  - higher secondary

- No of students of current academic year
  - preprimary and primary level
  - lower secondary
  - secondary
  - higher secondary

- Class and sex wise new entrants, repeaters, promoters and drop outs

- Age and class wise enrolment or current academic year
  - preprimary and primary levels
  - lower secondary and secondary levels
  - new entrants from NFE and pre primary/ECD classes

- Details of students from disadvantaged caste
  - preprimary and primary level
  - lower secondary and secondary levels
  - higher secondary

- No of disabled students of current academic year according to type of disabilities
  - preprimary and primary level
  - lower secondary and secondary levels
  - higher secondary

➢ Examination details
  o Number of students appeared and passed in each grade of examination previous academic year
  o Number of dalits students appeared and passed in each of grade examination previous academic year

➢ Details of various scholarship granted previous year

➢ Previous year's financial statement

➢ Teacher's Information
  o total number of approved post for male and female teachers in each level
  o name, type of employment, qualification, trainings etc.
  o locality of teachers, appointment, transfer, resignation and termination of teacher

➢ School management committee, formation, female members and no of meetings in last year.

Use of information in DEP
➢ Diagnosis - situation analysis, sharing with communities, strategies
➢ Planning - base line, progress, target
➢ Monitoring - change from base line, (context, input, process, output, outcomes and impact)
➢ Forecasting - class rooms, teachers, schools, textbooks
➢ Cost estimate - financial and human resource requirements

What is an indicator
➢ Indicators are statistics specially put together to provide information on the functioning of the education system and are related to the objectives of the education system
➢ Indicators are often compared to a norm or a standard or to a previous score
➢ Indicators help us to understand what is working in the system and what is not working in the system and further help us to interpret by asking relevant questions as to why the system is not functioning well and how it can be improved.

How indicators should be selected?
➢ Policy
➢ Objectives
➢ Programs and strategies

Characteristics of a good indicator
➢ Information for policy makers
➢ Summary of information
➢ Comparable (from base line to present status, between schools, VDCs/MCs, RCs, Districts, Regions and Countries, Regional and Global

➢ Reliable and validity (Methodology and its impact on result)
➢ Updateable

Universal Access
➢ Distance between household and schools (1km,? 2km? 15 min? 20min?)
➢ Served population (habitation - 300, 500, 700, ...?)
➢ No of teacher (per school 1 for PP and 3 for primary/STR 40-45-50 for M, H, T, and V districts)
➢ Physical infrastructure (space, classroom, veranda, furniture, play ground, drinking water, toilet, library, laboratory , etc)
➢ Educational materials (curriculum, textbooks, reference books blackboard, guide books, etc)

Universal Participation/Enrolment

Admission Rate
➢ Gross intake
➢ Net intake (age specific)

Enrolment rate
➢ GER
➢ NER
➢ Age specific enrolment for grade 1-5

Disaggregated Information (girls, disadvantaged, children with all kind of disabilities, VDC, Habitation, household, etc.)
➢ Regularity - daily, monthly (teacher, student at classroom and school)

Universal Retention
➢ Promotion, repetition and dropout rate
➢ Survival rate
➢ BCompletion rate
➢ Transition rate

Universal Achievement
➢ Time utilization and methods of teaching and evaluation
➢ g
➢ Graduation rate (minimum level of learning - Nepali, English, Local language, Math, Science, Social study, Art and sports, etc)
➢ Per child expenditure (between VDCs, VDCs and MCs, between MCs, between districts, between regions in context of national level)
➢ Effective and functional schools as per the classification

Issues related to quality primary education in Nepal: A Discussion Note, S. K. Sapkota, NCED, Kathmandu, Nepal

1. **Defining quality**
   - ❖ *Cliental satisfaction with the goods or services received*
   - ❖ *Meeting the set standards*
   - ❖ *Meeting the expectation*

2. **Quality is used to refer:**
   - ❖ Characteristics of the factors that go into the education process
   - ❖ Aspects of the process itself
   - ❖ The outcomes of the process

3. **Quality of education relates to-**
   - ❖ Content of learning,
   - ❖ The teaching–learning environment and
   - ❖ The processes involved. *It is also highly dependent on relations among teachers, students, parents and the community.*

4. **Factors that impact on the amount of learning**
   - ❖ The quality of materials/ curriculum
   - ❖ The quality of teaching
   - ❖ The amount of time spent on teaching learning
   - ❖ The quality of supervision and administration

5. **Three major characteristics of effective school**
   - ❖ Defined and accepted expectations for student learning
   - ❖ Defined, accepted and applied standard for student behaviours
   - ❖ Mobilization of community to manage resource constraints

6. **Quality status with special reference to primary education**
   1. Poor physical facility
   2. Teaching by around 3% under qualified and some 50% untrained teachers
   3. Limited practice of contextualizing the curricular intent to suit the local need
   4. Common practice of teaching textbooks not curriculum
   5. Textbooks reaching the students few month after the session starts
   6. Insufficient teacher support materials
   7. 75-80% schools managed by untrained head-teachers
   8. Insufficient hours spent on teaching-learning
   9. Use of instructional materials in a limited scale
   10. Commonly existence of disparity in treating students
   11. Negligible school visits by the supervisors
   12. Overloaded RPs prevented from spending time in schools
   13. Teaching by poorly motivated teachers
   14. Seldom visits of community members/parents to the schools

15. Existence of many single teacher school
16. Teacher/pupil ratio 1:37 and school/teacher ratio 3.8: not maintained in many cases

7. Quality related issues in primary education

1. *Classroom improvement*
  ❖ Creating conducive teaching–learning environment
  ❖ Designing local relevant curriculum
  ❖ Providing range of instructional materials
  ❖ Enhancing differentiated teaching–learning methods

2. School improvement
  ❖ Providing school facilities (Physical, Human, Material)
  ❖ Ensuring the required number of school days and instructional hours
  ❖ Reducing dropout and repetition
  ❖ Enhancing behaviour / attitude
  ❖ Enhancing school culture / environment
  ❖ Ensuring school based planning and management
  ❖ Ensuring classroom and school based monitoring

3. *Capacity building*
  ❖ Improving teacher capacity
  ❖ Improving capacity of HTs as professional leaders
  ❖ Improving capacity of RPs as professional cadres to provide professional support
  ❖ Improving capacity of SMCs, PTAs and other local bodies

4. *Community involvement*
  ❖ Clarifying roles of SMCs, PTAs, Schools and local bodies
  ❖ Increasing the interaction between school and community

8. Framing Strategies to address the quality issues

Issues	Strategies
Issue-1: Classroom improvement 1. Creating conducive teaching–learning environment 2. Designing local relevant curriculum 3. Providing range of instructional materials 4. Enhancing differentiated	1. Providing lump sum budget for increasing classroom facility 2. Running orientation programs to the teachers and RPs to ensure contextualzation of the curriculum as per the local requirement 3. Preparing teachers and RPs to generate local element to reflect in the curriculum 4. Provide adequate instructional materials and encourage the teachers

teaching–learning methods	to use them 5. Incorporate the complete teaching learning modalities in the whole school approach training courses
Issue-2: School improvement 1. Providing school facilities (Physical, Human, Material) 2. Ensuring the required number of school days and instructional hours 3. Reducing dropout and repetition 4. Enhancing behaviour / attitude 5. Enhancing school culture / environment 6. Ensuring school based planning and management 7. Ensuring classroom and school based monitoring	1. Developing leadership skills in HTs to generate and efficiently mobilize resources for maintaining minimum standard of physical and material resources 2. Deploy teachers to comply with the set Ratio. 3. Conduct monitoring 4. Implementing CAS provision and mobilizing the community 5. Establishing the agreed norms and organizing workshops to review the achievement 6. Building capacity for SIP and VEP and run the management accordingly 7. Involving parents, RPs, HTs and SMC for monitoring against the indicators developed jointly
Issue-3: Capacity building 1. Improving teacher capacity 2. Improving capacity of HTs as professional leaders 3. Improving capacity of RPs as professional cadres to provide professional support 4. Improving capacity of SMCs, PTAs and other local bodies	1. Providing training through PTTCs and RCs 2. Building capacity of RPs and HTs to provide on-site support followed by sharing workshops 3. Providing separate professional training minimum facilities to the RPs 4. Conduct orientation and interaction program for SMCs, PTAs and representatives from local bodies.
Issue-4: Community involvement 1. Clarifying roles of SMCs, PTAs, Schools and local bodies 2. Increasing the interaction between school and community	1. Orienting SMCs, PTAs and local bodies to their changed roles stipulated 2. Creating different programs for joint collaboration ensuring mutual fund in place.

Annexure VI

NIEPA Faculty and Staff

Director: *B.P. Khandelwal*   *Joint Director:* *M. Mukhopadhyay*
Email: bpkhandelwal@niepa.org   *Email: mmukhopadhyay@niepa.org*

Educational Planning Unit

Khandelwal, B. P., Director and Head   Email: bpkhandelwal@niepa.org
Biswal, K. K., Associate Fellow
Snehi, Neeru, Associate Fellow

Educational Administration Unit

Akhtar, Najma, Sr. Fellow and Head   E-mail: najmaakhtar@niepa.org
Bhushan, Sudhanshu, Sr. Fellow
Josephine, Yazli, Associate Fellow
Tyagi, R. S., Associate Fellow
Murthy, Ravindra K., Associate Fellow
Narula, Manju, Research & Training Associate

Educational Finance Unit

Tilak, J. B. G., Senior Fellow & Head   E-mail: jtilak@niepa.org
Rani, Geeta, Associate Fellow
Reddy, A. N., Research & Training Associate

Educational Policy Unit
Mukhopadhyay, Sudesh, Senior Fellow and Head
Bandhopadhyay, Madhumita, Associate Fellow
Mohanty, N. K., Research & Training Associate

School & Non-Formal Education Unit

Govinda, R., Senior Fellow & Head   E-mail:rgovinda@niepa.org
Juneja, Nalini, Fellow
Sood, Neelam, Fellow
Diwan, Rashmi, Associate Fellow
Malik, S. K., Research & Training Associate

Higher Education Unit

Sharma, G. D., Senior Fellow & Head   E-mail: gdsharma@niepa.org
Wizarat, Kausar, Research & Training Associate

International Unit

Sujatha, K., Senior Fellow & Head   E-mail:ksujatha@niepa.org
Panda, B. K., Associate Fellow
Raju, V. P. S., Research & Training Associate

O.R.S.M. Unit

Mehta, Arun C., Fellow   Email:arunmehta@niepa.org
Srinivas, K., Systems Analyst   Email: ksrinivas@niepa.org
Chug, Sunita, Research & Training Associate

Sub-National Systems Unit

Menon, Pramila, Fellow & In-charge   Email:pramilamenon@niepa.org
Zaidi, S. M. I. A., Fellow
Jalali, J, Associate Fellow

Library & Documentation Centre

Makol, Deepak, Librarian   E-mail: deepakmakol@niepa.org
Thakur, D.S., Documentation Officer

Registrar

Nair, P. R. R.,   E-mail: prrnair@niepa.org

Publication Unit

Rawat, Promod, Deputy Publication Officer   Email: promodrawat@niepa.org
Singhal, Amit, Publication Assistant   (On deputation to VVGNLI)

Hindi Cell

Sharma, S.C., Hindi Editor   Email: subhash@niepa.org
Gaur, Manoj, Hindi Translator

Cartography Cell

Tyagi, P.N., Cartographer (Computer Applications)

Training Cell

Khanna, Surjeet, Training Assistant

Office Administration

Bhardwaj, G. S., Administrative Officer
Choudhary, S.R., Section Officer
Mani, P., Section Officer
Bhatacharya, Ujal, Section Officer

Accounts & Finance

Gulati, M.K. Finance Officer
Sharma, Usha, Section Officer
Jayanand, Accountant

Education for All in India
Developing EMIS in Nepal & its use in district plan formulation (NIEPA-Nepal Project)
NIEPA-NEPAL Project on District Level Planning
NIEPA-NEPAL Cooperation on Decentralised District Level Planning of Education

**Readers are advised to refer original report and give reference of the material used
of any form.**