NEWSLETTER ANTRIEP

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

The theme for this Issue is "The role of private actors in education: An opportunity for innovation or a barrier to equity"?. The articles in the present issue are drawn from the ANTRIEP Policy Seminar held on 19-21 October, 2011 in New Delhi covering India, Bangladesh, Australia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Vietnam and a paper on Shadow Education.

The article from ACER, Australia, argues that governments have responsibility to provide adequate education and ensure equity. The paper examines outcomes of PISA and compares public and private schools and highlights the critical reasons for differential outcomes among public and private schools. The paper on India makes it clear that the private sector in school education no more serves only middle and upper class as it has percolated down to lower socio-economic groups albeit with differential quality. This in turn necessitates governments to pay attention to policy implications. The paper augments freedom for parents to choose better schools through voucher system. This paper also discusses the diversity and heterogeneity of private schools and suggests that governments need to consider important policy changes.

The paper on Financing Education in Indonesia describes several Acts that Government has adopted in recent decade. Since nineties, the Indonesian government has consistently increased expenditure on education. However, Ministry of Religious Affairs serves the private schools which follow same curriculum and examination system as the government schools. The National Education System Law mandates accreditation for all types of schools.

The paper from Sri Lanka presents private sector support in school improvement and specific interventions. In Sri Lanka private individuals, business sector and old students' association are actively involved in providing support in improving school facilities. The business

organizations have adopted small schools and helped in numerous ways in making the programme for school improvement initiated by the government.

The paper from Vietnam examines experiences of a decade old resolution to promote socialization (privatization) in education to establish and promote a learning society and provide different choices to all individuals for learning, upgrading qualification and nurture their talent. The paper examines the government's policy, extent of coverage in private sector at school and college education. Socializing in education is not only to increase the investment on education but also to expand and improve the quality of curriculum, school management and to instill accountability. The paper elaborates how private institutions manage schools and make institutions function effectively. The Government facilitates the private educational institutions to have enough land adopting tax free system, ensuring good welfare to people working in the education sector.

The paper from Bangladesh deals about role of NGOs in education. About 22,000 NGOs are working in multiple fields. There are 1,315 NGOs in the country working in the field of education. NGO activities began with functional literacy programmes and over time spread in most areas of education. Increase of NGOs'

involvement had implications on privatization policy in the country. The role of private schools became significant at all levels of school education and in recent years in higher education too. In Bangladesh the majority of NGOs work in primary education and one fourth of them are involved pre-primary education. Only BRAC works in secondary education. The paper presents funding and management of NGOs involved in education. It advocates for more role for government in school education and support to NGOs.

The paper on Regulating the Shadow Education describes extent of existence of private tutoring in different countries in developed countries as well as in developing countries. The paper raises the core question concerning the role of the state, and in particular the nature of appropriate regulations for the shadow education sector. While some governments have refused to get involved and others are more willing to have some role in consumer protection. The paper presents a comparative picture of different countries in Asia.

We would like to express our sincere thanks and gratitude to all the contributors of the present issue of the newsletter. Besides, we would also like to thank the readers, individual professionals and institutions for their continued support and overwhelming response.

Editor

The Policy Implications of the Involvement of Private Actors in Education in India

Till about a decade ago, educational policy discourse in India proceeded on the premise that the magnitude of unrecognised and recognised private unaided schools is too small to merit attention, and that the government need not bother about them while formulating policies for educational development as they cater to the needs of 'ever-rising ambitions of middle class parents who can afford to pay high fees for such types of schools', and are lured by the English medium such schools offered. With the spectacular growth of private unaided schools charging low fees , or saivents as I would like to call them, at all stages of schooling, in rural as well as urban areas, and in almost all states, mainstream educational discourse has moved from a stage of denial to acknowledging the growth of private unaided schools and expressing concern about increasing dualism of the school system; sceptics continue to insist that 'the choice of private schooling is not an option for most low caste and poor households' , and that reliance on private schools is a quick fix that ought to be avoided. In contrast to the past however, the discourse has not been one sided. The quick fix denunciation itself is a response to the increasing articulation of the view that low cost private unaided schools offer a better solution to the challenge of universaliation of elementary and secondary education, and that government should encourage parents to choose better schools through grant of vouchers. Protagonists in the policy debate look at the government and private schools in binary, Manichean terms reminding one of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* ; one side is bleating 'private good, public bad' while the other side is bleating the exact opposite.

Private schools differ in many respects, not merely whether they are recognised or unrecognised, and not merely whether they receive grant from government or not. One needs to differentiate between boarding and day schools. Another axis of differentiation is the board to which a school is affiliated, international schools being higher in the pecking order than All India Boards like CBSE and the ICSE, which in turn outrank state boards. Another axis of differentiation is whether a school is a stand-alone school or part of a network which could be local, national or international. According to the *Select Education Statistics* 2008-09, there were in all 176,952 private unaided schools of all kinds. Barring about 15,000 schools, the rest are *saivents*, which if recognised, are generally affiliated to the state boards, and though they themselves are quite heterogeneous, most of them charge fees negligible in comparison with those affiliated to International or All India Boards, and cater to lower middle class and the poor. In terms of growth in numbers and enrolment, they seem to be the most dynamic segment of the school system. Their remarkable growth covers all stages of schooling including primary and upper primary levels. The statistical trends based on available data from different sources establish that the growing importance of private unaided schools is not a flash in the pan. Over the last fifteen years when the flagship programmes of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA) had facilitated huge investments in elementary education and promoted quality improvement programmes, considerable additional enrolment took place in private unaided schools which were not covered by programme interventions of DPEP and SSA . This reality gives lie to the proposition that the expansion of private schools is due to the retreat of the State from its obligation to provide basic education. Further, the neo-liberal policies or the structural adjustment of early 1990s did not trigger the growth of private unaided schools of all types. The 1990s and 2000s actually witnessed the continuance of trends that began in the late 1970s. Another trend is no less significant. The expansion of private aided schools was coeval with the decline of private unaided schools. From a historical perspective, the decline of

private aided schools marks the end of an era of modern education in India.

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

It is axiomatic that policy has to be evidence-based. Conflicting views about State and markets are reminiscent of theological disputes; however, reasonable men can draw reasonable conclusions if adequate, reliable data were available. The lack of detailed data on private schools validates the saying of Bertrand Russell that the most savage controversies are about those matters for which there is no good evidence. We need to have detailed information of the different varieties of private schools, where they are located, the socio-economic profiles of students and parents, their financing modalities, fees charged, facilities they possess, and their learning outcomes; and this information needs to be collected with reasonable frequency so that it is possible to gauge the trends, and assess the factors underlying the trends. Needless to say *Select Education Statistics*, All India Education Survey, DISE, and SIMES should gather and report data on private schools on par with government schools. And the collection of such statistics should be supplemented by periodic and nation-wide micro-studies which bring out the ground reality underlying statistical trends.

Dr. R. V. Vaidyanatha Ayyar,
Retd. Secretary, MHRD
Government of India
Hyderabad, India
Email: rv_ayyar@yahoo.com

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

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

In Australia, 40 per cent of schools are classed as private schools, defined by PISA as "schools managed directly

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

However, examining outcomes in PISA, one finds that in 16 OECD countries and 10 partner countries and economies (including Australia and Shanghai), the average private school student outperforms the average public school student, with an advantage of around 30 score points (the equivalent of about three-quarters of a year of schooling). Around ten per cent of this advantage is the result of competition for students and higher levels of autonomy enjoyed by private schools, but more than three-quarters of the score difference can be attributed to private schools' ability to attract students with higher levels of socio-economic advantage. An "all things equal" analysis found that the private school advantage was not evident in 13 of the 16 countries which showed a private school advantage (including Australia and Shanghai).

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

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

Dr. Sue Thomson
Director
Educational Monitoring and Research
Australian Council for Educational Research
Melbourne
Email: thomsons@acer.edu.au

Regulating the Shadow Education System: Government Policies and Controls on Private Supplementary Tutoring

ANTRIEP's 2011 Policy Seminar in New Delhi on the role of the private sector included focus on the so-called shadow education system of private supplementary tutoring. The metaphor of the shadow is used because private tutoring mimics mainstream schooling: as the content and size of the mainstream change, so do the content and size of the shadow.

The New Delhi meeting noted that shadow education is a significant phenomenon throughout Asia. Discussions built on both the 2009 Policy Seminar in Shanghai and a previous issue of the *ANTRIEP Newsletter* (Vol.11, No.1, 2006). The present article draws on the discussions in New Delhi, which themselves contributed to a 2012 publication on this theme (Bray & Lykins 2012).

The Scale and Shape of Shadow Education

Shadow education is widespread in both prosperous and low-income parts of Asia. Beginning with prosperous parts of East Asia:

- *Hong Kong*. A 2011/12 survey found that 53.8% of Grade 9 students and 71.8% of Grade 12 students were receiving private supplementary tutoring (Bray et al. 2012).

- *Japan*. A 2007 survey found that tutoring institutions known as *juku* served 15.9% of Primary 1 children, that this proportion increased steadily in later grades, and that it reached 65.2% in Junior Secondary 3. In addition, 6.8% of Junior Secondary 3 pupils received tutoring at home, and 15.0% followed correspondence courses (Japan 2008: 13).

- *South Korea*. In 2008, 87.9% of elementary school pupils were estimated to be receiving tutoring. In middle school the proportion was 72.5%; and in general high school it was 60.5% (Kim 2010: 302).

- *Taiwan*. A 2001 survey indicated that 72.9% of Grade 7 students were receiving tutoring for an average of 6.5 hours per week (Liu 2012: 49).

In contrast are lower-income countries in South Asia in which shadow education is also extensive:

- *Bangladesh.* According to a 2008 household survey, 37.9% of primary students and 68.4% of secondary students were receiving tutoring (Nath 2011). At Grade 10, over 80% were receiving tutoring.

- India. Among a sample of Grade 10 students in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh, 58.8% were receiving tutoring (Sujatha & Rani 2011: 113).

- *Pakistan.* Private tutoring is very common in both cities and rural areas (Mulji 2003; ASER-Pakistan 2011). Concerning the latter, a 2010 household survey found that only 80% of children attended school. Among those who did attend school, 14.3% received private tutoring (ASER-Pakistan 2011: 52).

- *Sri Lanka.* Survey data in 2006/07 indicated that 63.7% of households with students aged 6-21 had spent money on private tutoring (Pallegedara 2011: 9). This compared with just 23.3% in a comparable survey in 1995/96.

This tutoring takes various forms. Some is one-on-one, while other tutoring is in small groups, full classes or even large lecture theatres. In addition, the advent of internet technology has also permitted tutoring through websites and video cameras. Much tutoring is provided informally by students and others as a casual occupation. Companies are also becoming increasingly visible, with some operating on franchised models not only nationally but even internationally.

Some Core Issues

The private tutoring industry, unlike the school sector, is generally unregulated. Individuals are free to advertise their services on the internet, in supermarkets and in other locations. These people may or may not have appropriate qualifications; and no country has a machinery for systematic or random checks of the quality of tutoring provided. The prices charged are governed by the tutors themselves with reference to what the marketplace can bear. Many financial transactions are made in cash, possibly without formal receipts and beyond the reach of the government tax collector.

Problems may arise when teachers themselves provide supplementary tutoring. It might seem logical for teachers to be among the most important suppliers, since these people know school systems well. Yet when teachers take on additional loads, they may be tired and neglect their regular duties.

Especially problematic are situations in which teachers provide tutoring to the students for whom they are already responsible in regular classes. This is common in much of South and Southeast Asia. Teachers may be tempted to cut content from their regular classes in order to promote the market for the private ones. This can lead to a form of blackmail in which students feel obliged to attend the tutoring classes to secure the full curriculum. Pressures are especially severe when the teachers themselves set the end-of-year tests that decide which students will be promoted from one grade to the next.

What Regulations for What Shadow Education?

A core question concerns the role of the state, and particularly the nature of appropriate regulations for the shadow education sector. Some governments have refused to get involved, arguing that their responsibility is only for mainstream schooling. Others are more willing to have some role in consumer protection. They also recognize that shadow education can have a negative backwash on the mainstream education system.

A starting point is commonly a requirement for tutoring enterprises to register with either the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Commerce. Governments may consider whether such a requirement would apply to all tutors, including individuals who operate informally, or whether it should only refer to establishments of a certain size. In Hong Kong, for example, tutors are only required to register if they serve 20 or more persons during any one day or eight or more persons at any one time.

For tutoring operations above a minimum size, the authorities may insist on regulations for health and safety, including provision of toilets, lighting and fire escapes. Such regulations exist in such countries as Japan and Singapore. Yet even these countries have no regulations on the curriculum or on the qualifications of tutors. Although over the decades the school sector has come to be increasingly regulated, these dimensions do not apply to the shadow sector.

A further question concerns the roles of teachers. In Hong Kong, Malaysia, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore, teachers are forbidden to provide private tutoring to the students for whom they are already responsible. However, Malaysian teachers are permitted to provide tutoring to other students. The regulations restrict such work to four hours a week, and require a renewable permit valid for one year. Malaysian teachers are not permitted to use school premises or equipment for tutoring, and teachers who have been granted the permit must offer their services through tutoring centres registered with the State Department of Education and not owned by their family members or relatives.

Of course issue of regulations may not always be accompanied by enforcement. In Bangladesh, a 1979 stipulation which is still officially in force states that no full-time teacher can provide private tutoring or other employment without prior permission of the employing authority. This has been widely ignored; but in 2010 and 2011, various public comments demanded tightening of regulations. The High Court became involved, pressing the Ministry of Education and various schools from which teachers were said to be working in tutoring centres.

Learning from comparisons

Survey of practices across Asia shows wide diversity. It also provides opportunities for policy makers and planners to learn from each other on what works and does not work, and why.

The significance of the shadow education sector is now being increasingly recognized. Some of the ANTRIEP member institutions have contributed to this recognition both through their own research and through translation of materials. Some of this work contributed to the publication mentioned at the beginning of this article (Bray & Lykins 2012). In addition, some ANTRIEP member institutions have assisted in translation of a book published by UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (Bray 2009). Among the Asian languages are Bangla, Chinese, Hindi, Korean, Mongolian, Nepali, Sinhala and Urdu.

Shadow education is a major phenomenon with far-reaching implications for household expenditures, social inequalities, student attainment, and the lives of both pupils and teachers. The author of this article will welcome further collaboration in addressing the agenda both for further research and for improvement of policies and practice.

References

ANTRIEP Newsletter (2006). *Private Tuition: Issues and Concerns.* 11 (1). http://www.antriep.net/html/Antriep%20 jan-june%20 2006.pdf.

ASER-Pakistan (2011). *Annual Status of Education Report (Rural).* Islamabad: South Asian Forum for Education Development (SAFED).

Bray, Mark (2009). *Confronting the shadow education system: What government policies for what private tutoring?.* Paris: IIEP-UNESCO. Versions in Bangla, Chinese, English, Hindi, Korean, Mongolian, Nepali, Sinhala and Urdu can be downloaded from http://www.iiep.unesco.org/information-services/documentation-centre/library-resources.html.

Bray, Mark & Lykins, Chad (2012). *Shadow Education: Private Supplementary Tutoring and its Implications for Policy Makers in Asia.* Manila: Asian Development Bank and Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong. Available online: http://www.fe.hku.hk/cerc/Publications/monograph_no_9.htm.

Bray, Mark; Kwo, Ora; Lykins, Chad; Mang, Emily; Wang, Dan & Zhan, Shengli (2012). 'Private Supplementary Tutoring: Scale, Nature and Implications for Secondary Schooling in Hong Kong'. GRF project (2011-2014). Hong Kong: Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong.

Japan, Ministry of Education and Training (2008). *Report on the Situation of Academic Learning Activities of Children.* Tokyo: Monbukagakusho Hokokusho. (In Japanese)

Kim, Kyung-Keun (2010). 'Educational Equality', in Lee, Chong Jae; Kim, Seong-yul and Adams, Don (eds.), *Sixty Years of Korean Education.* Seoul: Seoul National University Press, pp.285-325.

Liu, Jeng (2012). 'Does Cram Schooling Matter? Who Goes to Cram Schools? Evidence from Taiwan'. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32 (1): 46-52.

Mulji, Neda (2003). 'All Work and No Play'. *The Review, Dawn*, 28 August – 3 September, pp.4-8.

Nath, Samir Ranjan (2011). 'Shadow Education in Bangladesh'. Presentation at a seminar organized by UNESCO in conjunction with the National Academy of Educational Management (NAEM), Dhaka, 11 August.

Sujatha, K. & Rani, P. Geetha (2011). *Management of Secondary Education in India.* New Delhi: Shipra and National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA).

Mark Bray
Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong
mbray@hku.hk

Financing Education in Indonesia - the role of state and private actors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MoNE, district education offices and MoRA procure from the market under government procurement guidelines.

Privatization in 3 forms:

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

2. Private Funding: Education can be funded by private individuals/agencies.

3. Private Regulation: Education can be monitored by those who receive the services directly, i.e. the students and their families.

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

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

Private Actors include:

1. For-profit companies
2. NGOs
3. United Nations, Donor Agencies
4. Faith-based Organizations
5. Civil Society

6. Private Individual/Family

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

Regulations on private actions in education in Indonesia

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

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

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

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

Mr. Anwar Alsaid
Head of Education Unit
UNESCO, Jakarta
Email: a.alsaid@unesco.org

Private Sector Support in School Improvement Specific Interventions in Sri Lanka

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

1. The PSI (SBM) movement and how it has given momentum for private sector support.
2. The direct role played by the private (business) sector in the improvement of schools.
3. The role of old pupils in drawing private sector support.

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

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

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

Nearly 30 per/cent of Sri Lanka schools are small schools with less than 100 students on role. Some of the schools among them have taken several initiatives

and have employed good practices that are unique. Such schools are adopted by business organizations and are helped in numerous ways to do better. (The paper presents few specific examples of such interventions).

(iii)   The Old Pupil support in School Improvement

Along with the small schools, Sri Lanka also has a number of large schools with well over 4000 students. These schools have old pupil's associations. These associations have taken priority to support the schools by way of infrastructure development, support for co-curriculum, teacher development etc. (The paper highlights some methods where old pupils support schools).

Dr. Wilfred J Perera
Education Consultant
The Finance Commission
Colombo, Sri Lanka
Email: wilfredperera@yahoo.com

Socialization in Education - Some Initial Experiences in Vietnam

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

In school year of 2009 – 2010, private schools in Vietnam enrolled 1.6 million early child-care pupils (counting for 51% of total early child care pupils of the system), 4.8% students from K1 to K12, 22.2% professional students, 12.7% students of colleges and universities. In Hanoi, the number of private schools counts for 21% of total schools, enrolling 11% students. There are more and more private schools with good and modern infrastructure. The appearance and development of private schools not only responses the increasing and diverse demands but more importantly, it brings about a new education model which is more flexible, dynamic and effective. Quite a number of private schools are becoming more and more competitive with the public schools, creating a comparison of the effectiveness in education, becoming a motivation for the movement of the education.

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

spending for the learning of people counts for about 25% total social spending.

Socialization in Education

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

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

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

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

Together with the socialization in education and the development of private schools, Vietnam Government

encourage the cooperation and joint venture in education with advanced foreign training institutions; encourage to open quality and prestigious education institutions in the form of 100% foreign investment; encourage scientists and educationists with high

qualification from overseas to participate in teaching in Vietnam.

Dr. Chu Hong Thanh
General Director of Legal Department
Voetma, Ministry of Education and Training
Email; chthanh@moet.edu.vn,
chthanh@moet.gove.vn

Role of NGOs in Education: The Bangladesh Case and its Wider Implications

Although there is no common definition of NGOs, these may be characterized by their non-governmental nature, not for profit mode, and community based activities. The NGOs represent civil societies of any country. These may be community based or local, national or even international. The international NGOs often work through partnership with the national or community based organizations. However, there are examples of local NGOs turning gradually into national or international. For instance, Oxfam and BRAC may be two of them. Activities of NGOs may be any of the wider range of human development issues; of which education is one.

Bangladesh had ten to twelve NGOs of various sizes before its independence in 1971. A few more were established in this decade, mostly for carrying out relief and rehabilitation activities in post-war situation, followed by a huge expansion seen in the next two decades of 1980's and 1990's. At present, there are approximately 22,000 NGOs in Bangladesh, mostly working in multiple fields of development such as microfinance, income generation, employment, environment, human rights and legal aid, health and nutrition, and education. Of these only 1,315 NGO's work in the field of education there are also activity based NGO coalitions to facilitate advocacy with the government.

NGO activities in education, although started with functional literacy programmes in the 1960's, spread

over time in most areas of education, currently covering functional literacy, early childhood development, pre-schooling, primary education, adult education, secondary teacher training, and university education. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), a coalition of education NGOs, facilitates both networking among the NGOs and advocacy with the government, besides working closely with the teachers unions and other civil society organizations interested in education.

Increase in NGO's involvement in education is linked to privatization policy of the country. In 1970, there were only 28% of the primary students enrolled in private schools. Although the government nationalized all primary schools in 1974, the establishment of private schools did not stop. In 2008, as many as 43% of all primary students were enrolled in schools other than government. Note that the primary education for children aged 6–10 years (grades I to V) is compulsory in Bangladesh by law. Secondary education in Bangladesh is mostly privately initiated and privately managed, though partially aided by the government. About 97–98% of the secondary students study in these schools. There was no private university in Bangladesh before 1992 but now, over half of the tertiary level students study in private institutions.

Among the NGOs working in education, 10% are involved in early childhood development, a quarter in pre-primary education, 80% in primary education, and another quarter in adult education. Only BRAC works

in secondary education and three NGOs work in the area of university education.

Pre-primary centres of the NGOs are mostly established nearer to the formal primary schools; in some cases on campus of the formal schools. These provide pre-primary education of one year duration with the aim of preparing the students for primary education with a lively start. Although NGOs are mandated to work for the poorer section of the communities, the pre-primary centres enrol students irrespective of parent's education and poverty status of the households. Due to an embargo of the government, after completing pre-primary education in NGO centres, the students are subject to enrol in formal schools (government or non-government) for primary education but not in NGO run non-formal primary schools. Till date four million children have received pre-primary education from the NGO centres. Currently, over half a million children are enrolled in about 20,000 centres.

The NGOs provide primary education mostly in non-formal mode targeting the first generation learners of the poor households, the dropouts and those who did not enrol in school timely. Schools are generally established in those areas where there is no school. Parents and community participation, close supervision and monitoring, small class size, female teachers, continuous teacher training, supplementary materials, and emphasis on girls education are some major characteristics of such programmes. Attendance and cycle completion rates are higher in these schools and thus dropout rate is very low. As of today, over four million children received primary education from NGO schools. Now, 1.32 million children are taking primary education from 40,000 NGO schools. They are 9.6% of total primary school students in the country. Last year, the pass rate of the BRAC school students in the primary completion examination was about 99% against the national average of 91%. Independent study showed that whereas, on an average, on completion of primary education, all Bangladesh students achieved 18.7 competencies, the NGO school students achieved 20

competencies. Incidence of private tuition was also less among them– 12% against the national average of 38%.

The NGOs do not have their own secondary schools. BRAC is engaged mostly in overall development of the rural secondary schools. The teacher development includes management training for the heads and their assistants and subject based short courses for the mathematics, science and English teachers. Orientation course is arranged for the school managing committees. BRAC organizes peer learning forums and co-curricular activities for the students of these schools. Development or establishment of school libraries also forms a part of this programme. About 6,000 schools are currently working with BRAC.

Private University Act was passed in Bangladesh in 1992. Of the total 52 private universities, three are run by NGOs. Like other private universities, cost of education is much higher in these universities than in the public universities. Provisions of scholarships to attract meritorious and poor students are there. Students receiving primary education from NGO schools get preference in admission and for scholarships, provided they have satisfied minimum criteria for admission. Females are given preference in NGO run university admission. A recent report of the University Grants Commission shows that the females share was 25% in the public and 24% in the private universities. It was 32.5% in the three NGO run universities. Although ASA university admitted a fifth of its students from the females, BRAC university took 43% and Gono Bishwaviddyalaya 39%. Taking the advantages of the development programmes of the NGOs, the students of all faculties of these universities are orientated on the livestyles of the masses. A few other NGOs applied for permission to open new universities.

School education in the NGOs, whether it is pre-primary, primary or secondary is mostly donor-funded. A small portion of funds of some NGOs comes from the surplus generated from other programmes which is mostly used for innovations. In 2010, total budget of the education NGOs was US$ 1043 million, of which

US$ 65 million was allocated for education. Share of education in total NGO budget was only 6.2%, less than the same in the national budget. About 90% of this money is spent by 10% of the NGOs. BRAC alone spends 55%. Establishment cost of the NGO run universities is borne by the respective NGOs; running cost is made from the tuition fees of the students. The development partners extend their support to the NGOs bilaterally or through a consortium. Recently, BRAC received grants under strategic partnership with DFID and AusAid.

The education NGOs in Bangladesh are actively involved also in research and advocacy activities. A number of NGOs have their separate wings for these activities. Although, research in NGOs is mostly on their own activities, the *Education Watch* is a distinguished one because of its focus on national education systems. It is a civil society initiative to monitor progress in school education and literacy situation of the population. CAMPE is the secretariat of this initiative where the Research and Evaluation Division of BRAC plays a significant role in carrying out the research. The findings and recommendations are consulted with various stakeholders at national and regional levels and disseminated through various media. Lobbying with the concerned ministries in line with the research findings and recommendations is an obvious part of this. Till date, 10 reports have been produced. The *Education Watch* provided major research inputs in the new education policy.

As school education is the responsibility of the nation, the NGO schools can be considered as the bailey bridges as a temporary solution. These are to supplement national initiatives until the national system stands on strong footing. The national systems can learn from the NGOs specifically from their innovations. However, at the same time, owing to many practical reasons, it may not be easy for the national systems to recognize lessons learned from NGO experiences. The NGO provisions can be suitable to improve rural school systems, education in urban slums and isolated regions of the countries. BRAC replicates its Bangladesh experiences through similar programmes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, South Sudan, Uganda and the Philippines with support from the governments of the respective countries and the international development partners.

Samir Ranjan Nath
Programme Head,
BRAC Research and Evalution Division
Email; nath.sr@brac.net

Role of Private Actors in Education: Bangladesh Perspective

Bangladesh is one of the most densely populated countries in the world with about 150 million people within an area of 1,47,570 sq. km. Its vast population is one of the major resources but the problem lies in transforming the potential people into a productive force in the line of quality education. Education, therefore, has been recognized as a priority sector here by all governments since her independence. There has been a remarkable development in education in the last thirty years and the rate of participation has increased steadily at all levels. There are about 72,600 educational institutes from primary to higher education levels. The education system in Bangladesh is characterized by the co-existence of three separate streams. The mainstream is based on secular education carried over from the colonial past and others are religious education and English medium institutions.

The mainstream education system in Bangladesh is structured as follows: -

Primary Stage

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

Secondary, Higher Secondary Stage

On completion of primary education, students (11+) are enrolled for junior secondary education spans 3 years, in 3,494 non-government institutions. After the end of this phase, some students switch over to join the vocational stream, where 947 (79.31%) private technical education institutes are run privately in Bangladesh, offered at Vocational Training Institutes and Technical Training Centers run by the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Labor and Employment respectively, while students in the mainstream continue their education in 317(1.66%) government and 18,766 (98.34%) non-government secondary schools. A total of 71,40,582 (97.06%) students are enrolled at private secondary general schools (2009 academic year). There are 9,475 (99.96%) non-government Madrasahs at grade 6 to 16 but only 3 (0.03%) governments (kamil) Madrasahs are here in Bangladesh. A total of 20,67,590 (99.99%) students are studying in private Madrasahs.

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

Tertiary Stage

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

Coaching Centers in Bangladesh

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

Private actors including NGO's involvement in education with a view to increasing school participation, reducing drop-out rates greatly benefit the mass of people. This points out that besides purely privately funded and managed schools, all kinds of partnerships exist between governments and private agents. These public-private partnerships will be the enterprise of our analysis of private interventions. Their number along with their importance has increased dramatically over the last twenty years. So, Bangladesh needs a dynamic and sustainable education to meet the challenges of poverty reduction and increased competition in an emerging outward market economy. So, GO and NGO initiatives are inevitable in education.

Prof. Shamsur Rahm
Director General,NAEM
Dhaka
Email: info@naem.gov.bd;
srahman13bd@yahoo.com

Regional Workshop on "Vocational Education: Policies, Programmes and Innovations (5-8 November, 2012)

The National University of Educational Planning in collaboration with ANTRIEP and UNESCO Office, New Delhi will organize a Regional workshop on " Vocational Education: Policies, Programmes and Innovations from 5-8 November, 2012.

The education systems worldwide have witnessed significant changes in tune with the fast changing developments in technology and economic liberalization and consequential changes in the world of work and production. In this context, several new issues and challenges have emerged placing Vocational Education and Skill Development (VE&SD) at the centre stage of education reform process. While this is not altogether a new area in the education sector in any country, policies, programmes and delivery mechanisms with respect to VE&SD have received increased importance in many countries of Asia. Keeping these developments in view, the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) in collaboration with Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP) and UNESCO Office, New Delhi proposes to organize a Regional Workshop on Vocational Education: Policies, Programmes and Innovations from November 5-8, 2012.

The main objectives of the Workshop include:

- To review policies and programmes in the area of Vocational Education and Skill Development;

- To identify critical areas requiring empirical research with respect to Vocational Education and Skill Development; and

- To prepare a draft research proposal for studying Vocational Education and Skill Development in a comparative framework.

The Workshop is specially designed for participants from ANTRIEP member institutions from different countries of Asia and hosted by NUEPA, New Delhi. NUEPA hosts the Workshop.

News from Member Institutions
(January - June 2012)

Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development
Shanghai, China

- **Review on National Development of Private Schools**

  Commissioned by the Department of Basic Education II, Ministry of Education, SIHRD analyzed statistics of China's private high schools, junior high schools and primary schools on enrollment and school funding. A comparative analysis was done between the local public schools and private schools on enrollment and school funding.

- **Equal Access to Basic Public Education Services**

  SIHRD joined the research project launched by Shanghai Education Commission in 2011 as one of the annual major research projects with the title of *equal access to basic public education services.* SIHRD undertook three sub-projects — *An Empirical Analysis to Shanghai basic public education services; equalization with system data; and international comparison on the equalization of basic public education services.*

Aga Khan University - Institute for Educational Development (AKU- IED)
Karachi, Pakistan

- AKU has undertaken a research study on "Role of Civil Society Institutions in Promoting Cultural Diversity and Pluralism in Chitral District of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa". *funded by HEC*

- A study on "Educational Development and Improvement (EDIP) and School Communities' Perceptions on Education in Gilgit-Baltistan of Pakistan" is being conducted

Korean Educational Development Institute
Seoul, South Korea

The 5th APEC Education Ministerial Meeting was held in Gyeongju, Republic of Korea on May 21-23, 2012 under the Chairmanship of Ju-Ho Lee, Minister of Education, Science and Technology of the Republic of Korea. The theme for the meeting was *"Future Challenges and Educational Responses: Fostering Global Innovative and Cooperative Education",* which closely correlates with APEC priorities proposed by the Russian Federation in the year of 2012. The meeting aimed at cooperation in education as an integral part fostering regional innovative growth, promoting future skills suitable for the global society, creating innovative instructional delivery systems and fostering more collaborative policy decisions that provide for our common fulfilment.

Institute of Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management)
Pahang, Malaysia

- Thirty-two Educational Leaders from Afghanistan participated in the Leadership and Management Training Course held at IAB Main Campus from 17 April – 12 May 2012. This international training programme was arranged under the Malaysian Australian Education. Project for Afghanistan (MAEPA) with IAB helping to provide training in leadership and educational management.

- 25 senior educational leaders from Sindh, Pakistan and 20 senior educational leaders from Sumatra, Indonesia made benchmarking visits to IAB Main Campus to discuss about developments in the area of leadership and educational management (ELM) on 15 February 2012. Another 9 senior educational leaders from Brunei Darussalam also made a similar working visit to IAB on 27 April 2012 for discussion and sharing of expertise in ELM.

National University of Educational Planning and Administration
New Delhi, India

- International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration began on 1st of Feburary, 2012. The first phase of the programme was successfully completed on 30, April, 2012. 32 participants from 23 countries participated.

National Centre for School Leadership (NCSL)

National University of Educational Planning and Administration has established **National Center for School Leadership.** This is funded by Department of School Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The Centre has become functional from April, 2012. The NCSL is committed to building leadership capacities for improving school leadership practices at different levels of school education in India. The Centre proposes to offer long-term sustainable program for School Leadership Development that brings in transformation of functional managers into outstanding leaders. Addressing to the concerns vital to leadership development, the Centre will offer a variety of need- based programs by bridging the gap between theoretical perspective and school realities to help leaders and schools to improve.

The Centre looks at research as an ingrained activity to support different contexts and diversities among schools in India. Through Leadership Academies, the NCSL looks forward to long term engagement with states through a network of institutions at district and block levels to reach out to School Practitioners.

Goal

To prepare new generation leaders for transforming school system and governance in India.

Mission

"Learning to lead and leading to learn". Become an apex centre in school leadership through training, capacity building, research and consultancy.

Core Functions

- Establish a critical mass of well-trained teams of trainers/facilitators to facilitate planning, design and organization of short and long-term capacity building and professional training programs.
- Expand the knowledge base related to school leadership development by undertaking, promoting and disseminating researches required to address context-specific school leadership in the states/UTs.
- Offer Fellowships to talented professionals for engaging in research and documentation of effective leadership practices in school education.
- Establish international collaborative arrangements with similar leadership development programs and institutions.

Beneficiaries / Stakeholders

The Centre will cater to aspiring, prospective, practicing heads / principals, systemic administrators holding different hierarchical positions in the management of government schools, government supported institutions, grant in aid schools from primary to higher education stages across the country.

For further details on ANTRIEP activities contact

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
7-9 Rue Eugene - Delacroix
75116 PARIS, France
Fax: + (33) 1 40728366
E-mail: a.de.grauwe@iiep.unesco.org

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

ANTRIEP Member Institutions

1. Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Education, Taleemi Chowk, G-8/1,P.O. Box 1566, ISLAMABAD, Pakistan (http:/aepam.edu.pk)

2. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), 19 Prospect Hill Road, Private Bag – 55, Camberwell, Melbourne, VICTORIA-3124, Australia (www.acer.edu.au)

3. Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Puslit Penelitian), Office for Educational and Culture Research and Development (Balitbang Dikb) Ministry of Education and Culture, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman, Senayan, JAKARTA – 12041, Indonesia.

4. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) 75, Mohakhali Commercial Area, DHAKA – 1212, Bangladesh (www.brac.net)

5. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), 5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, DHAKA – 1207, Bangladesh (www.campebd.org)

6. Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), D.B. Rodda Road, Jubilee Circle, DHARWARD - 380 001, Karnataka (INDIA) (www.cmdr.co.in)

7. Centre for Education Leadership Development, (CELD), National Institute of Education (NIE), Meepe Junction, Padukka, Sri Lanka (www.nie.lk)

8. Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Sri Layang 69000, Genting Highland, PAHANG, Malaysia

9. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 PARIS, France (www.iiep.unesco.org)

10. Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), 92-6 Umyeon-Dong, Seocho-Gu, SEOUL 137-791 KOREA, (www.kedi.re.kr)

11. National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM), Dhanmodi, DHAKA – 1205, Bangladesh (www.naem.gov.bd)

12. National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Sanothimi, BHAKTAPUR 2050, Nepal (www.nced.gov.np)

13. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 (INDIA) (www.ncert.nic.in)

14. National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi –110016, India (www.nuepa.org)

15. Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development, Tribhuvan University, P.O. Box 2161, Balkhu, Kathmandu, Nepal, (www.cerid.org)

16. Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), 21 North Cha Ling North Road SHANGHAI - 200 032, China

17. South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, SEAMEO INNOTECH P.O. Box 207, Commonwealth Avenue, U.P. Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines (www.seameo-innotech.org)

18. State Institute of Educational Management & Training (SIEMAT), 25 P.C. Banerjee Road, Allenganj ALLAHABAD, Uttar Pradesh, India

19. The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P) House No.3 & 4, F-17/B, Block VII KDA Scheme 5, Clifton, Karachi-75600, Pakistan (www.akdn.org/akes)

20. The Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development, (AKU-IED), 1-5/B-VII, F. B. Area Karimabad, P.O. Box No.13688, Karachi-75950, Pakistan (http://www.aku.edu)