

District and Sub-District Management Structures under DPEP

A Study of two districts from Bihar and Kerala

S.M.I.A. Zaidi



**National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi – 110016
2003**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Universalisation of Elementary Education is a constitutional commitment which has been endorsed by several commissions and committees appointed by the government. The National Policies on Education have also emphasized on achieving this goal at the earliest. Concrete steps were taken in this regard and several projects and programmes, aimed at Universalisation of elementary/primary education, were launched in various states of the country during 1990s. One such programme known as District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), which started in 1994 in 42 districts, has now covered more than 250 districts of the country. This programme has been implemented in the districts by creating its own management structures at the district and sub-district level. These newly created structures are parallel to the educational administrative structure already created by the states. This study is an attempt to examine the linkages between the educational administrative structure created by states with the management structures created under DPEP. The study is based on empirical evidences collected from two DPEP districts namely Gaya from Bihar and Malappuram from Kerala.

The study was sponsored by Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of HRD, Government of India. I am grateful to the officials of the department for giving approval and providing financial support for the study.

I am grateful to Prof. B.P. Khandelwal, Director NIEPA for his continuous support and encouragement in conducting the study.

The Govt. of Bihar and Govt. of Kerala permitted us to conduct this study in one district each from these two states. I am thankful to the state governments in general and to the State Project Directors (DPEP) in particular.

In order to conduct the study a lot of support was provided by the District Project offices (DPEP) of both Gaya and Malappuram districts. I am particularly

grateful to Shri S.A. Moin, District Project Coordinator DPEP Gaya and Shri M. Basheer, District Project Coordinator DPEP Malappuram for the help and co-operation provided by them and their offices for the field study. I am also thankful to Shri Vijai Thakur Asstt. Resource Person, Ms. Vandana Kumari Asstt. Programme Officer and Shri Junaid Ansari, Assistant Computer Programmer, District Project Office DPEP Gaya for extending all help in collecting data and contacting block and cluster level people in Gaya district. Shri Ahmed Kutty, Programme Officer Malappuram D.P.O. accompanied me to the blocks and clusters for field survey. I am thankful to him.

The staff of D.P.O. in both districts has been extremely helpful in conducting the study in the districts. The staff of the BRC of the six blocks (Imamganj, Tikari and Wazirganj from Gaya district and Areacode, Manjeri and Tanur from Malappuram district) extended tremendous help and provided relevant information. I am specially grateful to all the six BRC coordinators. The study covered 56 CRCs and all 56 CRC coordinators cooperated with me during the field survey by providing the necessary information and giving their free and frank opinion. I am grateful to all of them.

Shri M. Abdul Razak, Principal Malappuram DIET, Shri M. Abdul Hameed Dy. Director of Education Malappuram and Staff of DIET Gaya and D.S.E. office Gaya provided data and interacted with me during field survey. I put on record my thanks to all of them.

My thanks are due to Ms. Alka Vazirani, Project Data Entry Operator, NIEPA who provided secretarial support and undertook the responsibility of word processing for writing and finalization of this report.

I am grateful to each and everyone who has helped me in any form in conducting this study.

S.M.I.A. Zaidi

CONTENTS

	Page No
Acknowledgements	01
List of Tables	04
Chapter 1 Introduction	06
Chapter 2 Educational Administration in States	22
Chapter 3 Profile of the Districts selected for the study	28
Chapter 4 Profile of the Blocks covered	45
Chapter 5 Management Structures under DPEP	57
Chapter 6 Management Structures : Horizontal Linkages	84
Chapter 7 Management Structures : Vertical Linkages	92
Chapter 8 DPEP Management Structures : Future Prospects	103
Chapter 9 Conclusions	109
References	124

LIST OF TABLES

Page No

Chapter 1

Table 1.01	Growth of Primary Education in India	07
1.02	Growth of Upper Primary Education in India	08
1.03	Progress of Elementary Education in India (Primary)	09
1.04	Progress of Elementary Education in India (Upper Primary)	10
1.05	Coverage of CRCs in selected blocks	21

Chapter 3

Table 3.01	Demographic Profile of Malappuram (2001 Census)	29
3.02	Number of Schools in Malappuram district (2001-02)	31
3.03	Teachers Profile of Malappuram district (2001-02)	32
3.04	Grade-wise Enrolment in Malappuram district (2001-02)	33
3.05	Grade-wise NER in Malappuram (2000-01)	35
3.06	Population of Gaya district (2001)	37
3.07	Literacy rates in Gaya district (2001)	37
3.08	Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya District by category (2001-02)	39
3.09	Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya District by Management and by location (2001-02)	40
3.10	Teachers in Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya (2001-02)	41

3.11	Enrolment at Primary and Upper Primary level in Gaya (2001-02)	42
3.12	Facilities in Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya (2001-02)	43

Chapter 4

Table 4.01	Background data of selected blocks (2001)	45
4.02	Demographic profile of selected blocks (2001)	46
4.03	Literacy Rates in Selected blocks (2001)	47
4.04	Institutions, Teachers and Enrolment in selected blocks (2001-02)	48
4.05	Enrolment in selected blocks (2001-02)	49
4.06	Selected Teacher related Indicators in blocks (2001-02)	50
4.07	GER and Transition rates in selected blocks (2001-02)	52
4.08	Facilities in Schools in selected blocks (2001-02)	54

Chapter 5

Table 5.01	Staffing pattern in District Project Office (DPEP)	65
5.02	Staffing Pattern of DDE/DSE office	66
5.03	Staffing Pattern in Gaya and Malappuram DIET	68
5.04	Jurisdiction of BRCs (Schools, Teachers, Clusters)	73
5.05	Number of Primary Schools in CRCs	76
5.06	Number of Primary teachers in CRCs	77

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Education is a powerful instrument for the over-all development of a country in general and that of its economic development in particular. It is therefore necessary to educate the total population in order to ensure development of the country. This is perhaps the reason that in many developed countries there is a provision of compulsory education for 12 or at least 10 years of schooling. However, in the developing countries like India universalisation of education is restricted up to 8 years of schooling and thus secondary and higher secondary education is not compulsory. But unfortunately despite our planned development for more than half a century after getting independence, we did not succeed in providing free and compulsory education to all children upto 14 years of age, which means the country has not been able to achieve the goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education (UEE).

India being a signatory of EFA Meet of Jomtien (1990) and Dakar (2000) declaration, has developed a plan of action for EFA. The efforts towards Education for All (EFA) started very seriously after Jomtien meet. The District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) was launched in 1994, which now covers more than 250 districts of the country. Further as a follow up of Dakar a nation wide programme known as Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) was started in the year 2000. The focus in the former programme i.e. DPEP was on Universal Primary Education (UPE) where as the later one i.e. SSA aims at Universalisation of Elementary Education (UEE). These two important programmes are over and above the centrally sponsored schemes implemented by the Central Government in 1970s, and 1980s, which were related to elementary education. Another very important step taken in the country was the Constitutional amendment to make elementary education a fundamental right. However, in this regard an Act is in the process of making. This is perhaps the most important step taken at national

level to universalize free and compulsory education for all children up to 14 years of age which is a constitutional directive.

All committees and commissions appointed by the Government have emphasized on the need to achieve the goal of UPE, UEE at the earliest possible time. This has also been endorsed in the National Policies on Education. Despite all these commitments and serious efforts the bitter fact is that the country is still struggling to universalize even the primary education (i.e. 5 years of schooling) what to talk of universal elementary education, which is 8 years of schooling.

Progress in Elementary Education

It is to be noted that concerted efforts have been made in all the states of the country for fulfilling the Constitutional directive of free and compulsory education to all children up to 14 years of age. As a result of these efforts undoubtedly impressive progress has been made in the country towards expansion of elementary education. Data presented in the following table reveals this fact.

**Table 1.01
Growth of Primary Education in India**

Item	Years		Average Annual Growth Rate
	1950-51	2000-01	
No. of Primary Schools	209,671	638,738	2.25
No. of Teachers at Primary level	537,918	1896,791	2.55
Enrolment at Primary level (in millions)	19.2	113.8	5.39

Source : Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Secondary and Higher Education 'Selected Educational Statistics 2000-2001' New Delhi, 2002.

Table 1.02
Growth of Upper Primary Education in India

Item	Years		Average Annual Growth Rate
	1950-51	2000-01	
No. of Upper Primary Schools	13,596	206,269	5.59
No. of Teachers at Upper Primary level	85,496	1326,652	5.64
Enrolment at Upper Primary level (in millions)	3.1	42.8	5.39

Source : Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Secondary and Higher Education. 'Selected Educational Statistics 2000-2001' New Delhi, 2002.

The data presented in the above two tables show that the number of primary and upper primary schools which were 209,671 and 13,596 only in 1950-51 have increased to 638,738 and 206,269 in 2000-01 respectively. This shows an impressive average annual growth rate of 2.25 per cent for primary and 5.59 percent for upper primary schools. The number of teachers at primary level has increased from 537,918 in 1950-51 to 1896,791 in 2000-01 and at upper primary level it has increased from 85,496 in 1950-51 to as high as 1326,652 in 2000-01. These data show average annual growth rate of teachers at primary level as 2.55 percent and 5.64 percent at upper primary level. The enrolment trend shows an increase from 19.2 million in 1950-51 to 113.8 million in 2000-01 at primary level while at upper primary level the same has increased from 3.1 million to as high as 42.8 million during the same period of 50 years. These figures show average annual growth rate of primary level enrolment as 3.62 percent and that of upper primary level enrolment as 5.39 percent.

On the basis of figures presented above for primary and upper primary education we can infer that average number of teachers per school have slightly increased. This is from 2.56 teachers per primary school in 1950-51 to 2.96 teachers in 2000-01. The respective figure for upper primary level has increased

from 6.29 teachers per school in 1950-51 to 6.43 teachers in 2000-01. It may further be inferred that the primary schools are now far more crowded than what was earlier as the average enrolment per primary school which was about 92 in 1950-51 has increased to about 178 in 2000-01. However for upper primary the position has slightly improved. The average enrolment per upper primary school has declined from about 228 in 1950-51 to about 208 in 2000-01. Further the pupil-teacher ratio in the country has sizably increased at primary level from 35.69 in 1950-51 to 60 in 2000-01. But at upper primary level the pupil-teacher ratio has slightly declined from 36.26 in 1950-51 to 32.26 in 2000-01.

The performance of education system in terms of progress made in the country during last half century is presented in the following tables.

Table 1.03
Progress of Elementary Education in India (Primary)

Item	Years		Increase (in % points)
	1950-51	2000-01	
Gross Enrolment Ratio	42.6	95.7	53.1
% of Girls Enrolment	28.1	43.7	15.6
% of Female Teachers	15.3	35.6	20.3
Retention Rates	35.1 (60-61)	59.3	24.2

Source : Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Secondary and Higher Education. 'Selected Educational Statistics 2000-2001' New Delhi, 2002.

Table 1.04**Progress of Elementary Education in India (Upper Primary)**

Item	Years		Increase (in % Points)
	1950-51	2000-01	
Gross Enrolment Ratio	12.7	58.6	45.9
% of Girls Enrolment	16.1	40.9	24.8
% of Female Teachers	15.1	36.1	21.0
Retention Rates (Elementary)	21.7 (60-61)	46.3	24.6

Source : Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Secondary and Higher Education. 'Selected Educational Statistics 2000-2001' New Delhi, 2002.

The figures presented in the above two tables (Table 1.03 and 1.04) show that as far as participation of children is concerned the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) at primary level has increased from 42.6 per cent in 1950-51 to 95.7 percent in 2000-01 which shows an increase of 53.1 percent points. However, at upper primary level the GER has increased from 12.7 per cent in 1950-51 to 58.6 percent in 2000-01, which is an increase of 45.9 per cent points.

The participation of girls in primary and upper primary education presented in tables reveals that in 1950-51 of the total enrolment at primary level only 28.1 per cent were girls which has increased to 43.7 per cent in 2000-01. Similarly, at upper primary level girls enrolment has increased from 16.1 per cent in 1950-51 to 40.9 per cent in 2000-01. Thus substantial progress is made in this regard but still the participation of girls in primary and upper primary education is not at par with boys and so it is clear that gender disparities are still persisting.

Though, impressive progress has been made on enrolment but retention of children in the schools is still serious challenge. The tables show that in 40 years i.e. from 1960-61 to 2000-01, the retention at primary level has increased

from 35.1 per cent to 59.3 per cent whereas at elementary level it has increased from 21.7 per cent 46.3 per cent during the same period. It virtually shows that out of 100 children taking admission in grade I, only 59 reach grade V and hardly 46 reach grade VIII.

As far as the achievement levels of children at primary and upper primary level of is concerned no authentic data is available in the country. However, a general feeling is that the quality of education imparted in our schools at primary and upper primary level is poor in general and in the government schools in particular. This has been substantiated by the Bareline Assessment Studies conducted under DPEP as also the mid-term and term end assessment studies conducted under the same programme in many districts.

Despite the constitutional provision, national commitment, emphasis given by commissions/committees and National Policies and priority accorded by the plans, we have not yet been able to achieve the goal of UEE. Even the goal of universalisation of primary education (UPE) which is a first step towards achieving the goal of UEE still remains elusive in the country. The upper primary level of education cannot be provided to all children belonging to the relevant age group unless primary education is universalized. Therefore, from the very beginning of planned development in India, the emphasis has been placed on the faster progress of primary level of education.

Universalisation of primary or elementary education lays emphasis on three aspects, namely: (i) universal access and enrolment; (ii) universal retention of children in schools; and (iii) ensuring comparable levels of learning achievement among all children. The slow progress in enrolling children in primary schools and the continuing high rates of dropout make the prospects of expanding the base of upper primary education very limited.

An analysis of educational development in India reveals that different regions and groups in the country are at varying levels with respect to these three crucial elements of universalisation of primary education. Access provisions

are created in most of the habitations. As per the Sixth All India Educational Survey (NCERT, 1998) nearly 95 per cent of the rural habitations have primary schools within one-kilometer walking distance. The enrolment trends indicate that most of the children from majority of habitations are already enrolled in schools. However, the number of out of school children in certain areas and among certain categories of people continues to be quite high. In other words, access provisions are nearing universalisation and enrolment of children closely follow the provisions. However, non-enrolment in schools continues to be a major concern in backward areas and among the disadvantaged groups. In this sense, non-enrolment is a reflection of deprivation since most of the non-enrolled children belong to deprived regions and socially and economically deprived groups.

The dropout rates at the primary level of education has been declining. However, the rate of improvement in retention is rather low and hence even when large number of children are enrolled in schools, a substantial share of them dropout without completing the primary cycle. Issues related to retention are not confined to any particular locality. It is emerging as a more common problem than those pertaining to enrolment. Moreover, the recent surveys (NSSO: 1996) have shown that many children dropout due to school factors. In other words, improving school facilities and teaching-learning process may help reducing dropouts in many cases. Perhaps, the gains from reducing dropouts may be equally or even more rewarding than the gains from expanding access.

What happens to children who are retained in the system? Are they learning? What they are supposed to learn? Studies on learner achievement (Shukla, 1994, Varghese, 1996a, NCERT, 1998) have shown a consistent pattern of low levels of learner achievement at the primary stage in all the states. This shows that low levels of learning is a common feature and a major problem in primary education. The efforts from the mid 1980s have been to improve the learning conditions and teaching learning processes in primary schools. The public initiatives (Varghese, 1995) like the Operation Blackboard Scheme,

establishment of DIETs and introduction of programmes like Minimum Levels of Learning were initiatives to improve quality of primary schools in terms of provision of facilities, improving pedagogical skills of teachers and improving teaching-learning process to enhance levels of learner achievement.

Those who are left out of the system now are more deprived than those who are left out of the system twenty or thirty years ago. Identifying and bringing them to schools needs local specific strategies, which necessitates decentralization in decision-making. Decentralization of educational planning and management is an important reform measure initiated during the 1980s. It is widely accepted that district is the lowest viable unit for initiating decentralized planning in India. Therefore, the National Policy on Education 1986 and the subsequent Programme of Action emphasized on district level planning in education in India.

The programme of Action (NPE-1992) resolved under its para 7.4.6 . that “Further efforts would be made to develop district specific projects with specific activities, clearly defined responsibilities, definite time schedule and specific targets. Each district project will be prepared within the major strategy framework and will be tailored to the specific needs and possibilities in the district. Apart from effective UEE, the goal of each project will include the reduction of existing disparities in educational access, the provision of alternative systems of comparative standards to the disadvantaged groups, a substantial improvement in the quality of schooling facilities, obtaining a genuine community involvement in the running of schools, and building up local level capacity to ensure effective decentralization of educational planning. This is to say, the overall goal of the project would be reconstruction of primary education as a whole in selected districts instead of piecemeal implementation of schemes. An integrated approach is more likely to achieve synergies among different programme components.”

The Task Ahead

The goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education and even Primary Education still seems to be a distant dream, which is particularly true for educationally backward states. Substantial progress has been made to universalize access and enrolment but the real challenge is to reduce the dropout rates in many states and to improve the quality of education to satisfactory level is almost a universal problem all over the country. This is perhaps the reason that all projects and programmes launched in various states related to primary/elementary education have focused on improvement of quality in a big way. This is because in almost all states about 90 to 95 per cent of the total investment in primary education goes to salaries and there is hardly any scope for quality improvement. In case India has to fulfill the Constitutional Commitment of free and compulsory education to all children up to 14 years of age, the major task ahead is to reduce the dropout rates substantially, improve the quality of education and do away all types of disparities whether gender, social or spatial/regional.

The dream of Constitution makers that the country should provide free and compulsory education to all children up to 14 years of age within 10 years of the adoption of the Constitution (i.e. by 1960) is yet to be met. It is necessary to have greater focus on elementary education and more investment is to be made at this stage of education. This can perhaps be met when the commitment of investing 6 per cent of GNP on education is realized in India. This has also been highlighted by the Tapas Majumdar Committee which estimated that Rs. 1,20,000 crores will be needed to achieve the goal of UEE by 2010. Otherwise, the Committee was of the view that, if 6 per cent of GNP is given to education, resource will never be constraint towards universalisation of Elementary education.

In addition to the efforts made by the Central Government and all the state governments on regular basis many centrally sponsored schemes have been launched by Government of India in various states. Further some projects and

programmes related to the primary/elementary education have been launched in several states. These were programmes implemented in various districts with focus on district level planning. In this regard, it was envisaged in the National Policy on Education (1986) that District Boards of Education (DBEs) will be constituted in all the districts to co-ordinate educational planning activities. But unfortunately the DBEs could not be established in any of the states. Perhaps Total Literacy Campaigns (TLCs) were the first district-based programmes which were introduced in a decentralized mode. It may thus be appropriate to say that TLC was a significant step towards decentralizing decision-making process in the field of education. The next major programme which focused on district level planning was DPEP.

District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)

Although decentralization of educational planning was recognized as a necessary step towards improving primary education, the idea was not translated into an operational practice due to various reasons. Firstly, even when district level educational planning was emphasised, the resource decisions continued to be centralized at the state level leaving very little scope for the districts to fix their own targets and mobilize the necessary resources to achieve the targets. Secondly, there existed no organizational mechanism to facilitate district planning in education. The Chief educational functionary at the district level is the District Education Officer (DEO) who could get very little time to prepare and develop district level educational plans. In the absence of any organizational arrangements, like the DBE envisaged in the Programme of Action, the possibilities of decentralized planning at the district level seemed a distant dream. Thirdly, planning competencies were poorly developed at the district level. In other words, these three factors, namely, centralized resource decisions, absence of organizational arrangements and poorly developed planning competencies among educational functionaries at the district level acted as major constraints in promoting district planning as an operational practice in education (Varghese, 1996b).

The efforts under the DPEP were to overcome these constraints by improving the financial resource base at the district level and creating mechanisms and developing competencies to plan education at the district level. It was expected that each district covered under the DPEP will be developing district level plans which will be scrutinized and improved upon before they were finalized and funding support was provided.

This programme started in 1993-94 was based on the experiences gained in the country through the implementation of projects like Bihar Education Project, Lok Jumbish Project, the U.P. Basic Education Project, the Andhra Pradesh Primary Education Project, Shiksha Karmi Project, Mahila Samakhya Programme etc. The main thrust of the District Primary Education Programme is on district level planning, community participation and decentralized management, focus on education of girls and deprived sections of population and improving the effectiveness of education through training of teachers, improvement in learning materials and upgrading of infrastructural facilities.

The purpose of launching DPEP in selected districts of the country was to ensure that the goal of universalisation of primary education is achieved in the district within stipulated period of 5 to 7 years. More specifically the focus of the programme was on (i) reducing differences in enrolment, dropout and learning achievement among gender and social groups to less than 5 per cent; (ii) reducing overall primary level dropout rates for all students to less than 10 per cent; (iii) raising average achievement levels by at least 25 per cent over measured baseline levels and ensuring achievement of basic literacy and numeracy competencies and a minimum of 40 per cent achievement levels in all competencies by all primary school children, and (iv) providing, according to norms, access for all children to primary education classes (I-V) i.e. primary schooling wherever possible, or its equivalent non-formal centers. Therefore, enrolling all children and retaining most of them and ensuring quality education to all are the major concerns under DPEP.

The programme which was initiated with 42 districts in 7 states of the country in 1994 has ultimately covered more than 250 districts in 18 major states in its different phases. In order to implement the programme in the respective districts, district and sub-district level management structures were created. This study is an effort to analyse the linkage of these newly created structures managing DPEP with the existing mainstream educational administration at these levels. The study not only focuses on these horizontal linkages but also looks at the vertical linkages between these management structures operating in the DPEP districts.

The Present Study

In order to ensure proper implementation of District Primary Education Programme at the district level in most of the states District Project Offices were established which had full time responsibility for the programme. Further the District Institute of Education and Training (DIET) which was already in operation was also given the responsibility in DPEP towards the activities related to quality improvement. The District Project Office headed by a District Project Coordinator was a parallel structure to the already existing office of the District Education Officer i.e. DEO (Elementary).

At the block level Block Resource Centres have been established where as Cluster Resource Centres at Cluster level were established to ensure proper implementation of the DPEP at Block and Cluster levels respectively. The BRC is a parallel structure to the already existing office of the Block Education Officer. However, there was no existing management structure in any of the states at the cluster level.

The present study focuses on analyzing the linkages between the above mentioned management structures created under DPEP and structures already in existence in the states.

Objectives

More specifically the present study has the following objectives

- (i) To study role and functions of district and sub-district management structures created under DPEP.
- (ii) To analyze the vertical and horizontal linkages of district and sub-district management structures with other academic and administrative structures.
- (iii) To discuss the future role of district and sub-district level structures like BRC and CRC.

Coverage

The present study was conducted in two DPEP districts of two states. These districts are Malappuram in Kerala which was a DPEP Phase-I district and Gaya in Bihar which is a DPEP Phase-III district. Selected BRCs and CRCs from these two districts were taken for in depth study.

Methodology

The study is based on the data collected from the secondary sources as well as primary data collected from the field in the selected districts. Data pertaining to primary education was collected from secondary sources like Census Reports, Education Departments of Government of Kerala and Government of Bihar, MIS data from DPEP offices of Malappuram and Gaya, District Institutes of Education and Training, Malappuram and Gaya.

Apart from the data collected from the above-mentioned secondary sources, primary data were collected from the field. It was collected through

structured questionnaires, formal and informal interviews conducted on various officials at all the three levels namely district, block and cluster. The information gathered through these tools was pertaining to the roles and responsibilities as well as the functioning and activities undertaken as a part of implementation of DPEP at district and sub-district levels by various management structures.

At the district level information was collected from (i) DDE office in Malappuram in Kerala and DSE office in Gaya, Bihar; (ii) District Project Office DPEP in both districts; (iii) District Institutes of Education and Training, Malappuram and Gaya. Structured questionnaires were administered for all these offices and informal discussions were held with Deputy Director of Education, Malappuram, District Superintendent of Education Gaya, Principals of Malappuram and Gaya DIETs, District Project Coordinator of DPEP of these two districts and also with selected staff members of these offices.

At the Block level information was collected from (i) Asstt. Education Officer's office in 3 blocks of Malappuram and Block Education Extension Officer's office in 3 Blocks of Gaya district (ii) Selected Block Resource Centres in these two districts. Structured questionnaires were administered for AEO/BEEO offices and BRCs and informal discussions were held with AEO/BEEO and BRC Coordinator. Information related to functioning of Block Education office, roles responsibilities and activities undertaken by BRCs was gathered through these questionnaires.

At the Cluster level information were gathered from Cluster Resource Centres. Structured questionnaire were administered on CRCs which was responded by the CRC coordinator of the selected blocks of the two selected districts in Kerala and Bihar. Information regarding the activities of CRCs were collected through these questionnaires.

In order to undertake in depth study of management structures and their linkages, two DPEP districts from two different states were selected. One DPEP

Phase-I district named Malappuram was selected from Kerala, which is the educationally most advanced state in the country. The other selected district was DPEP Phase-III district named Gaya from Bihar, which is educationally the most backward state in the country. Thus, the in depth study includes districts belonging to the two states out of which one is educationally most advance and the other state is educationally most backward in the country.

For the study three blocks from each of the two selected were taken. These blocks were selected in such a way that it includes one educationally advanced, one educationally backward and one average block of the selected districts. The criteria used for knowing the educational development was the literacy rates for the year 2001.

The Malappuram district in Kerala has 15 blocks out of which 3 blocks were selected for the study. These are Areacode block, which is a tribal block with average literacy rate, Manjeri block having high literacy rate and Tanur block having low literacy rate. Out of these 3 blocks the CRCs covered are as follows. Out of total 14 CRCs in Area code block 08 CRCs were covered in the study. From Manjeri block where there are 17 CRCs the number of CRCs covered in the study is 05. Further, from Tanur block the study covers 07 CRCs out of the total 15 CRCs in the block. Thus, out of the total 46 CRCs in these 3 selected blocks the study covers as many as 20 CRCs. It may be mentioned here that the study planned to covers all CRCs of the 3 selected blocks but since many CRC coordinators had left CRCs to join back their respective schools as teacher because DPEP was coming to an end, the study could cover only 20 out of 46 CRCs.

The Gaya district of Bihar has total 24 blocks out of which 3 blocks were selected for the study, These are: Imamganj block which is educationally backward and is a naxalite effected areas, Tikari block which is educationally advance block and Wazirganj which is an average literacy block of the district. The CRCs covered under the study from these three selected blocks are as

follows. All 13 CRCs of Imamganj block, all 13 CRCs of Tikari block and 10 out of 12 CRCs of Wazirganj block. Thus out of the total 38 CRCs in these three blocks the study covers as many as 36 CRCs.

The sample and coverage of CRCs in the study is presented in the following table.

Table 1.05
Coverage of CRCs in Selected Block

Malappuram District (Kerala)			Gaya District (Bihar)		
Name of Block	Total CRCs	CRCs covered	Name of Block	Total CRCs	CRCs covered
Areacode	14	08	Imamganj	13	13
Manjeri	17	05	Tikari	13	13
Tanur	15	07	Wazirganj	12	10
Total	46	20	Total	38	36

The Report

The report of the present study contains 9 sections in all. These include the present section Introduction. This is followed by a section on Educational Administration in States. Third section is of Profile of the selected Districts followed by Fourth section on Profile of Blocks selected for the study. The fifth section is on Management Structures under DPEP. The Sixth section focuses on Horizontal Linkages between management structures followed by Seventh section on Vertical Linkages. The Section 8 presents the future prospects of DPEP management structures and finally the last and Ninth Section of this report is the conclusion.

Chapter 2

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN STATES

As far as educational administration in various states of the country is concerned there is no uniformity across states. Different states have their own administrative structure. However, in each state the education is administered by the Secretariat and Directorate. Depending upon the size of the state the state may have one or even more than one Secretary to manage education in the state. Similarly, smaller states have only one Director of Education looking after all the levels whereas in bigger states there can even be 5 to 7 Directors who may be managing various levels of education in the state. In such case there is a possibility of having Director Primary or Elementary or School Education who may be looking after the administration of primary education in the state. The pattern of educational administration in the two selected states and the districts is as given below.

At the state level DPEP is managed by State Implementation Society, which is, an autonomous body registered under the Societies Registration Act. The day-to-day management of the programme is looked after by State Project Office, which is established for this purpose only. The State project Office is headed by State Project Director who is generally an officer of the Indian Administrative Service Cadre. He is assisted by Programme Officers, Component Incharges in addition to several administrative and accounts staff. Thus in order to manage DPEP, the states have created a structure which is parallel to the Directorate of Education. It has generally been observed that the Directorate of Education has a very marginal role to play in implementation of DPEP and sometimes one finds that there is a lack of coordination between these two offices i.e. Directorate of Education and State Project Office.

Educational Administration in Bihar

Till early 1950s in Bihar the Director of Public Instructions held overall charge of all the educational institutions. The DPI also used to act as the Principal Educational Advisor to the State government. The field staff was responsible for the inspection of schools and development of education in the area. The officer on special duty was responsible for the administration of primary education. However, at the district level, primary education was the sole responsibility of the district boards, assisted by the inspecting staff of the Education Department. The government decided to take over the control and administration of elementary schools (Primary and Middle) in the year 1954.

Till 1970, the Additional Director of Public Instruction was the head of the Directorate held the charge of elementary education. In 1971, the powers and functions of the DPI underwent tremendous changes. Posts of Director (Secondary Education), Director (Primary Education) and Director (Higher Education) was created by keeping in abeyance the post of DPI. However, in 1974, the Directorate of Primary Education and Secondary Education was merged into one directorate namely Directorate of School Education.

The administrative set up Education Department at the Secretariat level in Bihar is headed by Commissioner and Secretary who is the executive head of the Secondary, Primary and Mass Education Department. He is assisted by a Special Secretary, Additional Secretary and Joint Secretaries.

At the Directorate level the Director of Primary Education looks after the entire work relating to primary education and controls the finances of the department and the service conditions of persons connected with teaching and inspection of schools. He is also responsible for sanctioning the construction of school buildings and purchase of teaching aids and equipments. The Deputy Directors of Primary Education assist the Director in discharging these functions.

At the district level the District Superintendent of Education (DSE) looks after primary education. Earlier the DSE was under the control of the district Education Officer (DEO) who is head of the educational administration in the district in respect of secondary education. However, after the nationalization of elementary and secondary schools, these two officers namely DEO and DSE have been placed with independent charges of secondary and elementary education respectively.

Below the district level for primary education the officer below the DSE is Area Education Officer (AEO) who holds the charge of two or three educational blocks. Further, below the Area Education Officer there are Block Education Extension Officers (BEEO) who are at the lowest rung of the ladder in the hierarchy of officers for primary education.

The size of administrative machinery is fixed according to the workload at different levels although no systematic assessment of the workload has been undertaken in the recent past. However, certain norms were provided in fixing the size of the administrative set up. One post of an Additional BEEO was created when the number of primary schools was more than 60. Till sometimes back one Deputy Inspector of Schools (DIS) was considered necessary for every 40 middle schools. But at present the post of DIS has been abolished. Instead the post of Area Education Officer has been created for every two or three educational blocks in the state.

As mentioned above the District Superintendent of Education is key officer at the district level who is responsible for development and management of primary education. In Gaya district, where the present study was conducted, there is quite a strong District Superintendent of Education office in terms of staff. The office has as many as 51-sanctioned positions which includes the D.S.E., 3 Deputy D.S.Es, 34 Assistant Clerks, One Stenographer, one driver and two peons. It is heartening to note that out of 51 sanctioned positions as many as 49 positions are filled. Only 2 posts of Deputy Superintendent of Education are

vacant. However, as discussed by a key official the Gaya DSE office lacks basic infrastructure. There is only one vehicle in the office, which is not enough to supervise and monitor the schools in such a big district like Gaya.

The block level educational administration to look after primary education is headed by the Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO). But in Bihar in general and the blocks in Gaya district in particular and specifically in the 3 blocks where study was conducted it was found that BEEO office is very weak . The BEEO office has staff of only 2 persons, which includes the BEEO himself/herself and a peon. This is the reason that BEEO is always overburdened with file work and that is why it was found that BEEO deputes one or two teachers in his office for undertaking the routine clerical work which is only an informal arrangement. It was also told during the visit to the blocks that one post of clerk is sanctioned in the BEEO office but that staff member has been taken by Block Development Officer for assistance in his/her office. There is a general perception in all blocks of Gaya that there is not only a lack of staff in BEEO office even there is no building available for BEEO office. The work of inspection and supervision of primary school suffers, as the mobility of BEEO is limited because of non-availability of a vehicle.

Educational Administration in Kerala

Like other states, in Kerala also administration of education is the responsibility of Secretariat and Directorate of Education. At the secretariat level a Secretary is incharge of department of general (school) education. The secretariat is generally responsible for policy issues and is headed by the Secretary who is assisted by Additional Secretary, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries. There are about 18 sections in the Department of Education, which have Section Officers and dealing assistants. All important policy matters are scrutinized by the Secretary before final decisions are taken.

The Directorate of Public Instructions looks after the affairs of School Education in Kerala. It is headed by the Director who is assisted by Additional Director, Senior Administrative Officer and Finance Officer. Joint Directors, Deputy Directors and Assistant Directors also assist the Director with regard to various responsibilities. The Directorate of Public Instruction in Kerala has a staff strength of more than 300 people.

Kerala has a State Education Advisory Board, which was set up in 1958 to advise the government on matters pertaining to educational policy and the administration of the department of education. The board has several members, which also includes non-official members and a Chairman, who is Minister of Education. The appointment of non-officials is made from amongst persons who are eminent educationists or who have rendered distinguished services to education or who have had an outstanding experience in administration of education.

At the district level educational administration, a Deputy Director of Education (DDE) is in charge of each revenue district. On the administration and management he is assisted by an administrative assistant and on accounts, audit and budgeting he is assisted by an accounts officer. However, there is no technical staff available to assist the deputy director on academic matters. No norm seems to have been prescribed for fixing the staff strength of the office of Deputy Director of Education or even district education officer.

Each district in Kerala has a District Council which has been established to introduce decentralization in the administrative system. Every district council consists of elected members whose numbers vary between 20 to 40 depending upon the population of the district. Educational functions of the district council are: (i) management of government pre-primary, primary, basic and secondary schools exercising powers prescribed in the Kerala Education Rules; (ii) Educational extension work in the district involving promotion of non-formal education, adult education, science and technology and prevention of dropouts in

schools ; (iii) Promotion of library movement in the district and (iv) Distribution of scholarships to students under various schemes of the state government.

The administration of education in Malappuram district is also looked after by a Deputy Director of Education. However, Malappuram being a big district has two posts of deputy directors, out of which one is designated as DDE (General) and the other as DDE (Quality Improvement). The DDE office Malappuram has a staff having strength of total 100 positions. This includes one Administrative Officer, two Accounts Officers, two Senior Superintendents, 12 Superintendents, as many as 66 clerks, 6 typists and 9 Grade-IV employees. Out of these 100 positions sanctioned in Malappuram only 3 positions are vacant and 97 persons are in place. These vacant positions include one Accounts Officer, one clerk and one Grade-IV employee. Despite the huge staff the DDE is facing several problems. These are lack of computerization facilities, lack of vehicles and hardly any facility of training/orientation of the staff of DDE office in academic and administration matters.

At the sub-district level an Assistant Education Officer (AEO) is the head of block level education office. The AEO is generally assisted by a junior superintendent and supporting staff in all administrative, academic and accounts matters. In Malappuram district all the three blocks covered in the study reported to have a staff strength of 11 persons. This includes apart from AEO, Senior Superintendent, Typist, 6 Clerks, a peon and a full time menial staff. So unlike the BEEO office in Gaya district Bihar, in Kerala the AEO office has good staff strength. Despite this, one AEO out of the three interviewed for the study complained that the office has a problem of lack of sufficient staff, AEO is overburdened with administrative work and the number of schools to be supervised by AEO are quite large

Chapter 3

PROFILE OF THE DISTRICTS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

The present study covers two DPEP states namely Kerala and Bihar which are incidentally the most advance and most backwards states of the country as far as educational development is concerned. In Kerala, DPEP was launched in 3 districts in its first phase and the present study covers one of these 3 districts named as Malappuram. Though, Bihar has been taken under DPEP in its third phase but prior to DPEP some selected districts of Bihar were covered under Bihar Education Project. However, this study is conducted in a district which was not part of Bihar Education Project. The district known as Gaya is covered under DPEP only in its third phase.

Despite the fact that the two districts are selected from two states which are at extremes of educational development the district selected from Kerala (i.e Malappuram) is educationally backward from Kerala standards and the district selected from Bihar (i.e. Gaya) is advance from Bihar standard. It may therefore be noted that the present study covers a backward district of an educationally advance state and an advance district of an educationally backward state. In spite of this Malappuram (a backward district of Kerala) is far ahead from Gaya (an advance district of Bihar) on almost all parameters of education. Since in depth study of district and sub-district management structures have been undertaken in these two districts, a profile of these districts is presented below.

MALAPPURAM DISTRICT

The district was formed in 1969 by merging the under developed regions of erstwhile Palakkad and Kozhikode districts. The district stretches from Arabian sea shore to the high hills in the Western Ghats. The district derived its name from its head quarter Malappuram which literally means a terraced place over the hills. With its scenic coastal line in the West and hilly tribal belt in the east,

Malappuram has been a typically backward district in Kerala for a long time. However, the situation was changed in several quarters of life due to intervention of joint effort of educational and other social welfare programmes implemented in the district. But, still certain pockets in the district such as coastal and tribal areas exhibit very poor living condition due to various reasons.

Malappuram is the most populous district in Kerala. Administratively the district is divided into 15 sub-divisions (i.e. blocks), 5 urban areas, 225 clusters and 101 Gram Panchayats. Demographically, Malappuram district comprises of about 11.65 per cent of the state's population according to 1991 census. The detailed demographic profile of the district is presented in the following table.

Table 3.01
Demographic Profiles of Malappuram (2001 Census)

Item	Total Population	Rural		Urban	
		Population	% to Total	Population	% to Total
Total Population					
Male	1759479	1586791	90.19	172688	9.81
Female	1870161	1686866	90.20	183295	9.80
Total	3629640	3273657	90.19	355983	9.81
S.C. Population					
Male	147798	137022	92.71	10776	7.29
Female	151943	141038	92.82	10905	7.18
Total	299741	278060	92.76	21681	8.24
S.T. Population					
Male	6111	6086	99.59	25	0.41
Female	6262	6238	99.62	24	0.38
Total	12372	12324	99.61	49	0.39

Source : Census of India (2001)

As is evident from the above table the total population of the district in 2001 was 3629640 out of which male population was 1759479 and female population was 1870161, which shows sex ratio of 1063 females per 1000 males. The percentage of rural population was 90.19 and only 9.81 percent population was urban based. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes represent 8.39 per cent and 0.34 per cent respectively of the total population of the district.

The growth rate of population during 1991-2001 decade was as high as 17.22 percent, which was highest among the 14 districts of Kerala and was far more than the decadal growth rate of population in the state which was 9.42 per cent only. The total area of the district is 3550 sq. kms. and the density of population in 2001 in the district was 1022 persons per sq. km.

As per 2001 census the literacy rate of Malappuram district was 88.61 per cent. The male literacy was 91.46 per cent and the female literacy was 85.96 per cent. It may be noted that the literacy rate of the district i.e. 88.61 per cent is less than the literacy rate of the state Kerala where it was 90.92 per cent. Similarly, both male and female literacy in the district is lower than the male and female literacy of Kerala which was 94.20 and 87.86 per cent respectively.

Educational Scenario in the District

Though the study is related to the primary education only as it concentrates on DPEP, the school education scenario of the district is presented here. This includes the total number of schools functioning in the district. The following table presents the total number of schools in Malappuram district in the year 2001-02.

Table 3.02
Number of Schools in Malappuram District (2001-02)

Level of Schools	Number of Schools			
	Government	Aided	Private Unaided	Total
High Schools	82	80	30	192
Upper Primary Schools	112	225	14	351
Lower Primary Schools	346	479	08	833
Special Schools	0	04	08	12
Pre-Primary Schools	2361	43	46	2450
Total Schools	2901	831	108	3838

Source : SSA Malappuram Perspective Plan 2001-2011, DPEP Malappuram, Kerala, 2002.

The above table shows that there are 833 lower primary schools out of which the private schools are in majority. However, the number of private unaided lower primary schools is only 8. Similarly, out of total 351 upper primary schools, there are only 112 (i.e. about one third of the total) government schools and about two third schools are private though again private unaided schools are only 14. It is interesting to note that the government is running as many as 2361 pre-primary schools. This includes Anganwadis run by Social Welfare Department and Pre-Primary schools attached to primary schools. Further, there are 270 unrecognized nursery schools run by private agencies.

The following table presents the teacher's profile of Malappuram district in year 2001-2002.

Table 3.03
Teachers Profile of Malappuram district (2001-02)

Level of Education	Posts sanctioned	Posts filled	Vacancies	Trained	Untrained
Lower Primary	9896	9826	70	9085	741
Upper Primary	7941	7861	80	5758	2102
Total	18837	17687	150	14843	2843

Source : SSA Malappuram Perspective Plan 2001-2011, DPEP Malappuram, Kerala, 2002.

The teachers profile presented in the above table shows that at lower primary level percentage of trained teachers is 91.50 percent while rest 8.50 per cent are untrained teachers. However, at upper primary level the percentage of trained teachers (78.79 per cent) is comparatively quite low and a sizable teachers percentage belong to the category of untrained.

The sex-wise data of teachers reveal that at lower primary level out of 9826 teachers the number of female teachers is 6387 which is 64 per cent of total teachers. However, at upper primary level out of total 7861 teachers the number of female teachers is 4196 which is 53 percent of total teachers. It shows that the proportion of female teachers is quite high at lower primary level as compared to that of upper primary level.

The following table presents grade-wise enrolment of students at primary and upper primary level in Malappuram in year 2001-02.

Table 3.04
Grade-wise Enrolment in Malappuram district (2001-02)

Grade	Enrolment			Percentage of S.C. Enrolment	Percentage of S.T. Enrolment
	Boys	Girls	Total		
Grade I	36350	35487	71837	7.88	0.38
II	37817	35804	73621	7.41	0.28
III	38671	36437	75108	7.43	0.33
IV	39830	37907	77737	7.16	0.35
V	41596	37804	79400	7.29	0.35
VI	44215	40508	84723	7.74	0.31
VII	45975	42567	88542	7.54	0.27
VIII	46400	40845	87245	7.39	0.20
Total (I-VIII)	330854	307359	638213	7.51	0.31
Total (I-IV)	152668	145635	298303	7.46	0.34
Total (V-VII)	131786	120679	252665	7.61	0.31

Source: SSA Malappuram Perspective Plan 2001-2011, DPEP Malappuram, Kerala, 2002.

The grade-wise enrolment presented in the above table shows that the participation of girls at lower and upper primary level is less than the boys. At lower primary level (which is grade I-IV in Kerala) the percentage of girls in the total enrolment is 48.82. Similarly, at upper primary level (i.e. grades V-VII) the percentage of girls in the total enrolment is 47.76. If the total enrolment in grade I-VIII (i.e. elementary education as per national pattern) is taken into account the girls constitute only 48.16 per cent of the total enrolment. Thus gender disparity in enrolment is shown. One may have also to keep in view that sex ratio in Kerala as well as Malappuram is in favour of females and females constitute about 51.5 per cent of the total population in Malappuram.

The table also reveals that the participation of scheduled Castes at lower primary and upper primary level is comparatively low. As against their population

(8.33 per cent) in the district their share in enrolment is only 7.46 per cent in lower primary and 7.61 per cent at upper primary level. The situation is more or less the same in all grades. We can infer that for participation in primary and upper primary level Malappuram data shows both gender as well as social disparities in education.

On the basis of the data presented about the number of teachers at lower primary level and upper primary in Table 3.03 and the Enrolment data presented in Table 3.04 we can infer that the teacher pupil ratio at lower primary level in Malappuram is 1:30 and at upper primary it is 1:32. This shows that sufficient number of teachers are available both at primary and upper primary levels.

The Household survey conducted in the Malappuram district in 2001 for developing District Elementary Education Plan under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan revealed that total out of school children in Malappuram was 2789 out of which 1808 children were never enrolled while rest 1981 children are drop outs. Out of these 2789 children, a little over one third are out of school due to their physical disabilities. It clearly shows that total out of school children in Malappuram was even less than 1 per cent of the child population.

The following table shows the grade-wise Net Enrolment Ratio at lower and upper primary classes in Malappuram during 2000-01

Table 3.05
Grade-wise Net Enrolment Ratio in Malappuram (2000-01)

Grade	General		Scheduled Caste		Scheduled Tribes	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
I	99.12	99.03	97.03	98.97	99.91	99.53
II	99.41	99.41	98.20	98.80	94.30	86.30
III	99.32	99.33	99.01	98.70	99.20	99.40
IV	99.56	99.21	99.00	99.31	99.43	99.47
V	99.90	98.70	99.10	99.21	99.02	99.51
VI	99.44	98.93	92.51	99.40	98.94	86.23
VII	99.35	98.81	99.30	98.97	73.61	99.30
VIII	99.02	97.30	97.20	84.32	69.21	50.23

Source : SSA Malappuram Perspective Plan 2001-2011, DPEP Malappuram, Kerala, 2002.

The data presented in the above table shows that enrolment at primary and upper primary grades in Malappuram is near universal. However in the grade VIII which is a part of secondary education in Kerala enrolment ratio for Scheduled caste girls and for Scheduled Tribes boys and girls is quite low.

The problem related to primary education in Malappuram is with respect to facilities. The SSA perspectives plan for Malappuram developed in 2002 shows that facilities such as classrooms, furniture, urinals etc. of the private aided schools are to be provided by their management and these schools do have these facilities. However, most of the government schools do not possess the essential facilities such as sufficient number of classrooms, toilets, urinals etc. Many schools are working in semi-permanent buildings or thatched sheds whereas many schools are working in rented buildings. There are some schools which do not have sufficient land for construction of classrooms.

Despite DPEP being implemented for 7 years the SSA Perspective plan for Elementary Education submitted in 2002 puts requirements for physical facilities in the Government lower primary and upper primary schools in Malappuram district. The requirement estimated in the plan document is to the tune of 2075 additional classrooms, 221 school buildings for replacing rented buildings, 296 school buildings for replacing thatched buildings. Requirement of partition wall in 1318 schools, compound wall in 236 schools, toilets in 108 schools, girls toilet in 226 schools, drinking water in 47 schools, major repair of building in 461 schools and minor repairs in 1194 school buildings has been identified in Malappuram district in 2002.

GAYA DISTRICT

Gaya is a very important pilgrim center both for Hindus as well as Buddhists. Being a city of temples lakhs of pilgrims come from every nook and corner of the country and even from abroad to offer Tarpan and Pinda to their ancestors. The geographical area of the old district of Gaya have come to be known as Magadh division. Bodh-Gaya town which is a part of Gaya district has one of the most important temples of India where a tree of Pipal still exists under which Lord Buddha attend Gyan about 2500 years ago. Being one of the holiest places for Buddhists it is a popular international tourist center.

Administratively Gaya is divided into 4 sub-divisions comprising of total 24 development blocks and 4 urban areas. There are 2926 revenue villages in the district out of which 2896 are inhabited and 30 uninhabited villages. There are 333 Panchayats in the district having 4596 wards. There are 4501 habitations in Gaya district.

Demographically Gaya is one of the biggest districts in Bihar. The following table shows the demographic structure of Gaya district according to 2001 Census.

Table 3.06
Population of Gaya district (2001)

	Male	Female	Total	% of SC Population	% of ST population
Rural	1536340	1453602	2989942	31.90	0.19
Urban	252891	222150	475041	19.97	0.14
Total	1789231	1675752	3464983	30.26	0.18

Source : Census of India 2001

It is clear from the above table the total population of Gaya district in 2001 was 3464983 out of which 1789231 were males and 1675752 females. This shows that the sex ratio in the district was 937 females per 1000 male population. The density of population in Gaya was 696 persons per sq. km whereas the decadal growth rate of population during 1991-2001 decade was 23.94 per cent in the district. The urban population was only 13.71 per cent in the district whereas the Scheduled Castes constitute about 30.26 percent of the district population. The Scheduled Tribes population is almost negligible (0.18 per cent only).

Literacy Scenario

The following table shows the literacy figures for Gaya district in 2001.

Table3.07
Literacy Rates in Gaya district (2001 Census)

Area	Total	Male	Female
Rural	46.08	60.13	32.42
Urban	77.05	84.79	68.15
Total	51.07	63.81	37.40

Source : Census of India 2001

The table shows that the total literacy rate in Gaya district was 51.07 per cent which is better than the literacy rate of Bihar (47.53 per cent). The male literacy was 63.81 per cent in Gaya which is about 3 per cent points more than that of Bihar (60.32 per cent). However, the female literacy rate in the district (37.40 per cent) is about 4 per cent points more than the female literacy rate of Bihar (33.57 per cent). The district exhibits both gender and spatial disparities in literacy to a great extent. The gap between male and female literacy is about 26 percent points while difference between rural and urban literacy is about 31 per cent points.

District Educational Profile

In Gaya district, as in any other district of Bihar, primary education is managed by District Superintendent of Education (DSE) who is assisted by 4 Area Education Officers (AEOs) and 24 Block Education Extension Officers (BEEOs). The district has 12 Block Resource Centres (BRCs) and 148 Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs), which have been established under DPEP.

A glance at the education scenario reveals that Gaya is comparatively backward in education as well as in other developmental aspects. As per the DISE data of Gaya district in year 2001-02 there were 2594 primary and upper primary schools in the district. This includes 2184 exclusive primary schools, 302 primary with upper primary schools, 3 primary and upper primary with secondary/higher secondary schools, 5 exclusive upper primary schools and 100 upper primary with secondary/higher secondary schools. The following table presents the number of schools by category in Gaya district.

Table 3.08
Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya district
by Category (2001-02)

School Category	Total Schools	Total Classrooms	Total Sections
Primary only	2184	4114	11600
Primary with Upper Primary	302	1418	2105
Primary & Upper Primary with Sec/H.S.	3	11	24
Upper Primary only	5	23	21
Upper Primary with Sec/H.S.	100	636	120
Total	2594	6202	13870

Source : DISE 2001 (Gaya District)

The data presented in the above table shows that there are total 2489 primary schools/sections whereas there are 410 upper primary schools/sections in the district. Further, on an average there are about 2.4 classrooms per school if we put all schools and classrooms together. However, for exclusive primary schools the average number of classrooms per school is even less than 2 which shows the dearth of availability of classrooms in the schools.

The following table presents primary and upper primary schools in Gaya district by management and by rural urban location.

Table 3.09
Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya district by Management
and by Location (2001-02)

Schools by Management/Location	Total Schools	Total Classrooms	Total Sections
Department of Education	2588	6167	13837
Tribal/Social Welfare Deptt.	4	19	20
Private aided	2	16	13
Total	2594	6202	13870
Schools in Rural areas	2403	5701	12881
Schools in Urban areas	191	501	989
Total	2594	6202	13870

Source : DISE 2001 (Gaya District)

It is clear from the above table that the primary and upper education is the exclusive responsibility of Education Department. As far as the availability of classrooms per schools is concerned in the schools run by Tribal/Social Welfare department, the average number of classrooms per school is about 5 and the same for private aided schools is 8 whereas for Government schools the average classrooms per school is about 2.4. This clearly shows the lack of sufficient classrooms in the Government schools.

In total 2594 primary and upper primary schools in Gaya there are 5089 teachers in position. However, the total sanctioned posts of teachers is 6693 which means only 76 per cent posts of teachers are filled up while about one-fourth of the total sanctioned posts of teachers are vacant. The following table presents the teachers by category.

Table 3.10
Teachers in Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya (2001-02)

Category	Total Teachers in Position	Female Teachers		S.C. Teachers	
		Number	%	Number	%
Primary	3434	663	19.30	597	17.40
Upper Primary	1655	491	29.63	225	13.60
Total	5089	1154	22.67	822	16.15

Source : DISE 2001 (Gaya District)

It is clear from the table that at primary level the percentage of female teachers is only 19.30 per cent, which shows that female teachers are even less than one-fifth of the total teachers. However, representation of females is better at upper primary level where there are about 30 per cent female teachers. Over all at elementary level percentage of female teachers is only 22.67. Similarly, the percentage of teachers belonging to Scheduled Castes category is only 17.4 per cent at primary and 13.6 per cent at upper primary level. These figures may be seen against the percentage of Scheduled Castes in the population of district which is 30.26 per cent. It is heartening to note that over-all about 87 per cent teachers are trained in primary and upper primary schools in Gaya. The over-all teacher pupil ratio at primary and upper primary level (combined) as per 2001-02 DISE data is 1:68 in Gaya. At primary level the teacher pupil ratio is as high as 1:78 while it is slightly better at upper primary level (1:55). This is perhaps because of so many vacant posts of teachers in the district.

Enrolment Scenario

The total enrolment in Gaya district in 2001-02 at primary level was 3,53,891 while the enrolment at upper primary level was only 59,426. The following table presents enrolment at primary and upper primary level in the district.

Table 3.11

Enrolment at Primary and Upper Primary level in Gaya (2001-02)

Level of Education	Enrolment			% of Girls in Enrolment	% of S.C. in Enrolment
	Boys	Girls	Total		
Primary (I-V)	198220	155671	353891	43.98	31.31
Upper Primary (VI-VII)	37107	22319	59426	37.55	15.56
Elementary (I-VIII)	235327	177990	413317	43.06	-

Source : DISE 2001 (Gaya District)

The total enrolment at elementary level in Gaya in 2001-02 was 4,13,317 out of which the girls constitute 43 per cent. However, the representation of girls at primary level is slightly better with about 44 per cent. At upper primary level girls share in enrolment is only 37.5 percent which means a little over one-third.

The table reveals that total enrolment at upper primary level is very less when compared to primary level. The average per grade enrolment at primary level is about 70,778 while the average per grade enrolment at upper primary level is as low as only 19808 in the district. This is a clear indication of having high dropout of children between primary and upper primary level. One of the reasons for this sharp decline in enrolment at upper primary level may be low accessibility of upper primary schooling facilities in the district.

If one looks at the pattern of enrolment of Scheduled Castes one finds that their enrolment at primary level is more or less at par with others. The representation of Scheduled Castes in primary enrolment is 31.31 per cent as against the population of SCs in the district which is 30.26. However, at upper primary level the representation of Scheduled Castes is very poor. Scheduled Caste children represent only 15.56 per cent in the total enrolment at upper primary level. It may be inferred that dropout between primary and upper primary level is higher among scheduled castes than other categories.

Some important points to be noted for primary level of education in Gaya district as revealed by the DISE-2001 data are as given below.

- About one third of the total primary schools in Gaya are single teacher schools.
- The Gross Enrolment Ratio at primary level was only 76.11 per cent which was 81.04 per cent for boys and 70.64 per cent for girls in the district.
- The dropout rate at primary level between years 1997-98 and 2001-02 was 49 per cent in the district. It was 50 percent for girls and 48.31 percent for boys.
- The data reveals that transition between primary and upper primary is about 67 percent in the district. The figure for boys was 70.62 percent whereas for girls it was only 61.77 percent.

The following table presents the availability of facilities in primary and upper primary schools in Gaya.

Table 3.12
Facilities in Primary and Upper Primary Schools in Gaya (2001-02)

Name of the Facility	Percentage of Schools Having	
	Primary	Upper Primary
Water	69.50	75.00
Electricity	00.20	05.00
Playground	22.00	35.00
Compound Wall	04.00	15.00
Toilet	05.00	29.00
Toilet for Girls	03.00	12.00
O.B. Kits	50.00	61.00

Source: DISE 2001 (Gaya District)

The above table reveals that about 30 percent primary and about 25 percent upper primary schools in Gaya district do not have drinking water facility. There are hardly a few primary schools which have electricity whereas only 5 percent upper primary schools have this facility. More than three-fourth of the primary schools and 65 percent upper primary schools do not have playground. Only 4 percent primary schools and 15 percent upper primary schools had compound wall. At primary level only 5 percent schools had toilet while only 3 percent schools have toilet for girls. The percentage of upper primary schools having toilets and separate toilets for girls were 29 percent and 12 percent respectively. About half of the primary schools and 61 percent upper primary schools had Operation Blackboard (OB) kits. Over all, the table shows that there is lack of basic facilities in the primary and upper primary schools in Gaya district.

Chapter 4

PROFILE OF THE BLOCKS COVERED

In order to study the sub-district management structures created under DPEP few blocks from the two selected districts were selected to have an in depth study of block and cluster level management structures. The study covers 3 blocks from each of the two selected districts. These three blocks are selected in such a way that it represents one educationally advanced, one educationally backward block and one average block of the district. Thus from Malappuram district of Kerala out of total 15 blocks, the three selected blocks are : Manjeri (advance), Areacode (average) and Tanur (backward). Similarly, from Gaya district of Bihar, out of total 24 blocks the three blocks selected are Tikari (advance), Wazirganj (average) and Imamganj (Backward). The profile of these 6 blocks under study is presented below.

Background

All the six blocks selected from the two districts are located at a reasonable distance from the district headquarter. The following table presents the area of blocks, distance of block from district headquarter, density of population and sex ratio of these blocks.

Table 4.01
Background Data of Selected Blocks (2001)

Items/Blocks	Gaya District (Bihar)			Malappuram (Kerala)		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Distance from District Headquarter (kms.)	62	24	25	30	25	30
Area (in sq. kms.)	264.17	232.29	267.75	235.09	243.19	118.78
Density of Population (Persons/sq. kms.)	573	904	670	799	920	2089
Sex Ratio (Female/1000 males)	952	938	936	1016	1000	1071

Source : District Statistics (2001)

All the blocks are at a distance of 25 to 30 kms. from the district headquarters except Imamganj block in Gaya which is 62 kms away from the district headquarter. The total area of the three blocks of Gaya ranges between 232 sq. kms. and 268 sq. kms. whereas the three Malappuram blocks have area between 118 sq. kms. to 244 sq. kms. Except Tanur block in Malappuram, which is area wise quite small, all other 5 selected blocks in the two districts have more or less average area ranging between 230 sq. kms. and 270 sq. kms.

The above table reveals that the density of population in the three selected blocks of Gaya is comparatively less than that of selected blocks of Malappuram. The three blocks of Gaya have the sex ratio more than that of district (936) as whole. However, out of the three blocks of Malappuram only Tanur (1071) has more sex ratio than the district (1063) while rest two blocks have lesser sex ratio than the district average. As far as density of population is concerned Tikari blocks (904) has quite higher density than the district average for Gaya (696) whereas in other two blocks it is less than the district average. In Malappuram district the density of population is very high in Tanur block (2089) whereas in Areacode (799) and Manjeri (920) the density of population is less as compared to that of district Malappuram (1022).

Demographic Profile

All the three blocks have sizable population that ranges between 151491 and 248171. The following table presents the demographic profile of the selected blocks.

Table 4.02
Demographic Profile of Selected Blocks (2001)

Population/ Block	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Male	77812	108331	95522	93195	111850	11989
Female	73879	101613	86562	94660	111890	128370
Total	151491	209944	179084	187855	223740	248171

Source : Census (2001)

The table reveals that the individual population of two blocks in Gaya is less than 2 lakh whereas Tikari block has more than 2 lakh population. However, in Malappuram only Areacode has population less than 2 lakh while in other two blocks the population is more than 2 lakh each but is below 2.5 lakh.

Literacy of the Blocks

The following table presents the literacy rate of the 6 selected blocks of the two districts.

Table 4.03
Literacy Rates in Selected Blocks (2001)

Literacy Rates/Block	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Male Literacy	51.85	71.56	63.72	-	95.0	95.5
Female Literacy	28.93	40.96	37.51	-	95.0	85.0
Total Literacy	40.73	56.76	51.09	87.0	95.0	90.0

Source : Census (2001)

The above table reveals that the literacy rates of the three selected blocks of Gaya district range from 40.73 percent (Imamganj) to 56.79 percent (Tikari). The literacy rate in Wazirganj more or less coincides with the literacy rate of Gaya district (51.07 percent). However, in Malappuram the Areacode block (87 percent) has lesser literacy rate than the district average (88.61 percent) whereas Manjeri has a very high literacy rate of 95 percent. The literacy rates of the six blocks presented above is evident that these blocks represent educationally backward, educationally advanced and average literacy, which was the criteria for selection of these blocks

Educational Profile

The following table presents the number of primary and upper schools, the number of teachers at primary and upper primary level in the 6 selected blocks of the 2 districts.

Table 4.04

Institutions, Teachers and Enrolment in Selected blocks (2001-02)

Items of Data/Block	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
INSTITUTIONS						
Primary/L.P.	132	199	165	81	79	64
Upper Primary	11	31	17	34	19	20
TEACHERS						
Primary/L.P.	147	274	195	672	738	622
Upper Primary	46	150	97	460	512	602

Source : EMIS Data (2001-02)

The above table reveals that the number of primary schools in the three blocks of Gaya are quite high as compared to that of Malappuram blocks. The reason probably is that Malappuram has bigger schools with high enrolment in each school whereas Gaya district blocks have schools having less enrolment i.e. smaller schools. However, the number of upper primary schools are comparatively more in the three blocks of Malappuram. It clearly shows that the accessibility of upper primary education is quite less in Gaya than in Malappuram. In fact in Malappuram blocks access is almost universal both for primary and upper primary schooling. The above table reveals that ratio of primary and upper primary schools in the three blocks of Gaya district is as high as 12:1 (Imamganj), 6.5:1 (Tikari) and 10:1 (Wazirganj). But for the three blocks of Malappuram the ratio is as low as 2.5:1 (Areacode), 4:1 (Manjeri) and 3:1 (Tanur).

The table reveals that despite the fact the number of primary schools is less in Malappuram blocks than in Gaya blocks, the number of teachers at

primary level in Malappuram blocks is very high as compared to Gaya block. Similar is the case at upper primary level. It is clearly evident that the blocks of Gaya district have lack of sufficient teachers. The reason being that sizable proportion of teacher's positions is vacant in Gaya district. The EMIS data shows that about one-third teachers posts were vacant in Tikari and Wazirganj blocks whereas in Imamganj block about one-fourth of the teachers positions were vacant.

At the upper primary level average number of teachers per school in the three blocks of Gaya, as evident from the above table, is about 4 in Imamganj, about 5 in Tikari and about 6 in Wazirganj block. However, the same figures in the three blocks of Malappuram shows the average number of teachers per upper primary school as 14 in Areacode, 27 in Manjeri and 30 in Tanur block. It shows that in Malappuram blocks enough number of teachers are available both at primary as well as upper primary level.

The following table presents the number of students studying at primary and upper primary level in the 6 selected blocks of the two districts. The data presented refers to the enrolment figures for the year 2001-02.

Table 4.05
Enrolment in the Selected Blocks (2001-02)

Enrolments/Blocks	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Primary Level						
Boys	7229	12740	10459	13397	10015	10076
Girls	5498	10091	8392	12567	10135	9816
Total	13227	22831	18851	25964	20150	19892
Upper Primary Level						
Boys	1644	3308	2540	7885	14690	10462
Girls	924	1868	1419	7428	14655	9984
Total	2568	5176	3959	15313	29345	20446

Source : EMIS Data (2001-02)

The enrolment data presented above reveals that there are gender disparities of high order in the three blocks of Gaya district whereas in the three blocks of Malappuram district the disparities are quite low. Further if we compare the enrolment of upper primary with primary level we find the enrolment at upper primary level in the three blocks of Gaya district is less than even one-fourth of the enrolment at primary level. However, in the three blocks of Malappuram district we find a different trend. In Areacode block the enrolment at upper primary is about 60 percent of primary, in Manjeri the enrolment at upper primary level is far more than the enrolment at primary level whereas in Tanur block the enrolment at upper primary level is slightly more than the enrolment at primary level. From the figures one can infer that in the Gaya district the transition between primary and upper primary is comparatively low and dropout may be of a high order while in the blocks of Malappuram this is not true in general.

The following table presents data on teacher related indicators of primary and upper primary education for the 6 selected blocks of the two districts namely Gaya and Malappuram in year 2001-02.

Table 4.06
Selected Teacher related Indicators in the Blocks (2001-02)

Item of Data/Blocks	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imanganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
% of Female Teachers						
Primary	16	17	14	56	81	57
Upper Primary	15	20	12	56	32	58
Pupil-Teacher Ratio						
Primary	78	66	76	39	45	35
Upper Primary	52	44	55	33	45	40
% of Trained Teachers at Primary & Upper Primary Level	94.3	92.4	87.6	100	100	98
% of Single Teacher Primary Schools	-	30.1	41.7	3	<1	5

Source : EMIS Data (2001-02)

As is evident from the data presented in the above table the three blocks of Gaya district have very low percentage of female teachers both at primary as well as upper primary level. However, it is lowest in Wazirganj as it is only 14 percent and 12 percent of the total teachers at primary and upper primary level respectively. In the three blocks of Malappuram district the percentage of females is more than 50 percent at primary level as well as at upper primary level except in Manjeri where female teachers at upper primary level is only 32 percent of total teachers. Surprisingly, in the same block the percentage of female teachers at primary level is as high as 81 percent.

The availability of teachers in the blocks is shown by the teacher pupil ratio presented above. In Gaya district the teacher pupil ratio at primary level in the three blocks is as high 1:66, 1:76 and 1:78 as against the prescribed norm of 1:40. Even at the upper primary level the teacher pupil ratio is more than 1:50 in Imamganj and Wazirganj though it is 1:44 in Tikari block. The situation is comparatively quite comfortable in the three blocks of Malappuram. However, in Manjeri block the teacher pupil ratio both at primary and upper primary level is 1:45, which is more than the prescribed norm of 1:40. In other two blocks i.e. Areacode and Tanur the pupil teacher ratio both at primary and upper primary level is less than 1:40.

As far the percentage of trained teachers is concerned the position is quite encouraging even in the three blocks of Gaya. In two out of three blocks namely Imamganj (94.3%) and Tikari (92.4%) the percentage of trained teachers at elementary level is more than 90 percent whereas in Wazirganj (87.6%), it is a little less than 90 percent. In the blocks of Malappuram almost all teachers at primary and upper primary level are trained. Further on single teacher primary schools the data available in two blocks of Gaya District shows 30.1 percent schools in Tikari and 41.7 percent schools in Wazirganj block. In Malappuram district the percentage of single teacher primary schools is about 3 percent in Areacode, 5 percent in Tanur and less than 1 percent in Manjeri block. It was

informed by the officials that all these single teacher schools are actually EGS type schools.

The following table presents the Gross Enrolment Ratio at primary level and transition rates from primary to upper primary level in the selected blocks of the two districts.

Table 4.07
Gross Enrolment Ratio and Transition Rate in Selected Blocks (2001-02)

Items/Blocks	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
GER (Primary)						
Boys	72.85	86.03	82.69	96.7	96	98
Girls	56.59	75.52	73.72	97.8	96	96
Total	65.08	81.04	78.44	97.2	96	97
Transition Rate (Primary to Upper Primary)						
Boys	82.77	80.52	72.31	-	95	98
Girls	83.77	74.11	56.31	-	94	96
Total	83.15	77.85	65.59	-	95	97

Source : BEEO/AEO office 2001-02

The above table reveals that the Gross Enrolment Ratio at primary level in the three blocks of Gaya district varies from 65.08 percent in Imamganj to 81.04 percent in Tikari. However, sharp gender disparities are evident in all the three blocks in GER. The gap between GER of boys and girls is as high as about 16.3 percent points in Imamganj, about 10.5 percent points in Tikari and about 9.0 percent points in Wazirganj block. The data on GER in these blocks reveal that substantial proportion of 6-11 years age group children is out of school as the NER in these blocks may be at least 5 to 10 percent points less than the GERs which means about 40 percent children of 6-11 age in Imamganj, about 25 percent in Tikari and about 30 percent children in Wazirganj may be out of school. As far as the three blocks of Malappuram is concerned the GER in all the three blocks is more than 95 percent and it is expected that percentage of out of

school children in 6-10 age group in these blocks may be even less than 10 percent. Further, the gender disparities in GER are also negligible in these blocks of Malappuram.

The data on transition rate shows that transition between primary and upper primary level in the three blocks of Gaya varies from 65.59 percent in Wazirganj to 83.15 percent in Imamganj. An important feature evident here is that there is hardly any gender disparity in transition rates in Imamganj whereas the gap between boys and girls transition rate is as high as 16.0 percent points in Wazirganj while it is about 6.4 percent points in Tikari. However, in the three blocks of Malappuram transition rates between primary and upper primary level is more than 95 percent.

Facilities in Schools

The table given in the next page (Table 4.08) presents the data on availability of facilities in primary and upper primary schools of the selected blocks of Gaya and Malappuram districts in 2001-02.

The data presented in the table 4.08 concerning facilities in schools show that in the three blocks of Gaya district good proportion of primary and upper primary schools do not have even basic facility of drinking water. In Imamganj, about 36 percent primary and about 9 percent upper primary schools do not have drinking water facility. The figures for Tikari are 34 percent and 29 percent for primary and upper primary schools whereas in Wazirganj about 27.5 percent primary and about 12 percent upper primary schools do not have drinking water facility. However, in Malappuram almost all primary and upper primary schools in Manjeri and Tanur have this facility but in Areacode block about 33 percent primary and 37 percent upper primary schools do not have drinking water facility.

Table 4.08
Facilities in Schools in Selected Blocks (2001-02)

Items (% of Schools having)	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Drinking Water						
Primary	63.36	66.03	72.44	67	100	100
Upper Primary	90.90	70.96	88.23	63	100	100
Electricity						
Primary	Nil	Nil	Nil	50	20	40
Upper Primary	Nil	Nil	5.88	59	35	80
Playground						
Primary	24.75	20.75	22.04	96	10	53
Upper Primary	36.36	32.25	47.05	93	20	60
Compound Wall						
Primary	Nil	3.14	3.14	33	18	23
Upper Primary	18.18	12.90	5.8	26	35	35
Toilet						
Primary	2.97	8.18	5.51	98.36	50	77
Upper Primary	27.27	35.48	29.41	97.73	80	90
Toilet for Girls						
Primary	Nil	7.54	1.57	93.5	50	4
Upper Primary	9.09	19.35	11.76	93.6	80	5

Source : BEEO/AEO office (2001-02)

It is disheartening to note that no primary and upper primary schools have electricity in Imamganj and Tikari block whereas in Wazirganj about 6 percent upper primary schools have electricity but no primary school has this facility. But in Malappuram district about 50 percent primary and 59 percent upper primary schools have electricity in Areacode block. The respective figures for Manjeri are 20 percent and 35 percent whereas in Tanur block 40 percent of primary and 80

percent of upper primary schools have electricity. Thus the situation in the 3 blocks of Malappuram is far better than the 3 blocks of Gaya district.

In Gaya district not even half of the primary or upper primary schools in the three blocks have playground. About one-fourth primary and about one-third upper primary schools in Imamganj have playground. In Tikari, the figures are about 21 percent for primary and 32 percent for upper primary schools. However, in Wazirganj though only 22 percent primary schools have playground but 47 percent upper primary schools have this facility. In Malappuram the situation is bad in Manjeri block where only 10 percent of primary and 20 percent of upper primary schools have playground. Position is better in Tanur where 53 percent primary and 60 percent upper primary schools have playground. But it is heartening to note that in Areacode block 96 percent primary and 93 percent upper primary schools have playground.

The compound walls in primary schools of the three blocks of Gaya district are not available even in 5 percent schools. But it is available in 18 percent upper primary schools in Imamganj, 13 percent in Tikari and about 6 percent in Wazirganj. In Malappuram, 33 percent primary and 26 percent upper primary schools have compound wall in Areacode, 18 percent primary schools and 35 percent upper primary schools in Manjeri and 23 percent primary schools and 35 percent upper primary schools in Tanur have compound wall.

In Gaya district not even 10 percent of the primary schools in the three blocks have toilets. It is available in about 3 percent schools in Imamganj, 8 percent schools in Tikari and 5.5 percent schools in Wazirganj. But the position is better in upper primary schools as 27.27 percent schools in Imamganj, 35.48 percent schools in Tikari and 29.41 percent schools in Wazirganj have toilet facility. In Malappuram almost all schools have the toilet facility in Areacode but in Manjeri only 50 percent primary and 80 percent upper primary schools and in Tanur 77 percent primary and 90 percent upper primary schools have toilets.

There are hardly any primary schools in Imamganj and Wazirganj blocks of Gaya district, which have facility of girls toilet but in Tikari block about 7.5 percent primary schools have this facility. However, at upper primary level about 9 percent schools in Imamganj, 19.35 percent schools in Tikari and 11.76 percent schools in Wazirganj have this facility. In Malappuram more than 90 percent primary and upper primary schools in Areacode blocks have girls toilet while in Manjeri block 50 primary schools and 80 percent upper primary schools have separate toilets for girls.

In general, it may be inferred that in the three blocks of Malappuram district the facilities in primary and upper primary schools are far better than those available in the schools of three blocks of Gaya district. So, the schools of Malappuram are comparatively better equipped with facilities than the schools of Gaya district.

Chapter 5

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES UNDER DPEP

The District Primary Education Programme was launched in its first phase in 42 districts of 7 states in 1994. These 42 districts include 3 districts of Kerala also and one of the three districts is Malappuram, which has been selected for the present study. In Bihar, the DPEP was launched in its third phase and 17 districts were covered where the DPEP implementation started in 1997. Gaya is one of these 17 districts that has been selected for the present study.

The structure created for the management of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) has been in addition to the educational administrative structure already working at various levels in the country right from national level down to the cluster or even village level with substantial autonomy, high degree of flexibility and above all, space for experiment with different methods and models. The programme is claimed to have worked towards institutionalization of an appropriate management culture across the primary education system in the country. The management structure of the Programme (DPEP) has several levels namely national level, state level, district level, block level, cluster level and village level which are discussed as follows.

National Level

The role of National Level Structure (NLS) of DPEP is in facilitation, capacity building, appraisal, co-ordination and overall direction of the programme. Till adequate capacity is built in states, it would also assist in planning and implementation. The NLS includes:-

- Mission General Council (GC) headed by the Union Minister of Human Resource Development, is the apex body which provides policy direction to

DPEP and reviews the progress. It also facilitates center – state co-ordination and promotes debate on issues with policy implications for primary education development. GC meets annually and is adequately represented by NGOs, educationists, public men and representatives of state and central government.

- Project Board (PB) headed by the Union Education Secretary is the empowered executive body with full financial and administrative powers to implement the Programme. It recommends to the Government policies on DPEP, considers Annual Work Plan, promotes convergence, approves norms and reviews DPEP quarterly. PB meets at least once every quarter.
- Joint Secretary of DPEP will be the Member Secretary of both GC and PB.
- DPEP Bureau in the Ministry is a dedicated cell to implement the programme. Much of the background work relating to policy, servicing of PB, release of finances to states, overall review of the programme is done by this Bureau. It also provides for appraisal, supervision, monitoring, research and evaluation, reimbursement, procurement and technical support. The Bureau is accountable to the General Council and the Project Board for implementation of the Programme.
- The Technical Support Group (TSG) of the Educational Consultants India Limited (Ed.CIL) provides professional and technical support. The National Resource Centres – National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) and Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), also provide support, apart from Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) and Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs).

State Level

At the state level, the programme is implemented in a mission mode through a registered autonomous society, which has two organs. General Council (GC) with Chief Minister as ex-officio president and Executive Committee (EC) headed by the Chief Secretary/Education Secretary of the State.

The project is implemented by the State Project Office (SPO) and the executive responsibility rests with the State Project Director (SPD) being the Member Secretary of the GC and EC. Government of India is represented in the GC and EC. As the plans are formulated and implemented with the association of the community, NGOs, teachers, universities, national apex institutions and educationists, they are given adequate representation and voice in management of the projects at all levels – state, district, block and village.

Management Structure of DPEP have many common features across the states. These include small staff size, linkages with the State Department of Education and other related departments and consultancies for accessing expertise in key functional areas. The state project management structure is supported by State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT), State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT), State Resource Groups (SRGs), Textbook Corporation and other Institutes.

District Level

District and sub-district level programme planning and management are carried out by the District Project Committee headed by the District Collector or the Chief Executive Officer of the Zila Parishad. The Committee reviews the progress of DPEP in the district and works towards widening the network of supportive agencies. The Committee has representation of NGOs, Panchayats, educational institutions, Village Education Committee and functional specialists

apart from government departments. Besides, there is a District Implementation Committee which functions as the executive body at the district level.

District Project Officer (DPO) headed usually by the District Primary Education Officer have been established as a separate structure in all the districts. Day to day implementation is managed by a full-time District Project Co-ordinator (DPC) assisted by Assistant Project Co-ordinators. Staff of the Department of Education posted in the district including supervisory officials and functional specialists work closely with the district DPEP units.

District Level Structure is also supported by District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), District Resource Groups (DRGs), NGOs and other Institutes.

Academic Support Institutions

The DPEP envisaged utilization of academic support Institutions at all level starting from the National level Institutions down to the District Level Institutions for planning and management of primary education. However, below the district level no academic support Institution existed prior to DPEP. These structures were created under DPEP at the block and cluster levels. The role and functions of these academic support Institutions in DPEP is presented below.

District Level Institution (DIET)

District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs), which provide academic and resource support to elementary education teachers and non-formal education instructors in districts, have been identified as the principal technical and professional resource institutions in DPEP districts.

Strengthening of DIETs has been attempted through provision of equipment, books etc. Equipment provided includes photocopiers, overhead

projectors, typewriters, duplicating machines etc. In most of the states library books have been provided to the DIETs by DPEP. The initial effort was to ensure adequate staffing in DIETs.

Most DIETs have taken up the following activities under DPEP:-

- In-service teacher training
- Academic monitoring and supervision
- Action Research, TLM preparation etc.
- Facilitating implementation of activities under other functional areas.

Key DIET faculty members have been identified and involved with the programme in most states. They have contributed significantly to the programme. The SCERT, DIETs and the resource groups have been contributing in the areas of developing training packages and materials for training, curriculum and textbook development, supervision and provision of academic inputs to the BRCs and CRCs. District Resource Groups (DRGs), wherever they are functional, are helping BRCs and CRCs in the regular academic support to teachers.

To supplement the efforts of SCERTs and DIETs, state and district level resource groups have been constituted comprising representatives from the State Departments of Education, SCERT, SIE, DIET, Universities, Colleges (including B.Ed Colleges), NGOs, SPO, DPO, BRC, CRC, etc. The State Resource Groups (SRGs) have often included 'good' primary school teachers who undergo an intensive selection process. The presence of persons with experience of working in primary schools has helped in the development of training programmes that have participatory and experiential training methodologies and content that is more relevant to the school situation.

Sub-District level Institutions

In line with the understanding of teacher development as a continuing process with the requirement of regular academic support, sub-district structures

at block and cluster levels have been created under DPEP. These structures are known as Block Resource Centre (BRC) and Cluster Resource Centre (CRC). The CRC has been created for a group of 8 to 10 villages and BRC for a group of 8 to 10 clusters. These academic support Institutions have been created under DPEP to provide on-site support to teachers in terms of school visits, demonstration and feedback, teacher training, material preparation, discussion of specific problems in monthly meetings etc.

Block Resource Centres (BRCs)

The role of Block Resource Centres pertains to the academic support, planning, organising, coordinating and administration of academic activities as well as in monitoring and follow-up of the programme (DPEP). These roles of BRC are discussed below.

Academic Role – BRC is to be built in to a resource center where books, discussion papers etc. are available. It has also to conduct in-service training for teachers and for even other educational personnel. It is also expected to guide the schools in developing teaching learning material. The BRC has the responsibility of visiting the schools and conduct monthly meeting to get feedback from schools and share its observations with teachers.

Planning, Coordination and Administration Role - The BRC has a role in planning and organising training programmes, workshops, review meetings, monthly meeting at BRC. It has also to collaborate and coordinate with Block level Education office on the one hand and with the DIET on the other. BRC has a role in preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget and in preparation of the training calendar. It has the responsibility of financial disbursement, providing support to activities undertaken at CRC level. BRC has an important role in setting up CRCs and Alternative Schooling Centres as also to coordinate with ECCE Centers. The environment building activities in the block are supposed to

be coordinated by BRC which has also to have upward linkage to coordinate with District Project Office (DPO).

Role in Monitoring and Follow-up – The BRCs have to monitor the activities of CRCs, they have to collect report of various meeting and submit them to DPO. They also have to take feedback from teachers through school visits, have to attend review meeting at district level and also to supervise the civil works undertaken in the block with respect to DPEP.

BRCs are headed by co-ordinators who are normally secondary school teachers with experience in primary education. BRCs may also have resource persons, trainers, teacher educators, subject experts and academic co-ordinators. But this arrangement varies from state to state.

Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs)

The Cluster Resource Centres created for a cluster of 10 to 15 primary schools has to cater to the academic needs of the schools that come under its jurisdiction. The responsibilities of CRC include : Training at cluster level (basically that of teachers), organising and conducting monthly meetings for teachers, follow-up and support visits to schools in order to share problems and give demonstration lessons, making cluster a resource center by equipping it with books, discussion papers etc.; collecting data and information on enrolment, attendance, dropout etc. which is asked by BRC or DPO; holding meeting with community leader/VEC members, undertaking environment building activities, collecting information about civil works going on in the cluster, giving feedback to BRCs and attending monthly meetings at BRC.

Cluster Resource Centres have been involved in conducting training programmes for teachers. In the monthly meetings all the CRC teachers come together to share and discuss their academic and administrative problems. One of the major activities in these meeting has been conducting lesson

demonstration followed by discussions. The CRC coordinator, who is generally a primary school teacher having 10-15 years of experience, facilitates the discussions and sometimes gives lesson demonstrations also.

Both the sub-district academic support institutions i.e. BRC and CRC independently take school visits but the nature of support provided by BRC and CRC are different. The CRC co-ordinators generally make monthly visits to each school. During the visit CRC co-ordinators attempt to provide on-site academic support and guidance to teachers by listening to their problems, giving lesson demonstrations and by helping them to make their lesson plans. The BRC co-ordinators' visits to schools are less frequent and they generally play a supervisory role.

District Level Management Structures

In order to manage the programme (DPEP) the arrangement consists of the District Project Office which is a parallel arrangement to District Education Office (Elementary). The planning, implementation and monitoring of the implementation of DPEP is the sole responsibility of District Project Office (D.P.O). The District Project Office is headed by a full time co-ordinator who is generally designated as District Project Co-ordinator (DPC). In both districts under study i.e. Gaya in Bihar and Malappuram in Kerala, the District Project Co-ordinators were interviewed and information were sought about the functioning of these offices. In addition to the District Project Office, the information were also collected from the District Education Office (Elementary Education) and District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET) which are the two district level offices responsible for the development of elementary education in the district.

District Project Office, DPEP

In Malappuram as well as in all other DPEP districts in Kerala the D.P.O. is headed by D.P. C. who is an officer of State Education Department and the

post of D.P.C. is equivalent to Deputy Director of Education (DDE) who is incharge of School Education in the district. In fact the posts of DPC and DDE are mutually interchangeable. However, in the DPEP districts of Bihar the D.P.Cs were appointed by conducting rigorous selection tests and interviews. But in Gaya, the district taken for study, the D.P.C. is basically the principal of Gaya DIET and he works both as D.P.C. (DPEP) as well as Principal Gaya DIET. The present incumbent D.P.C. in Malappuram is fourth since the inception of DPEP there. However, the DPC Gaya has been on this position since the inception of DPEP in the district and thus he is continuing since beginning.

For the staffing pattern of District Project Office DPEP, guidelines are provided from national level in which a suggestive pattern is given. At the time of visit to the DPOs in both districts, the District Project Offices of DPEP was found to have the following staffing pattern.

Table 5.01
Staffing Pattern in District Project Office (DPEP)

Item	Gaya	Malappuram
Total No. of Sanctioned Posts	23	24
No. of posts filled up	15	22
Vacant Positions	08	02
Categories of Vacant Posts	Accounts Officer (1) Asstt. Progr. Officer (2) Asstt. Resource Person (1) Asstt. Engineer (1) Junior Engineer (1) Asstt. Accountant (2)	Programme Officer (1) Civil Engineer (1)

Source : District Project Office, DPEP (Gaya and Malappuram)

It is evident that Gaya District Project Office had about 25 percent posts vacant. However, in Malappuram only 2 posts were vacant. Further, Gaya District Project Office had important vacant positions like Accounts Officer, Assistant

Programme Officers, Assistant Engineer and Junior Engineer. The programme had suffered due to absence of these persons in the office.

District Educational Administration

In Malappuram district the Deputy Director of Education (DDE) is incharge of school Education. He is assisted by Education Officer (EO) who looks after Secondary Education at the district level and Assistant Education Officers (AEOs) who are block level officers looking after elementary education. Malappuram has DDE, one E.O. and 15 AEOs. In Gaya district, as in other districts of Bihar, there are two district level officers in Education. The District Education Officer (DEO) is incharge of Secondary/Higher Secondary Education and District Superintendent of Education (DSE) is incharge of elementary education. The DSE is assisted by Deputy DSE and Block Education Extension Officers (BEEO) who are block level officers incharge of elementary education. Gaya district has a DSE, three Deputy DSEs and 24 BEEOs.

Since the present study is concerned with primary education only detailed information were collected from the DDE office Malappuram and DSE office Gaya. These district level offices had the following staffing pattern in 2002.

Table 5.02
Staffing Pattern of DDE/DSE office

Item	DSE office Gaya	DDE office Malappuram
Total Posts sanctioned	51	100
No. of Posts filled up	49	97
Vacant Posts	02	03
Category of Vacant posts	Deputy DSEs (2)	Accounts officer (1) Clerk (1) Grade IV (1)

Source : DDE/DSE office (2002)

The above table reveals that the DDE office in Malappuram is relatively very strong in terms of the total number of sanctioned posts. As against 100 sanctioned posts in Malappuram DDE office the Gaya DSE office has only 51 positions. It is heartening to note that only 2 positions in Gaya and 3 positions in Malappuram are vacant. It is however important to note that in Gaya, 2 posts of Deputy DSE are vacant which are important positions. But in Malappuram out of 3 vacant posts one post of Accounts Officer is important.

The problems faced by DDE Malappuram to perform his duties efficiently include lack of computerization facility in the office, lack of training to the staff members of DDE office, shortage of vehicles in the office for inspection and supervision work. Further lack of teachers training Institutes in the district was highlighted as a problem. In Gaya district the problem faced by DSE office relates to shortage of teachers specially female teachers. This is because of large number of vacant posts of teachers in the district. Further, there is lack of supervisory staff in the district as many positions of BEEOs are vacant. The inspection and supervision work suffers because of shortage of vehicles in the DSE office.

District Institute of Education & Training (DIET)

At the district level the only academic support institution available is District Institute of Education and Training. Both Gaya and Malappuram districts have DIET which have been established in early 1990s. The Malappuram DIET was established in 1992 and Gaya DIET in 1993. Incidentally both these DIETs have their own building. The Gaya DIET has an old building whereas Malappuram DIET has partly old and partly new building. The Gaya DIET has 6 rooms and 6 training halls whereas Malappuram DIET has 16 rooms including 7 training halls. Gaya DIET has 2 hostels with a capacity of accommodating 100 persons while Malappuram DIET has a hostel having 30 doubled seated rooms. A new block is under construction in Gaya DIET whose old building was

constructed in 1961. The Malappuram DIET building was constructed in 1994. The following is the staffing pattern in the two DIETs

Table 5.03
Staffing Pattern in Gaya and Malappuram DIET

Type of Staff	Gaya DIET			Malappuram DIET		
	Posts sanctioned	Posts filled	Vacancies	Posts sanctioned	Posts filled	Vacancies
Academic Faculty	23	05	18	19	19	0
Support Staff	10	03	07	01	01	0
Administrative Staff	13	02	11	10	09	01
Total	46	10	36	30	29	01

Source : DIET Gaya/Malappuram (2002)

The table reveals that a large number of positions in the DIET Gaya are vacant. Out of 23 faculty positions as many as 18 positions are vacant. Similarly, in support staff out of 10 posts only 3 persons are in position and out of 13 positions in administration only 2 people are working. However, in Malappuram DIET there is only one vacancy and that is even an administrative staff. It may therefore be expected that DIET Gaya, because of lack of staff, may not be functioning efficiently. An important point to be mentioned here with regard to DIET Malappuram is that one faculty member of DIET is made academic co-coordinator of each of the 15 BRCs and thus 15 out of 19 faculty members are designated as academic co-coordinators of BRCs. It is therefore clear that despite having 19 faculty members only 4 faculty members are available to DIET on full time basis. This is the reason that DIET Malappuram is able to perform only limited activities.

DIET is a key institution with respect to DPEP activities. The Gaya DIET has been playing important role in connection with DPEP implementation. It had undertaken the responsibility of capacity building of BRC resource persons, training to CRC coordinators, capacity building of Resource Groups of Alternative

Schooling and ECCE, conducted learners' evaluation and conducted action researches. Similarly, DIET Malappuram has conducted training for District Resource Groups and Block Resource Groups, undertaken responsibility of planning for all academic programmes at the district level and also provided guidance for planning and monitoring of block level academic programmes under DPEP.

Both the DIETs of Gaya and Malappuram are in close coordination with the DPEP District Project Office. Incidentally, in Gaya DIET Principal is also working as District Project Coordinator DPEP and in Malappuram DIET Principal is designated as ex-office Additional District Project Coordinator DPEP.

Sub-District Level Management Structures

Since DPEP is a district based programme, the programme is being implemented and monitored by a separate structure created for the purpose known as District Project Office. But no such arrangement has been created at the block level to manage the programme. However, at the block level, academic resource institution known as Block Resource Centre (BRC) has been created under DPEP and the responsibility of planning and management of DPEP at the block lies with this institution only.

Block Level Educational Administration

In most of the states in India the lowest educational administration unit is the block specially with respect to primary/elementary education. Almost all states where there is a concept of Block (whether revenue block or educational block) a block level education officer is in charge of primary/elementary education. However, the nomenclature of the officer may vary from state to state. The two districts where in depth study has been carried out i.e. Gaya (in Bihar) and Malappuram (in Kerala) block level education offices are in place. In Gaya

there is a Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO) whereas in Malappuram the block level officer is known as Assistant Education Officer (AEO).

In Gaya district, as is the case in all districts of Bihar, the Block Education Office has hardly any staff. The BEEO office has only 2 persons which includes BEEO himself and a peon. Even there is no office building for BEEO also. As against this there is a strong Assistant Education Officers (AEO) office in Malappuram as well as in other districts of Kerala. The AEO offices in Malappuram have total staff of 11 persons. This includes AEO himself, one senior superintendent, as many as 6 clerks, one peon and one full time menial staff.

It may be noted that in Gaya the three blocks selected for this study have between 125 and 200 schools and one BEEO has to inspect, supervise and monitor that many schools. It is therefore clear that the jurisdiction of a BEEO is so large that it is very difficult for him to manage and at the top of it there is neither any staff with him nor even a building to accommodate his office. On an average in these three blocks i.e. Imamganj, Tikari and Wazirganj, the number of primary schools is 165 and upper primary schools 20 which shows that responsibility of one BEEO is that of 185 schools. Due to lack of any staff it was found that BEEO generally keeps one or two primary schools teachers in his office to perform the routine work but this is only an informal arrangement.

In Malappuram the jurisdiction of AEO is relatively smaller when compared with a BEEO of Gaya. For the three selected blocks in Malappuram i.e. Areacode, Manjeri and Tanur average number of primary schools is 75 and upper primary schools 24. So on an average the responsibility of a AEO is that of about 100 schools. More over with comparatively lower number of schools to be managed by AEO office it has a strong staff strength (of 11 persons) and has reasonably good building also.

It can therefore be inferred that there is a strong block level educational administration in Kerala with comparatively less number of schools to be managed and is also better staffed while in Bihar the block level educational administration is too weak having hardly any staff and having about 200 schools to be managed. The schools in Malappuram are therefore better managed than the schools in Gaya district. This has been told by the three BEEOs with whom detailed interaction was conducted for this study. The problems highlighted by BEEO include lack of office building, lack of staff, non-availability of vehicle and that is why BEEO is overburdened with the routine work. Even one AEO in Malappuram has also said that he faces problems like getting overburdened due to administrative work, lack of sufficient staff and the numbers of schools to be taken care of are large.

Block Resource Centres (BRCs)

As mentioned above under DPEP an academic support institution has been created at the block level named as Block Resource Centre. Each block in the DPEP districts is expected to have one BRC. In Malappuram district all the 15 blocks have BRCs and thus there are 15 BRCs in the district. However, due to some reason in Bihar (including Gaya district) it was decided that one BRC will be established for every two blocks. So in Gaya district where the number of blocks is 24 there are only 12 Block Resource Centres.

Staffing

Though some suggestive guidelines had been given in DPEP for the staffing pattern of BRCs but there are variations across the states. The 6 BRCs in the two districts of Bihar and Kerala namely Gaya and Malappuram where the in-depth study was conducted, it was found that in Gaya the Imamganj BRC had 4 persons in staff which includes BRC coordinator and 3 Resource Persons. In Wazirganj BRC also the position is the same. However, in Tikari BRC there are 5 persons which includes the BRC coordinator and 4 Resource Persons. As

against this the position in the BRCs of Malappuram is better. In both Areacode and Manjeri BRC the staff is of 7 persons each which includes Academic Coordinator, 3 Resource Persons, 2 trainers and one peon. In Tanur BRC has staff of 8 persons including one Academic Coordinator, 2 Resource Persons, 4 trainers and a clerk. Thus it is clear that in terms of staff the Malappuram BRCs are better equipped than the BRC of Gaya district. The problem of BRC in Gaya is further aggravated as one BRC has to cater to the needs of 2 blocks.

The BRCs are expected to be headed by the coordinators who are generally school teachers. But the situation is different in the two states namely Kerala and Bihar. In Kerala the BRC coordinators were selected through rigorous selection process and the incumbents were generally secondary teachers or AEOs. But the BRCs in Kerala have the provision of two coordinators. One BRC coordinator selected through selection process is designated as Administrative Coordinator and the second one designated as Academic Coordinator is taken from DIET faculty. So each BRC in Kerala including Malappuram has a DIET faculty deputed as Academic Coordinator. At the time of visit for this study it was found that neither of the 3 BRCs had Administrative Coordinators in position (as all of them had gone back to their parent organization as their deputation was over) and the Academic Coordinators were in charge of the BRCs.

The arrangement made in Gaya (as elsewhere in Bihar) for BRC was that a BEEO was nominated as ex-officio BRC coordinator. Thus, even BRC coordinator was not on full time basis as BEEO has to take the additional responsibility of BRC and also to work as BEEO. But the problem of coordination found in Gaya BRC and BEEO was that since BRC caters to the need of 2 blocks and 2 blocks have 2 BEEOs but only one of the two BEEO (in most of the cases the senior ones) was given the charge of BRC coordinator, the other BEEO who was not a BRC Coordinator takes no interest in the activities of BRC. Many a time it was felt that the BEEO who is not BRC coordinator was quite critical of BRC activities and to some extent was also found biased against BRC and even DPEP.

Jurisdiction of BRCs

The study tries to see the jurisdiction of the 3 selected BRCs of Gaya and 3 BRCs of Malappuram district. The jurisdiction is seen in terms of number of schools, number of teachers and number of clusters whose needs are to be catered by the respective BRCs. The following table presents the jurisdiction of BRC in terms of primary education only.

Table 5.04
Jurisdiction of BRCs (Schools, Teachers, Cluster)

Item	Gaya district			Malappuram district		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
No. of Primary Schools	248	161	170	81	79	68
No. of Primary Teachers	351	240	255	672	738	622
No. of Clusters	13	13	12	15	17	15

Source : BRC Office (2002)

The above table shows that the number of primary schools under a BRC are relatively very high in the three BRCs of Gaya district as it ranges from 161 schools in Tikari BRC to 248 schools in Imamganj BRC. But in the three BRCs of Malappuram district the number of schools vary from 68 schools in Tanur to 81 schools in Areacode BRC. However, if we look at the number of primary teachers who are under the jurisdiction of BRCs, they are relatively very high in the three BRC of Malappuram than that in Gaya district. The number of primary teachers whose capacity building is to be undertaken by BRC ranges from 622 teachers in Tanur BRC to 738 teachers in Manjeri BRC. But in Gaya district the number of teachers under Tikari BRC is 240, in Wazirganj 255 and in Imamganj 351. In the three BRCs of Gaya the total number of clusters is 38 only whereas the same in the three BRCs of Malappuram is 47. It ranges from 12 clusters in Wazirganj (Gaya) to 17 clusters in Manjeri BRC.

Activities

The BRC coordinators of the 6 selected BRCs were asked about the role and responsibilities the BRCs are expected to take. An analysis of responses shows that Gaya BRC coordinators are of the view that BRCs have to train Teachers, Headmasters VEC members and EGS/AIE instructors. It has also to undertake block level planning, conduct monthly meetings of CRC coordinators and organize block level bal melas and 'TLM Workshops'. The coordinators of 3 Malappuram BRCs are of the view that in addition to what has been noted for Gaya BRC coordinators, the BRCs have also to organize cluster workshop, organize medical camps to detect physically challenged children, conduct remedial teaching for disabled children, organize community awareness programmes, undertake IED training, do action research and undertake women empowerment programmes.

During the latest year 2001-02 the 3 BRCs of Gaya district have conducted 3 batches subject specific training known as Ujala-II, conducted CRC coordinator's reflection meeting, visited more than 170 schools as a follow-up of training and on-site support, conducted Bal Melas, TLM Workshops. The 3 BRCs of Malappuram district, conducted 5 days training to all primary teachers, conducted training to headmasters for preparation of annual plan, conducted cluster workshops, undertook evaluation training, organized orientation for PTA/MTAs, organized medical camps and provided on-site support to many schools.

Problems faced (by BRCs)

The BRC coordinators were asked to mention the problems they face in conducting the activities of BRC efficiently. Surprisingly, one of the three BRC coordinators in Gaya said that there is no problems while the other two coordinators presented the problems like : non-availability of clerk/typist in BRC, teachers do not want to stay in BRC during residential training, non-availability of

night guard or peon in BRCs, non-availability of vehicles for visits to schools and BRC coordinators not given freedom to undertake activities independently.

The problems faced by the BRCs of Malappuram include : lack of office staff and CRC coordinators (as most of CRC coordinators have already left and their positions are not filled up), lack of computers in BRCs, lack of accommodation in BRC for residential training, non-availability of photo copying machines, lack of sufficient funds for undertaking various activities and lack of transport facility for school supervisors.

Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs)

In the existing educational administration no administrative machinery is available below the block level. However, in DPEP it was envisaged to create academic support institution between the block and the schools and it was known as Cluster Resource Centre (CRC). One CRC generally comprises of 10 to 15 primary schools and about 40 to 50 primary teachers under its jurisdiction. The Cluster Resource Centres were established in Malappuram in 1995 in Areacode, in 1996 in Manjeri and in 1997 in Tanur block. It may be kept in view that the DPEP started in Malappuram in 1994-95. In the Gaya district most of the CRCs in the three blocks i.e. Imamganj, Tikari and Wazirganj started functioning in 1998 except 2 CRCs in Wazirganj, which started in July 1997, and one CRC in Wazirganj that was established only in April 2000. It may be noted that DPEP implementation started in Gaya in 1997. It shows that the CRCs were established relatively faster in Gaya district than in Malappuram district.

Under DPEP there is a provision of CRC building comprising of one room constructed in any of the primary schools. In this regard in Malappuram for most of the CRCs there is no building constructed. In Areacode block out of 8 CRCs covered in this study only 4 had building, in Manjeri block only 2 out of 5 CRCs had their own building whereas in Tanur block only 1 CRC (out of 7 CRCs studied) had its own building. So, it is clear that out of 20 CRCs covered in this

study only 7 CRCs had building. In Gaya district out of total 36 CRCs covered under this study only 7 CRCs did not have building rest 29 CRCs had their own building. In the Tikari block all CRCs except one had building, in Imamganj 10 out of 13 CRCs had building while out of 10 CRCs covered in this study in Wazirganj only 3 CRCs did not have its own building. It may be mentioned here that in Gaya not only many CRC buildings have been constructed but even the quality of construction as well as maintenance of buildings was found to be quite good.

Jurisdiction of CRCs

As mentioned above the clusters have generally been formed for 10-15 primary schools and for about 40-50 teachers. However, this pattern varies from state to state and from district to district within a state and even from block to block in a specific district. The six blocks covered under this study from 2 DPEP districts of Kerala and Bihar had altogether 84 CRCs out of which 56 CRCs were covered under this study. This includes 20 CRCs from 3 blocks of Malappuram and 36 CRCs from 3 blocks of Gaya district. The following table presents the number of primary schools under each of the CRCs

Table 5.05
Number of Primary Schools in CRCs

No. of Primary Schools/No. of CRCs	Number of CRCs having Primary Schools in					
	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Upto 4 schools	-	02	-	03	-	-
5 to 9 schools	01	01	01	04	05	07
10 to 14 schools	01	06	04	-	-	-
15 to 19 schools	07	04	03	01	-	-
20 to 24 schools	02	-	01	-	-	-
Schools>24	02	-	01	-	-	-
Total	13	13	10	08	05	07

Source : BRC office (2002)

As far as the number of primary schools in CRCs are concerned the above table reveals that there are 5 very small CRCs where the number of

primary schools is upto 4 only. Out of these 5 CRCs, 2 are in Tikari block of Gaya and 3 CRCs in Areacode block of Malappuram. There are 19 CRCs under which the number of primary schools are between 5 and 9. Out of these 19 there are 04 CRCs in Areacode, 05 in Manjeri and 07 in Tanur blocks of Malappuram. Further, there is one CRC each in the three blocks of Gaya where number of schools are from 5 to 9. There are another 11 CRCs where number of schools is in between 10 and 14. All these CRCs are in 3 blocks of Gaya namely 01 in Imamganj, 06 in Tikari and 04 in Wazirganj. Out of 15 CRCs where number of primary schools are between 15 and 19 only one CRC is in Areacode block of Malappuram. Out of rest 14, there are 07 CRCs in Imamganj, 04 CRCs in Tikari and 03 CRCs in Wazirganj where number of schools is between 15 and 19. There are 3 CRCs where number of schools is between 20 and 24 and another 3 CRCs have more than 24 schools each. These CRCs are in Imamganj and Wazirganj block of Gaya district.

The following table presents number of teachers in the CRCs of the selected blocks under study.

Table 5.06
Number of Primary teachers in CRCs

No. of Primary Teachers/Number of CRCs	Number of CRCs having Primary Teachers in					
	Gaya District			Malappuram District		
	Imamganj	Tikari	Wazirganj	Areacode	Manjeri	Tanur
Upto 25 teachers	03	13	09	01	-	-
Teachers between 26 and 50	10	-	04	06	04	-
Teachers between 51 and 100	-	-	-	-	01	07
More than 100 teachers	-	-	-	01	-	-
Total	13	13	13	08	05	07

Source : BRC office Data (2002)

The above table reveals that number of primary teachers per CRC is relatively less in the three blocks of Gaya district than in Malappuram. In

Imamganj block 3 CRCs have 25 or less than 25 teachers and in rest 10 CRCs, the number of teachers is between 26 to 50. In Tikari all CRCs have 25 or less than 25 teachers each whereas in Wazirganj 09 CRCs have upto 25 teachers each and in 04 CRCs there are teachers numbering between 26 and 50. In the three blocks of Malappuram there are bigger CRCs in terms of number of primary teachers. In Areacode 01 CRC has teachers upto 25, 06 CRCs have teachers between 26 and 50 and 01 CRC has even more than 100 teachers. In Manjeri block 04 CRCs have 26 to 50 teachers and 01 CRC has 51 to 100 teachers. However, all the 07 CRCs in Tanur block have 51 to 100 teachers each. Depending upon the number of teachers in Cluster Resource Centre (CRC) the workload of a CRC varies. The monthly meetings of teachers may be easily managed if the number of teachers within CRC are less than 50. Even providing on site support to the teachers will be difficult for a CRC coordinator if the number of teachers under his jurisdiction is large.

CRC Activities

The CRC coordinators were asked about the activities that were undertaken by them during last two years. The responses given by 20 CRC coordinators of 3 block of Malappuram district and 36 CRC coordinators of 3 blocks of Gaya district were analyzed and are presented below.

The Cluster Resource Centres in Gaya district were engaged in the activities related to awareness campaign, orientation programmes, cultural programmes, on-site support to teachers, distribution of mid-day meals and scholarships to disadvantaged children. There are certain activities, which are undertaken by CRCs every year. These include organizing 'Bal Melas', conducting evaluation workshop for final examination, distribution of free textbooks, mid-day meals and scholarships and distribution of question papers to schools for examinations. Some other activities done by the CRCs in Gaya are : organization of TLM workshops and TLM exhibition, organizing competition for children, organizing selection meet for disabled children, orientation for VEC

members, on-site guidance to teachers, organizing enrolment campaign, demonstration of joyful learning methods for children, orientation for TLM preparation, organizing special campaign for girls enrolment and organizing literacy campaigns.

The Cluster Resource Centres in Malappuram had relatively lesser number of activities in the latest year. The reason being that most of the CRC coordinators who were originally the primary school teachers have joined back their schools as the period of their deputation was over. In fact during the field survey for the present study it was found that hardly a few CRC coordinators were in place and in order to get information about the functioning of CRC the former CRC coordinators were contacted who were at present teachers in primary schools. This is the reason that in general CRCs in Malappuram were found hardly functioning efficiently. In fact 6 CRCs informed that during 2001-02 they did not have any activity. However, on the basis of responses given by the rest 14 CRCs it has been found that some activities have been organized. These activities are : conducting cluster meetings, conducting teachers training, providing on-site support to teachers, training of teachers on IEDC, organizing camps, conducting evaluation workshops, organizing awareness programme for parents, conducting planning meetings for Panchayat members. Some other activities done by CRCs on occasional basis are : orientation of PTA/MTA members, supporting teachers for Action Research, conducting orientation for headmasters, organizing workshop for TLM preparation, celebration of school days, conducting remedial teaching for disabled children, organizing medical camps and organizing field trips for schools etc.

Problems faced by CRCs

The CRCs have been functioning in the Gaya district as well as in Malappuram but the Gaya CRCs were seen better functioning than Malappuram. However, the CRC coordinators during interaction with them expressed that

there are many problems faced by them in running the CRCs in efficient manner. These problems shared by CRC coordinators are as presented below.

In Gaya district as also in all DPEP districts of Bihar the CRC coordinators are primary school teachers and they have to work as coordinators and also continue teaching in their respective schools. So the CRC coordinators are not on full time basis. Because of this arrangement many problems are faced such as CRC coordinator does not find time to concentrate on CRC activities as in some cases CRC coordinators have to move 5 to 10 kms. to see the schools and provide on-site support and in such cases the teaching in their respective schools suffer. Secondly being a teacher the CRC coordinators have also to do many other works assigned by the Government from time to time. The responsibility for many routine activities of Government has also been given to CRC coordinators like distribution of Mid-day meals, scholarship, free textbooks etc. which consumes a lot of time and the CRC activities suffer. Even many CRC coordinators face lack of cooperation from Education Department officials and sometimes even lack of support from BRC is also there. At many CRC there is lack of infrastructure. Even sometimes teachers also do not cooperate with CRC coordinators. Further, due to shortage of teachers, as many posts are lying vacant, the teaching work suffers. In some CRC the schools are at far off places so providing on-site support to these schools is problematic. It was told that sometimes VEC takes irrational decisions, which the CRC finds difficult to implement.

The problems faced by the CRCs in Malappuram district, as discussed by the CRC coordinators are : lack of resources as well as infrastructure and library in CRCs, lack of support from Education Department officials. CRCs are overburdened with training activities and have hardly any time for undertaking other activities. Lack of building is a serious problem in many of the Malappuram CRCs. Lack of confidence on part of teachers is yet another problem faced by CRCs. Under DPEP, new pedagogy has been adopted which focuses on activity based teaching and joyful learning. It is difficult to convince parents on the

advantages of this new pedagogy. Many village Panchayat and Municipalities are unsupportive for CRCs which creates problem in CRC functioning. Many CRC coordinators have felt that there is a lack of coordination between BRC and AEO office which actually becomes problem for functioning of CRC as cooperation of both AEO office (for deputation of teachers for orientation training etc.) and BRC (for academic support) is necessary.

Sustainability of Academic Support Institutions

The sustainability of academic support institutions created under DPEP is to be ensured by the respective state governments. The BRC and CRC coordinators were asked about the need for sustaining these institutions after DPEP comes to an end. As may be expected all the 6 BRC coordinators were of the view that the BRCs should continue functioning after DPEP is over. The reasons given by the BRCs in this regard are : (i) the academic support to the schools is necessary for all times to come and in case BRC is disbanded the academic support will also discontinue. Malappuram BRC coordinators were of the view that AEO office does only administrative work and this office may not be able to undertake the academic responsibilities undertaken by BRC and so continuation of BRC is non-negotiable. (ii) An important role of BRC is to contribute towards improvement of quality of primary education. Since the quality improvement programmes need to be sustained in future also the BRCs have to continue functioning. (iii) Since the BRCs have made significant contribution towards achieving the goal of Universal Primary Education (UPE), these institutions need to be sustained so that efforts towards UPE can continue in future also.

Opinions were sought from the block level education officers from the 6 selected blocks of Gaya and Malappuram district about functioning of the BRCs in their block as well as the need to sustain these BRC after the DPEP is over. The analysis is presented below.

In Gaya district since the BRC coordinators are BEEO also it was decided to take views of only those BEEOs who are not BRC coordinators so that an outsider's view about functioning and sustainability of BRC could be gathered. It was found that in Gaya district 2 out of 3 BEEOs were of the view that BRCs have helped their offices in developing primary education in their block. One BEEO had a feeling that BRCs have taken over many of the powers and privileges of BEEO. Even two BEEOs felt that there is a rivalry between BRC and BEEO office. However, all BEEOs felt that BRCs have contributed significantly towards the development of primary education. Further on being asked that should the BRC be closed after DPEP is over, one BEEO was of the view that BRC should be closed though no appropriate reason could be mentioned. Rest two BEEO could not reply the question and were found indifferent on sustainability of BRCs.

In Malappuram district all the three AEOs were of the view that BRCs have helped AEO office in developing primary education in the block. One out of 3 AEOs felt that BRCs have taken over many powers and privileges of AEO office. Further, 2 out of 3 AEOs were of the view that BRC and AEO office have supplemented each other's efforts for the development of primary education in the block. About sustainability of BRCs after DPEP is over 2 out of 3 AEOs were of the view that BRC should continue whereas one AEO did not have a clear opinion on this point. One of the 3 AEOs admitted that AEO office will not be able to undertake the activities done by BRCs and that is why BRCs need to continue even after DPEP is over.

About the sustainability of Cluster Resource Centres almost all the CRC coordinators to whom discussions were held during the field study were of the view that CRC should continue functioning after DPEP is over. However, out of total 56 CRC coordinators who were contacted 3 were found indifferent and did not give any response about the sustainability of CRCs in future. Out of these 2 are from Areacode block of Malappuram and one is from Wazirganj block of Gaya District.

The reasons given by CRC coordinators from Malappuram district of Kerala for sustaining CRCs are : teachers need to get continuous academic support, to help teachers know about innovation and new trends in teaching, to continuously provide forum to share innovative ideas among teachers, to continue inputs to teachers towards improving quality of primary education; to continue provide academic support to schools for their smooth functioning; to provide platform for teachers to discuss their academic problems and share experiences.

The CRC coordinators of Gaya district had given their own reasons to support the sustainability of CRCs after DPEP is over. These are : for overall development of children, to continue teacher's monthly orientation meeting, to continue activities like 'Bal Mela' and 'TLM Mela', for overall improvement of schools; to continue efforts towards UPE, to continue providing platform for teachers meet and share their views and TLM; to continue centralized evaluation system; to continue improving teachers competence, CRC to continue as a link between schools and BRC, to sustain good efforts done under DPEP; to maintain cooperation among teachers, to continue improving quality of primary education, to continue joyful learning and activity based teaching learning and to continue achieving the objectives of DPEP.

Chapter 6

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES : HORIZONTAL LINKAGES

The district level educational administration of primary/elementary education is basically the responsibility of the office of Deputy Director of Education (DDE) in Malappuram district in Kerala and that of the office of District Superintendent of Education (DSE) in Gaya district of Bihar. These are the key officials responsible for the development of elementary education in the districts. In addition to this structure both districts also have District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET) which is a key resource institution responsible for development of elementary education in terms of quality improvement and planning and management in addition to other areas. These two structures namely District Education Office and DIET have been in operation in both Gaya and Malappuram before implementation of DPEP in these districts. However, as a result of DPEP implementation the District Project Office DPEP was also established to ensure smooth implementation and monitoring of the DPEP programme. In short the district level management structure related to elementary education consists of two already existing and one newly created structure in the DPEP districts.

At the sub-district level i.e. at block level the responsibility of development of elementary education lies with office of Assistant Education Officer (AEO) in Malappuram (Kerala) and that of the office of Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO) in Gaya district in Bihar. So the AEO/BEEO are key officials responsible to manage elementary education in their respective blocks. In addition to this office a Block Resource Centre (BRC) has been established in the blocks of the districts, which are covered under DPEP. SO in DPEP districts the block level management consists of AEO/BEEO office and the BRC. The AEO/BEO office has been working since independence in the districts whereas BRCs have been established as a result of DPEP implementation only.

There is no management structure available below the block level either in Malappuram, Kerala or in Gaya, Bihar and AEO/BEEO is lowest level educational administrator below which there are primary and upper primary school headmasters only. However, under DPEP the Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs) have been created in all DPEP districts.

The present study focuses on analyzing the linkages between the management structures responsible for the development of elementary/primary education at the district and sub-district level namely block and cluster level. The horizontal linkages in this regard can be seen in terms of linkage between DDE/DSE office and DIET, linkage between DDE/DSE office and D.P.O. (DPEP) and linkage between DIET and D.P.O. (DPEP) at the district level. These linkages are analyzed and presented below.

Linkages between DDE/DSE office and DIET

Both the DDE/DSE office and DIET have been in existence even before DPEP was launched. The DDE/DSE office is in operation since independence but DIETs have been established after 1986 National Policy on Education. The DIET in Gaya district which is one of a few functional DIET in Bihar was established in 1993 while DIET Malappuram was established in 1992.

DIET is supposed to provide technical and professional support to the District Education office i.e. DDE/DSE office and is expected to function as an academic support institution. In Malappuram (Kerala) the rank of DIET principal is more or less equivalent to the rank of DDE whereas in Gaya (Bihar) the rank of DIET Principal is higher than the rank of DSE.

Being a resource Institution in the area of elementary education it is expected that there should be a close linkage between DIET and the DDE/DSE office. In Malappuram and Gaya districts such a linkage does not only exist but is working effectively. This is in terms of mutual consultation on academic matters

like teacher's training, planning and school related activities. It was told that the DIET Principal regularly visits DDE/DSE office to discuss the academic matters. However, such visits are more frequent in Malappuram (it is almost every week) than in Gaya where such visits take place about once in a month. On the other hand the district level officials namely DDE/DSE also sometimes visit the DIET in connection with supervising/seeing the training programmes being organized at DIETs and also to discuss the academic matters related to primary and upper primary education. However, the visits by DSE in Gaya to DIET are more frequent than the visits by DDE in Malappuram. Perhaps one of the reason is that the Malappuram DIET, which is located in Tanur town, is at a distance of about 35 kms from the district headquarter where DDE office is located. In case of Gaya both DSE office and DIET are located at the district headquarter town only. It was told in both the districts that DIET Principal is invited in various meetings held at DDE/DSE office. Specially in Gaya district the DIET principal regularly meets DSE and other inspecting staff to seek their cooperation with respect to the activities conducted by DIET.

Linkage between DDE/DSE office and District Project Office DPEP

The District Project office DPEP is a new structure created under DPEP for implementation of the programme. In a sense this office is a parallel structure to the District Education office (Primary/Elementary). At many places it has been found that the coordination between these offices is not of desired level and it is perceived that in absence of such a coordination proper implementation of DPEP cannot be assured.

While trying to see the linkage between these offices, the DDE/DSE was asked if they or their office have any role in the implementation of DPEP. In both the districts officials said that they have a role in terms of providing data related to schools and teachers and also provide administrative support which is needed for the implementation of DPEP. Further they depute their teachers and headmasters for training conducted under DPEP. In Malappuram the DDE

sometimes convenes the meetings of BRC coordinators and DDE also attends planning and monitoring meeting at the DPEP District Project office.

On being asked whether there any coordination between his office and DPC office of DPEP the Deputy Director of Education Malappuram explained that his office helps the D.P.O. in conducting training programme, directs teachers and headmasters to attend the trainings and also regularly takes part in the planning and monitoring meetings at the District Project office. However, in Gaya such a linkage and coordination does not seem to be working as the response of DSE office in this regard was that whenever District Project office requests for any help the DSE office provides that.

After having a detailed discussion with officials of DSE office it was found that the linkage between D.P.C office and DSE office is not upto desired level. The DSE office was found generally unaware about the DPEP activities in the district and does not seem to be even interested to know about DPEP. This may be due to the fact that DSE is too overburdened with his routine work and there is hardly any time for him to bother about DPEP activities. This is to the extent that despite several attempts and personal visits to the DSE office the investigator could not get an audience with DSE Gaya. However, information regarding DSE office were taken from his subordinate staff. The role of DSE viz-a-viz DPEP activities has been limited to the extent of providing data relating to schools and teachers and giving administrative support. On further probe it was revealed that DSE's cooperation with DPEP activities is in the form of not creating hurdles in the functioning of D.P.C. office. However, the DPC office seeks help and cooperation from DSE office by inviting him in the meetings regularly. However, the fact of the matter is that DSE officials do not attend D.P.O. meetings regularly and even if they come and attend the meeting they hardly participate in discussions.

The officials of District Education office namely DDE/DSE offices have been of the view that DPEP has significantly contributed in development of

primary education in the district. On being asked whether the responsibility of DPEP should have been given to mainstream education administration (i.e. DDE/DSE office) rather than creating a parallel structure i.e. District Project Office, the response from both Gaya and Malappuram was negative which shows that the DDE/DSE offices are comfortable with parallel structure and do not want to take the responsibility of implementation of DPEP. However, the D.P.O. has a feeling that without active support and cooperation from DDE/DSE office DPEP cannot be successfully implemented in the district.

Linkage between DIET and District Project Office DPEP

The District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) have been established after implementation of National Policy on Education (1986) and the two districts selected for this study have DIETs established in 1992 and 1993. These Institutions (DIETs) are expected to be academic support institution in the districts and are responsible for quality improvement of elementary education in the district by organizing pre-service and in-service training of primary and upper primary school teachers. The DIETs are supposed to be partner in the Implementation of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and are responsible for planning and management of quality related issues undertaken under DPEP.

Since many responsibilities were to be undertaken by DIETs these organizations were supported under DPEP by providing infrastructure and other facilities. It has been found that in Gaya district DIET has been provided vehicle, telephone, furniture, typewriter, fans and duplicating machine from DPEP funds. Similarly, the Malappuram DIET was provided computer, telephone, dish antenna for teleconferencing, generators, gas connection, library books, hostel furniture etc. from DPEP funds. Both Gaya and Malappuram DIETs have undertaken several responsibilities under DPEP. The Gaya DIET took the responsibility of capacity building for resource persons of BRC, conducted training for CRC coordinators, training of instructors of Alternative Schools and ECE, conducts

monthly reflection meetings of BRC coordinators and Resource Persons, conducted learners' evaluation studies, action researches and undertook school health and sanitation programme under DPEP. Similarly, DIET Malappuram conducted training for members of District Resource Group and Block Resource Groups, undertook the responsibility of planning for all academic programmes at the district level and also did monitoring of Block level academic programmes.

As already pointed out earlier in both Gaya and Malappuram districts DIETs have been deeply involved in the DPEP activities. Incidentally in Gaya district DIET Principal is District Project Coordinator DPEP also and in Malappuram the DIET Principal is designated as ex-officio Additional District Project Coordinator D.P.E.P. It is therefore clear that there is a close linkage between DIET and District Project Office DPEP in both these districts. In Malappuram the responsibility of developing perspective plan of DPEP was undertaken by DIET. Further, DIET has nominated one faculty member as Academic Coordinator of each Block Resource Centre (BRC). Thus in Malappuram 15 DIET faculty members are working as Academic Coordinators of 15 BRCs and in a few BRCs where General Coordinator's positions were vacant the DIET faculty members are virtually incharge of BRCs. In both the districts neither DIET faced any problem in getting support from District Project Office DPEP, nor D.P.O. face any problem in getting academic support from DIET. It may therefore be concluded that a close linkage exists between the DIET and the District Project Office DPEP in both the districts undertaken for the study.

Linkage between Block Education Office and BRC

In the educational administrative structure related to primary/elementary education the lowest administrative structure in Bihar including Gaya district is office of Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO). In Malappuram district as in other districts of Kerala the office of Assistant Education Officer (AEO) is lowest in the rank of administrative structure. However, under DPEP an academic support institution has been created at block level known as Block Resource

Centre (BRC). The present study attempts to analyze the linkage between BEEO/AEO office and BRC in the two DPEP districts namely Gaya and Malappuram.

In Gaya district the Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO) has been ex-officio designated as the BRC Coordinator whereas in Malappuram district the BRC coordinators were appointed by appropriate selection process though a few AEOs were also selected and appointed as BRC coordinators. It is interesting to note that in Gaya one BRC is established for every two blocks and thus there are only 12 BRCs in Gaya, which has 24 blocks. Thus, 12 BEEOs were nominated, as BRC coordinators and rest 12 BEEOs are not coordinators. The study reveals that for obvious reasons there is a perfect coordination between the BEEO who is coordinator and the BRC but there is hardly any linkage between BRCs and the those BEEOs who are not BRC coordinators.

In Gaya the BEEO deputes teachers for training conducted by BRC, BEEO discusses quality issues and takes feedback from BRC on it, BRC gets all data about schools and teachers from BEEO office. Similarly, in Malappuram BRC discusses its programmes with AEOs, academic activities of BRC are planned after discussion with AEO, the AEO attends the planning and review meetings conducted at BRC and thus AEO cooperates in all BRC activities. The BRC coordinators visit BEEO/AEO office to seek the deputation of teachers for training and to inform about teachers who do not attend the training.

The BRC coordinator visits BEEO office to seek cooperation in training related work and in connection with examination and evaluation work, in connection with teachers deputation for BRC trainings, the BEEO visits BRC to attend teachers monthly meetings and to monitor teachers attendance during training. In Malappuram AEO visits BRC to attend BRC coordinators meetings, meeting of headmasters for planning, to see IEDC medical camps conducted by BRC, to see the cluster workshops and Resource Persons workshops, to monitor

teachers training, to participate in BRC meetings and to discuss programmes with BRC coordinators.

The Block Education Officers both from Gaya and Malappuram were asked if they have any role in the functioning of BRCs. In Gaya districts the question was asked from 3 BEEOs who are not BRC coordinators. One out of 3 BEEO said he has no idea about BEEOs role in functioning of BRC, one BEEO did not respond to the question and only one said that BEEO has to cooperate in all works related to primary education, which are undertaken by BRC. In Malappuram out of 3 AEO one did not respond the questions whereas other 2 AEOs said that role of AEO is important in functioning of BRC in order to ensure attendance of teachers in BRC trainings and in the monthly reflection meetings, to give guidance to BRC to conduct teachers' training, to monitor BRC/CRC trainings and to undertake academic inspection and supervision etc.

Chapter 7

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES : VERTICAL LINKAGES

The management structures under the states educational administration at the district level consists of District Education Office and District Institutes of Education and Training and also District Project Office DPEP in DPEP districts. Similarly in DPEP districts the block level structures include Block Education Office and Block Resource Centre (BRC). However at the cluster level only Cluster Resource Centres have been established and that even in DPEP districts only. The present study attempts at analyzing the vertical linkages with special reference to the management structure already in operation before DPEP and the structures created under DPEP in the two selected DPEP districts namely Gaya in Bihar and Malappuram in Kerala. These linkages are presented as follows.

Linkage between DSE/DDE office and BEEO/AEO offices

In Gaya district in Bihar both District Superintendent of Education (DSE) office and Block Education Extension office (BEEO) are part of the existing educational administrative structures created by state government after independence. Similarly, the DDE office working at the district level and AEO office working at Block level in Malappuram is also part of educational management structure created by Government of Kerala from the beginning. It is therefore quite clear that BEEO offices in Gaya are accountable to and are expected to report to DSE office directly. Similarly the AEO offices are under the direct control of DDE office in Malappuram. It is therefore clear that there is a close linkage between the DSE and BEEOs as also between DDE and AEOs offices. The vertical linkage between district level structure and block level structure created by state governments are perfect both in Gaya district and in Malappuram.

Linkage between DSE/DDE office and BRC

The DSE/DDE offices are part of existing educational administrative structure whereas BRC is a structure created under DPEP. In Gaya district the BEEOs are designated as ex-officio BRC coordinators and BEEOs are under the direct control of DSE. It is therefore clear that the BRC coordinators are accountable to DSE for their role of BEEO and when they report to DSE they may also be reporting about the activities of Block Resource Centre. However, in Malappuram district the linkage between DDE office and BRCs is in terms of DDE convening the meeting of BRC coordinators. DDE sometimes visits BRC for monitoring of its activities and to see the training programme going on there. The DDE also sometimes depute teachers as trainers in the BRC when required.

On an average the DSE/DDE visits the Block Resource Centres once in a quarter whereas the BRC coordinators visits the DSE/DDE office quite often to take some information or to discuss about the trainings conducted by BRC. The District level officials (DSE/DDE) visit the BRCs to monitor the training activities and see and evaluate the quality of training imparted at BRC.

Linkage between DIET and BEEO/AEO office

Both DIET and BEEO/AEO offices are part of management structure created prior to DPEP. But the role and responsibility of DIET is related to academic activities whereas BEEO/AEO office has the responsibility of administrative inspection and supervision. It can therefore be seen that areas of activities of DIET and BEEO/AEO offices are more or less mutually exclusive.

On being asked about the linkage between DIET and AEO office the DIET Principal told that linkages are in terms of DIET principal attending all meetings of AEOs conducted at the district level. Even AEOs are given training by the DIET in Malappuram. It was told that AEOs sometimes visits DIET to attend meetings and training programmes. However, in Gaya districts the BEEOs visit the DIET

quite frequently to attend monthly reflection meetings and discuss other academic matters. But the DIET Principal hardly visits the Block Education offices. In Malappuram DIET principal said he never visits the AEO offices whereas in Gaya the DIET principal on an average visits BEEO offices once in a month for discussions and meetings.

Linkage between District Project office DPEP and BEEO/AEO office

The District Project office obviously has been created under DPEP whereas BEEO/AEO office exists in the districts even earlier. So the study tries to see the linkage of the district level structure created under DPEP with the block level structure already created by state government earlier.

It was asked from the District Project Coordinator of DPEP whether they need help of and support from the block level education offices. Both DPCs of Gaya and Malappuram told that they not only need such support but in fact they also seek support and get it from Block Education Officers. This help and support is sought for deputation of teachers for conducting the training programme. In Gaya such a support is sought by D.P.C. by visiting the BEEO office and many a times by calling the BEEO in District Project office and sometimes by sending official notes to them. However in Malappuram the D.P.C. calls the AEO in their offices or sends official notes to them but do not generally visit the AEO offices.

The block level education officers were asked whether they visit the District Project office DPEP and for what purpose. All the three AEO of Malappuram district said that they visit the D.P.O. when they are called and the frequency of such visit is about once in a month. In most of the cases they visit the D.P.O. to participate in the meetings conducted by District Project Coordinator or to attend District Planning and Implementation Committee meetings. The three BEEOs from Gaya district also told that they visit the District Project office DPEP almost every month and the purpose of the visit is either for

attending meetings or sometimes even to know about the DPEP activities being undertaken in their respective blocks.

Linkage between DIET and BRC

Both DIET and BRC are academic support institutions which have prime responsibility of quality improvement in their respective areas of jurisdiction. In fact BRC is supposed to be the counterpart of DIET at the block level and what DIET is supposed to do for the district (under DPEP) the BRC is supposed to do for the block. It has been observed during field survey that there is a very close linkage between DIET and BRCs. As already pointed out earlier in Malappuram one DIET faculty is designated as Academic Coordinator of each BRC and thus he/she regularly informs the DIET about the activities undertaken by the BRC.

The close linkage between DIET and BRC in Malappuram district is established as all BRCs regularly report to the DIET, BRCs continuously take help and guidance from DIET for conducting training and other activities, the DIET conducts regular meetings of BRCs, the DIET staff visits BRCs regularly. Further all academic activities of BRCs are looked after by DIET faculty in the capacity of academic coordinator. Such a close linkage between DIET and BRCs is found in Gaya district also. In addition to the mechanism of linkages mentioned above for Malappuram in Gaya district the DIET conducts monthly reflection meetings of BRC coordinators as well as BRC resource persons.

The BRCs have close link with DIET in Gaya as BRCs regularly discuss their academic programmes with DIET, BRC staff participates in Workshops conducted by DIETs, all BRC activities are done under the guidance of DIET, DIET faculty helps the BRC to conduct training programmes and workshops. In Malappuram the BRC coordinators always keep in touch with DIET to discuss their academic programmes and DIET reviews all the academic activities of BRCs. Even DIET Principal regularly visits the BRCs to monitor the trainings conducted in BRCs.

Linkage between D.P.O. (DPEP) and BRC

Both District Project office and Block Resource Centre are established under DPEP. The role of D.P.O. is to implement the programme in the district whereas B.R.Cs. have even broader role. It is expected that District Project office will be winded up once DPEP is over but the Block Resource Centres as Academic Support Institutions at the block level will continue even after DPEP comes to an end. However, there is a close linkage between the District Project office DPEP and BRC. All the activities carried out by BRC are funded under DPEP and the funds to BRC flow from D.P.E.P. District Project Office only. Thus the BRCs are accountable to D.P.O. for reporting purpose on utilization of funds while for academic activities BRCs are accountable to DIET.

The close linkage between D.P.O. (DPEP) and BRC can be seen in terms of the District Project coordinators visiting the BRC in their respective districts. As told by the DPC Gaya he visits all BRCs at least once in a month. This is because the number of BRC in Gaya is 12 though blocks are 24 and secondly the D.P.C. Gaya is also DIET Principal and so his visit to BRCs is not only in the capacity of a D.P.C. but also as a DIET principal. The purpose of DPC's visit to BRC in Gaya as told by DPC are: attending monthly reflection meetings of CRC coordinators conducted at BRCs, attending planning meetings at BRC to help and guide BRC coordinators and resource persons, to monitor the training programmes conducted at BRC for teachers, ECE instructors and instructors of Alternative Schools and to see the orientation programmes conducted by BRCs for VEC members.

In Malappuram district though the DPC visits BRCs but the visits are not as frequent as in Gaya. The DPC Malappuram visits all BRCs at least once in a year and the purpose of such visits is to monitor the training programmes and to monitor planning meetings held at BRCs. The DPC whenever visits the BRCs devotes about two to three hours and thoroughly discusses on the BRC activities at length.

The BRC coordinators also regularly visit the District Project office DPEP. In Gaya it was found that the BRC coordinators visit almost every fortnight to D.P.O. for discussion with District Project Coordinator for attending monthly reflection meeting of BRC coordinators and for attending planning meetings. In Malappuram the BRC coordinators visit the D.P.O. once in every month for discussing financial matters, for attending planning-cum-review meeting and to discuss about training programmes being conducted by BRC.

The BRCs keep in touch with District Project office and supply the data of BRC to D.P.O., participate in workshops conducted by D.P.O., send reports on the expenditure on all activities conducted by BRC to District Project Coordinators and also to get funds for its activities the B.R.C has to be continuously in touch with D.P.O. Sometimes the D.P.O. also conducts administrative training for BRC, which are attended by BRC coordinators. The BRC coordinators and Resource persons also attend other training and workshops at D.P.O. from time to time. The BRCs also provide information about disabled children and invite the DPC in the medical camps organized by BRC for disabled children.

Linkage between BEEO/ AEO and CRC

The office of BEEO/AEO which is block level educational administrative structure is responsible for development of primary/elementary education in the block. But there is no management structure available in the states below block. However, under D.P.E.P. an academic support institution has been created which is known as Cluster Resource Centre. The CRCs have jurisdiction over 10 to 15 primary schools. The present study attempts to analyze the vertical linkage between Block Education office and Cluster Resource Centres.

In order to see the linkage between BEEO and CRC the BEEOs who are block level officers in Gaya districts were asked whether they visit the CRCs which come under their block and if they visit what is the frequency and purpose

of the visit. All the 3 BEEOs said that they visit the CRCs though one BEEO did not tell about frequency. The other two said that they visit CRCs 6 to 10 times in 3 months and the purpose of the visit is to see and monitor CRC activities and to have meeting with CRC coordinator and teachers specially on the day when teachers meet at CRC.

In Malappuram district out of the 3 AEOs contacted one said that he does not visit CRCs at all while other two AEOs said that they visit CRC once in a month. The purpose of such visit to CRC is to ensure that teachers attend the monthly meetings and participate in training conducted at CRC and also to monitor the cluster workshop.

The responses of CRC coordinators also reveal that they visit the BEEO/AEO office. These visits are in connection with seeking BEEO/AEOs cooperation in deputing the teachers for training, to discuss about CRC training, medical camps, to seek help for cluster workshops, in connection with distribution of free textbooks (in Gaya) and to invite them for functions like 'Bal Mela' organized by CRCs. The BEEO/AEO are of the view that they have a role in the functioning of CRCs as they have to monitor and evaluate CRC activities, have to depute their teachers for CRC meetings and ensure teachers attendance in these meetings.

The study covers 20 CRCs of 3 blocks in Malappuram district and 36 CRCs of 3 blocks of Gaya district. The CRC coordinators were asked whether they visit BEEO/AEO office. In Malappuram 12 out of 20 CRC coordinators said that they visit AEO office while rest 8 CRC coordinators said that they do not visit AEO office. In Gaya district 23 out 36 CRC coordinators said that they visit BEEO office while 13 CRC coordinators do not visit BEEO office. Even the frequency of visits to AEO/ BEEO office also varies. The frequency ranges from fortnightly to even rarely.

The block-wise analysis shows that in Malappuram out of 8 CRCs studied as many as 5 coordinators visit AEO office and rest 3 do not visit. In Manjeri block none of the 5 CRC coordinators visit AEO office whereas in Tanur all 7 CRC coordinators said that they visit AEO office. In Gaya district in Imamganj block only 2 out of 13 CRC coordinators sometimes visit BEEO office and rest 11 do not at all visit BEEO office. But in Tikari 12 out of 13 CRC coordinators visit BEEO office and in Wazirganj also 9 out of 10 CRC coordinators visit BEEO office. Only one CRC coordinator each from Tikari and Wazirganj do not visit BEEO offices.

The purpose of CRC coordinators' visits to the block education office is also analyzed. In Gaya the CRC coordinators visit the BEEO office for (i) getting orientation about mid-day meal and scholarship distribution exercise, (ii) submitting important papers to BEEO office, (iii) seeking cooperation in administrative work (iv) getting and giving information about teachers (v) submitting data forms, (vi) discussing the problems of teachers and schools, (vii) briefing BEEO about DPEP activities in the cluster, (viii) attending teachers meeting (as CRC coordinators are teachers), (ix) getting departmental information and (x) discussing administrative problems of CRC.

In Malappuram district the purpose of CRC coordinators visit to AEO office include (i) to conduct joint school visits, (ii) to invite AEO to see CRC activities, (iii) to seek the cooperation from AEO, (iv) to get headmasters participation ensured in CRC meetings, (v) to convey about the progress in the DPEP activities, (vi) to share the experiences of school visits, (vii) to discuss about on-going and future activities of CRC and (viii) to send messages (by telephone) to district level offices like DDE and D.P.C. office.

It can therefore be inferred that though there is a linkage between the Block Education office and Cluster Resource Centres but it is not uniformly applicable for all CRCs. Many a times the visit of CRC coordinators to AEO/BEEO office is not in the capacity of CRC coordinator but in the capacity of

a teacher as all CRC coordinators are teachers of primary school. However, it is also clear that even if the CRCs do not have linkage with AEO/BEEEO office it hardly affects the activities of CRC as CRCs are not directly accountable to Block Education Officer.

Linkage between BRC and CRC

Both Block Resource Centres and Cluster Resource Centres are academic support institutions created under DPEP at block and cluster levels respectively. Though it can be easily said that there is a close linkage between BRC and CRC the present study attempts to analyze these linkages more deeply. In this regard the discussion were held with the 6 BRC coordinators in Malappuram and Gaya district and also with 56 CRC coordinators in these two districts. The analysis of these discussions is presented below.

All the BRC coordinators told that there is a regular interaction between BRC and CRC. This interaction is through regular meetings of CRC coordinators at BRC and BRC staff's visits to CRCs. The CRC meetings are conducted at BRC every month and on an average the BRC staff undertakes 10 to 15 visits to CRC in three months.

The CRC coordinators regularly visit the BRCs. All the 56 CRC coordinators said that they visit the BRC. However, in Malappuram all 20 CRC coordinators said that on an average they visit BRC once in a week. But in Gaya only 1 out of 36 CRC coordinators said that the frequency of his visit to BRC is once in a week, another 7 CRC coordinators visit BRC once in a fortnight and rest 28 coordinators visit BRC once in a month.

The purpose of CRC coordinators visit to BRC is also analyzed. In Gaya district the purpose of such visits include: (i) to present the report of CRC activities, (ii) to discuss academic problems of teachers, (iii) to attend monthly reflection meeting, (iv) to discuss the problems of CRC, (v) to get information

received in BRC from District Project office, (vi) to provide help in evaluation work, (vii) to submit question papers and other forms and data, (viii) to get books from BRC library, (ix) to discuss the problems of schools/teachers which CRC is unable to resolve, (x) to attend block level training and TLM Workshop and (xi) to attend CRC coordinators meeting.

In Malappuram the purpose of CRC coordinators' visit to BRC include (i) to attend planning and review meeting, (ii) to share activities already conducted and plan for forthcoming activities, (iii) to discuss with other CRC coordinators and seek their advice and help, (iv) to attend training programmes, (v) to attend meeting for conducting teachers training, (vi) to participate in block level programmes and (vii) to participate in workshops and academic discussions organized at BRC.

The CRC coordinators were asked whether BRC staff visits the CRC. The responses given by 56 CRC coordinators show that only 2 out of 56 are of the view that BRC staff does not visit CRC and both these responses are from Gaya district. Further 3 CRC coordinators did not respond which includes one from Gaya and 2 from Malappuram. Rest 51 CRC coordinators said that BRC staff visits CRCs. But the average frequency of BRC staff's visit to CRC in Malappuram is about once in a quarter whereas in Gaya the frequency was found to be about once in a month. It can therefore be inferred that the BRC coordinators and resource persons visit CRC comparatively more frequently in Gaya district than in the Malappuram district.

The purpose of BRC staff's visit to CRC as perceived by CRC coordinators of Gaya district are (i) to monitor CRC activities, (ii) to give suggestions, (iii) to monitor one day orientation, (iv) to give information received from District Project office, (v) to monitor evaluation of answer books, (vi) to provide guidance in functioning of CRCs, (vii) to see 'Bal Mela' and 'TLM Mela' and, (viii) to address teachers at CRC in monthly meetings. The purpose of BRC staff visit to CRC as told by CRC coordinators of Malappuram are: (i) to help

CRC to conduct CRC meetings and PTA orientation, (ii) to monitor CRC activities, (iii) to provide guidance and support to CRC, (iv) to observe cluster trainings, (v) to monitor progress of implementation of DPEP activities, (vi) to inspect CRC workshop (vii) to help CRC to plan future activities and (viii) to provide pedagogical support to CRC.

The linkage between BRC and CRC is quite strong as has been discussed above and CRCs seek support from BRC for its academic activities and BRC provides guidance to CRCs in their work.

Chapter 8

DPEP MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES : FUTURE PROSPECTS

The District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) is managed by district project office created under DPEP as an independent structure. This office runs parallel to District Education Office (Elementary) and it is expected to be winded up once DPEP comes to an end. Further all the activities being carried out by District Project Office in connection with development of primary education are supposed to be undertaken at the district level by DDE office in Malappuram and DSE office in Gaya district. However the activities carried out by DIET in connection with DPEP are expected to be continued by DIETs even after DPEP is over. Since one of the important aspect of DPEP is sustainability the state governments are more or less bound to carry out all activities undertaken under DPEP after the programme is over.

The DDE/DSE was asked to give their views on whether the responsibility of DPEP implementation should have been given to mainstream educational administration (i.e. their office) rather than creating parallel structure i.e. District Project office. The district education officer of both Malappuram and Gaya were of the view that it should not have been given to mainstream educational administration. This shows that creation of parallel structure for implementation of DPEP was appropriate in view of the district educational administrators. The District Education officers were also asked whether the implementation of DPEP be handed over to their office as it has the sole responsibility of managing primary education in the district. The response from both DDE of Malappuram and DSE of Gaya was negative which shows that the district educational administrators are not inclined/ready to take the responsibility of DPEP implementation, as perhaps it would have given an additional burden to his office.

In order to elicit their views on the competence of their offices DDE/DSE was asked whether his office has enough capacity and competence to take over all the activities currently being handled by District Project Coordinator after the DPEP is over. Both officers are of the view that their office has enough capacity and competence to take over all the DPEP activities. It may therefore be expected that the DDE/DSE office may be able to sustain the DPEP activities in the district.

Block Resource Centres

At the block level academic resource institutions created under DPEP is BRC. Under the sustainability clause of DPEP the BRCs are supposed to be sustained by the state governments after DPEP is over. However sustainability in this regard seems to be doubtful, as states do not seem to have enough funds to support these institutions at their own.

The study focuses on knowing the views of block level education officials about the future of Block Resource Centres. The AEOs/BEEOs were asked if the BRCs should be closed after DPEP is over. In Gaya district one BEEO was of the view that BRC should be closed and other two BEEOs did not give any view in this regard as they put a tick mark on can't say response. However in Malappuram 2 out of 3 AEOs were of the view that BRC should not be closed which means that they are in favour of BRCs continuity even after DPEP is over. One AEO did not respond in this regard. Thus altogether two block education officers are in favour and one against the sustainability of BRCs.

The Block Education officers were also asked whether they think that their office is capable of handling all the activities done by BRCs under DPEP. All the 3 BEEOs from Gaya said that their office may be able to handle all activities of BRC. In Malappuram 2 out of 3 AEOs said that their office may not be able to undertake all the activities done by BRC whereas one AEO said he has no definite idea about it. It may be mentioned here that the 3 BEEO to whom

discussion was held in Gaya were those who are not BRC coordinators and it was found that since they were not nominated a BRC coordinator they seemed to be biased against DPEP in general and BRCs in particular.

The BRC coordinators were asked to give their opinion about the continuity of BRC after DPEP is over. All 6 BRC coordinators (3 from Gaya and 3 from Malappuram) are in favour of BRCs continuity in future also i.e. even after DPEP is over. The reasons given by BRC coordinators from Gaya were (i) in order to continue providing academic support to teachers (ii) so as to continue quality improvement activities and (iii) to continue progress towards achieving the goal of UEE. However the BRC coordinators from Malappuram were of the view that BRC should continue because (i) academic activities done by BRC have to continue and AEO office can't undertake these activities (ii) AEO office have neither time nor capacity to undertake quality improvement programmes and training which BRC is doing (iii) there is a need to sustain the quality achieved through the efforts of BRCs and (iv) improving school efficiency for which BRCs have worked, need to be continued in future also.

It may be kept in view that there was no provision of academic monitoring and supervision of schools in any of the states and further there had been no possibility of providing on-site support to teachers and solve their academic problems. DIET was the only organization to provide such a support but DIET being one institution in a district can't fulfil the need of thousands of teachers and hundred of schools which a district has. Further the block level education officers have neither been trained to give academic support to teachers nor they have time for it. The creation of BRC under DPEP has filled up this gap and these organizations (BRCs) have contributed significantly towards improvement of quality of primary education by providing support to primary schools and teachers on continuous basis. Since such a support will be needed in future also the sustainability of Block Resource Centres is undoubtedly necessary.

As mentioned above due to financial problems, sustainability of BRC by providing its staff salary is a big challenge for the states. However with the implementation of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme there may be the possibility of continuing the BRC with financial support from SSA funding. However the scope of BRC activities need to be enhanced as the BRCs have to provide academic support not only for primary education but also for upper primary education under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme.

Cluster Resource Centres

The academic support structure created under DPEP at the cluster level is closest to the schools as the jurisdiction of a CRC ranges generally between 10 to 15 primary schools. CRC provides a forum for academic discussion among primary teachers during monthly meeting and is also responsible for providing on-site support to teachers when they are teaching in the classroom. Since there is a need to continue these activities to provide academic support to teachers in future also the sustainability of CRC is almost non-negotiable.

The coordinators of all the CRCs covered under this study were asked whether the CRC should continue even after DPEP is over. Out of the total 56 CRC covered under the study 53 CRC coordinators are of the view that CRCs should continue. One CRC coordinator from Wazirganj block of Gaya district did not respond to the question. However 2 CRC coordinators from Areacode block of Malappuram were of the view that CRCs should not continue after DPEP is over. Thus about a 94 per cent CRC coordinators favoured the continuation of CRC. They were also asked why should the CRC continue in future. The reasons given by CRC coordinators from Malappuram district are (i) teachers need continuous academic support (ii) to help teachers to know new trends and methods in teaching (iii) to discover and share the innovative ideas (iv) to continue the inputs towards quality improvement (v) to continuously provide academic support to schools (vi) to provide platform to teachers to discuss their

academic problems and experiences, and (vii) to continue strong support system for smooth functioning of the schools.

The reasons for sustainability of CRCs after DPEP is over as given by the CRC coordinators of Gaya district include : (i) for over-all development of children in education (ii) to continue teachers monthly orientation (iii) to continue activities like 'TLM Mela' and 'Bal Mela' (iv) for over-all improvement of schools (v) to continue providing a platform for teachers meet and sharing of views and sharing of TLM (vi) to continue efforts towards U.P.E. (vii) to continue centralized evaluation system done by CRCs in Gaya (viii) to continuously improve teacher's competence (ix) as CRC works as a link between the school and BRC it should continue (x) to maintain cooperation among teachers (xi) to continue the activity based teaching and joyful teaching-learning process and (xii) to continue good efforts done under DPEP.

The sustainability of CRCs in Gaya district may not be a problem on two counts. First it is expected that CRCs will be funded under SSA also and so funding may not be a problem and secondly no salary is accounted for as the CRC coordinators are all school teachers and are not on full time basis with CRC and it is only an additional responsibility given to them. However in Malappuram the CRC coordinators were full time and their salary component is also to be borne by state government. Continuity of CRC after DPEP may create financial liability on state. But it is expected that the CRCs may be maintained through SSA funding as SSA starts when DPEP comes to an end.

It may therefore be suggested that the academic support institutions created under DPEP namely Block Resource Centres and Cluster resource Centres should continue functioning even after DPEP comes to an end. These institutions have contributed significantly towards development of primary education in general and in improving the quality of education in particular. Since the quest for quality is likely to continue in future also for all times to come the

institutional arrangements made towards quality improvement need to not only continue in future but needs even further strengthening.

Chapter 9

CONCLUSIONS

The Universalisation of Elementary Education is a national commitment which has been re-inforced in India recently by making elementary education a fundamental right. Despite the fact that tremendous progress has been made in country the goal of UEE is still not achieved and in many educationally backward states it seems to be a distant dream. Concerted efforts have been made in various states and several projects and programmes were launched in early nineties and there after to focus on Universalisation of Primary Education. These include Andhra Pradesh Primary Education Project, Bihar Education Project, Uttar Pradesh Basic Education Project and Lok Jumbish and Shiksha Karmi Projects of Rajasthan.

On the basis of experience gained under the above-mentioned projects and as a result of operationalization of para 7.4.6 of Programme of Action (1992) a countrywide programme known as District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) was launched in 1993-94 in 42 districts of 7 states of the country. However this programme has finally covered more than 250 districts of the country which are from 18 major states.

The DPEP focuses on educationally backward districts of the country. The districts covered under this programme have been selected on the criteria of educational backwardness which is defined in terms of female literacy level below the national average. The main thrust of DPEP is on district level planning, community participation and decentralized management, thrust on education of special focus groups and deprived sections of population and improving the effectiveness of education through teachers training, improvement in learning material and providing better infrastructure facilities in schools.

Management Structure under DPEP

The District Primary Education Programme has evolved a management structure from national level down to the village level with substantial autonomy, high degree of flexibility and space to experiment with different method and models. The management structure of the programme have been created at several levels namely national, state, district, block, cluster and the village.

The District level and sub district level structure created under the programme includes District Project Committee headed by District Collector or the Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Parishad. The Committee reviews the progress of DPEP in the district and works towards widening the network of supporting agencies. The Committee has representation of NGOs, panchayats, educational institutions, Village Education Committees and experts in different areas apart from government departments. Apart from it there is also a District Implementation Committee which functions as the executive body at the district level.

The District Project Offices (DPOs) have been established as a separate structure in all the DPEP districts. Day to day implementation of the programme is managed by a full time District Project Coordinator (DPC) who is assisted by Assistant Project Coordinator, Resource Persons etc. Generally staff of the Education Department posted in the district including supervisory officials are expected to work closely with the district project office of the DPEP. The District level structure is also supported by the District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), District Resource Group created for the said purpose and other institutes.

At the sub-district level in many districts there is a Block Project Implementation Committee. Block Resource Centre (BRC) created under DPEP lends academic support at the block level whereas the same support is given by Cluster Resource Centre (CRC) at the cluster level. Further at the village level there are Village Education Committee (VEC), Parents Teachers Association

(PTA) and Mother Teacher Association (MTA) to oversee the implementation of the programme at the grass root level.

Objectives of the Study

The study focuses on the district, block and cluster level management structures created under DPEP. It tries to analyze the linkage of the newly created structures with the structures already created by state government at these levels. More specifically the following are the objectives of the study.

- (i) To study role and functions of district and sub-district management structures created under DPEP.
- (ii) To analyze the vertical and horizontal linkages of district and sub-district management structures with other academic and administrative structures.
- (iii) To discuss the future role of district and sub-district level structures like BRC and CRC.

Methodology

The study is based on both secondary and primary sources of information. The secondary data was collected from District Education office, Block Education Office as well as from District Project Office DPEP, BRC and CRC. However primary data was generated by administering questionnaires at district level for District Project Office (DPEP), DIET and District Education Office (Elementary). At the Block level primary data was collected by administering questionnaire on Block Education Office and BRC while a questionnaire was administered on CRCs for collection of primary data at the cluster level. The study does not cover village and grass root level structures at all.

In order to undertake in depth study of the management structures and their linkages, two DPEP districts from two different states were selected. One DPEP phase I district named Malappuram was selected from Kerala, which is the most advanced state of the country from the point of view of educational development. The other selected district was DPEP Phase III district named Gaya from Bihar, which is educationally the most backward state.

The Malappuram district in Kerala has 15 blocks out of which 3 blocks were selected for the study and these blocks are Areacode block which is a tribal block with average literacy rate. Manjeri block having high literacy rate and Tanur block having low literacy rate. Out of these 3 blocks the CRCs covered are : 8 CRCs out of total 14 in Areacode block, 5 CRCs out of total 17 CRCs in Manjeri block and 7 CRCs out of total 15 CRCs in Tanur block. Thus out of total 46 CRCs in these 3 blocks the study covers 20 CRCs.

The Gaya district of Bihar has total 24 blocks out of which 3 blocks were selected for the study. There are: Imamganj block which is a backward block and is a naxalite effected area, Tikari block which is forward block and Wazirganj block which is an average literacy block of the district. The CRCs covered for the study under the 3 blocks are: all 13 CRCs of Imamganj, all 13 CRCs of Tikari and 10 out of 12 CRCs of Wazirganj block. Thus out of the total 38 CRCs in these 3 blocks the study covers 36 CRCs.

Management Structure at District Level

In Malappuram district in Kerala the Deputy Director of Education (DDE) is incharge of elementary education who is assisted by AEOs who are block level education officers dealing with elementary education. In addition to this there is a DIET also which caters to the need of quality improvement of elementary education. The management structure created under DPEP in Malappuram consists of a district project office (DPO), which is responsible for implementation of DPEP at the district level. Incidentally both DPO (DPEP) and DDE offices are

located in the same campus. Further the District Project Coordinator DPEP is a person from State Education Department only and his rank is equivalent to DDE and the posts are interchangeable also. The present DPC was DDE Malappuram about two years ago. Because of such an arrangement the coordination between DPC and DDE Office is expected to be better. However, during discussion with the district level functionaries it was found that the coordination is not as good as it appears to be. The District Project Office DPEP has the responsibility of implementation of DPEP and his office works independently without involving much the DDE office, which is only next-door. However for administrative matters DPC consults the DDE office whereas for academic matters DPC office works independently and DDE office does not have much idea as to what activities District Project Office is doing in connection with DPEP.

The linkage between DIET and DPC office is ensured by making DIET Principal as ex-officio Additional DPC of DPEP and so the coordination between DIET and DPC office is fine. For sometime in Malappuram, DIET principal also had charge of DPC.

In order to see the horizontal linkages between the three district level offices namely DDE, DPC and DIET certain questions were asked. The findings in this regard are as follows:

- DDE office has a role in convening meetings of BRC coordinators, and AEOs and also in deputing teachers to work as trainers in BRC and attend various training programmes conducted at BRC. This is how DDE office has some role in DPEP activities but as is clear this role is limited to administrative matters only. The DDE is also invited to participate in planning and monitoring meetings of DPEP. Further DDE office has some linkage with DIET also which is in the form of mutual consultations in academic matters like teacher training, planning and school activities.

- The DIET is involved in DPEP activities very closely. The DIET faculty members have been appointed as Academic Coordinators of BRCs. Further DIET conducts training for District Resource Groups (DRG), Block Resource Groups (BRG) and is involved in all academic programmes conducted under DPEP at the district level. DIET principal is invited in meetings at DPO as well as at DDE office.
- As told by Officials, the DPC office of DPEP gets support and cooperation from DDE office as well as from DIET as and when DPC office seeks help and guidance from these offices. This help and cooperation is taken by inviting the Officials in various meetings and by having informal discussion with them.

In Gaya district of Bihar, the District Superintendent of Education (DSE) is in charge of elementary education. He is assisted by Block Education Extension Officers (BEEO) who are block level officers dealing with elementary education. In Gaya there is a DIET also which one of the very few functional DIETs of Bihar. The structure created under DPEP at the district level consists of District Project Office, which is headed by District Project Coordinator (DPC). Incidentally in Gaya the DIET principal is also DPC from the very beginning of DPEP implementation and DIET as well as DPC office are located in the same campus. It is therefore quite clear that there is a perfect coordination between DIET and DPC office as incharge of both these organization is the same person. It may be noted that in Bihar the DPCs have been recruited through rigorous selection process and many DPCs selected were from outside Education Department. It was therefore more pertinent to see the linkage between DPC office created under DPEP and DSE office, which is part of mainstream educational administration in the state.

By visiting all the three district level offices in Gaya it was found that despite perfect coordination between DIET and DPC office the linkage between DPC office and DSE office is not upto-desired level. The DSE office is generally

unaware about the DPEP activities in the district and does not seem to be even interested to know about DPEP activities. This may be due to the fact that DSE is too over burdened with his routine work that there is hardly any time at his disposal to bother about DPEP activities. Despite several attempts and personal visits to the DSE office the investigator could not get an audience with DSE Gaya. However information regarding DSE office were taken from his subordinate staff.

Some important findings with regard to the horizontal linkage between DSE office, DPC office of DPEP and DIET are as presented below:

- The role of DSE office vis-à-vis DPEP activities has been limited to the extent of providing data relating to schools and teachers and giving administrative support. However, DSE office is not much aware about the DPEP activities.
- Even the linkage between DSE office and DIET is also almost non-existent and is limited up to DSE's sometimes casual visit to DIET when teacher training is conducted. The officials of DSE office have not much idea as to what type of training are conducted in DIET and other details of the trainings imparted for their teachers etc.
- On probing it was revealed that the DSE office cooperation with DPEP activities is in the form at not creating any hurdle in the functioning of D.P.C. office of DPEP in the district. The interpretation that may be made is that DSE office does not bother much about D.P.O. and DIET activities.
- The DPC office seeks help and cooperation from DSE office by inviting them in the meetings regularly. However it is a matter of fact that DSE officials do not attend the DPO meetings regularly and even when they come and sit in the meeting they hardly participate in its discussion.

- In connection with DPEP the DIET has undertaken the responsibility of capacity building of BRC Resource Persons, training of CRC Coordinators, attending monthly reflection meetings, conducting learners evaluation and conducting action research etc.
- During discussion it was found that there is almost no linkage between DIET and DSE office. However DIET Principal is sometimes invited in the meetings conducted by DSE office and DIET also invites DSE to participate in the meetings but the response from DSE office is not much encouraging.
- It was found that DIET faces problem in getting support and cooperation from DSE office in connection with appointment of staff, resource support etc.

Management Structure at Block Level

At block level in the existing educational administration, Block Education Officer is incharge of Elementary Education. However the nomenclature of this officer varies from state to state. In Malappuram (Kerala) it is known as Assistant Education Officer (AEO) where as in Gaya (Bihar) it is known as Block Education Extension Officer (BEEO). The jurisdiction of AEO in Malppuram (Kerala) in terms of number of primary schools ranges between 60 and 100 whereas in Gaya (Bihar) it ranges between 125 to 200 primary schools. For the 3 selected blocks in Malappuram Kerala namely Areacode, Manjeri and Tanur average number of primary and upper primary schools is 75 and 24 respectively while in 3 selected blocks of Gaya districts in Bihar namely Imamganj, Tikari and Wazirganj average number of primary and upper primary schools is 165 and 20 respectively.

The structure of Block Education Office also varies from state to state. In Malappuram Kerala the AEO office has a staff of 11 persons which includes AEO, Senior Superintendent, Typist, 6 clerks, peon, and a full time menial staff. But the BEEO office in Gaya has virtually no staff as it has only BEEO himself and a peon. In order to perform routine work BEEO generally takes one of two primary teachers in his office, which is only an informal arrangement.

Under DPEP at the block level an academic support institution has been created which is named as Block Resource Centre (BRC). Each block is expected to have one BRC. This is the situation found in Malappuram (Kerala). However in Gaya (Bihar) due to some reason it was decided to establish one BRC for every two blocks. So in Gaya district where there are 24 blocks, the number of BRCs is only 12. The BRCs have been established to provide on site support to teachers in terms of school visits, demonstration and feedback, teacher training, material preparation etc.

The Block Resource Centres are headed by BRC Coordinators who are generally school teacher. BRC may also have resource persons, trainers, teacher educators, subject experts and academic coordinators.

The staffing in BRC office also is different in different states. In Malappuram Kerala BRC has a staff of 8 persons, which includes, BRC Coordinator, Academic Coordinator, 3 Resource persons, 2 trainers and a peon. However in Gaya, Bihar the BRC personnel include BRC coordinator and 3 or 4 resource persons only. Further even BRC coordinator is not full timer as the BEEO is nominated as ex-officio BRC coordinator. This is the reason that in Gaya BRC is run virtually by resource persons. This staff of 4 or 5 persons in BRC in Gaya is despite the fact that one BRC has to cater to 2 blocks because the number of BRCs set up is only half the number of blocks.

In order to have an idea about the linkages and coordination between BRC and BEO office questionnaires were administered on both BRC coordinator

and Block Education Officers. In this regard 3 BRC Coordinators each in Malappuram and Gaya and 3 AEOs in Malappuram and 3 BEEOs in Gaya were contacted. Findings of this interaction are as follows:

- Since in Gaya BEEO is ex-officio BRC Coordinator also the linkage and coordination between BRC and BEEO office is proper. However it may be noted that jurisdiction of a BRC is of 2 blocks in which there are 2 BEEOs out of which only one is nominated as BRC coordinator. It was found that the BEEO who is not a BRC coordinator takes absolutely no interest in DPEP activities and many a time he is quite critical of BRC activities. It was found that these BEEOs are sometimes biased also against BRC and DPEP activities, as they have not been appointed as BRC coordinator.
- In Malappuram most of the BRC coordinators have left and Academic Coordinators who are faculty members of DIET were found to be incharge of BRC at the time of visit by the Investigator.
- The linkage between BRC and AEO/BEEO office is generally seen in terms of AEO/BEEO deputing teachers for training conducted at BRC, providing data to BRC about schools and teachers etc., AEO attending CRC Coordinators meeting. Planning and Review Meeting Discussion with AEO/BEEO on BRC programmes etc.
- The BRC Coordinator in Gaya attends teachers monthly meeting with BEEO, takes part with BEEO in the formation of Vidyalaya Shiksha Samiti (VSS) and in connection with teachers training related works. However in Malappuram BRC coordinators visit AEO office in connection with discussion on awareness building programmes, for PTA orientation, for IEDC medical camp etc.

- The BEEO/AEO sometimes visit BRC to see the training conducted there, to attend CRC reflection meeting, to get and take various information, to attend headmasters meetings, to see IEDC medical camp etc.

Cluster Level Structure

In the existing educational administrative structure there is no cluster level officer who looks after primary/elementary education. In states generally below the block education officer there are primary and upper primary school headmasters only. However under DPEP an academic support institution is created at cluster level known as Cluster Resource Centre (CRC). The CRCs are created for a group of 8 to 10 villages where there are about 12 to 15 primary schools. The CRCs are headed by Cluster Resource Centre Coordinators.

In both Malappuram as well as Gaya the CRC coordinators are school teachers. In Malappuram CRC coordinators generally work at BRC as trainers and not much activities are undertaken at CRC and in most of the cases even there is no room or building for CRC. In Gaya district the CRC coordinators are not full time persons as they continue teaching in their respective schools and also work as CRC coordinators.

Vertical Linkages

As noted above there are three structures at the district level out of which two namely DDE/DSE office and DIET were in existence in the states even before DPEP while one structure named District Project Office has been created under DPEP. Similarly at block level there are two structures, one already in existence was AEO/BEEO office and the other created under DPEP is the Block Resource Centre (BRC). However at the cluster level there is only one structure and that even created under DPEP is known as Cluster Resource Centre (CRC).

The paper focuses on studying the vertical linkages between various structures which were already existing before DPEP and the one created under DPEP. In this regard the linkages between DPC office and AEO/BEEO office, between DDE/DSE office and BRC, between DIET and BRC and between AEO/BEEO office and CRC have been analyzed as follows.

Linkage Between DPC Office and AEO/BEEO Office

The study focuses on linkage between the District level structure created under DPEP and block level structure already existing before DPEP. In Gaya district in Bihar since BEEO is also ex-officio BRC coordinator the linkage between this BEEO office and District Project Office is better as this BEEO in the capacity of BRC coordinator is totally involved in DPEP activities. However, the BEEO who is not a BRC Coordinator the linkage between his office and DPC office is almost non-existent. But DPO seeks help and support of BEEO/AEO for deputation of teachers for training. In Malappuram the DPC seeks support from AEO for conducting training programmes, to get in touch with local bodies and teachers organizations and also to provide on site support to teachers. For seeking this support sometimes DPO staff also visits AEO office. They also sometimes visit AEO/BEEO office to collect data about teachers and schools.

The BEEO/AEO generally visit the DPC Office when they are called for some purpose e.g. to participate in various meetings conducted by DPC. Sometimes some enthusiastic BEEOs/AEOs also visit DPC office to know about DPEP activities. However on day-to-day basis there is no concern of AEO/BEEO office with the District Project Office DPEP.

Linkage between DSE/DDE Office and BRC

At the district level DSE in Gaya and DDE in Malappuram is incharge of elementary education and this arrangement is in place since independence. But Block Resource Centre, which is an academic support institution at the block

level, is a creation of DPEP. In this regard in Gaya district all the BRC coordinators are under the control of DSE in the capacity of being BEEO also. It is therefore clear that they are accountable to both DSE as well as DPC because of being BEEO and BRC coordinator respectively. However there seems to be no direct linkage of BRC coordinator with DSE with respect to DPEP activities. In Malappuram the DDE sometimes visit BRCs to monitor the training programmes and ensure that teachers are regularly attending. They also depute their teachers as BRC trainers. Thus the DDE in many cases help BRC for its better functioning. But for day-to-day activities there is no direct linkage of BRC with DDE Office.

The Block Resource Centre seeks support of DSE office for deputation of teachers and resource persons in the BRC trainings. In Malappuram it was told that all DPEP programmes are planned after discussion with DDE office including the activities of Block Resource Centres. However it is very rare for DDE/DSE to visit the BRCs.

Linkage between DIET and BRC

The DIETs have come into existence as district level resource institutions after implementation of the teacher education scheme envisaged under National Policy on Education 1986. The Block Resource Centres though set up under DPEP are also supposed to be the resource institution at block level. So it is expected that DIET and BRC will be supporting each other as the capacity building of BRC coordinators and resource persons is the responsibility of DIET. In Malappuram, Kerala the BRCs have two coordinators out of which one is designated as Academic Coordinator and a faculty member of DIET is academic coordinator of each BRC and thus 15 faculty members of DIET are designated as academic coordinators of 15 BRCs. Thus on day-to-day basis there is a direct linkage between DIET and BRC. However it was found that because of this arrangement the activities of DIET suffer as out 20 faculty members in DIET as many as 15 are deputed as academic coordinators who come to DIET not more

than once or twice a month and only 5 faculty members are full time available for undertaking the activities of DIET.

In Gaya district also it was found that there is a good coordination between DIET and BRCs. All BRCs regularly report to DIET about their activities and take guidance from DIET. DIET also conducts monthly reflection meeting of BRC coordinators and resource persons of BRC. Further DIET faculty also takes part in monthly reflection meeting of CRC coordinators at BRC.

In both districts namely Malappuram and Gaya the DIET gives guidance and reviews and monitors all the academic activities of BRCs and help BRCs to conduct training programmes and workshops. The DIET faculty frequently visits BRCs and BRC coordinators and Resource Persons also visit DIET to discuss academic matters.

Linkage between AEO/BEEO Office and CRC

The CRC coordinators are generally the primary school teachers whose accountability is towards the block level education officers. In Malappuram Kerala the CRC does not seem to be a full-fledged resource center and the CRC Coordinators generally act as BRC trainers and that is why many CRCs do not have even a room also. However in Gaya Bihar the CRC Coordinator has a dual role to play i.e. he is teacher in a school and continues teaching also and he also acts as a CRC Coordinator. So CRC Coordinator is only a part time job for him. It was found that CRC coordinators have hardly any work in AEO/BEEO office in connection with CRC activities. Even if CRC coordinator visits AEO/BEEO office he does it in the capacity of being a primary school teacher rather than as a CRC Coordinator. Even if he sometimes visits Block Education Office it is with a purpose of inviting BEEO/AEO to see CRC activities, share their experience of school visits and to ensure participation of teachers in CRC meetings.

It was told by the AEO/BEEOs that sometimes they visit CRC though it may be once or two times in a quarter only. They visit to see and monitor CRC activities, to meet the teachers in monthly meeting to ensure that teachers attend CRC meetings regularly etc. In Gaya the CRC coordinators have also been given responsibility of supervising mid-day meal distribution, distribution of text books, scholarships etc. In order to undertake these works also CRC Coordinators have to visit BEEO office for guidance and support.

As far as future prospects of DPEP management structures is concerned the District Project office (D.P.O.) is expected to be winded up after DPEP comes to an end. But it is suggested that block and cluster level academic support Institutions namely Block Resource Centres (BRC) and Cluster Resource Centres (CRC) should be sustained by the state governments after DPEP is over. This is because these structures have significantly contributed towards development of primary education and such contribution needs to continue in future also.

REFERENCES

Census of India, Final Population Totals, Bihar 2001 Series I R.G.I. office, Government of India, New Delhi

Census of India, Final Population Totals, Kerala 2001 Series I R.G.I. office, Government of India, New Delhi

Government of Bihar, Gaya district DISE 2001, District Project Office DPEP Gaya 2002

Government of Bihar, 'Report on EMIS 2001-02 of Gaya District', District Project Office DPEP, Gaya, 2002

Government of Bihar, 'SSA Perspective Plan of Gaya District', District Project Office DPEP, Gaya, 2002

Government of Kerala, Malappuram district EMIS (2001-02), District Project office DPEP Malappuram, 2002

Government of Kerala, Malappuram district DISE 2001, District Project Office. DPEP Malappuram, 2002

Government of Kerala, SSA Malappuram Perspective Plan 2001-2011, District Project Office DPEP Malappuram, 2002

Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Education 'National Policy on Education', New Delhi 1986

Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Education 'Programme of Action' NPE, New Delhi 1986

Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Education 'Programme of Action National Policy on Education (Modified) New Delhi, 1992

Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Secondary and Higher Education, 'Selected Educational Statistics 2000-01' New Delhi, 2002

Government of India, Ministry of HRD, Department of Education, 'DPEP Guidelines' New Delhi 1995

Kapoor, M.M. et al, 'Educational Administration in Kerala', Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, 1994

National Council of Educational Research and Training, 'Sixth All India Educational Survey' NCERT, New Delhi, 1998

National Sample Survey Organization, Department of Statistics, Govt. of India, Attending an Educational Institution in India : Its Levels, Nature and Cost NSS Fifty Second Round, 1998

Shukla, Snehlata, Attainment of Primary School Children in various States, NCERT, New Delhi, 1994

Sinha, Anil et. al, Educational Administration in Bihar, Vikas Publishing House New Delhi, 1999

Varghese N.V., Public Initiatives in Primary Education, **New Frontiers in Education**, Vol. 25, 1995

Varghese N.V., Decentralization of Educational Planning in India : The case study of DPEP-I **International Journal of Educational Development**, Vol. 16 No. 4, 1996

Varghese N.V., 'Quantity of Primary Education, What to we learn from Research', **Journal of Education and Social Change**, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1996

Varghese N.V. & S.M.I.A. Zaidi 'Local Bodies and Planning for Education' : A Study of Aurangabad district Maharashtra' NIEPA New Delhi, 1999 (unpublished)

Zaidi, S.M.I.A., 'Planning and Management of Primary Education' An Indian Experience' A paper presented at Educational Policy Analysis and Planning Workshop, 1995 HIID Harvard University U.S.A. (unpublished)

Zaidi, S.M.I.A., 'Management of Primary Education Under DPEP' Paper presented at Regional Seminar on Teacher Empowerment and School Effectiveness at Primary Stage', April 1997 organized by RIE Ajmer (unpublished)