

**Understanding School Processes in Nepal:
A School Level Status Study of Policies and Practices of School Sector Reform Program**

Report of the Piloting of the Study Design

Mahesh Nath Parajuli
Renu Thapa,
Megh R. Dangal
Prakash C. Bhattarai
Anila Jha
Bhola Dahal

January 2012

Embassy of Finland
Kathmandu

Synopsis of the Report

This study is designed with the main purpose of understanding how the activities under the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) are functioning at the school level with the purpose of suggesting improvement measures. Before going to the main study, a pilot study was carried out for seeing the applicability of the study design. As the main study is designed to conduct using qualitative approach, this pilot study was also conducted with the same approach and was based mainly on conversational interaction with the school actors – head teachers and teachers, members of School Management Committee (SMC) and Parents Teacher Association (PTA), parents, and students in five community (public) schools in Lalitpur District.

This pilot study revolved around the four themes: accessibility of policy provisions to local school actors, understanding of those provisions, implementation situation, and participation in the school processes. This study revealed that the local school actors have little information about different policy provisions. They have not even heard several provisions designed to improve the school processes and whatever they know their knowledge was only partial. Whatever they had known that was mainly through the verbal transmission during the interactions made at their respective Resource Centre (RC) indicating the need for substantial improvement in the Ministry of Education (MOE) support system. The finding also indicates head teachers' inactiveness to access policy provisions.

It was found that confusion and misunderstandings prevail among the local school actors in apprehending the policy provisions. More critically, neither the head teachers and teachers nor the SMC and PTA members were found serious in understanding and in following the rules and procedures. Perceived lack of relevance of these programs to schools or to the school managers was mainly responsible behind their indifferent attitude towards different policy provisions. Their claim, however, was that those provisions were not implemented because of lack of necessary government support. There was also the situation of lack of meaningful participation in school processes. Lack of government monitoring, the school management not very willing to involve other actors, and parents not able to see the school as *their* school were largely responsible for limited or no participation in school processes. The situation was thus very much unsatisfactory in all four themes: access, understanding, implementation and participation. MOE system was of course there to support in all these processes but obviously, the system was not performing well and thus was requiring urgent attention.

Amidst such bleak situation, the study also found that the visited schools were progressing in terms of student size and infrastructure development. However, these schools were functioning in a very traditional way without giving due consideration to the SSRP objectives like developing better learning environment in the school, making the school system transparent and accountable, and promoting participation in school processes. Inability in initiating an appropriate change process with a strong political commitment, inability to giving due considerations to aspects like existing political-cultural realities and their complexities, and inability in understanding paradoxes found in education at different levels explain problem in the functioning of the SSRP processes at the school level.

The Research Team

Mahesh Nath Parajuli, Professor, School of Education, Kathmandu University

Renu Thapa, Associate Professor, Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID), Tribhuvan University

Megh R. Dangal, Assistant Professor, School of Arts, Kathmandu University

Prakash C. Bhattarai, Freelance Researcher

Anila Jha, Freelance Researcher

Bhola Dahal, Embassy of Finland

Acknowledgements

The Research Team wants to express its sincere thanks to the Embassy of Finland for entrusting us this very important task. We have made every effort to stand as per this trust. We would particularly like to thank Satu Pehu-Voima (Ms), Counsellor (Development), for her active interest and support in conceiving, designing and implementing this pilot study.

Thanks are also due to all our participants whom we discussed in the schools we visited as well as official in the District Education Office. The information they provided and their ideas and perceptions were quite important for us to build our ideas. We drew upon our arguments, analysis and interpretations based upon what we listened from them.

We would also like to thank senior officials of the Ministry of Education system with whom once we met and shared in the Department of Education about the research, its purpose, specific objectives, themes to be explored, methods to be applied, and other aspects of the research. The ideas they expressed was quite important to give the final shape to the research design. This same meeting formed a Technical Committee to guide and support the Research Team in the successful implementation of the research activities.

Three of the members of this Technical Committee Hari Lamsal, Under Secretary, Ministry of Education, Balaram Timalina, Deputy Director, Department of Education, and Samanta Mani Acharya, Curriculum Development Centre were quite instrumental during the research process. They actively participated in designing the study framework and tools, joined the school visits and actively participated in the discussion made there. Their reflections were quite important in making interpretations and developing conclusions of this study. Hence, the Research Team likes to express its sincere thanks to them.

Table of Contents

Synopsis of the Report	i
The Research Team.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents	iv
A School Diary – Reflections on Field Work.....	1
The Policy Setting – School Sector Reform Program	3
The Research – Objectives and Methods	4
Objectives of the Study	4
Scope of the Study.....	4
Methodology	4
The Change Process – Paradoxes and Complexities.....	6
Processes in Schools – the Four Themes	7
Access to Policy Information	8
Understanding the Essence of Policies	10
Implementation of Policies	12
Participation in Decision Making.....	15
Drawing upon – Discussions and Conclusions	18
Recommendations – for the Main Study.....	20
References	22
Annexes: Implementation status of the SSRP policies and practices in Schools.....	23
Annex 1: Visited School Information.....	23
Annex 2 A: Study Framework Nov – Dec 2011.....	34
Annex 2 B: Tools for the field study Nov – Dec 2011.....	38
Annex 3: Availability of Policy Documents (Applicable to School) in Five Study Schools....	41

A School Diary – Reflections on Field Work

We arrived at the school, located in a rural market town, at about 8 o'clock in the morning, the scheduled time for our arrival. The head teacher of the school was informed that a team of researchers, including officials from the Ministry of Education are coming to discuss about the situations in school. It was a school day and morning classes were going on. Some teachers and students were roaming around; probably they did not have class at that time. Wearing school dress, both girls and boys were looking smart. Looking from the outside, the school infrastructure was impressive, though one of the buildings was yet to be completed.

We were taken in a teacher common room where our meeting was arranged with the members of the School Management Committee (SMC) and Parents Teachers Association (PTA). They were enthusiastic in saying that this school was one of the good schools in the area. Their justification was that the school now has good buildings, good SLC results, and increase in number of students. There were members who informed us that they had taken their children from private school and enrolled in this school. They had, however, no answer on what happens inside the class, whether children are learning what they should be learning and whether teachers were teaching appropriately. Chairperson of the SMC was saying, "How can I interfere in the job of the head teacher and teachers? My task is to support the head teacher (or the school) when he asks me for that. Except that I should not be interfering in his job. If I am to go to the class what teachers do here?"

Throughout the day we were in that school, the same message was conveyed to us – the school was improving very well, teaching in this school was very good and that the school was making good competition with the private schools. SMC and PTA members, teachers, parents and even students were conveying the same thing. This was of course a very positive aspect but, as we found, the other side of the story was that the school was not following, either not at all or in a proper manner, the policy and program provisions developed to achieve the objectives of the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP). The school had prepared the School Improvement Plan (SIP) but the members of the SMC, PTA, parents and many of the teachers did not know about this and as remarked by one of the teachers the prepared SIP was very sketchy. Same thing was true about social audit, and financial record was also not properly kept. Members of SMC and PTA and parents had no idea on how scholarships and textbooks are distributed. The conclusion was that though the school was getting success, as was shown by visible outcomes and parents reported satisfaction, the school could not be the example of good management. Instead, questions could be raised on aspects like transparency, accountability, and poor participation in school governance and management.

In one or other way, same was the situation in all five schools the Research Team visited in different parts of Lalitpur District as a part of a school level status study of policies and practices of School Sector Reform Program (SSRP). The first reflection we have had in all schools was that the schools did not have access to policy/program documents related to school. Among about 40 documents developed for effective school management and governance as well as for enhanced learning of children, hardly two-three were available in schools. Excepting few other documents in few schools, only available documents in all visited schools were education act and regulations. This showed that the head teachers and

school management were not serious on running the school in a transparent, accountable and participatory manner. It also showed that head teachers were not enthusiastic in conducting the school in an innovative way. SMC and PTA members were unaware of different provisions made for improving the school. More critically, they were of opinion that they don't need to worry about all those things.

Our reflection on the whole was that schools were very much focused on getting financial support, in addition to the regular government grant. Some schools were getting support from some NGOs and INGOs as well as from other local sources. In itself this was very good but probably this would increase the tendency of somehow centralized and less transparent school management practice. Moreover, the supports thus received were focused in infrastructure development and teacher recruitment and there was little investment in quality enhancement. Not all schools were that fortunate in getting external financial support and they did not show any promising situation.

Schools were not keen on adopting practices of better management. Financial transactions were not properly maintained and the audit was carried out without following the prescribed norms. Social audit was not practiced as a process of sharing and discussion but a ritual exercise of reading out income and expenditure amidst mass gathering where generally no one would question or comment. No environment would be created prompting for discussion. Moreover, none of the schools had submitted the social audit report of the previous years to the District Education Office.

Class observation showed satisfactory teaching-learning situation but without any additional teaching learning materials and group works. Children's participation in the class processes was considered as a ritual process and assessment was carried out in a traditional manner. Teachers were observed regular in the class, though students in all schools reported leisure classes. Interestingly, all schools visited had claimed to adopt English as the medium of instruction. They were also using English as a subject under local curriculum. Owing to declining student size as well as strong market demand, schools had adopted this strategy to attract students and it seemed that this was working. Parents whom we interacted did not complain problem of understandings in their children because of English medium. However, children were not silent. Though they expressed their satisfaction that they were studying well in English medium, they also complained lack of understandings. To cope with such situation teachers were found using Nepali even in English class. One teacher remarked on the shift to English, "We left Nepali but could not arrive at English." While interacting with us, students demanded practice and life-skill based curriculum and teaching learning, and teacher discipline. None of the school had developed and practiced the code of conduct for school actors. School improvement plan was yet to be fully internalized by the schools we visited, and schools lacked five years SIP and regular updating system of the SIP

Our reflection after visiting five schools was that schools were running only on a day to day manner. The first concern of the school management was to run schools without any problem. All their attention was confined in getting more and more financial support so that they could improve their physical facilities, in increasing the number of students, and in making efforts for better student results. These were their strategies to compete with private schools and they were getting some success in their endeavor. There was not at all

or very limited attention on how to improve cognitive as well as psycho-social development of the students.

One other reflection was on head teacher's leadership. Head teachers were not appointed in line with the concept of performance contract as mentioned in the SSRP. However, in all schools we visited, the head teacher was described as instrumental in all development the school could achieve, indicating the key role of the head teacher or school administration in making the school a better one. Nevertheless, lack of some generic skills of leadership and management such as establishing effective communication, better coordination, building team work and creating participatory environment were less evident in the schools we visited.

The Policy Setting – School Sector Reform Program

Nepal began its planned development intervention in 1950s; with the first education development plan in 1956. The second major planning exercise came only in 1971 in the form of National Education System Plan. Then came 1990s and afterward, with series of major education interventions with donor support. All those projects/programs had national coverage aiming to bring improvements in the existing school system.

In this sequel of centrally planned education interventions, came the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) as a continuation of best practices of previous interventions. Initiated in July 2009 as a five year program, the SSRP aims to bring some systemic changes like change in school structure, school focused interventions, increased fund-flow to schools, change in governance and management practices, quality enhancement, improvement in internal efficiency, social inclusion, emphasis on technical and vocational education, etc. However, the government has yet to develop legal backing to this program for its effective implementation. That is, the SSRP reform provisions do not match with the existing Education Act. Despite this problem, SSRP activities are being carried out in a nationwide manner. For this, the government has been making necessary budget allocations as well as regulatory provisions. So far the government has issued, in addition to acts and regulations, about 40 directives, guidelines, manuals, and circulars to central and district level education authorities as well as to schools and teachers.

With the involvement of nine pooling and other non-pooling Development Partners (DP) or donors, it has become a multi-stakeholder program. Funding for the SSRP comes both from the government and donors who are directly or indirectly involved in planning, implementation and monitoring of SSRP activities. SSRP is being implemented under the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) where all the donors and the government pool their fund in a common program and is designed basically to promote national ownership and management of the program. Several tools such as Paris Declaration, Accra Agendas for Action, Joint Financing Arrangement and Code of Conducts are used while managing the SSRP program and funding.

So far no research has been conducted on the status of implementation of the SSRP at the school level. How is the situation at the school level? Whether the situations in schools are toward achieving the aims of the SSRP or not? What positive aspects as well as problems

and issues are there at the school level? There are media reports on gaps and lapses in the implementation of SSRP activities. Likewise, there are also anecdotal observations questioning the relevance and efficiency of the whole school level education.

This explorative study is designed and conducted (pilot) to respond to these concerns. This study on the implementation status (through enforcing guidelines and frameworks) of the SSRP policies and practices would add value by providing an understanding of school processes so that the delivery and support mechanism for SSRP implementation could be improved. It also provides insights on whether the MOE has fulfilled the stated obligations or not. By providing policy feedback from the level of actual practice, the school and the school actors, to the policy makers this study would contribute to complete the policy cycle and bridge the gap between policy formulation and implementation process. All these will help to accelerate the process of achieving the desired results.

The Research – Objectives and Methods

The design of this research study including setting the objectives and scope of the study is made clear while preparing the Terms of Reference for this study. Likewise methodological procedures (discussed below) are also largely specified in the TOR.

Objectives of the Study

Given the concerns discussed above, the purpose and objective of the study is set to identify the strengths and causes of weaknesses of policy implementation in education sector (evaluation of policy and guidelines) in order to suggest actions on how to improve the operations at the school level, how to support schools and by whom. The specific objectives are to analyze the persistence of results in the medium and long term and main risks which might affect the sustainability and to find solutions to the existing problems to improve the quality of outcomes.

Scope of the Study

- Assess and document the availability and understanding of various stakeholders at school and district level including students on different SSRP policies and directives.
- Analyze the views and understanding of the DEOs/SSs/RPs, Head teachers/teachers, SMCs and PTAs on their roles and responsibility as prescribed in the Act, Regulation, and guidelines and also assess the difficulties of its implementation.
- Explore the implementation status (both strengths and weakness) of the different policies and directives at school level as listed in the annexure one and also document the factors and reasons for implementing and not-implementing those guidelines.
- Suggest options and support mechanism to school for effective implementation of the SSRP policy and guidelines in Nepal.

Methodology

As required by the TOR a piloting or the first phase of the study was conducted during November-December 2011 with the main purpose of developing study framework, tools,

and checklists in the second and main phase of this study. The TOR also requires that the study be conducted using qualitative research methods.

The piloting was conducted in five schools in Lalitpur District. Among the schools selected one was in city area, one in rural market and three were in rural areas (urban outskirts, clustered village, sparse village). Likewise, two were lower secondary, one secondary and two were higher secondary. This report is the outcome of the pilot phase of the study. Schools were selected in consultation with the District Education Office on the basis of location, level, accessibility, readiness to participate in the study. As per the one of the set criteria for school selection, at least one school was selected on the basis of receiving support from some other agencies (UN agencies or I/NGO).

This first or pilot phase of the study began by studying and preparing the gist of about 40 policy documents including acts, regulations, directives, guidelines, and manuals that were issued by the government to facilitate school level education. Largely based on the essence of these policy documents, a matrix was developed with four major themes – accessibility/availability, understanding, applicability (implementation), and participation as well as nine areas of school functioning (Annex 2). Based on this matrix, guidelines were developed to facilitate interviews and discussion with different stakeholders at the school level as well as at the district level. In addition, a check list was also developed to note the availability of all 40+ policy documents in the schools as well as in the districts (Annex 3).

While this document mapping and studying was going on, a joint interaction was organized with the senior officials from the Ministry of Education, Department of Education, Curriculum Development Centre, National Centre for Education Development, and Office of the Controller of Examinations. Several aspects of the proposed study particularly the expectations as well as scope, limitations, and challenges were discussed during this interaction. Officials informed the Study Team that among 40+ documents related to school education, ten are directly relevant to the schools. This same meeting formed a Technical Team consisting one each representative from the Ministry of Education, Department of Education, Curriculum Development Centre, and National Centre for Education Development with the purpose of providing technical guidance or support to the Study Team. The Technical Team members were actively involved in finalizing the Framework and the Guidelines. They also actively participated in visiting the schools and districts, and provided their reflections while drawing upon from the field data. It also provided first hand information as well as clarity and feedback to the agencies concerned on policy formulation about the status of policy implementation from the local level.

This piloting phase of the study was also considered as training or orientation to the members of the Study Team. All Study Team members had actively participated in the development and finalization of the framework, guidelines, and checklists. Besides, once these tools were developed the Team Leader discussed, in detail, with the members of the Team about the intent and purpose of items included in the tools with the purpose of maintaining clarity and consistency. Excepting some cases, all of the Study Team members participated in school visits.

In schools, interactions were generally made with separate groups formed consisting of different school actors. Often, one group consisted of the school administration team including the Head teacher, the Assistant Head Teacher, the teacher looking after the school account, and teacher representative to the School Management Committee. The other groups included the Chairperson and members of the SMC and the Parents Teachers Association; parents; students; and the teachers. Other activities carried out in visited schools included class observation; general school observation; looking at the minute books of the SMC, PTA, and teachers' meetings; looking at some documents prepared by schools (if available) like the school improvement plan, social audit report, and financial audit report; observing student attendance on the day of the visit and student attendance register; and noting the availability of the policy documents in the school.

Interaction with school actors mainly focused on exploring the availability/accessibility of different policy documents, their understandings on the essence of those documents, applicability (implementation) of provisions in those documents, and participation in school processes. In general, efforts were made to understand the status of the SSRP policies and practices at the school level. Positive aspects and available opportunities as well as weaknesses and challenges were also discussed during these school interactions.

In all visited schools the Study Team was welcomed very well. In order to facilitate the Study Team, school members came either well ahead of school time or stayed late after school. In all schools, the discussion was live and majority of presented people actively participated in the discussion. These were the indication of their enthusiasm in participating in the study and in turn, supporting the efforts of improving the school processes. Interaction was also made at the District Education Office which was participated mainly by Resource Persons of the district, School Supervisors, and other staff members. Female representation was ensured in all of the interactions we carried out at the school and district level.

All the data thus collected were transcribed and processed in order to draw the meanings expressed by the participants. The data were grouped and regrouped as per the four identified themes. School profiles of each visited schools were also prepared separately (Annex 1). Following the practices of qualitative data analysis, data were at times aggregated while at other times unique identities were maintained. When appropriate, the meanings derived and the interpretations made from the data were also compared with some concepts and theories mainly with the complexity and change but also with leadership and participation perspectives.

The Change Process – Paradoxes and Complexities

Development interventions are intended for change – positive change or improvement in existing situations. Change would take place as a gradual and self-automated process but then the outcome might not be desirable. For achieving the intended outcome, change should be designed and directed. Accordingly, SSRP was designed and implemented with the purpose of bringing positive changes by addressing the existing *problem situations* in school level education in Nepal. But then, achieving the intended change is not simple and linear. There are several paradoxes and complexities and these need to be addressed first.

Paradoxes are dilemmas. Knowingly or not knowingly when one is not clear which way to move or when one shows the contradictory understandings or behavior then the situation is of paradox. Considering our schools, this study has noted several paradoxes of differences in saying and practicing as well as confusion in directions. Addressing these paradoxes with all their complexities is what is missing now. Complexity is a mess where several interconnected phenomenon and their dimensions are interwoven along certain thread(s) forming a whole where both the whole and the part are active in themselves, or in relation to other parts, and where the whole is again the part of some other whole (see, Serrat, 2009). In other words, complexity is the understanding that phenomena are interconnected forming a complex maze of web and this interconnection goes on and on. For example, a girl's absence from her school on a certain day might be related with several factors, which, in turn, might be the result of several other factors. Again, these several others might be the result of additional others. A sound complexity analysis behind problem phenomena is thus essential to address the problems strategically. Otherwise, the intended change could not be realized.

Change is inevitable in complexity. According to Ramalingam et al. when change takes place it would go in a disproportionate and unpredictable manner because the relationship among phenomenon is nonlinear (Ramalingam & Jones, with Reba & Young, 2008). According to them, a small change at the beginning could create ripple effects bringing massive influence at later stages and that there are agents – individuals as well organizations – who respond to the change as per the context they are in and their own goals. Change, according to Fullan, is a force for school improvement (2006). That is, it is very important to understand how and why changes are taking place (or not taking place). Looking from the other perspective, often education interventions fail to bring the intended change because we fail to realize what brings and sustains changes, how they need to be directed, and what the complexities of the process are. To initiate the change in an effective way Fullan (2006) has emphasized on changing the culture – culture of individual and of the organization or the system in which they work. When we talk about these entities, we are considering leaders and members who are in dialectic interaction either from within and from outside the system. This brings the concern for leadership and participation. Both these aspects are intricately related and are essentials for a successful change (Bennis, 2000).

How is change taking place at the school level? We now move to exploring the school processes – actually what is happening and how is happening at that level, based on our study of five schools in Lalitpur District.

Processes in Schools – the Four Themes

As discussed above, this exploration is carried out on the basis of four themes: accessibility/availability, understanding, applicability (implementation), and participation. SSRP objectives are transformed into action plans for implementation through different programs and activities. Implementation of these policies and activities are regulated and facilitated through different acts, regulations, guidelines, manuals and directives. These are the means for communicating SSRP objectives into actions and it is very important that schools are communicated about the policy intentions. With accessibility we thus wanted to explore

the availability of these different documents at the school level. Even if the policy is not available in the school in any documentary form, school actors might have information/knowledge about the policy intention. So, we also explored how informed school actors are regarding different policy provisions. Likewise, it is very important that school actors understand the policy intention in a proper way. If there is problem in understanding, obviously the policy could not be implemented in an intended manner or there might even be the risk of unintended application. Applicability of policy intention is another important dimension for realizing the SSRP goals. The concern here is to explore readiness, capability and the support mechanism available at the school level for the effective practicing of SSRP intentions. Finally, we explored how participatory is the SSRP implementation practices at the school level. A broad based participation is one of the conditions for successful realization of the SSRP goals.

Access to Policy Information

As discussed above, Ministry of Education and its constituent central level agencies have prepared several policy documents including acts, regulations, directives, manuals, and guidelines with the purpose of achieving the SSRP objectives. It is thus essential that these provisions be communicated to districts and school or to school people who are responsible to carrying out the intended provisions and it is the responsibility of the government to communicate these to the school. This depends upon how efficient the education service delivery system is. It is also important that the school people show awareness/willingness to acquire such information and this depends upon how aware, capable and committed school people are towards their roles and responsibilities.

Excepting Education Act and Regulations, all five schools visited reported having no policy documents (see Annex 3). Education Act and Regulations were available because this was available in the market in one book form. Schools were found not even having curricular materials such as national curriculum framework, teachers' guide and assessment tools; only two reported having the national curriculum framework. Likewise, schools also did not have teacher guidebook (one school reported having 10 years ago older version of teacher guidebook). Schools were carrying out different activities like preparing School Improvement Plan, social audit, continuous assessment of the students, etc. obviously without having the concerned documents (guidelines of SIP preparation, Social audit and continuous assessment of students), raising concerns about quality of those works. These findings make it clear that neither the government is strategic enough to make its own programs successful and effective nor the school management, head teacher particularly, is serious enough to make the school a better learning place.

It can be said that if the school management is well informed and well versed about the policy provisions that should be considered as very good. Situation was not very encouraging in this case also. Among 40+ documents, there were few areas or themes specific documents like piloting SSRP model building or the technical and vocational education related documents which were not applicable to schools visited. Hence, neither the schools needed to keep these documents, nor the head teachers needed to know about them. Excepting few such cases, head teachers mentioned that they had no idea about the existence of many of other documents that were directly related to their school. One

further explanation of lack of knowledge in head teachers was that some of these documents were not popularized by the concerned MOE offices. That is, the document was prepared but not disseminated to the schools on a wider scale. Child Friendly Quality Education National Framework, Resource Person Mobilization Guideline, National School Health and Nutrition Strategy, SMC/PTA training guideline etc. were some of the examples which were prepared but disseminated either on a very limited scale or not disseminated at all. Hence, it seems that the problem of not having policy documents in school or head teachers not knowing about the policy provisions is less because of their weakness or fault but more because of inefficiency of the MOE service delivery system including poor communication strategy and inappropriate delivery and dissemination mechanism.

Actually, when the Research Team had met with the senior MOE Officials, it was mentioned that there were actually only about ten policy documents which should be available in all schools. These documents were Education Act, Education Regulation, Program Implementation Guidelines, School Improvement Plan Guidelines, Social Audit Guidelines, Local Curriculum Implementation Guidelines, Welcome to School Campaign Manual, Continuous Assessment System Implementation Manual, School Accounting Manual, and Child Friendly Framework.

It means that from 40+ documents we come down only to the ten. What does this mean? Can somebody simply indicate that the MOE system has largely been confined in its routine exercise and thus has been unable to hold more innovative responsibilities?

It was found that in all five schools the head teachers and the school administration (the assistant head teacher, teacher representative to the SMC and the PTA, and the teacher taking care of school account) knew about SIP, social audit, local curriculum implementation, welcome to school campaign, and CAS and they were performing these activities in one or the other way. However, a discussion with them as well as with other school actors like teachers, SMC/PTA members, parents, and students, and also by looking at some documents prepared by schools it was clear that the head teachers or the school management were hardly informed about the proper procedure of carrying out these activities. They were performing these activities because they were told to perform them. It was clear during discussion that none of the head teachers were fully clear about the proper procedures as outlined in those documents.

Head teachers informed that the main source of their knowledge about these different policy provision were the Resource Person (RP) who had shared these information mostly verbally with the head teacher during discussion or interaction session at the Resource Centre. According to one of the head teachers, "these documents were discussed at the Resource Centre during the meeting, but the RP hardly provides the hard copies." More or less similar ideas were expressed by other head teachers also. Two points are worth noting – verbal communication of policy provisions, and head teachers blaming the system for not informing them properly about the policy. However, while interacting at the District Education Office, some of the RPs outright rejected this blame and claimed that they have properly oriented the head teachers about different provisions and have also given them, in some cases, the hard copies (whatever is available) also. As compared to the head teachers, SMC/PTA members and school teachers were less informed about the policy provisions.

They relied on the information provided by the head teacher. Some of them also mentioned that the RP was also their source of information. Likewise, some teachers also mentioned about the media. Though need of advocacy at the local level is greatly emphasized in the policy documents, such as the Three Year plan and the SSRP, no mechanism is seen till now for informing parents and students about different provisions.

Head teachers and teachers have suggested to using media for wider dissemination of relevant policy documents. They also suggested for making these documents available in the market (bookshops). According to one teacher in one of the schools visited, “I had no idea about all these documents. Now I think I should find them.” Lack of information, and motivation was thus clear. Innovative strategies using available technologies as well as participation with potential agencies would bring breakthrough in this area.

Finally, it can be said that the schools were found having very little information about different policy provisions regarding the SSRP and whatever they had known was only partial. Verbal transmission through RP was their only main source of such information. Inefficiency of the MOE system as well as the head teachers’ inactiveness both were responsible for limited availability or access to information for school actors. As is clear, availability or access alone is not enough and that school actors need to understand the provisions, at least as is required, is essential. We now intend to explore this dimension.

Understanding the Essence of Policies

Availability of document or access to information is not enough, it is equally necessary that the school actors understand the policy provisions in a proper way. Without such understanding, it is natural that the program implementation could not be that effective. For the purpose of this study, understanding was taken as the ability to explain the intent, purpose or essence of policies; if not the whole document, that much, as is necessary for successful implementation of the program.

It was found that either the head teachers were not clear about the policy provisions or they have the attitude of ignoring those provisions. In most cases they were unable to explain the procedure as described in policy provisions. Upon discussion with other participants and upon looking at some documents prepared by the schools like school improvement plan, social audit report it was clear that the prescribed procedures were not followed. When asked to describe in detail the procedures followed to prepare the SIP, the head teacher mentioned, “Previously, we used to follow the government norms to prepare the SIP. Teachers were asked to fill the necessary forms and then the prepared document was sent to the DEO. However, last year an NGO supported us in preparing our SIP. A discussion session was also organized for this purpose where NGO people, teachers, SMC/PTA members, parents and students participated and discussed the school issues.” This was of course a very positive aspect that the local school actors sat together and discussed the school issues. However, this response from one head teacher also indicated that for this head teacher SIP was filling-up of some forms and that the document was for sending to the DEO and not for their own purpose. Some other head teachers also echoed somehow similar understandings indicating lack of clarity in the policy intention. One class teacher in one of the schools mentioned, “Myself and other class teachers gave necessary data and as I

understand, the head teacher and the teacher responsible to managing the school account prepared the SIP document.”

One school, located in urban outskirts, reported conducting social audit two years back. The head teacher mentioned, “We invited parents, SMC/PTA members, students and some other community people. We told them the school income and expenditure for the year. Then we asked the participants to give their opinion about the school because social audit was not only income and expenditure but also a time for discussing school issues. People said different things but however we did not document those things.” The school was thus trying to do something in the name of social audit. It had gathered the people in the school and in whatever form informed its stakeholders the financial situation of the school. Moreover, some discussion on different school issues was also made. We can say, at least, one objective of social audit was achieved. However, it was also clear that the school did not follow the proper procedure of social audit. In spite of the participatory management envisioned in the SSRP, visited schools were found not giving due value to participate parents and students and other stakeholders in school processes like preparing the school improvement plan or carrying out social audit.

Some of the head teachers mentioned that they were largely clear about different policy provisions. One head teacher emphasized, “Till now, I have not faced any problem because of not knowing policy provisions.” However, while discussing continuous assessment system this same head teacher was unable to explain how the continuous assessment of students was to be carried out. This tendency of ‘I know things’ was shown by almost head teachers in one or the other way. What might be the case was that they knew something about the provision in a general way either by participating in Resource Centre meetings or by other means but were not fully clear about the requirements and procedures to follow. This attitude of the head teachers not willing to show their lack of understanding is however problematic because this results in maintaining only the routine and obstructs the improvement.

There was also absence of a sharing culture in schools that would otherwise facilitate a systematic sharing of policy provisions with the teachers as well as with the members of the SMC and the PTA. Understanding of the policy provisions by other school actors like teachers, and SMC/PTA was far less satisfactory. Head teacher was their only source of information in most cases though some teachers also mentioned about Resource Person, media, interaction among themselves, etc. They indicated that there was a lack of systemic dissemination of these policy documents from resource persons and school supervisors. Students, parents, and other local stakeholders had no access at all to most of the information though some would know through informal channel or when they gather at school for some purpose. Thus, there was no any mechanism to make understand students and parents about the policy provisions. Such situation was contributing in creating doubt on them on school decisions and practices. Parents expressed such doubt while interacting with us. The situation of no-communication was thus making the school less transparent and less accountable. Because of this reason people might lack ownership of school processes.

In most of the schools we visited, Chairperson and members of School Management Committee (SMC) and Parents Teacher Association (PTA) expressed their ignorance about different policy provisions. SMC and PTA Chairperson had even no idea about their roles and responsibilities. It was surprising to find that even people like retired professor, retired government officials, active business people, who were in SMC and PTA of visited schools were unaware about their roles and responsibilities. Some of them were in their present position since some years and would like to describe themselves 'actively supporting the school.' They had little idea on how scholarship and textbooks are distributed, how SIP is prepared and how social and financial audit is carried out. A quick look at the meeting minutes of the SMC and PTA in all visited schools revealed that most of the discussion and decisions were confined on administrative and managerial aspects like managing construction and repair of school facilities, getting financial support and other support from other organizations, financial transactions, appointing teachers and other staff, etc. and there was little discussion and decisions on aspects like teaching learning, quality of learning, or on improving classroom environment. It seems that the SMC and the PTA were there only to do whatever head teacher would ask them to do. According to one SMC Chairperson, "we do what head teacher tells us to do". One other SMC Chairperson was clear in his understanding, "I don't know what the rules are. I don't see them, I see what is practical. I know I should support the head teacher and I know how I should do that."

The findings make it clear that there were lots of confusion and misunderstandings in apprehending the policy intentions. It was also clear that the school administration as well as SMC and PTA, were not that serious either in understanding or in following the rules and procedures. On the other hand, government efforts to make local school actors understand the SSRP policy objectives were not bringing the desired results. This shows the need for changing the strategy to make people understand, internalize and actively participate in implementing SSRP activities. We now turn to look into the situation of implementation of SSRP policies at the school level.

Implementation of Policies

The effectiveness of education programs or policies depend upon how implementable those policies or programs are. Effective implementation of any program would also depend upon how people have understood and internalized the policy provisions because we cannot expect proper implementation when there is limited understanding. As discussed, understandings and internalization of different SSRP provisions was limited among local school actors raising doubt and concern on effective implementation of SSRP policies. Our study on five schools showed that there were critical problems in this aspect.

There were problems in different SSRP provisions like free education, local curriculum, social audit, school improvement plan, continuous student assessment, scholarship, free textbook, etc. It was not that head teachers or others regarded these programs as un-implementable, though they see some requirements of some programs as really difficult. The problem was, in the words of a head teacher, "There is no government support facilitating the program implementation." The head teacher elaborated, "The government says free education and that we should not be raising fee from the students but who is going to support this free education? Who provides all the costs required for running a

school and the costs for drinking water and toilets, and books and equipment?" The argument was that the government grants do not cover costs for all these basic requirements. The blame was, "The government neither provides us full support nor allows us to raise the fees." Nevertheless, all the visited schools were raising 'fees' even in primary grades. 'Fees' were charged using one or other names and by making decision in the SMC meeting. Some of the parents we discussed expressed their dissatisfaction over the 'fees' whereas others took it positively thinking that it helps in providing quality education to children. Some teachers and also some SMC/PTA members were of opinion that charging some 'fees' was necessary for building sense of ownership among parents on school. Some were also of opinion that parents would show awareness on their children's education only when they pay something. However, raising fees from students in basic education is against the notion of Interim Constitution, Three Year Plan and School Sector Reform Program.

There was however little space for parents to show their concerns on aspects of school management. In all five schools we visited it was found that students and parents were not aware on provisions and criteria regarding scholarship and textbook. As envisioned in the SSRP, policies of allocating funds to schools based on SIP and making audit report mandatory to release funds to schools are yet to be implemented. Many of girls and children from deprived groups were receiving scholarship, mostly in kind – stationeries, school dress, bag, shoes, etc. However, parents and students had no idea on who were getting scholarship, how much and from which source and on which ground. In some schools some NGOs were also providing scholarship in cash or in kind form. Scholarship and textbook distribution was just the decision of head teacher and school administration and generally not a matter of discussion at SMC meetings. The head teacher and her/his team would also decide which textbooks are to be used in the school. In the name of using English medium, schools were using textbooks published by private publishers which would cost more than the books prescribed by the government as textbook. In such case, parents would have to bear the additional costs. Some parents also reported that their children were given both books – the government books and also the private books. As they would use the private books, the government books were for nothing. This was an example how the resource was being mis-utilized.

Box 1: Priority for English

In a school located in a sparse village, priority was given for English rather than for local language. A local teacher from the local community emphasized the need of English instead of mother tongue as it is the international language. According to him, "Those who are proficient in English can get job easily. Learning English is necessary for a good job." According to a parent local language does not provide employment and employment is necessary for a better life. So there was mismatch between what language and political activists demand and what people want. Moreover, the government provision of local curriculum was challenged at the local level. This could also be seen as the failure of the government to dialogue with parents and establish coherence between parental demand and the policy provision. A complexity analysis understanding paradoxes is essential here.

The program of the local curriculum was found in a paradoxical situation in all five schools (see, Box 1). Under this program schools were allowed to choose any field of study relevant

to local socio-cultural, economic or livelihood related aspects of the community. However, all schools had chosen English as their local curriculum. This was because of a strong market demand for including English not only as a subject but also as a medium of instruction. Schools were also taking English as one of the strategies to compete with private schools in attracting more students and they were getting some success in this regard. All five schools reported increase in their number of students due to introducing English as a medium of instruction. The concept of local curriculum was thus very much defeated.

All these problems schools were facing in the implementation of the SSRP provisions were related with insufficient technical and managerial support to them. Teachers as well as SMC/PTA members complained that they get very little support from the government. Giving examples of programs like school improvement plan, continuous assessment of student, social audit, financial audit, design and implementation of local curriculum, etc. some of the head teachers noted that the reasons behind problems in effective implementation of these programs were that the schools did not have necessary skills to carry out these programs. It was also mentioned that they were not given enough training and orientation for carrying out these activities in an effective manner. It was found that the school improvement plan and social audit was being prepared in a ritual manner; prescribed norms and standards were not followed in account keeping of school financial transactions and was maintained in a very crude manner; implementing continuous student assessment was pushed for the next year because teachers were “not yet clear” on all those “complex forms”; not having the copies of the curriculum in the school or with teachers was not considered a problem situation because teachers were not aware that they should actually be following the curriculum and not the textbook; and none of the five schools had designed and implemented the local curriculum because school people had no such idea. As informed by Resource Persons during an interaction session at the District Education Office, school teachers however have been provided some orientation and training on the implementation of all those programs. Nevertheless, it was clear that some brief orientation or training programs were not enough for successful implementation of these different tasks. It was obviously not possible for effective outcome out of these programs without necessary exposure not only on technical aspects but also on socio-cultural and political dimensions of these programs.

Data discrepancies were also observed in all schools we visited. This was partly because of intention to receive more public resources and partly because of weak accountability mechanism in place. This directly questioned the capacity of the system to monitor the input-process-output at the school level. The prescribed norm of student teacher ratio was hardly followed in any of the school we visited. Schools themselves tried to justify the rationale of keeping extra teachers but in the mean time the situation questions on the efficient use of available resources.

Lack of support from the MOE system (DOE and central level technical agencies) was of course a critical reality and hence, there was need to be effectively prioritized support mechanism from the government side. However, the other side of the story was that, as discussed above, school management people including the SMC and the PTA members, were not giving due considerations to implement these programs effectively. That is, they were not finding these programs relevant or supportive for them and thus were ignoring

these programs. Rather, they might be seeing these programs not in accordance to their culture and politics of school management. The key implementation related problems of the SSRP provisions were thus lack of necessary government support, local actors not internalizing and not seeing the relevance of these programs and the lack of a broad-based participatory and transparent management culture.

Participation in Decision Making

A broad-based participatory management practice was lacking in all five schools. This was happening despite government emphasis on promoting participation in school governance and management. The SSRP noted to emphasize “school-based management accountable to parents and children” (MOE, 2008, p. 25). The concept of school based management and decentralized management of education system are also emphasized in the three year plan (National Planning Commission, 2010, pp. 121-125). As explained in the SSRP, the school based management is planned to strengthen through empowerment of SMCs and making them accountable towards parents and local level actors. The implicit assumption behind promoting participation in school processes was that this would contribute to enhance community support to school as well as community surveillance of school processes. Accordingly, several policies and strategies have been developed to promote participation in school. Bodies like School Management Committee and Parent Teacher Association and processes like school improvement plan, and social audit are examples towards this direction.

Despite these provisions, the intended participation could not be realized and the school management could not be made accountable, in a functional sense, to parents and children. There were both School Management Committee and Parent-Teacher Association in all visited schools but they were seen little functional because they could hardly realize their roles and responsibilities. However, as already discussed, their role and authority in school decision making process were found at minimum level. Neither the parents, specifically the members of the SMC and the PTA, were properly oriented about their roles, responsibilities, rights and obligations nor were they pro-active enough to be aware and understand about their own position. Behind all these was the notion of political culture of centralization, hierarchy and subordination. Neither the government was serious enough on creating a meaningful space for parental participation nor was the immediate school management active to invite and involve parents in school processes. In absence of a meaningful dialogue, parents themselves could not realize the importance of their own role in school governance and management (see, Box 2).

One unique reality about the lack of parental participation observed in the visited schools was that majority of children were either from the migrant labor families or the children themselves were working as household worker and this reality was greatly affecting on interest and participation of their parents in schools. In the city school, students were mostly household worker or the children of migrant labor families whereas in schools in urban outskirts and rural market there mainly were children of migrant labor families. As they were migrants and their job was temporary, their staying in the locality was also temporary. They would move place to place depending upon their job availability, greatly affecting continuity of their children in school. This was one of the reasons for high student

dropouts in schools. More critically, as they were not permanent residents in the locality it could be assumed that they would have little time and interest on school affairs. This indicates towards the possibility of non-parent members in the SMC and the PTA. Actually, there were cases of non-parent membership in the SMC and the PTA in some of the visited schools. In such a situation, school teachers on the one hand were complaining about the lack of parental interest but on the other, they were doing little to attract those parents on school processes. Similarly, there were no specific programs from the government's side so that even the migrant parents could actively participate in school processes.

Box 2: Caste Discrimination in School

In a school located in urban outskirts, a female ECD facilitator from Dalit community is working from two years. Her task is to take care of ECD children. In day time she helps children in having their tiffin. Sometimes some children cannot take all the tiffin so they carry it back home. One day she saw some tiffin thrown outside the school compound. When she inquired, she learnt that some children from the upper caste family had thrown the tiffin. She was dumb when she learnt the reason for throwing. The children's parents had told them not to bring back the tiffin if touched by her. She felt a deep sense of humiliation and frustration and as she complained with the Research Team, since then she has not been able to perform well. This was simply an example how such social evils were active even in education institutions and were hampering the education environment there.

The case of migrant and non-local parents raises the question of 'Whose school?' During the school visit, it was found that in some cases children from the same neighborhood community where the school was located were not coming to the school and those who were coming were from distant and scattered communities also. That is, people in the neighborhood might not be taking care of the neighborhood school because their children were not attending that school. It is however important that the school get support from the neighborhood community as well as from the community which sends children to the school. One other concern that raises the question 'Whose school?' is related with giving space to parental voice in designing and delivering teaching learning in schools. The second concern is addressing the needs of diverse groups of children and parents – migrant laborers who is deprived, local but deprived ones, and better off. The dropout or non-participation of so many children from the school might directly be related with this concern of 'Whose school?' Actually, many parents and children might not be seeing the school as *their* school; resulting in their non-participation in schooling.

The question of participation is also related with who are accessing the school. It was found that most of the students in the five visited schools were mainly from the deprived groups of people – household worker (in the city school), migrant laborer, and the poor locals. One father in one of the schools noted, "Excepting few, most of the students in this school are those who could not go to private school." Again, a mother was pointing, "If one sends her/his children to public school then s/he would lose status in the society. So, parents send their children to private schools for social prestige." These statements were examples of people's losing faith on public school system. Even some teachers in some schools were sending their children to the private schools causing further decrease in public faith towards the public school system. However, the case was slightly different in case of daughters. Except in one city school, all four schools had girls' majority in the current school year.

According to one mother in one of the schools, “Sons are sent to private schools and daughters to public schools.” That is, sons were getting preferential treatment and were sent to fee paying private school of perceived high quality education and daughters were discriminated by sending none or low fee paying public schools of perceived low quality education (see, Box 3).

Box 3: Role Model in Girls’ Education

In a school located in a clustered village, there were more girls than boys in all grades. The reason was, boys were sent to private schools expecting better education for them and daughters were sent to public schools. Contrary to this general trend, a couple was sending their daughter to a boarding school and son to a public school which seems quite amazing in Nepali context. The father, an illiterate person, was a tailor, a low caste, but his idea on the importance of girls’ education was significantly different from others. He said, “If females are well educated then the whole family will be educated.” Upon further exploration the Research Team found that there was his wife behind all his ideas on girls’ education. According to him, his wife was educated and was thus taking the whole household responsibility. He was happy that compared to males in the village, his wife was more efficient in carrying out household responsibility. As the couple was financially not able to send both children to private school, they decided to provide better education to daughter and sent her to a private school and son to a public school. This was an example how demonstration effect works to attract people towards education and thus has important policy implication.

Except attending the classes and participating in limited extra-curricular activities, students’ involvement in the decision making processes was found at minimum level in visited schools. Discussion with students and other respondents made it clear that students were not invited in any of the processes like preparing the school improvement plan (SIP) or carrying out the social audit. Likewise, they were not invited to attend the SMC or the PTA meetings. Though there were child club and junior red-cross in all those schools, students were thus not given any opportunity to put forward any say in the school decision making process. As noted by students in one of the schools, even the activities of their clubs were developed by the teachers, though they also suggest some activities. The Research Team however found that students were willing to contribute to school processes and some even claimed that they were capable to make such contribution.

Teachers also had little opportunity to influence the decision making process in the school. Some of the teachers however mentioned about participating in processes like preparing the SIP, carrying out social audit, or suggesting student names for scholarship. Such participation was however limited in performing supportive role and not on decision making role. According to a teacher in one of the visited schools, “We participate in staff meetings but these meetings are not for decision making; they are for the head teacher giving us the directions. Sometime we also discuss aspects like the school calendar, the daily class-routine, preparing for the exams, timely completing the courses, etc.” As is clear, these are just aspects of administrative management and are directly not related with making the school transparent and accountable. According to one other teacher, “It is politics that influence the school decision making; not anything else.”

To sum up, participation in the sense of meaningful involvement of local school actors in the decision making process was at minimum in all the visited schools and ownership towards school affairs at the local level was less evident. Schools were running largely in a traditional and hierarchical manner with little or no effort at all to involve local stakeholders in school processes. All this was mainly because of the government that fulfilled its obligation by instituting some mechanism and framework but then not looking how these were functioning in different schools in different context, because of school administration that was not very willing to make the school process a participatory process, and because of the parents who were finding it difficult to think the school as *their* school. Thus, the SSRP envisioning of developing capacity at the local level and increasing school ownership were yet to be realized, seriously restricting participation and inclusion.

Drawing upon – Discussions and Conclusions

Ministry of Education or the SSRP heavily relies on school (SMC, PTA, head teacher and teacher) to bring positive changes in the school processes so that the students' enhanced learning and development could be ensured. To facilitate this objective, different policies are formulated, guidelines are developed and procedures are prescribed. The notion behind all these policy documents, guidelines and directives is that the school and what happens in the school are pivotal in the success of any educational system. Hence, it is essential that the policies and strategies developed to address these concerns be communicated properly to all the school actors. School Sector Reform Program Joint Consultative Meeting (11–13 December, 2011) has also realized a need for developing appropriate mechanism to communicate and disseminate the policies to the school level. Along with such communication, it needs to ensure that the school actors rightly understand the provisions made, that the provisions are being implemented in an appropriate manner and that a broad-based participatory environment is there for the implementation of the policy provisions. It can be said that if any lapses are seen in these aspects at the school level that would be indicative of some shortfalls in the education system as a whole.

The present five school study has shown that there really are weaknesses in the system. It is found that schools are not well communicated about the policy provisions. Not only schools do not have policy documents, school actors are also not well-informed about the policy intents. Of course, the MOE has deployed the Resource Centre (RC) system for the purpose of supporting schools in achieving the SSRP objectives and there are Resource Persons who work as a link between schools and the MOE system and communicate the policy provisions to schools through trainings, workshops, and discussion sessions. However, it is clear that this strategy is not working very well and thus there is the need for alternative thinking, which might also include re-enforcing the RC system or even considering restructuring the existing system. It is not only the RC system that is not working well but the leader of the school, the head teachers, also are found not very interested to access the policy provisions. This indicates the need for energizing this position.

The study also revealed that the local school actors have not internalized the policy provisions and there is misunderstandings regarding the intents and the procedures of different activities. More critically, they are found not very serious and enthusiastic in understanding those provisions; and thus making their implementation problematic. Again,

both sides, the MOE system and the school management, are to be questioned for such problems. The MOE support to the school system in order to implement the program is very weak and the school management is not showing enough concerns for the effective implementation of SSRP programs. Lack of enough concerns towards the SSRP programs from the school management can be understood as the perceived lack of relevance of those programs to local cultural and political context. Situation in the school is not very satisfactory from the perspective of participation as well. Weak monitoring from the MOE system, lack of willingness of the school management to make the school processes participatory in a meaningful way or limiting the participation in a more routine and ritual activities, and perceived distance between the school and the parents are mainly responsible for such lack of participation. On top of all these, the MOE system has so far not been able to understand all the social, political and cultural paradoxes and complexities and give direction to the change process. That is, though the schools are often described as change agent, the five schools study show that they are not prepared or are not supported for change.

In order to support or prepare the schools for acting as a change agent, their internal as well as external dynamics need to be explored which would include understanding the forces that support or resist the change. It is also important to understand that these forces do not operate in a binary position but remain active along a continuum. That is, the same force could play the role of supporting and resisting the change. Understanding this sort of complexities could begin by exploring the existing paradoxes. As this study has revealed there are several paradoxes at the school level: schools are made 'free', but are not fully funded; policy documents talk about learning environment, but schools focus on physical infrastructure; the scheme for continuous assessment of students is implemented, but parents want traditional examinations; teachers talk about child focused learning, but practice lecture mode. Likewise, both parents and teachers agree learning is more important, but then give emphasis on passing in examinations. School management, including the SMC and the PTA; have remained indifferent towards provisions for promoting participation and for maintaining transparency and accountability in school processes. That is why activities like preparing SIP, performing social audit, carrying out financial audit, etc. are simply ritualized and are carried out with the purpose of reporting to the MOE system and not for the development of the school. A different type of paradox found during the study is the blaming culture – one entity or actor blaming the other for failure or inefficiency in the system.

These situations raise the question of accountability, transparency and legitimation of education organizations. The long period of political transition in the country is resulting in weakening of state institutions and corruption is being institutionalized (Transparency International, 2011). Parents blame undue political interference in school processes and teachers' undue political interests. The accountability of state institutions, including the school, has consistently been questioned (T R Upadhyya & Co., 2007, Foundation for Human Development & Research Inputs and Development Action, 2009, Office of the Auditor General, 2011). All these have resulted in challenge to the state schooling – parents are rejecting the state schooling by sending their children to private schools and the school management, including the SMC and the PTA, are defying the state regulations.

In such a situation, what is required is a strong political commitment from all levels and actors for changing our socio-political culture for preparing the schools as a change agent – not only changing itself but also changing and empowering the community. Emergence of strong civil forces at several fronts and levels is also necessary in order to harness the required political commitment. Again, a space must be created for active emergence of civil forces. Only then they are able to raise voice for better service delivery. These are not easy but we have to begin. Change efforts thus should begin at several fronts: at political-cultural front as well as at administrative and management fronts. As discussed above, such efforts should begin with a complexity analysis that should necessarily be inter-disciplinary. So far, education sector in Nepal has remained confined within the sector itself and thus now should go beyond education and look into wider social, cultural, political and economic forces of the society.

In administrative-management front, the accountability-transparency framework is very important (World Development Report [WDR], 2004). Without understanding the interconnectedness of accountability-transparency framework of policy makers-managers/service providers-people, the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the service delivery could not be realized. Likewise, such understanding is also essential to make policy makers and managers accountable towards people. Improving the people's power over the service providers helps to improve the service outcomes (WDR, 2004). For this, the nature and commitment of the managers, availability and use of technology, social forces and available environment must be analyzed and understood (Robbins, Judge, & Sanghi, 2007). While talking about the school and its community, the change process should also be informed by the leadership dynamics, capacity building at the school level, and enhanced school-community relations. Finally, it is worthwhile to quote Pauline Rose, Director of Education of All Global Monitoring Report, "... a combination of strong political will and sustained financial commitment, with aid donors backing nationally developed education plans", is essential for achieving the EFA goals. Rose asserts, "Yet funding for education remains grossly insufficient and fragile according to recent analysis by the GMR team." (World Education Blog, 5 January 2012). This is equally true in relation to Nepal and School Sector Reform Program.

Recommendations – for the Main Study

This piloting was conducted in a very short period of time and was only a five school case study. As a pilot study, it focused on seeing how the study design works so that the intended purpose of the study could be achieved. Accordingly, the pilot particularly focused on relevance of tools, sample, respondents, themes to be covered, methods of data collection and analysis and the output to be derived. However, in itself this pilot study could be considered a study on its own and came up with many important insights about the processes that go (or do not go) in the school. In this sense, the design of the study could be considered appropriate. However, it would be better to consider following points for more effective outcome of the main study. The purpose of these recommendations is to make best effort to derive the insights of the people and make a more meaningful interpretation of the SSRP functioning.

- Make the study more focused and in-depth aiming to exploring the school processes so that their underlying meaning could be understood in a contextual manner
- Keep the coverage of the study – sample coverage and theme coverage – at an appropriate level in order to allow a fairly detailed analysis of the processes under the study
- Give more time to interact with school actors so that their ideas and perceptions could be explored thoroughly in the background context of their everyday activity
- Analyze the findings on the basis of emergent pattern of the study particularly focusing on aspects like how and why of the processes
- A comparative analysis would be more useful to explore the interplay of different phenomenon in different context
- As far as practical, the sample of the study should consider for heterogeneous sampling in order to allow maximum variation in sampling
- Attributes of head teacher like gender, ethnicity, age, experience as head teacher, and receiving management training could also be the base for school selection
- It would be better if the study team in a district includes at least two members (male and female) in order to allow more interactive and thoughtful coverage of the school processes

References

- Bennis, W. (2000). Leadership of change. In M. Beer & N. Nohria (Eds.), *Breaking the code of change* (pp 113-122). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Foundation for Human Development & Research Inputs and Development Action. (2009). *Improving local service delivery for MDGs in Asia: Education Sector in Nepal*. A study report submitted to UNESCO, Bangkok. 2009.
- Fullan, M. (November, 2006). *Change theory: A force for school improvement*. Centre for Strategic Education, Seminar Series Paper No. 157. Retrieved from www.michaelfullan.ca/Articles_06/06_change_theory.pdf
- Ministry of Education [MOE]. (2008). *School sector reform program. Core document*. Kathmandu: Author.
- National Planning Commission [NPC]. (2010). *Three year interim plan. Concept paper*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Office of the Auditor General (2011). *Annual report of the Office of the Auditor General, 2011*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Ramalingam, B. & Jones, H., with Reba, T. & Young, J. (2008). *Exploring the science of complexity - ideas and implications for development and humanitarian efforts* (2nd ed.). London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A. & Sanghi, S. (2007). *Organization behavior* (12th ed). New Delhi: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Rose, P. (January 5, 2012). Education for all: Three new year's wishes. *World Education Blog*. Retrieved from <http://efareport.wordpress.com/>
- Serrat, O. (November, 2009). Understanding complexity. *Knowledge Solutions*, 66. Retrieved from www.adb.org/Documents/...Solutions/understanding-complexity.pdf
- T. R. Upadhya & Co. (2007). *Findings of financial management review of Education for All Program (EFA) for FY 2004/05 & 2005/06*. Report submitted to the World Bank, 2007.
- World Development Report. (2004). *Making services for poor people*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Annexes: Implementation status of the SSRP policies and practices in Schools

Annex 1: Visited School Information

School A: Higher Secondary, Location - City

Visited on: 27th Nov 2011

Date of School Establishment: School established in 2007 BS.

- Started secondary level in 2038 but government permission granted only in 2052.
- Started higher secondary level in 2066

School Infrastructure:

- New building constructed after demolishing the 150 years old building. There are three blocks, block A, block B and block C, The block C is under construction.
- Canteen and security guard in school
- At ECD class, the floor is carpeted, and small round table appropriate to the height of small children,
- The wall of ECD, Class IV and Class V were decorated by some of drawing and chart and craft paper which was prepared by students themselves.
- Desks and Benches were appropriate with student's height
- There was whiteboard on every classroom and classrooms were clean and with dustbin

Record of Students and teachers:

Class wise student record as per Flash Report, School attendance register and head counting on the visit day was as follows:

Grade	Flash Report			Student Register			Attended (on the day of school visit)			Teachers (M/F)	Remarks
	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys		
ECD	63	34	29	63	34	29	35	14	21	21 (8/13) 3(2/1)	Govt quota Relief quota
One	31	9	22	39	13	26	29	9	20		
Two	43	14	29	46	21	25	46	22	4		
Three	45	20	25	51	22	29	40	18	22		
Four	40	14	26	44	29	15	31	21	10		
Five	45	23	22	49	24	25	38	20	18		
Six	53	26	27	56	27	29	33	10	23	4(1/3)	Local Teachers
Seven	31	13	18	35	16	19	27	12	15		
Eight	41	15	26	45	17	28	34	13	21		
Nine	49	24	25	49	24	25	38	18	20		
Ten	26	14	12	25	14	11	20	11	9		
Total	467	206	261	502	241	261	371	168	183	28(11/17)	

Availability of educational policies and procedures

- Acquire knowledge on the educational rules and regulations from administration, resource centre, head teacher, DEO, magazines such as Shikshak and Education Pages
- Education acts, and rules and regulations available but not updated.
- SIP developed in 2062 BS but not updated due to the lack of technical human resource and supporting staff.
- Social audit is developed with the support of teacher. It is presented among the teachers and parents every year but low participation. Student representative also participated in the program. The outcome of social audit is to bring improvement in school by regular monitoring.
- Process of social audit: All the stakeholders were called for meeting. Teachers involved in social audit request to provide school record. On the basis of school record suggestions are made to

improve the school facility. Students also involved in social auditing. After social audit students demanded for safe drinking water, dance classes, additional computer facilities, safe school compound, security guard. Parents and guardians also should be get involved in school's teaching and learning process.

Students participation and engagement:

- Students involved in social auditing. After social audit students demanded for safe drinking water, dance classes, additional computer facilities, safe school compound, security guard.
- No student representation in SMC and PTA. But regular feedback received from students and students' club

Scholarship distribution:

- Around 300 students receiving full and partial scholarship annually.
- No idea about scholarship and its distribution to the SMC/PTA

Textbooks distribution and availability:

- All students have received textbooks
- No idea about textbook distribution to SMC/PTA

School fees and charges

- Fund generated from student: grades 1-5 charged Rs. 500 annually, grades 6-10 charged Rs. 2000-2200
- Rs. 125 monthly is paid by secondary level students, which is quite convenient as the school is providing quality education.
- Parents are paying a minimal amount (Rs. 500) annually for computer but they do not have any objection.

Local Curriculum and Continuous Assessment System

- Difficult to implement local curriculum because of less interest of parents and students.
- CAS system initiated from last year in primary level. Parents rejected the grading system of CAS and demanded for examination system. So discussion is being made about taking examination with students.
- CAS is a good system of upgrading students and should be implemented. Our concern is to make student capable but not failed and for this purpose CAS is supportive.
- Implementation of CAS in secondary level by making their own format
- CAS brings teachers under a system. In CAS 20 marks is allocated for attendance, homework, class work and students' behaviour, 30 marks for unit test. All these marks are converted into 20% and 80% is allocated for final examination. Teachers unaware of keeping proper record of CAS and so using their own system in keeping record. It has made teachers more efficient.

Book Corners and Educational Materials

- Materials developed by students for their project work. A huge amount of school fund used in material development.

Financial Management and Auditing:

- Government fund is the major source of school but donors, NGOs and individuals provide fund
- There is a system of annual audit
- Income and expenditure of school published in school magazine (*Pragati*)
- Fund used in the construction of school building and for materials and games
- SMC's involvement in the overall monitoring of financial transaction and its approval

SMC and PTA

- SMC was newly formed in Kattik 29 without election but PTA was formed last year. The SMC member's academic qualification was SLC and above.
- No discussion of PTA with government officials.
- SMC and PTA members not aware of social audit but they assume that work is going sincerely and honestly.

Local Government Support to School

- Good public relation. Relation with NGOs and INGOs.
- Different institution provides stationary, book, tiffin for ECD children for 2 days a week, computers, and other amenities etc.

School Monitoring and Supervision

- Provision of award for outstanding teachers and students
- Evaluation on the basis of regularity and uniform and informed to SMC.
- The head teacher and a senior teacher observe classes regularly and provide suggestions.
- Supervision made by DEO occasionally.
- Lack of monitoring by RPs and SS
- Work plan is difficult to maintain properly.

Teachers Professional Development:

- 5 day's training of TPD received by both the temporary and permanent teachers. The TPD training process is not good as the whole package of 4 days is covered within 2 days but allowance is provided for 4 days. The trainers were not expert in the particular subject.

Class Observation

Class VI Subject : Unique's Math
Decimal into Fraction

Chapter: Decimal and Fraction

Topic: To convert

- Teaching medium was in English
- There was no use of any educational material
- All students were felt difficulty in understanding in English medium
- Teacher tried to explain the topics but it seemed that it was difficult to apply student-centered method due to the lack of time and also due to students made engaged in class work.
- The sitting arrangement is divided into two columns, one column occupied by girls and another by boys
- The uniform of students looked neat and tidy but some students had worn slippers instead of shoes.

Initiatives that should be taken

- The number of girls' toilet should be increased
- Provision for games and sports should be made
- Weekly extra-curricular activities should be introduced
- Cultural program should be introduced
- Make students well disciplined
- Scholarship program should be made transparent
- Code of conduct should be made
- Good to have English textbooks of listening, speaking, reading and practical activities
- Focus should be on English in public school
- Student-centered learning is needed

Date of School Establishment: Established: 2017 BS**School Infrastructure**

- The school is one-storey building in two places.
- Nine rooms including ECD room
- Common room of HT, teaching/non teaching staff
- A small library for the students and teachers beside the staff room

Record of Students and teachers:

Class wise student record as per Flash Report, School attendance register and head counting on the visit day is as follows:

Grade	Flash Report			Student Register			Attended (on the day of school visit)			Teachers (M/F)	Remarks
	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys		
ECD	18	10	8	17	9	8	11	7	4	1 (M) 11(5/6)	Govt quota Relief quota
One	16	7	9	13	7	6	6	4	2		
Two	18	8	10	16	8	8	8	5	3		
Three	24	10	14	10	7	3	7	3	4		
Four	14	8	6	13	7	6	7	4	3		
Five	10	5	5	10	7	3	3	2	1		
Six	11	5	6	11	6	5	2	2	0	2 (F)	Local Teachers
Seven	11	5	6	6	5	1	5	4	1		
Eight	11	7	6	10	6	4	3	3	0		
Total	133	65	68	106	62	44	52	34	18	14	

Availability of Educational Policies and Procedures

- Unaware of educational rules and regulations
- Social audit was prepared.
- SIP is made by the school but not aware of its contents
- SIP made in cooperation of school and NGO with students' involvement.
- School calendar made without the participation of students.

Student Participation and Engagement

- Existence of student's club
- Discussion on use of dustbin, gardening, sanitation and weekly planning in student club meeting.
- Wall bulletin published by the student club.
- Child club activities designed by teachers but students not involved in designing the activities.

Scholarship Distribution

- Scholarships provided to girls and Dalits.
- Various types of scholarships by NGOs and INGOs in kinds such as school bag, stationary, extra books, uniforms, etc.

Textbooks Distribution and Availability:

- Apart from government textbooks school use additional textbooks
- Textbooks are bought from different book stores but receipt of Sajha is submitted for refund.
- Textbooks and uniforms are provided to parents and voucher of it is made for record.
- Textbooks made available in Baisakh and few textbooks provided in Asar

School Fees and Charges

- Examination fee (Rs. 100) is charged to grades 6 to 8 only.

Local Curriculum and Continuous Assessment System

- Local curriculum on animal husbandry was designed but not implemented. Instead, English was used as local curriculum.

Book Corners and Educational Materials

- There was book corner on the ECD classroom, and other educational materials were hung on the walls

Financial management and Auditing:

- Financial transaction was made on the basis of SMC's recommendation
- Financial record was kept in a traditional way, without the recording system.
- Auditing was made by authorized auditor.

SMC and PTA

- SMC was formed in 2046/047 BS and dissolved in 2057 BS.
- After dissolving SMC the school could not function well.
- No effort has been made in the formation of SMC and PTA.
- In 2065 BS a new head teachers was appointed then SMC was formed.
- No information about SMC formation.
- SMC and PTA meetings jointly organized monthly
- SMC and PTA have not interfered in financial matters.
- The financial responsibility is given to the head teachers.
- All the responsibility of SMC and PTA are informed by the head teacher.

Local government support to school:

- Support of different organization to school.
- Fund provided by DEO for toilet construction.

School Monitoring and Supervision

- There was not any monitoring and supervision from the government sector.

Class Observation

Class VIII

2068/8/15

Sub: Nepali (Grammar) Page : 84

- Inside the classroom there was not any educational materials
- There was use of white board and marker
- Only three students (girls only) were present
- The classroom was fully ventilated

New initiatives

- Awareness program conducted.
- Door-to-door program
- Efforts made for maintenance of school boundary wall.

School C : Secondary, Location – Rural Market

Visited on: 2nd Dec 2011

Date of School Establishment: Established in 2016 B. S.

School Infrastructure:

- 3 buildings with sufficient desk, benches and sanitation facilities .

Record of Students and teachers

Class wise student record as per Flash Report, School attendance register and head counting on the visit day is as follows:

Grade	Flash Report			Student Register			Attended (on the day of school visit)			Teachers (M/F)	Remarks
	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys		
ECD	19	10	9	19	10	9	15	8	7	11 (6/5) 7(5/2)	Govt quota Relief quota
One	25	11	14	25	11	14	20	11	9		
Two	34	16	18	30	15	15	24	10	14		
Three	34	16	18	32	16	16	28	15	13		
Four	37	19	18	35	18	17	30	18	12		
Five	41	24	17	38	22	16	33	20	13		
Six	54	34	20	54	34	20	53	30	23	3 (2/1)	Local Teachers
Seven	59	38	21	49	28	21	33	20	13		
Eight	59	31	28	59	31	28	48	28	20		
Nine	60	38	22	55	35	20	47	29	18		
Ten	52	24	28	48	20	28	40	22	18		
Total	474	261	213	444	240	204	371	211	160	21	

Availability of educatin policies and procedures

- Parents are invited for dissemination on social audit but no such idea about it.
- Social audit is difficult to develop and social audit done last year.
- Social audit is made public in a mass.
- SIP guidelines not followed while preparing SIP.
- Instead of local curriculum optional English is taught.
- Welcome to school program conducted in collaboration with the community.
- Coaching class was conducted without following the guidelines.
- Account manual kept according to the direction of DEO.
- No involvement of students in preparing SIP.

Students participation and engagement:

- No involvement in preparing SIP.
- No idea about social auditing.
- Child club exists.
- Students' participation in junior Red Cross.

Scholarship distribution:

- No such discussion on scholarship is made in SMC and PTA.
- Scholarship provided to marginalized, Dalit and regular students based on the information provided by the class teacher
- Scholarship is received on the merit basis.
- There is no such discrimination by caste and sex.

Textbooks distribution and avaiability:

- Textbooks in both English and Nepali are provided but only English medium textbooks are used.
- Two types of textbooks used: English and Nepali. Textbooks provided on time free of cost. But extra textbooks have to be bought.

School fees and charges

- Tuition fee is charged.
- Fee is charged for school building construction.
- Examination fee charged from grade I to X.

Local Curriculum and Continuous Assessment System

- No implementation of CAS.
- No implementation of local curriculum.

Book corners and Education materials

- No book corner in any classroom
- Educational materials not used.
- Some reference books available in the staff room.

Financial management and Auditing:

- Approval of financial auditing not found in the minute book.
- Interaction made with SMC for financial audit.
- No double entry system but voucher made for keeping financial transaction.
- Account manual kept in direction of DEO.

SMC and PTA

- SMC is formed regularly.
- SMC and PTA chaired by a single person.
- Training not provided to SMC and PTA members.
- The SMC chairperson does signature on SIP but no such involvement in its developing process.
- The issues discussed in SMC are school building construction, teacher appointment, leave approval, student fee, income sources, etc.
- Some SMC members not enrolling their children in the school.

School monitoring and supervision

- SMC and PTA members monitor the school.
- Sometimes the resource persons also monitor the school.

Teachers professional development:

- Management training received by the HT
- 5 day's TPD training received by all teachers.

Class Observation

- Grade VIII A Time :10:20-10:45

Classroom Earth quake Resistant

Subject: Maths

Teacher: Female

The students and teacher were using calculator

The figure of heart was stuck on wall

The rules and regulation of classroom was hanging on the wall

There was use of white board and marker

Enough light and ventilation

Desk and Benches were clean and properly placed

New initiatives

- Water facility but not enough.

- Homework provided but not checked regularly

School D: Higher Secondary, Location – Clustered village

Visited on: 8th December 2011

Date of School Establishment: Established in 2017 BS.

School Infrastructure:

- In every class there was white board
- The classes were fully ventilated
- A building of 20 rooms is under construction with support of Indian government.
- RRR built the school compound of 52 meters.
- Library established by Room to Read.

Record of Students and teachers

Class wise student record as per Flash Report, School attendance register and head counting on the visit day is as follows:

Grade	Flash Report			Student Register			Attended (on the day of school visit)			Teachers (M/F)	Remarks
	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys		
ECD	25	12	13	21	8	13	10	5	5	5(5/0) 12(8/4)	Govt quota Relief quota
One	16	8	8	9	5	4	6	4	2		
Two	18	8	10	10	6	4	8	5	3		
Three	18	10	8	13	8	5	12	7	5		
Four	22	12	10	14	5	9	13	4	9		
Five	25	15	10	20	15	5	16	9	7		
Six	42	15	27	42	15	27	33	14	19	2(1/1)	Local Teachers
Seven	56	34	22	42	22	20	37	21	16		
Eight	66	35	31	54	35	19	51	37	14		
Nine	63	44	19	63	44	19	58	40	18		
Ten	78	46	32	75	43	32	73	29	44		
Total	429	239	190	363	206	157	317	175	142	19(14/5)	

Availability of Education Policies and Procedures

- Lack of coordination in availability of document related to educational act, rules and regulations (HT/Teachers).
- Social audit was not done this year.
- No involvement of students in SIP
- SMC and PTA exist but no participation of students.
- Students not aware of social audit.
- SIP was developed in 2061 but DEO did not inquiry about it.
- SIP guidelines not followed while preparing SIP.
- Social audit done under resource centre

Students Participation and Engagement

- Students were participating in Junior Red-Cross Society

Scholarship Distribution

- Scholarships provided to Dalits and Janjatis and few girls.

Textbooks Distribution and Availability

- English medium from grades 1-6.
- Extra English from grade 4-10.

- All textbooks were available on time

School Fees and Charges

- Examination fee charged Rs. 60-Rs. 100

Local Curriculum and Continuous Assessment System

- CAS folder was available but not implemented.
- DEO delayed in printing CAS file and so it was difficult to implement CAS this year.
- Annual calendar of SERESCOCOL is used.
- Instead of local curriculum Optional English was included

Book Corners and Education Materials

- There were not any educational material hanging on the wall of classroom
- There was not any book corner found in the classroom

Financial management and Auditing:

- Financial audit of last year was not made.

SMC and PTA

- The meeting of PTA has not been held since 2067 B.S. but previous SMC meeting was focused on teacher appointment, construction of school building and other financial issues.
- No training for SMC and PTA.
- SMC and PTA are not renewed because other schools also do not renew SMC and PTA.
- No participation of students in SMC and PTA.

Local government support to school:

- Support of red-cross in sports, training and extra-curricular activities.
- A building of 20 rooms is under construction with support of Indian government.
- RRR build the school compound of 52 meters.
- Library established by Room to Read.

School monitoring and supervision

- The responsibility of the monitoring team is weak.
- The role of RP very weak.
- The code of conduct of students and teacher was announced on the assembly time

Teachers professional development:

- TPD training received by teachers

Class Observation

- Grade IX A

Time :1:00-1:40

Classroom Earth quake Resistant

Subject: Social Studies

Teacher: Male

- White board at front and black board at back
- Earthquake resistant building
- Enough ventilation
- Desk and Benches were in good condition
- All students were in uniform
- Teacher explained each point written on the white board
- The wall of classroom was not decorated by any educational materials

- All students having textbook copy
- The chapter is about the election
- There are 32 students in the classroom, 19 girls and 13 boys.
- Separate sitting arrangement for girls and boys, but in middle front bench there were three girls

New initiatives

- School building
- Drinking water facility
- Sanitation in school
- Sufficient number of toilets
- English medium teaching.

School E: Lower Secondary, Location – Sparse village

Visited on: 9th Dec 2011

Date of School Establishment: Established in 2050BS. From 2058 B.S. started Lower secondary level

School Infrastructure:

- A school building was under construction
- Physical development in school: school building, toilets, furniture, book rack, etc.

Record of Students and teachers

Class wise student record as per Flash Report, School attendance register and head counting on the visit day is as follows:

Grade	Flash Report			Student Register			Attended (on the day of school visit)			Teachers (M/F)	Remarks
	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys		
ECD	67	36	31	66	45	21				5(4/1) 4(4/0)	Govt quota Relief quota
One	67	36	31	41	20	21					
Two	40	16	24	23	10	13					
Three	30	16	14	26	10	16					
Four	30	14	16	30	13	17					
Five	25	12	13	27	13	14					
Six	23	8	15	23	10	13				4(3/1)	Local Teachers
Seven	22	6	16	22	9	13					
Eight	15	13	2	15	13	2					
Total	319	157	162	273	143	130				13(11/2)	

- Note: During the visited date, the school was closed due to local festival.

Availability of Education Policies and Procedures

- SIP was made in 2063 BS [But SIP document was not available at the time of school visit]
- Social audit was not performed.
- HT has kept record of social audit in SMC minute book.
- Flash report record maintained by the HT.
- SIP was not formulated.

Student Participation and Engagement

- Students participated in Tulsi Batabaran Prakriti Club 2061

Scholarship Distribution

- Scholarship provided for girls only.
- Parents demand for scholarship for boys as well.

- Scholarship provided in kind (sweater, bag provided last year) not in cash.

Textbooks Distribution and Availability

- All books were available on time
- Printed from Triuga Offset Printing Press, Anamnagar, Sidhhbaba offset Printing press

School Fees and Charges

- Exam fee charged three times a year
Grade I – NRS 15, Grade II –NRS.35, Grade III NRs 40, Grade IV NRs 45, Grade V NRs.50, Grade VI NRs 55, GradeVII NRs 60 and Grade VIII 60

Local Curriculum and Continuous Assessment System

- CAS folders provided by DEO.
- No use of local curriculum.
- Optional English as local curriculum

Financial Management and Auditing:

- Financial auditing not made.
- No ledger and voucher kept.
- No capable person for keeping financial record.

SMC and PTA

- No PTA and SMC meeting held.

School Monitoring and Supervision

- No monitoring and supervision made from DEO

Teachers Professional Development

- TPD training received by teachers
- Teachers appointed from the school have not received the TPD training.

New Initiatives

- New school building under construction.
- School awareness program

Annex 2 A: Study Framework Nov – Dec 2011

Areas of sch. management	Access/availability	Understanding	Applicability (Implementation)	Participation
Documentation of major educational policies and their reflection in overall vision of school/education - EDUACT, EDUREG, PIM, WTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of the different policy documents (given above) in schools (either in the form of actual books or instructions or circulars or in other forms) • Modes of getting or receiving these documents, Practices of documentation in school • Accessibility of these documents to teachers and relevant stakeholders • Condition/storage of these documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge on rationale and purpose of these documents • Roles of schools and other relevant stakeholders/ organizations in understanding these documents • Provisions (actions, resources, management) made available to implement the policies • Knowledge on the linkage between policies and school vision and objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on implementation procedures and their status of progress • Relevance and usefulness of the implemented actions • Strengths and weaknesses of implemented actions • Constraints faced during implementation • Opportunities available • Reasons of slow progress (if there are) • Means to improve the implementation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture of sharing knowledge and information in the school • Display and documentation of different documents in Office • Management of library (informal) • Practices of sharing information with relevant stakeholders (meetings, interactions, notice board, and other means)
Plans and planning- PIM SIP, LCURR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of instructions/circulars about school academic planning • Annual budget and work plan, school audit, school improvement plan • Display of these materials • Documentation of these materials • Modes of receiving these documents • Condition/storage of these documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge about the provisions of school planning given in Education Act/Regulation, LSGA/LSGR • Importance, usefulness and relevance of these academic and school development planning • Necessity of technical supports and their availability (nature of technical supports) • Experiences on the usefulness of these plans in actual practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the implementation status, strengths and weaknesses of these planning • Skills to prepare them • Knowledge on linkage between these plans and the availability of funds from DEOs (and other sources) • Constraints faced during implementation • Opportunities available • Experiences on the nature, form and relevance of technical support from higher authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and experiences on the process of preparing all these planning in school • Experiences on the participation of relevant stakeholders during planning, implementing and monitoring • Reasons to invite stakeholders in the process
Curriculum and curricular materials - EDUACT, EDUREG, LCURR, PIM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability, documentation and display of national curriculum framework • Subject wise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge on the purposes and rationale of preparing these documents (National 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the preparation and use of these materials • Experiences on the use of school academic calendar in practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences on the process of preparing annual academic calendar • Roles of SMC members, parents and

Areas of sch. management	Access/availability	Understanding	Applicability (Implementation)	Participation
	<p>curriculum, teachers' guide, at least one set of textbooks of each grade, local curriculum guideline (either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation and display of reference materials 	<p>Curriculum Framework, Subject wise curriculum, local curriculum, teachers' guide, set of textbooks, reference materials)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages between/among these documents and with the annual academic plans • Skills to use them • Experiences on the usefulness and relevance • Nature of support received for their uses • Provisions made for their uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience on the use of local curriculum and parental views on it • Constraints faced during implementation • Opportunities available • Experiences on the use of teachers' guide, references books and other plans • Knowledge on book corners and their uses 	<p>students in preparing these plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the use of these plans in a coordinated ways/manner • Feelings of stakeholders on the use of different plans including local curriculum
Teacher Management - EDUACT EDUREG, PIM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal or procedural provisions on teacher management including female teachers) (recruitment, selection, transfer, deployment, service conditions, career development, motivation, reward and punishment) given in different policy documents • Display and documentation of these materials, • (These materials may be either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation (purpose, reasons, rationale and necessity) about the provisions made for teacher management (including female teacher) • Strengths and weaknesses of existing management • Discussion and sharing between/among teaching and non-teaching staff on the provisions given in these materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on different aspects of teacher management of teachers, parents, SMC. PTA and students • Local and female teachers, other deprived group teachers • Feeling of teachers on the provisions made available in the school by the school and by the policy • Availability of teachers in the classrooms and their uses of time • Use of the provisions (those are in control of school) while recruiting teachers • Status on the use of the provisions by the teachers • Constraints faced during implementation • Opportunities available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers' feeling on teacher management both at the policy level and school level • Feelings on the nature of support to teachers • Professional organizations, teacher unions, and teacher in teacher management • Experience on the cooperation and coordination between/ among teachers • Feelings on the mutual respects among/between stakeholders
Teaching learning process - EDUACT, EDUREG, PIM, CAS,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal or procedural provisions about child friendly teaching learning and child friendly school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and skills on different methods of teaching • Knowledge on the use of these in the practice, and their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on child friendly teaching and learning environment • Status of classroom management, Constraints faced during implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences and feelings on the divisions of roles and responsibilities • Partnership and collaboration for developing local

Areas of sch. management	Access/availability	Understanding	Applicability (Implementation)	Participation
	<p>environment, inclusiveness environment, gender friendly environment, disable friendly environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability, display and documentation of these materials, (These materials may be either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	<p>strengths and weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge on the different indicators useful to measure effective teaching-learning, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities available, School environment and inclusiveness (observation) • Status of results made by the school in certain key educational indicators of learning achievements • Experiences on the individualized instructions • Status of children's happiness • Status of teacher and children's attendance 	<p>teaching materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles of parents in supporting children's learning • Discussion and sharing between/among the provisions given in these materials • Practices of sharing information within schools
Financial Management - EDUACT, EUREG, SAUDIT, SACC, PIM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal or procedural provisions about funding to schools, financial record keeping system, school audit (social and financial) • Availability, display and documentation of these materials • (These materials may be either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and skills of procedural aspects of financial record keeping system, audit system, budgeting and spending system • Sensitivity on the importance of proper record keeping system, school audit (social and financial) Relevancy and usefulness of audits • Knowledge and skills on the techniques of resource generation and mobilization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the documentation of financial data • Skills to demonstrate the financial records • Skills to make decisions on the spending system • Experiences on the practices of keeping financial records • Experiences on the follow up actions on audit reports • Experiences on the practices of decision making process to generate resources and use of available resources • Experiences on the practices of disclosure of funds and audit reports to the parents and teachers • Constraints faced during implementation, Opportunities available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feelings on the documentation process (observation, studying records) • Feelings of stakeholders (parents, teachers, PTA and SMC) on finance related matters • Experiences on the audit status and their implementation • Modes of audit report and other financial record disclosure system • Record of locally generated and mobilized resources • Decision making processes • Reporting to the higher authorities
Student evaluation and assessment - EDUACT, EDUREG, PIM, CAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal or procedural provisions on students' evaluation and assessment (Education Act, Regulations, NCF and CAS guidelines) • Availability, display 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge on the importance of students' assessment and evaluation • Skills to link students' evaluation with the teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the practices of students' evaluation and assessment, CAS, daily, monthly, quarterly, bi-annually and annually exams • Status of progress till 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences on the student evaluation plan preparation and their implementation as well as monitoring • Feelings of teachers, parents, students, PTA and SMC and their

Areas of sch. management	Access/availability	Understanding	Applicability (Implementation)	Participation
	and documentation of these materials, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (These materials may be either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	learning process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge on the provisions made about students' evaluation and assessment in these documents and their relevancy as well as usefulness 	now on these <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception of teachers on these means Constraints faced during implementation Opportunities available Practices of communicating students' performance to the students and parents Practices of feedback mechanism about students' performance to them and their parents Perceptions towards existing practices 	reflections
Delivery of services, such as scholarships, constructions, renovation, textbooks – EDUACT, EDUREG, PIM, SACC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal or procedural provisions of services to students, teachers, parents and school Availability, display and documentation of these services, (These services may be recorded either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge on the amount, time, criteria, target beneficiaries of these services Knowledge on the process of ensuring the provisions on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences on the existing practices of scholarship distribution, textbook management Experiences on the use of available funds to the schools Constraints faced during implementation Opportunities available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences on the process of making decision Feelings of parents, students and other relevant stakeholders
Monitoring, supervision and support – EDUACT, EDUREG, PIM, SAUDIT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal or procedural provisions on monitoring, supervision and support to the teachers, school, and head teacher as well as school management Availability, display and documentation of these materials, timely availability, (These materials may be either in the form of actual publications, or instruction, or circulars, or other forms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge on the importance of monitoring, supervision and support for making schools' function more effective Knowledge on the techniques and methods of monitoring and supervision Knowledge on the roles of community and higher authorities for making schools' function more effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences on the present status of monitoring and supervision Constraints faced during implementation Opportunities available Experiences on the frequency of monitoring and supervision carried by different actors Feelings of relevant stakeholders towards monitoring and support Experiences on the suggestions provided by the monitors and supervisors and their follow up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences on process of preparing follow up plan to implement the suggestions of monitoring and supervision Feelings of relevant stakeholders on monitoring and supervision Overall perceptions of relevant stakeholders towards school and its functions

Annex 2 B: Tools for the field study Nov – Dec 2011

Questions in this tool are prepared in a general sense. While discussing with respondents some specific questions are needed considering the topics being discussed and the Respondents. For this consider the Study Framework. We must also consider provisions in policy documents. [Example – while discussing with teachers on financial management we should particularly be discussing about practices of financial/social audit in school, sharing reports of such audits with other stakeholders, etc]

Get information on Name of the respondent(s)/participant(s),
Institution and its address
Individual interview, group interview, group discussion, observation

Documents that are directly related to schools

1. Education act 2028 (with latest amendment) – EDUACT
2. Education regulation 2059 (with sixth amendment) – EDUREG
3. Programme Implementation Guidelines (issued by DoE each year) – PIM
4. SIP Guidelines – SIP
5. Social Audit Guidelines, 2065 – SAUDIT
6. Local curriculum implementation guidelines, 2067 – LCURR
7. Welcome to School Campaign Manual (issued by DoE each year) – WTS
8. Continuous Assessment System Implementation Manual, 2066 – CAS
9. School Accounting Manual – SACC

Availability/Accessibility (for each document)

1. Availability of these documents (which version)
2. Form when received (booklet or instruction letter from DEO/RC, photocopy)
3. Source (DEO, RC, procured from bookshops, from other source)
4. Requested or given,
5. Payment made (if any)
6. Storage – bookshelves, tables, trunk, displayed in wall, other
7. Access – open, anyone can access it, anyone who requests, only for the head-teacher, teachers, SMC members, PTA members, parents, students
8. Orientation or instruction to use these documents, by whom, where, who participated, heard about orientation (but not participated, why)
9. If these documents are not available, reason:
10. Felt problems (if any) because of absence of these documents

Understanding (for each document)

1. Knowledge on the purpose of these documents
2. Support received to understand these documents – self understanding, fellow teachers, Resource Centre/DEO, participation in some training/orientation program, other
3. Support/contribution of the provisions of these documents in school
4. Usefulness of provisions of these documents in quality enhancement, promoting gender equity and social inclusion, improving school management, teacher management
5. Knowledge on roles (of respondents) as given in these documents
6. Knowledge on roles of other stakeholders given in these documents

7. Opinion on relationships or linkages between policies and school vision and objectives

Applicability/Implementation (for each document)

1. Knowledge on / Support system (institution, resource, action, management) developed or preparation made to implement programs under the provisions in these documents – their effectiveness, weakness
2. Externalities in making these programs effective and ineffective – undue influence, who, in what form,
3. Availability of knowledge and skills to implement these programs
4. Implementation procedures of activities/programs under these documents
5. Experiences on such implementation
6. Experiences on the preparation and use of these materials
7. Strengths of the program or progress achieved
8. Weaknesses/problems of the programs
9. Relevance and usefulness of activities under these documents, particular areas of relevance and usefulness, which areas and context; If not relevant and useful, why, suggestions to make relevant and useful
10. Effects produced, changes in working culture, results and overall environment
11. Suggestion on improving the effectiveness of provisions in these documents
12. Overall feeling on the implementation of the provisions in the document

Participation in the process

1. Interaction or discussion about the provisions given in these documents – with other colleagues, school personnel, SMC members, PTA members, students, parents – frequency, purpose and outcome of such sharing, mechanism put in place to implement and following up the decisions of such sharing
2. Involvement in activities under these documents, participation on invitation or participation on self, roles performed, experiences on participation
3. Roles of different actors in performing these activities
4. Reasons for participation
5. Action upon receiving the documents
6. Monitoring provisions – what, how, who, when

General

1. Practices and impression on:
 - Implementation of free and compulsory education
 - Functioning of SMCs and PTAs
 - Status of school improvement plan,
 - Support you receive (pedagogical/managements) from RP's and SSs
 - Implementation of local curriculum and piloting of new curriculum
 - Implementation of continuous assessment (CAS) system
 - Supply of textbooks
 - Scholarship distribution
 - Teacher recruitment, management and professional development
 - Implementation of local governance and child friendly local governance framework
 - Implementation of school health and nutrition strategy
 - Support mechanisms for special needs and weak children
 - Formulation and implementation school calendar and code of conducts including students and teachers attendance

- Engagement of children and parents in school activities/governance including mobilization of Child Clubs and their parents
- Social auditing and stakeholders mobilization
- Operation and management of ECED
- Data quality and reporting

To be developed (these will be quite brief)

- Points/aspects to observe in the schools visited
- Information to receive from the schools visited
- Specific points to be discussed with DEO personnel

Annex 3: Availability of Policy Documents (Applicable to School) in Five Study Schools

SN	Education Policies	Availability						
		Sch A	Sch B	Sch C	Sch D	Sch E	DEO	RPs
1.	Education Act 2028 (1971) (eighth amendment, 2006?) (Nepali)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.	Education Regulation 2059 (2002) (seventh amendment, 2067) (Nepali)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.	Higher Secondary Education Act 2046 (1989) (Nepali)	Yes	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No
4.	Higher Secondary Education Regulation 2052 (1996) (Nepali)	Yes	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No
5.	Local Self-governance Act, 2055 (1999) (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
6.	Local Self Governance Regulation 2056 (1999) (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
7.	Child Friendly Local Governance Strategy and Operational Guideline, 2010 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
8.	School Sector Reform Plan (SSRP) 2009/10-2013/14 (Nepali & English)	Yes	verbal	No	verbal	No	Yes	Yes
9.	Free/Compulsory Basic Education Implementation Guideline, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
10.	Program Implementation Manual (yearly) (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	??
11.	PCF Implementation Guideline, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
12.	SIP Guideline (updating yearly), 2063 (Nepali)	Yes, old	No	No	No	No	Old	??
13.	Social Audit Guideline, 2065 (Nepali)	Yes	No	No	Circular		Yes	Yes
14.	Multi-Lingual Education (MLE) Implementation Guideline, 2066 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
15.	Local Curriculum Implementation Guideline, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
16.	Welcome to School Campaign Manual (issued each year) (Nepali)	Circular	Verbal sharing				Yes	Circular
17.	Coaching Class and Education Center Operational Guideline, 2063 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
18.	School Management Committee (SMC) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Training Guideline, 2066 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
19.	Institutional School Partnership and Support Guideline, 2066 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
20.	Child Friendly Quality Education National Framework, 2067 (Nepali/English)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	??
21.	Institutional school Partnership and Support Guideline, 2066	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
22.	Continuous Assessment System Implementation Manual, 2066 (Nepali)	Yes	Firms distribution				Yes	Yes
23.	Children as Zone of Peace operational Guideline, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
24.	Teachers Position Adjustment Directive, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
25.	National School Health and Nutrition Strategy, 2006 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
26.	School Accounting Manual 2009 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
27.	ECD Implementation Guideline, 2061 (Nepali)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
28.	Secondary School Model Building	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

SN	Education Policies	Availability						
		Sch A	Sch B	Sch C	Sch D	Sch E	DEO	RP's
	Guideline, 2068 (Nepali)							
29.	School Merging and Downsizing Guideline, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
30.	DDC Grant Operational Manual, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
31.	VDC Grant Operational Manual, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
32.	School Grant Operational Directives, 2063 (Nepali)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
33.	Informal School Operational Manual, 2065 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
34.	Higher Education Project Operational Guidelines, 2064 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
35.	Basic Education Operational Guidelines, 2066 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
36.	Resource Persons Mobilization Guidelines, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
37.	Textbook Publication and Distribution Guidelines, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
38.	National Curriculum Framework, 2007 (Nepali & English) and also level wise curriculum	Yes, but not all	No	Yes, but not all	No	No	6-8 not available	??
39.	Teacher Guidebook for each subject, latest one (Nepali)	Yes, 2057	No	No	No	No	No	No
40.	TPD policy and guidelines, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
41.	HT leadership and management guidelines, 2068 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
42.	Mid-day Meal Operational Guidelines 2066 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
43.	School Auditing Guidelines, 2065 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
44.	Learn without Fear implementation guidelines, 2067 (Nepali)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No