Participation for educational change: a synthesis of experience

Sheldon Shaeffer

International Institute for Educational Planning

Participation for educational change: a synthesis of experience

Sheldon Shaffer

Paris 1994
UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning

The views and opinions expressed in this volume are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of UNESCO or of the IIEP. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this volume do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO or IIEP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

The cost of this study has been covered by a special grant provided by the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA). The IIEP is also grateful to both DSE and CIDA for their support in the implementation of the overall research programme.

This volume has been typeset using IIEP's computer facilities
and has been printed in IIEP's workshop

International Institute for Educational Planning
7-9, rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 Paris

Cover design by
Thanh-Hoa Desruelles

© UNESCO1994

IlEP/ko'f

Preface

One of the most important recommendations of the Jomtien Declaration is that "new and revitalized partnerships at all levels" should be built in order to achieve *Education For All.* The call for more involvement of parents, communities, NGO's, and teachers in the implementation of educational programmes is at the heart of the expanded vision of basic education and constitutes a great challenge for educational planners and administrators.

The purpose of the IIEP research and training programme on *'Collaborating for educational change",* launched in 1990, was to go beyond the usual rhetoric about participation and to focus on specific things which planners and managers at different levels can do in order to encourage participatory approaches to educational development. This focus was achieved through the detailed, comparative analysis of generally successful cases in different parts of the world (many of which are summarized in this book) in terms of what seems to work and what makes it work. This analysis led in turn to suggestions concerning the decisions that need to be made in Ministries of Education in order to establish and strengthen parent-school-community organizations and promote greater involvement by such organizations (and other potential partners) in areas such as the diagnosis of educational needs, school management, and teaching and learning.

The original intention to focus particularly on actions which *central* planners and managers can take to encourage participation proved difficult to achieve fully for various reasons. Participation - what it looks like, how it is defined, and how 'far' it can go - is a very context-specific process, depending on history, culture, social and political structure, the capacity of the educational system, and the interests of

actors up and down the system. Also, much of what greater participation in development actually achieves depends not on decisions taken at the top but rather on decisions taken (or not taken) at the bottom of the system. Thus, generalizations about 'what to do' at the central level of the Ministry in order to make participation 'work' in schools and communities proved difficult to make. This synthesis does, however, provide important suggestions concerning the actions that need to be taken by central planners and managers both to encourage greater collaboration at their own level and to promote the conditions which permit collaboration to develop at the school and community level.

The programme upon which this synthesis is based begins from the assumption that participation is generally a 'good' despite the risks, difficulties, and uncertainties that often accompany its implementation. It assumes that the greater involvement of more partners in development can lead to positive outcomes. In order to understand more thoroughly what participation can achieve and the conditions which lead to such achievements, the programme consciously focuses on the 'positive' side of participation and of its successes. But clearly this kind of analysis is only a beginning and further study of success *and* failures, the positive *and* the negative, will be required.

A major lesson of the exercise is that participation - like decentralization - simply does not happen by itself It requires systematic analysis of what kinds of participatory mechanisms and of what facilitating conditions and constraints to participation already exist in a given society. It also requires both clear divisions of responsibility at various levels of the system and between asgencies inside and outside the system and high-level commitment to the idea of greater participation. It generally implies that the Ministry brings together across its various units and levels a combination of supportive instruments - legislation, policies, programmes, mechanisms, training activities, resources - in a planned and systematic way.

The IIEP wishes to thank Sheldon Shaeffer for his direction of the *'Collaborating for educational change'* project (which culminated in the present volume) during his stay at the Institute in 1990-1993 as an IIEP Resident Fellow, on leave of absence from the International Development Research Centre, Canada.

Jacques Hallak
Director, IIEP

Contents

Preface		v
Introduction		I
Chapter I	Participation in education: why it needs to be encouraged	6
Chapter II	Participatory development: what it is and what it can and cannot do	15
Chapter III	Partnerships in education: who can do it	32
Chapter IV	Areas of potential collaboration in education: where to do it	56
Chapter V	What participation in education can achieve	96
Chapter VI	Facilitating participation and collaboration: how to do it	116
Chapter VII	Implications for planners	148
References		169

Introduction

In 1990, as a result of an assessment of its institutional priorities and inspired by conclusions of the World Conference on *Education for All* held in Thailand in March of that year. the International Institute for Educational Planning began a programme of research and training called 'collaborating for educational change'. This programme, initiated thanks to a special grant provided by the *Swedish International Development Authority* (SIDA), was designed to review the conceptual literature and practical experience related to the involvement of a wide range of 'partners' in educational innovation. Based on such a review, it was expected to deepen the understanding of definitions, degrees, and rationales of participation; explore in some detail the nature both of potential partners and of areas within education of potential partnerships; and examine the factors which both constrain and facilitate the strengthening of such participation. The end result was to be both a synthesis of knowledge and experience gained (this document) and a set of training materials for Ministry of Education personnel in the encouragement of greater collaboration for educational change.

The strategy to achieve these objectives was composed of several activities. A literature review was first carried out in order to produce a 'starting point' - a conceptual framework upon which later activities could be based[1]. The review also led to the discovery of a number of ongoing programmes appropriate for further study. In general, with a few exceptions, these programmes were examples of various kinds of collaboration (within and across schools and between the school and the community) in which government played an important role, and which had passed the pilot stage to more widespread and sustainable dissemination. A common format for the in-depth, qualitative study of

1. Shaeffer, S. *A framework for collaborating for educational change.* Pans, IIEP,

selected cases was then developed. With the assistance of the *German Foundation for International Development* (DSE), such studies were carried out in different regions of the world and then discussed in regional seminars of researchers, planners, and trainers.

Hosted by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, the first such seminar was held in Cipanas, Indonesia, from 26 May to 6 June 1991. The case studies discussed dealt with programmes in India, Bangladesh, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Uganda. Two publications resulted from the seminar: a report2 and a monograph which reprinted selected studies) India, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines)3.

A further seminar was organized at the Kenya Institute of Education from 21 to 29 January 1992. Again, several case studies, this time focusing on partnerships within more non-formal educational programmes (agricultural extension, family planning, health education, early childhood education, community publishing) in Kenya, Malawi, and Zimbabwe, were prepared and then discussed at the seminar. Training materials for different levels of government officials were drafted at this seminar and subsequently developed further for DSE. A report of the meeting, with summaries of each of the case studies, was later published by IIEP4.

The third seminar, organized in collaboration with the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Education Office of UNESCO (OREALC), was held in Santiago, Chile, from 19 October to 20 November 1992. Case studies of innovative programmes were carried out in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago. Three

2. Shaeffer, S. *School and community collaboration for educational change . R* of an IIEP Seminar, Cipanas Indonesia, 29 May - 6 June 1991. Paris, IIEP.

3. Shaeffer, S. *Collaborating for educational change: the role of teachers, parents and the community in school improvement.* Pans, IIEP, 1991.

4. Shaeffer, S. *Collaborating for educational change* in *non-formal basic education.* A Report of an IIEP seminar and workshop, Nairobi, Kenya, 21-29 January 1992. Paris, IIEP.

of the studies (from Brazil, Trinidad and Tobago, and Chile) were subsequently published by IIEP[5].

As these activities were being organized, two other studies were prepared under the aegis of this IIEP programme. One, done by a team of researchers from Florida State University, examined the process of 'restructuring' education in the USA[6]. Another examined the nature of partnerships in education and the experience of local innovations in several francophone West African countries.

A final seminar was held in the Philippines from 25 August to l September 1993. Organized jointly be IIEP, DSE, and the International Development Research Centre in Canada and hosted by the SEAMEO INNOTECH Center in Manila, this meeting explored the nature of the emerging trends of participation and collaboration in the education systems of several Asian countries. It also discussed new innovations in India and the Philippines, examined research priorities in the general area of participatory development in education, and reviewed training materials in participatory approaches to educational development prepared by several training centres in the region. A report of the seminar was prepared and distributed to participants.

This volume represents a synthesis of experience derived from the case studies, the seminars, and a variety of other activities organized during the three years which the programme was being developed at IIEP. Simultaneous to the implementation of this series of case studies and seminars, the IIEP was also developing a set of modules for the training of educational planners and managers in more participatory approaches to educational development. These were tried out in various formats in three consecutive Annual Training Programmes at IIEP and will subsequently be disseminated by the Institute for possible use by

5. De Mello, G.N; Da Silva, R.N. *Competitive selection of school principals: case study of an innovation in Brazil.* Paris, IIEP, 1993- Mahabir, D. *Servol preschool and adolescent training programmes in Trinidad and Tobago.* Paris, IIEP, 1993; Filp, J. *The 900 Schools Programme: improving the quality of primary schools in impoverished areas of Chile.* Paris, IIEP, 1993.

6. Papagiannis, G.J; Easton, P.A; Owens, J.T. *The school restructuring movement in the USA: an analysis of major issues and policy implications.* Paris *IIEP,* 1992.

ministries, training institutions, and donor agencies interested in encouraging greater collaboration for educational change.

This book begins with an introductory chapter describing in general terms why further attempts at educational reform must be made and the difficulties of doing so given the limitations both of current economic and political conditions in many parts of the world and of traditional centralized, bureaucratic models of such reform. It argues that further reform efforts must at least in part be based upon broader partnerships and more participatory development processes. In order to do so, however, the chapter urges the promotion of a number of appropriate norms, policies, and approaches; it also describes the assumptions about participation which underlie the chapters which follow.

Chapter II presents various definitions and degrees of 'participation', positing a 'ladder' of participation, and relates participation to the ongoing process of 'restructuring' educational systems found in many parts of the world. This process is described in terms of four important and much-discussed issues: decentralization, accountability, autonomy, and empowerment. The chapter also describes in some detail what participation is generally thought able to achieve, at the levels of the individual, the community, and society at large, and - of equal importance - the difficulties! risks, and uncertainties of participation.

Chapter III focuses on the potential partners in education: their general characteristics, their norms and values and the nature of the 'culture' which surrounds them; and the extent of which such characteristics facilitate participation or make it more difficult. The 'partners' discussed include bureaucracies and bureaucrats of the government, school heads and teachers, parents and local organizations within the community, and non-government organizations. The chapter ends with a proposal for a kind of 'hybrid' or mix of powers between the central government and other levels and institutions of society.

Chapter IV looks more specifically at areas of potential collaboration in education. Beginning with a 'ladder' of participation specifically related to schooling, it examines how systems might climb up this ladder in three areas: (1) the diagnosis of educational conditions, needs, priorities, and resources; (2) policy-making and governance, including the setting of school goals and targets, the planning of school policies and programmes, and the managing of school budgets and personnel; and (3) the instructional process, including determining the content of education,

developing appropriate teaching materials and delivering the required content, training and upgrading teachers, and monitoring and evaluating school quality. For each of the areas, the chapter suggests why the greater involvement of more partners might be useful and how such involvement might be encouraged.

Based on a number of case studies from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, *Chapter V* describes several ways in which the more active participation by a wider range of actors in a variety of educational activities can lead and has led to changes both in the nature of education and among the actors themselves. *Chapter VI* examines the ways in which greater participation and collaboration in education can be facilitated. Discussed first are the encouragement of new social, political, cultural, and organizational norms at all levels of the system. These include openness to the outside world, to new ideas and new ways of doing things, and to change itself; a commitment to greater participation; and encouragement of greater professional and social autonomy and empowerment both down to lower levels of the system and out to other actors. Of equal importance are the mechanisms - the structures and organizations at various levels of the system, inside and outside the bureaucracy - which can be established or strengthened in order to promote greater participation. The role of parent-teacher associations and community education committees are especially important in this regard. The chapter closes with a discussion of various issues which planners and decision-makers need to consider in the selection and development of mechanisms for participation appropriate to a particular context.

Chapter VII, in conclusion, discusses the implications of these various issues for planners: the legislation, policies, and procedures which must be implemented at both the top and bottom of the system; the resources required for such implementation; and the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours needed to put them in place. The chapter closes with a plea for analysis of the longer-term, more intensive and fundamental changes required within a system to make a bureaucracy and the culture which supports it more willing to adapt and adopt some new forms of work behaviour - more professional and less bureaucratic , more open and permeable to new ideas, less rigid and more participatory in its work, and more supportive of bottom-up planning.

Chapter I

Participation in education: why it needs to be encouraged

> "Because basic learning needs are complex and diverse, meeting them requires multi-sectoral strategies and actions which are integral to overall development efforts. Many partners must join with the education authorities, teachers, and other educational personnel in developing basic education if it is to be seen, once again, as the responsibility of the entire society. This implies the active involvement of a wide range of partners - families, teachers, communities, private enterprises (including those involved in information and communication), government and non-governmental organizations, institutions, etc. - in planning, managing and evaluating the many forms of basic education".

(WCEFA, 1990a:4).

Both the persistence of poverty in many parts of the world after decades of so-called 'development' and the sea changes occurring more generally today in political, social, and cultural life have once again made education an issue of critical importance. The transformation of the macro-political landscape, the promise of expanded democratization, the threat of narrow nationalism and fundamentalism, the increasing risks of environmental degradation and endemic disease - all of these challenges call for the more effective development of human resources and thus for a greater demand for, and supply of, education of better quality.

But just as so much hope is being placed on education, doubts about the general vision of education systems, the actual availability of schooling, and the quality of education of education have increased. In much of the world, especially the least developed, education is becoming less, rather than more, available. In many countries, the growth of primary school enrolments is declining while the absolute numbers of illiterate adults and of school-age children not in school are increasing.

Even in countries where enrolment rates have continued to grow, a sizeable percentage of children and adults often remains unreached by primary schooling and literacy programmes. These trends, which particularly affect education for girls and women, reflect two things: (1) declining individual demand for an education seen as being irrelevant to a family's current welfare and a student's future success, and (2) declining public investment in education measured both as a percentage of the national budget and as per pupil expenditures (WCEFA, 1990).

The disturbing trends are not only quantitative in nature. In many countries, both research data and more anecdotal observation indicate an erosion in the general quality of education provided to learners as defined in traditional terms of inputs (teachers, facilities, books, and supplies), outputs (literacy and completion rates, achievement scores), and processes (the nature of the teaching-learning act).

A final, and perhaps most important doubt, concerns the narrowness of the traditional vision of what 'good' education is and what it is meant to achieve. It can be argued today that good education, given the state of the world described above, must now be defined not only in relation to the extent to which a school is well-housed and well-supplied; teaches literacy, job skills, and 'facts for life '; and facilitates an effective teaching-learning process. Education of good quality must also, by definition:

- encourage a more integrated view of how the world operates and how development does (or does not) occur,
- make students more critically aware of how their actions, individually and collectively, will hinder or help the world to meet future challenges; and
- help to mobilize and empower people with the knowledge and skills to participate more actively, more democratically, and more collectively in the development process.

The problem is that in order to achieve such a vision, while at the same time increasing the availability and the quality of education more traditionally defined, most education systems of the world would need to be considerably reformed. Given the history of educational reform, however, it is not easy to be optimistic about the possibility of altering a given system in significant ways. Such history shows that in the past, many (if not most) traditional, large-scale reforms designed by central governments -both conventional reforms and alternative, more non-formal innovations - have proven very difficult to implement, disseminate, and

sustain. Debt and recession, the isolation of marginal populations, and the interruptions of war and natural disaster share much of the blame for this persistent inability of many governments both to supply an increasing (or even a constant) number of educational places and to improve, on a day-to-day basis, the quality of education occurring in their schools - let alone re-define the very nature of education itself.

But the character of centralized bureaucracies and of their technocratic planning techniques also play an important role in this regard. Thus, the traditional community-based education model found in many societies, where communities "provided new generations of young people with the education necessary for transmitting local norms and economic skills...[and where] education was deeply embedded in local social relations [and]...government played a minor role", gave way to a more standardized, uniform, and centralized government-provided model. In this model education - often with unfortunate results - "came to be viewed as appropriate and necessary for everyone and as such was the proper business of government...through formal school systems, coordinated by bureaucracies placed above the community" (Williams, 1992:1,2).

The limitations of this model have now become clear. They arise from the fact that:

* governments often lack funds to provide all communities with the necessary education and thus are often unable to guarantee a sufficient education to all children;
* the management capacity of bureaucracies has not kept up with the expansion of the system and the sheer magnitude and complexity of the problems; and
* "centrally-designed programmes are seldom responsive to the needs of the poor, and the organizations through which they are implemented seldom have the capacity to implement these projects as designed, let alone identify the actual needs and adapt the project accordingly" (Korten, 1981a:213).

In the words of a manager of a 'basic school' in Mali:

> "The State can not descend to the level of the school. Even if it is able to do so, it does it with a level of information so inadequate that its intervention is completely inefficacious. The multiplicity of structures which form a screen between the

> central level and the level of the school alters all information....Moreover, the central level is too 'specialized' and imagines itself on a pedestal too high to 'descend' and to 'lower itself' to the level of the classroom" (quoted in Zevounou, 1992:20).

Despite such limitations, and in the face of the economic, social, political, and educational issues discussed above, planners and managers have no choice but to make further attempts to re-organize and reform education systems and processes. In doing so, they face several challenges.

First, they need to *respond more effectively toa much broader context of development.* Problems such as poverty, environmental degradation, and the spread of HIV/AIDS need to intrude much more sharply into the consciousness and everyday work of planners and managers. Education systems need to discuss such problems more frankly, deliver messages about them more effectively, and respond more immediately and forcefully to their impact.

Secondly, planners and managers need to *concern themselves with issues larger than the nature of inputs and outputs* in narrowly focused, formal education systems. They need to understand better the links between schooling and its social and cultural environment, the kind of socialization and informal learning provided to children both before school entry and outside of the classroom, and ways to develop more literate and supportive environments in the family and the community surrounding the school. Thus, for example, they need to work more closely with the more non-formal, frequently more innovative (and non-governmental) education programmes often available to mothers, out-of-school youth, and adult learners.

Thirdly, in order to reach those marginal populations often most in need of greater involvement in development programmes, planners and managers must *create educational systems and processes more flexible and non-formal in nature.* These will likely be characterized by school calendars and class timetables, entry ages, curricula, and teaching methods quite different from those found in traditional age- and grade-bound schools and classrooms.

Finally, and of greatest concern to this book, planners and managers need to *understand the importance of broad partnerships in development*

and to see their task not merely to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their own sector's delivery system, narrowly defined, but also to assist and collaborate with other sectors (health, community services, agriculture) and other actors (NGOs, community associations, local government, universities) in encouraging a more participatory development process. Such a process - unlike the traditional technocratic, top-down approach - can increase the control of people over development processes; lead to more resources from a wider range of actors; increase programme demand, relevance, efficiency, and sustainability; and develop new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in those participating in the process.

But bringing planners and managers to such an understanding is not an easy thing to do. It requires the development of a set of institutional norms and policies which promote more participatory approaches to development. These relate to:

1. the 'openness' of schools, education systems, and bureaucracies:
   - to more non-traditional, non-formal approaches to education; to the gaze, support, and appropriate intervention of other partners;
   - to new ideas, especially from lower levels of the system, and to new ways of doing things; and
   - to change, and to the flexibility and adaptability such change requires.
2. collaboration and participation across and among various actors in education, both inside and outside of the sector (other development sectors, local government, parents, community organizations, NGOs, private enterprise), so that:
   - these actors share responsibility for education and feel common ownership of the education system and common accountability for its quality;
   - such participation, by definition, becomes an accepted characteristic of 'good' education, and
   - government planners and managers become aware of the power of a new '-collaborative' model of education which recognizes both government and the community as important actors in improving the quality and relevance of basic education broadly defined.
3. the need for the system itself to become more participatory in nature - in needs assessment, goal setting, research, planning, management,

budgeting, instruction, evaluation and other activities in which teachers, parents, and communities can be involved more fully;

4. the transfer of some central authority and responsibility:
   - down the system in order to encourage greater local control and autonomy and empower local communities and officials; and
   - out to other sectors, parents, community and professional associations, and NGOs;
5. the development of a new balance or 'hybrid' of powers among the various partners in education, with the centre assuming more the position of facilitator and enabler of participation of other levels and actors of the system, especially at the level of the school; and
6. the need to translate the rhetoric of participation into the practical reality of more participatory, collaborative approaches, both:
   - across all levels of the system (the community, local government, district offices, the central ministry, even donors, and
   - across the various types of personnel at each of these levels (i.e., including planners and technical officers).

To assist decision-makers, planners, and managers to promote such norms and encourage more participatory approaches to developing their education system requires several things: convincing them of the need for such approaches, while alerting them to their risks and to the difficulties in implementing them; getting them to assess the current nature, context, policies, and practice in regard to collaboration and participation in their systems;

- helping them to clarify the nation's goals in regard to such approaches;
- designing the mechanisms to encourage these approaches at all levels of the system;
- developing the strategies (policies, regulations, and guidelines) needed to implement such mechanisms; and
- training the persons concerned at various levels of the system in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to put these strategies into place.

This book attempts to make a contribution in this regard by examining the nature of participatory approaches to development, their advantages and possible risks, the potential partners and the areas of possible collaboration in education, the conditions and factors conducive

to such collaboration, and the ways in which such conditions can be encouraged in ministries of education.

Specifically, the book describes the mechanisms, the implementation strategies, and the training programmes needed to put such approaches into place. This includes first the development of teacher, parent, and community organizations as partners in educational development. Such organizations - teacher clubs, parent associations, PTAs, village education committees - are the basic building blocks of stronger school and community collaboration.

Following the establishment of such organizations comes the facilitation of greater teacher, parent, and community involvement in specific areas of education. These areas include:

- the assessment of educational conditions, needs, priorities, and resources;
- policy-making and governance (the setting of goals, planning of programmes, and managing of budgets); and
- the instructional process.

The issues associated with participatory approaches to development are not neutral and 'value-free'. Rather, they are based on a number of assumptions which need to be taken into account while reading this book; namely that:

1. *Participation is a 'good' in itself.* The process of making decisions about one's own life and then acting on those decisions - of having some influence on the forces and pressures surrounding one's environment - brings benefits to individuals, communities, and society at large.
2. *Participation has become a necessary, if not sufficient, aspect of development.* Projects and programmes of development are likely to be more relevant, more supported, more successful, and more sustainable to the extent that they involve their 'targets' in their planning, implementation, and evaluation.
3. *Participation and collaboration are not panaceas for educational under-development.* They cannot solve all problems, and they should not be used as a substitute for serious, systematic public attempts to plan, manage, and finance basic education more efficiently and with greater imagination. Above all, they should not be used as a excuse by government to get out of the 'business' of basic education.

4. Participatory and collaborative approaches are dependent on, and affected by, social, cultural, and political contexts. What works in one country may not work in another. These approaches therefore cannot be treated as recipes able to be implemented in the same way in all regions of the world. Rather, they should be seen as items on a menu of mechanisms, procedures, and administrative actions which can lead to a higher degree of participation in education, at both local and national levels. The choice of the items on the menu will vary by context and may very well change (perhaps even evolve towards the more participatory end of the range) over time. The specific nature of the items on the menu and of the suggested steps in their implementation will need to be adapted to the particular political, economic, educational and cultural context of each country. This book is therefore not meant to propose universal, standardized methods to promote collaboration and strengthen partnerships. Rather, it will suggest steps that need to be taken by central government officials in order to facilitate the implementation of such approaches both at their own level and at the local level.
5. *Such approaches have disadvantages as well as benefits, costs as well as savings.* They are often difficult to implement, can be risky as well as beneficial, and are not 'free'.
6. Based on considerable evidence of case studies and project reviews, under the right conditions, and given the right precautions, *the greater participation of more actors can help improve the quality of, and the demand for, basic education.*

As a final caution *to*planners and managers of development, including the author and readers of this book, this introduction ends with following quotes:

> "In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or to society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human

> concern. The practitioner must choose. Shall he remain on the high ground where he can solve relatively unimportant problems according to prevailing standards of rigor, or shall he descend to the swamp of important problems and non-rigorous inquiry?" [Schon, *Educating the reflective practitioner 1987,* Bass]....

More than most others, and more often - indeed daily - [the development profession] must deal with what Schon calls the "indeterminate zones of practice - uncertainty, uniqueness, and value conflict things which escape the canons of technical rationality".

> "It is perhaps because of our unconscious attachment to the norms of technical rationality, and our resistance to the messiness of the swamp, that it is difficult to cross over to quality in practice. We see that, in practice, popular participation is a messy business. So we spend much time breaking it down into its elements, and looking for *mechanisms* that will help in its promotion. Then, in frustration...we ask for 'how tos' If we were to break out of confines of technical rationality, in which we quite naturally take refuge, we might be freer to deal with the artistry that is needed in the swamp. In those 'indeterminate zones of practice', 'how tos', at least generalizable ones, are by definition, not really possible to derive. We are talking about the art of development rather than the science of it" (Dichter, 1992:3-4).

Chapter II
Participatory development: what it is and what it can and cannot do

> "Popular participation consists of restoring the power of local people to take the initiative and the decision of formulating and implementing activities and programmes concerning their own future. It consists of recognizing that the people...are creators and full-fledged partners in development....Promoting popular participation therefore means instituting a partnership, a contractual relationship among the various agents of development, in particular between the people concerned and those intervening from the outside. Whether the programmes are initiated from outside or in support of previously existing local initiatives, those intervening from outside should start off where the needs and aspirations of the people begin and accept to negotiate on that basis. If, as in many cases, such a partnership is initially held back by such factors as poor organization and improper formulation of requests for assistance, the conditions for the partnerships must be created". (Kouassivi, 1991:24).

1. Definitions and implications: what it is

A more participatory approach to development begins with the assumption that "sustainable development ultimately depends on enhancing people's capacities as individuals and groups to improve their own lives and to take greater control over their own destinies" (Ogun, 1982:2). This assumption may seem self-evident, but, in fact, it is really quite radical in implication. A participatory approach to development represents a considerable change in the process of governance, in social and political relationships, and in who participates in, controls, and is empowered by the development process.

The definitions given to terms associated with 'participation' have often remained vague, confusing, even contradictory. The distinction between 'participation' and 'involvement' is a case in point. One author in the field "argues for the primacy of participation ahead of involvement because "community participation means that the community has a right to be part of the action;...community involvement implies that the community is drawn into the action" " (Hedley Beare quoted in Moyle and Pongtuluran 1992:8). The World Health Organization, on the other hand, has said that "the term 'community involvement' has been given preference over 'community participation' because it is not sufficient merely to participate, which may be simply a passive response; there should be mechanisms and processes to enable people to become actively involved and to take responsibility for some decisions and activities jointly with health professionals" (WHO:1981).

Only recently has there been greater success in clarifying the definitions and essential characteristics of participatory development. An extensive discussion in development literature concerning participation of whom, in what, for what purpose, and to what degree - has helped greatly in this regard (see, for example, Myers, 1991, Brownlea, 1987, Madan, 1987, Dichter, 1992, Hart, 1992). As a result, several different degrees or definitions of participation in development can be described. One description, based on an early work by Arnstein (1976), posits a 'ladder of participation', from non-participatory activities (manipulation, decoration, tokenism), to increasingly participatory activities where participants are 'assigned but informed', then consulted and informed, then share decision making in activities initiated by others, and then decide on and direct activities initiated by themselves (Hart, 1992).

A useful modification of this 'ladder' would describe degrees of participation as follows:

1. the mere use of a service (such as a primary health care facility);
2. involvement through the contribution (or extraction) of resources, materials, and labour;
3. involvement through 'attendance' and the receipt of information (e.g., at parents' meetings at school), implying passive acceptance of decisions made by others;
4. involvement through consultation (or feedback) on a particular issue;
5. participation in the delivery of a service, often as a partner with other actors;

6. participation as implementors of delegated powers; and
7. most completely, participation "in real decision-making at every stage - identification of problems, the study of feasibility, planning, implementation, and evaluation" (UNICEF, 1986:1). This implies the authority to initiate action, a capacity for 'proactivity', and the confidence to get going on one's own.

Note that the first four rungs of this ladder use the word *involvement* and, in agreement with Beare quote above, connote largely *passive* collaboration in development. In many societies, movement up these rungs - to the third or fourth rung (passive involvement in decision-making and in consultation and feedback) - would already represent considerable progress. Beyond such involvement, the last three items use instead the word *participation,* implying a much more *active* role, a role established by right. It is the last definition which is generally considered now as being that which underlies genuinely participatory development. Thus, people participate to the extent that they:

> "choose, cognitively, affectively, and physically, to engage in establishing, implementing, and evaluating both the overall direction of a programme and its operational details. Choice, in this context, implies not merely an agreement to follow but an active decision to assume responsibility in considering the rationale, implications and potential outcomes of the programme". (Bemard,1990:7).

Such a definition requires people to have extensive influence on development decisions and therefore to have more than mere involvement in the implementation or benefits of development. It implies participation in the various stages of development activities:

- diagnosing and defining problems;
- collecting and analysing information;
- articulating priorities and setting goals;
- assessing available resources;
- deciding on and planning programmes;
- designing implementation strategies and apportioning responsibilities among participants;
- managing programmes;
- monitoring progress;

- evaluating results and impact; and
- redefining problems generated for further action (Hollnsteiner, 1982, NFE Exchange, 1981, UNICEF, 1986, Durning, 1989).

Two important issues must be noted here. First, this definition represents a very ambitious goal - an ideal - likely unreachable (at least in the short-term) by many, if not most, societies of the world. The degree of participation able to be achieved in any given society, in other words, will need to be assessed realistically based on its level of development and its political, social, cultural, and economic context.

Second, achieving greater participation in a society is an evolutionary process; it is "a long-term learning process and not a management tool" (Walt, n.d.:204). A government bureaucracy, a community cooperative, a parent-teacher association do not suddenly, by fiat, become more participatory in nature, leaping from the first degree of participation to the last - or even to the middle. Rather, their willingness and ability to participate - and the feasibility of their doing so - evolve over time, faster or slower (perhaps with some backward steps), depending on a number of complex factors and conditions.

Having said this, however, it must be made clear that underlying all of the more participatory approaches *to*development are several important implications and issues that planners and managers as well as the political leadership of a government must understand. These all relate to the general process of the 'restructuring' of educational systems. This process represents a *"significant change in the pattern of school governance,* where governance refers to the norms and practices of decision-making regarding three critical areas of school life: (1) instructional methodology and curriculum; (2) administrative management and organization; and (3) the generation, allocation, and use of resources" (Papagiannis et al 1992:2, emphasis in the original). Such restructuring generally includes issues related to *decentralisation, accountability, autonomy, and empowerment.*

(i) Decentralization

The first relates to *decentralization,* a process often particularly crucial in any attempt to facilitate the participation of a broader range of actors in development. Decentralization is another concept, however,

fraught with multiple and often contradictory variations (Rondinelli et al 1990, Hallak, 1990, Bray, 1987, Bloomer, 1991, Weiler, 1990, Chimwenje, 1992, Zevounou, 1993). These include:

- *Deconcentration,* sometimes called administrative decentralization, involves handing over more routine authority and decision-making powers from a higher level of the central government to lower levels (regional, district, cluster), still accountable to, and staffed by, the central ministry.
- *Delegation* transfers (or lends) certain specific management responsibilities for some activities to other units, governmental or non-governmental, implying somewhat stronger (but easily cancellable) local autonomy. Neither deconcentration nor delegation necessarily lead to more participatory approaches to development.
- *Privatisation is* the divesting of functions to the private sector, to either voluntary or for-profit organizations.
- *Devolution* (sometimes called political decentralization) strengthens sub-national units of government and actually transfers considerable decision-making powers to local political bodies relatively independent of the central government.

It is in the actual devolution of power to local lower-level bodies of government (and even to community associations and NGOs) that the greatest scope for participatory development can be found. This strategy is meant to achieve various results: 1. to generate more resources and assure their more equitable allocation and effective use *within* the decentralized administrative units;

2. to improve the quality of decision-making and planning by making these processes more responsive to indigenous cultures and to local conditions, needs, and practices;
3. to speed up the decision-making process and free the centre to focus on its legitimate strategic concerns;
4. to encourage initiative, innovation, and participation;
5. to increase local responsibility and accountability over issues more readily understood by local management; and
6. to stimulate communication down and (especially) up the system of control.

But there are also problems with decentralization. It can lead to too much variety within a system and greater inequity across the system.

The diversity and complexity of the services and policies which often result from decentralization make necessary more systematic and sophisticated monitoring and training of people working in such a system. And given the newly defined functions of powers of different levels of the system, decentralisation might require both careful planning and extensive training and more staff, resources, and equipment, rather than less. Thus, "decentralization will not prove a cheaper form of management; its justification must be that it is better" (Bloomer 1991: 4).

Going further, it has been argued that decentralization is often more rhetorical than real; that, as "compensatory legitimation", it is designed to manage and diffuse conflict and fragment reform movements rather than bring about real change (Weiler 1990); and that if it involves only administrative aspects of a system, it "can result in more rather than less central control as the administrative function becomes more efficient at the local level" (Chimwenje, 1992: 12). Thus,

> "decentralization of government in itself does not necessarily involve a devolution of power. Far from it, the extension of the state outwards and downwards can just as well serve the objective of consolidating the power of the central state as it can serve the objective of devolving power away from the centre. It can extend the state's control over the people just as it can aid the people's control over the state and its activities. Decentralization is very much a double-edged sword"
>
> (Webster, 1992:129-130).

The important questions in this regard are: (1) *what* central powers are being decentralized (e.g., only data collection and not policy-making? Only resource extraction and not allocation and expenditure?), (2) why such decentralisation is occurring (e.g., for the reasons listed above or because an impoverished State can no longer finances its needed social services?); and (3) to whom various levels in more decentralized systems are ultimately accountable.

(ii) Accountability

The second issue arising from more participatory development is *accountability* - another word that "continues to span a very wide variety of concepts and policies, making it an elusive concept to grasp" (Kirst, quoted in Stanford Educator 1991:10). Accountability relates to who is required to report to whom about - and therefore can ultimately be held responsible for - the determination and implementation of policies and procedures, the achievement of goals, the performance of institutions, and compliance with standards and regulations.

At the most general and ideal level, this relates to the accountability of the "State and its agencies, institutions, and structures...to Civil Society" (Tandon, 1992:29). More specifically and realistically, in regard to participation and decentralization, it relates to the extent to which various levels of the administrative hierarchy are responsible to other levels both above and below it and to other 'partners'. In systems both decentralized *and* participatory, higher levels of the bureaucracy are to some extent accountable to lower levels (rather than only the other way around), and local government agents (e.g. the school and its staff) are to some extent accountable to their 'clients' (e.g. children, parents, the community) as well as to the local government office and the bureaucratic levels above. The question, answered differently according to the context, is how such accountability is put in place.

(iii) Autonomy

Societies where multi-directional accountability occurs guarantee some degree of *autonomy* or 'self-government' to lower levels of the system. This includes both autonomy for organizations to make and implement decisions regarding their own operations, and for individuals, to make decisions regarding matters pertaining to their own concerns. Such autonomy, within a context of accountability to other actors above and to clients below, can help to encourage better management, higher professional competence, and more effective services. One important premise of such a process of providing greater autonomy is that the various actors in the autonomous institutions (e.g. a school) are "professionals and able to make informed decision and conscious of self-responsibility for consequences arising from the decisions" (Chimwenje,

1992:42) - a premise which may need to be realized by better training of these actors.

(iv) Empowerment

One important outcome of more participatory processes will be *empowerment.* Greater participation in a decentralized system, with multiple and more democratic processes of accountability of more autonomous institutions, implies that people:

- *gain knowledge and awareness* of their own social, economic, and political conditions (Bhasin, 1979);
- *take action* - to make and act on choices and to construct "their own futures through a process of analysis and action" (Myers, 1991); and, above all,
- *gain control* over the goals and processes of development, and over regulatory institutions (Hollnsteiner, 1982). "If it is accepted that participation should start at the stage of conception and still be in evidence at the stage of supervision, then it is necessary to agree *to*share certain elements of power" (Bugnicourt, 1982:74-5).

The concept of empowerment has become especially important in attempts to move the concept of participatory development from rhetoric to concrete practice. This concept is perhaps best defined as "a group process where people who lack an equal share of valued resources gain greater access to, and control over, those resources" (Bernard Van Leer Foundation, 1990:2). As a result, "poor communities come more explicitly to assert rights and responsibilities in determining the direction of their own development" (Bemard, 1990:7). This power must be real, formal, and legitimate, including both the ability to make use of formal structures and regulations and control over decision-making processes, knowledge, and techniques. People who are empowered "have the power to find direct solutions to their problems - they propose solutions, they do not beg for them (Bemard Van Leer Foundation, 1990:5).

2. *What greater participation can achieve*

The interest in greater participation in development derives from the belief that such participation can achieve several goals, These include:

1. ideological goals: to empower people in order to ensure their greater control over development and their greater influence over decisions that affect them;
2. economic goals: both to seek more resources from a wider range of actors and to share the price of development by transferring some Costs from the 'suppliers' *to*the 'consumers';
3. political goals: from the government's side, to strengthen the legitimacy of the current government and make people co-responsible for social problems; from the 'popular' side, to gain greater share of power in policy-making and budget allocations;
4. programmatic: to increase programme or project demand, coverage, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, success, and sustainability; and
5. capacity-building: to develop new knowledge, skills, and attitudes and provide beneficiaries a useful share in management tasks, monitoring,etc.(Bernard Van Leer Foundation, 1990, Korten, 1987, Hamadache, 1990, Myers, 1991, UNICEF, 1978, UNICEF, 1986, Zainal Ghani, 1990, Walt n.d.).

In general terms, a great part of the impact of participation and empowerment is said to lie at the level of the *individual,* in the process of "hum an resource development" . Some of this impact is cognitive . Through greater involvement in a variety of development activities, people can gain more knowledge, learn better practice, and end with a greater awareness of the development problems that exist, the causes behind these problems (which may or may not be amenable to local control), and, in some cases, their possible solutions.

Some of the impact is also psychological; people feel greater self-confidence and self-reliance, less dependence on external inputs and 'wisdom', greater pride in the significance and validity of local knowledge and experience, a greater sense of accountability and responsibility for their own cations, less of a feeling of marginalisation and powerlessness. The combination of such impacts can lead to greater demand on the political and social system: people gain a better idea of the kind of life they want to lead, a greater understanding of what prevents them from achieving such a life, and a greater willingness to make their needs known and, when necessary, to play a larger role in fulfilling these needs themselves.

Much of the same kind of impact occurs at the *community* level as well. Communities can become less marginal and powerless, more self-

reliant and independent, more accountable and responsible. Such communities can:

1. gain greater control over information and local technologies;
2. form alliances and networks within their own area or across to others;
3. work toward the more efficient and effective management of local resources and, in the longer term, greater ecological sustainability; and
4. develop skills (in management and resource mobilisation), organisations (income-generating schemes, women's clubs), and a "corporate identity" which can serve them well, both in community development and as the basis for negotiating, from greater strength, with outside institutions and bureaucracies.

The result can be greater community cohesion; a more integrated process of "community learning" across formal, non-formal, and informal learning activities; greater economic development and cultural unity; and the assurance that local services - such as education - meet the needs, reflect the traditions and share the goals of the community.

In the best of circumstances, such achievements at the community level also benefit the *society at large.* Greater participation within a society can lower development costs (e.g., through more volunteer labour and the use of more local expertise and resources), make development programmes more cost-effective, and ensure greater equity of the benefits of development within and across communities. It can also increase the impact and sustainability of development programmes by encouraging more of a "hand-crafted approach to development" (UNICEF, 1986). With such an approach, utilisation rates, continuity, and maintenance of development programmes can be improved (UNICEF, 1982). Without such participation, the opposite may occur; thus, for example, "if the educational planners fail to consult the teachers before introducing reforms, they cannot but expect half-hearted support on the part of those concerned with their implementation" (Bude, 1985:258).

3. Why it is difficult to'do' participation

> "For some [participants]...the benefit of the participatory process is suspect; the participation involves people who have less skills or knowledge than those responsible for making

decisions, are less accountable for whatever the outcome might be, or have a more self-interested level of involvement or concern than perhaps might be expected of the ultimate decision-makers. In these situations and for these people, participation is burdensome, an unwarranted cost, and does little to improve the quality of the eventual decision" (Brownlea, 1987:605).

It is important to make clear that participation - and any accompanying devolution of authority and "empowerment of the masses" - should *not* be seen as a new panacea for underdevelopment. It is a difficult, frustrating process, sometimes risky and often unsustainable; both sceptics and advocates of participatory development recognize that it is a process fraught with disappointments, dangers, and unkept promises (Brownlea, 1987, Bude, 1985, Bude, 1989, Dove, 1980, Hollnsteiner, 1982, Madan, 1987, NFE Exchange, 1981, UNICEF, 1978, UNICEF, 1986, Zainal Ghani, 1990, Zevounou, 1993).

(i) The difficulties of participation

Encouraging participatory approaches to development is difficult to do for several reasons. First, *many communities - perhaps especially those most disadvantaged - are not at all homogeneous in nature.* Social stratification, divisions along caste, religious, and ethnic lines, personal rivalries and social factionalism, and the incompatibility of interests are all factors which make it difficult to talk of 'community' mobilisation through participation. A community seen as 'natural' in some ways (such as a caste) may not necessarily be the community most appropriate to mobilize towards a particular outcome (such as better sanitation), and a community defined by geography, perhaps most appropriate for improving a particular social service (such as sanitation), may be too riven with social discord to permit mobilisation. In such a context, participation may bring unresolved and unresolvable conflicts out into the open, exacerbating rivalries of class, caste, and ethnicity by making potential differences in goals and tactics explicit, rather than keeping them constrained and hidden through the operation of traditional roles and responsibilities.

Second, even where community members may want to work together, a major obstacle may be *the sheer lack of experience and skill in participatory and collaborative activities.* Participation by the community in development and the collaboration of the community with other partners imply certain knowledge and skills: setting goals and priorities, running meetings, planning budgets, accounting for resources.

Third, *potential participants, especially those economically and socially weakest, may lack a sense of self-confidence and political efficacy* - the feeling that "individual political action does have, and can have, an impact upon the policy process" (Campbell et al quoted in Chimwenje, 1992:25). They may also feel, or may have been encouraged to feel, that, given the overriding authority of the government, they have little political power, few obligations beyond receiving government services, and little ability to affect government policy.

Fourth, sceptics argue that *marginal communities (and many governments) cannot bear the added expense of participatory processes* - especially in terms of financial resources and of the time and energy required of participating community organisations, government agencies, and individuals. Overworked village leaders and community members struggling for survival, particularly if affected by the inherent passivity and illiteracy of many communities, do not find it easy to participate in labour-intensive, collaborative activities, and participation in the management of meagre resources is often seen as not worth the effort. And because sometimes "there are so many development agencies each dealing with problems in each sector, people can get only more and more confused because they do not have the training necessary to understand how all those activities which are being proposed willy-nilly to them tie into one another. The tendency is to set up village groups, associations, and committees each time a new operation commences. This has the double inconvenience of multiplying, at times needlessly, people's organizations and [of] marginalizing existing forms of organization with the result, in [some] cases, of creating social tension" (Kouassivi, 1991:25).

Fifth, *participatory processes* do not just happen by themselves or by fiat, but rather *require new and complex managerial and supervisory skills, attitudes, and behaviours.* Principals able to share authority within and across schools, teachers (especially those from another region, ethnic group, or language group) able to carry out surveys of community needs,

district officers able to work with programme staff of non-government organisations, central planners willing to issue the regulations mandating community involvement in curriculum development - all of these are not easy to develop in traditional bureaucracies and, once developed, to sustain.

Sixth, *participation is often in conflict with a political culture* where initiatives toward reform may require clear sanction from above and where, for example, both parental participation in designing (let alone questioning) school policies and flexible, non-standardized responses to a variety of development contexts are difficult to imagine.

Seventh, and similarly, *many institutions and individuals have a profound inability or resistance tochange.* The inertia of inflexible systems, bureaucratic delays, the lack of teamwork and co-ordinating mechanisms, the absence of clear rules as to who should do what and when, poor technical support from those meant to provide it, and the fear of losing control to other agencies, to lower levels of the system, or to outsiders - all make it difficult, at least early in various reforms, to encourage new initiatives. Thus, for example, reforms involving the participation of the community and of other sectors in education require flexible, multi-sectoral approaches and are often seen as interfering with the academic, examination-oriented aspects of the curriculum or as being intrusive, unprofessional, and working against the accepted wisdom that quality necessarily (and solely) depends on higher teacher salaries, better facilities, and the competence of a better teaching staff.

Eighth, and finally, such problems are compounded by more *concrete administrative obstacles.* Logistical problems and staff turnover are notable in this regard; when staff trained in a more participatory approach and method are transferred or resign, much time and effort are wasted. Administrative procedures may also discourage collaboration. In some countries, for example, ministry regulations forbid parent associations from involvement in 'academic' matters, and in a number of countries more than one ministry may have responsibility for primary education. This can make any innovation, let alone that based on greater popular participation, difficult to implement.

(ii) The risks of participation

Participatory approaches to development can also carry risks. First, these approaches can raise expectations, and then frustrations, and lead *togreater political and social instability.* Participation can also threaten the political order of things. In simple terms, for example, "how many of the ruling elite would be comfortable with a critically conscious peasantry, and how many teachers with a body of [students] who are developing critical consciousness?" (Dent Ocaya-Ladiki, quoted in Bude 1985:275). The result may be suspicion and fear among the elite and repression of the population. Such approaches can also mislead marginal populations, who have little margin for risk, into taking risks and then failing, with possible disastrous effects. And the lack of technical expertise, supervisory skills, and animaters and of a participatory grassroots tradition in many societies can lead to failed projects and a decline in the quality of services provided.

Second, the participatory process may place *greater power in the hands of the 'wrong' people* - factionalists, demagogues, racists, reactionaries. It can also be taken over by those parts of any community - i.e., often corrupt and inefficient local elites and party cadres - most able (financially and personally) to 'participate'. These groups may use their increased authority to manipulate the 'participants' and extract further resources from them. Attempt to encourage community involvement in development may therefore lead instead to the promotion of people who speak only for given segments of the population. It is they, rather than the "poorest of the poor", who benefit. The result may be an unequal distribution of participation itself and of its benefits either of the direct benefits meant to be derived from the new service or of the more generalized benefits of involvement in the development process.

Third, a further risk of participatory processes may be *the domination, at the local level, of narrow community self-interest,* which may be based on short-sighted perspectives and aim at short-term benefits. Such self-interest may ignore longer-term political or economic implications for the community or the larger society and contradict more general goals of national integration, the dissemination of scientific truth, and the modernisation of society. In education, for example, local communities participating in the support and governance of schools may

believe that these schools belong to them and have little responsibility to deliver more nationally-oriented messages. This may lead to undue interference in school management or the demand for favours in return for donations and support (Commonwealth Secretariat 1992). Also, 'popular' traditions and customs in areas such as health, nutrition, productivity, or social justice may, in fact, represent "developmentally inadequate practices and behaviour" (Rondinelli 1983:139) which should not be reinforced in development programmes or reflected in local social services (Schwille et al 1986).

Fourth, another problem lies in *the risk of tokenism* - only marginal change, wrapped in new packaging, leading not to an alternative model of development but rather to the reinforcement of central power and the reproduction of central values. Participation, in other words, may end up being 'system-maintaining', designed to "transform disadvantaged and disaffected groups into 'responsive citizens' implementing policies outlined by some higher authority", rather than 'system-transforming', designed to "effectively transfer political and economic power to hitherto disadvantaged groups and thus to introduce more radical social change" (Pearse and Stiefel 1980:65). Attention paid and energy spent by the general population on such token achievements are then lost to attempts to change more fundamentally the basic political and administrative patterns of a society . The process of change therefore becomes de politicized.

Likewise, the very public efforts to wrap the new package in an attractive cover of 'participation' can lead to a fifth risk - *the opting out of government from its responsibilities for delivering basic social services* and for the better management, or more equitable allocation, of resources. In some countries, rather than maintaining their monopoly on the education system. as omnipotent planner and funder, governments are moving in the opposite direction - surrendering their (expensive) responsibility for basic education to the family and the community. This may end up with the government co-opting NGOs and other community-based associations into State mechanisms and bureaucratic processes. Governments may even be able to blame poor results and poor quality on the other 'partners'; the more actors involved, in other words, the more blame can be distributed and the less the government itself can be held accountable.

(iii) The uncertainties of participation

In addition to the difficulties and risks of more participatory processes in development, there are also considerable uncertainties about it. First is *the sheer inability toknow, and toshow toothers, when a participatory process has succeeded.* Participation is a *process* and, as described above, its products are often psychological, procedural, or organisational in nature rather than concrete in terms of money saved or services delivered. "As a process, participation evolves at its proper pace and rhythm, adapted to the people involved rather than to bureaucratically or politically defined projects or goals. It may go in unforeseen directions and may not in the short term have an immediately quantifiable or measurable impact" (Stiefel and Racelis, 1990:3). The lack of process indicators and measures means that success is easy to claim but difficult to substantiate.

A second problem relates to *the inability tostandardize or generalize the implementation of participatory development* due to the different configurations of participation in various regions of the world and even in different parts of a country. To the extent that participation is not an 'intervention' per se, that culture, history, and government policy affect its success, and that it is a dynamic process which requires flexibility, it is very much situation-specific. In other words, there cannot be a standard recipe for achieving participatory development; what makes it 'work' varies tremendously across different economic, political, and cultural contexts. There are many reasons for such variety: different histories of development, different social relationships and cultural traditions related to participation, and different political constraints or freedoms. Thus, schools and communities may respond in quite different ways to regulations concerning collaboration, and the nature of such collaboration and the kinds of structures which might encourage it differ across urban, suburban, and rural contexts. Attempts to develop manuals, guidelines, and training materials related to participatory approaches must therefore be tempered by their extensive adaptation to local conditions.

Despite these problems, however, participatory approaches to development have proven instrumental, in particular contexts and under particular conditions, in expanding the supply and increasing the relevance of basic social services and in enhancing people's capacities as individuals and as groups to improve their own lives and to take greater

control over their own development. This occurs most readily, of course, under two conditions: (1) that the users of this approach recognize, and move to control, the possible negative aspects of participation described above, and (2) that the dominant actor in development - the government - is committed, at all levels, to working more collaboratively with, and encouraging the greater participation of, other partners in development. The chapters which follow describe in greater detail who these partners can be and how their greater participation in the development of education can be enhanced.

Chapter III
Partnerships in education: who can do it

"Two approaches appear to have dominated thinking about rural institutions, and both are unfortunately fallacious. The *paternalistic* approach assumes that rural people are passive and fatalistic, uninterested in improving their lives, and incapable of initiative in making improvements. Consequently, everything must be done for them (or to them) in a top-down, bureaucratic manner. An opposing view is the *populistic* approach which assumes that rural people are vitally interested in change and completely capable of transforming their communities if only the politicians and bureaucrats would leave them alone. Both approaches derive from unreal stereotypes of rural people, who are neither as inert and ignorant as the first assume, nor as virtuous and wise as assumed in the second. On the whole, rural people are more capable and responsive than the paternalistic model of social change suggests, but less able to change their lives autonomously than the populistic model presumes....What should be developed is an institutionalized system which is neither just top-down nor bottom-up nor exclusively governmental". (Uphoff; Esman 1974:xii-xiii)

1. Potential partners in education: who can participate

The particular interest of this review is the development of more participatory approaches in education. This includes the broader and more active partnerships both inside the system at the central level and in the school and the greater collaboration of educational personnel and the external community in planning, managing, and implementing educational programmes. The potential partners are many: teachers,

headteachers, and local educational officials; parents and members and leaders of the local community; community associations and non-government organizations (NGOs); private enterprises and universities. For the purposes of this analysis, we will focus on four major partners: two 'internal' (the government and its officials, and the school) and two external (parents and the larger community surrounding the school, and NGOs).

Before discussing where and how greater collaboration among such partners can more readily occur, it is necessary to understand clearly the characteristics of these major actors. What, in other words, do they typically 'look like'? What are their norms and values and the nature of the 'culture' which surrounds them; their procedures of work; and their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and motivations? And which of these factors are most harmful to the development of partnerships and most critical to reinforce or alter in attempting to increase the effectiveness of participatory approaches to educational change?

(i) The government: bureaucracies and bureaucrats

> "The administration administers: it does not delegate, it does not negotiate, it does not consider groups of peasants or town-dwellers as partners. When it asks for their participation, its aim is the execution of predetermined tasks at the lowest possible cost, or else the alleviation of its own obligations" (Bugnicourt, J. quoted in Stiefel; Racelis 1990:6).

What are the general characteristics of 'government' and its officials which affect their usual reaction to more participatory approaches to development? To answer this question, we must first differentiate between the political and the administrative sides of government. The political side is critical for any discussion of participation. Depending on the government's philosophy, legitimacy, and strength, it may either ignore, resist, or actively prohibit greater participation in society - or permit, encourage, and actively facilitate it.

To the extent that the political system wishes to promote participation - and even sometimes in the face of official discouragement of it - the bureaucratic side of government may help facilitate it. Especially in large education systems, it may realize the utility of moving

at least some of the responsibility for the implementation of policies and programmes to lower levels of the bureaucracy. In systems with inadequate resources, it may understand that parental and community participation (e.g., financial contributions) is essential for the maintenance of local schools. And in countries which accept some level of ethnic and/or religious diversity in public institutions, it may also promote local participation in the delivery of locally-determined curricula in areas such as language, culture, and religious instruction.

But even if the politics of a nation tend to encourage participation, the administrative side of government may also do the opposite. Although bureaucracies - in education ministries as well as in other sectors - may be effective managers of top-down development projects and programmes and may have a range of human and material resources, an extensive infrastructure, and administrators and experts who bring to their work considerable knowledge, skills, and experience, they also may possess several *characteristics which work against more participatory approaches todevelopment.*

Limited knowledge of, or sensitivity to, community conditions and local experience. Older educational administrators often may have started their careers as teachers but then worked many years in various parts and at various levels of the ministry structure, far from the everyday reality of schools and communities. While some younger ones may have teaching experience, many may have moved directly into ministry positions following university or college training. Their experience has largely been gained, therefore, in academic or office settings (or even in study abroad) rather than in the field. The experience of both kinds of administrators, only reinforced by their position within the central bureaucracy, may produce a particular view of development. In reference to another sector, but relevant as well to education, one observer describes a common perception among government managers that "all knowledge, the necessary clinical skills and insights, the right strategies, the right perceptions of the health problem s at the local are a, all supposedly reside at the centre of the centralized system" (Brownlea 1987:612).

One effect of this perception can be a particular set of attitudes toward the 'periphery'. This includes:

- the retaining of firm control over the development process by the centre with full confidence that the periphery will implement the centre's decisions as required;
- the assumption that lower levels of the bureaucracy are capable merely of implementing policies and decisions made at the top;
- little appreciation of (or even scorn for) local or indigenous knowledge or creative potential of what are seen as largely passive 'beneficiaries' (UNICEF, 1982, Myers, 1991), especially in comparison with the supposed expertise of professionals in the centre (Korten, 1981);
- little recognition of the potential or achievements of local institutions; and
- a kind of 'cultural arrogance' that none of these institutions could be more or less equal in collaboration for development.

One author describes these 'centre' attitudes in very clear terms:

> "One often hears the city people talk in contempt about the village people. They call the masses lazy, ignorant, conservative, fatalistic, even stupid....They have no respect for the wisdom of the masses, for the wealth of their experience. They do not realise that the masses have managed to survive and keep the economics of [their] countries going not because of the help of the city people, but in spite of their exploitation by the moneyed and landed urban and rural elites"
>
> (Bhasin, 1979:70-71).

A top-down mentality "based on transmitting instructions from above, giving orders to people below them, strictly obeying instructions received (or making a show of *it)* and making the boss happy" (Pinney, 1983:43). Vertical communication, when it exists, flows down such a structure, from the top to the bottom, with few opportunities for the reverse. This can lead to:

- the discouragement and even the fear of diversity and local initiative;
- the avoidance of open consultation and interaction, except with other professionals speaking the same language;
- the desire to control information, events, and people;

- a resistance to change in structures or procedures; and, ultimately,
- the principle motivation of the public servant and the expert being the maintenance and control of the status quo.

Centralized, standardized, and routinized governmental structures and procedures, based on departmental, sectoral, and/or disciplinary lines which make difficult any attempts to respond flexibly to particular local conditions and needs and to integrate development efforts (Korten, 1981; Duke; 1990; UNICEF; 1982). Thus, although,

> "the geographical dispersion of schools and the organisational tradition of teacher independence in the classroom give education all of the characteristics of a decentralized enterprise, [yet] in most developing countries the education system is hierarchically structured, with most of the important decisions made by central government ministries"
>
> (Rondinelli et al 1990:120).

The result is often an attempt "to enclose people in standardized rules, regulations, and official institutions, thereby discouraging voluntary initiatives and promoting apathy, withdrawal and often passive resistance"
(Stiefel;Raeelis 1990:50).

Limited financial and human resources necessary to penetrate regularly and systematically, even through what is often an extensive network of local offices, to all of a country's villages and settlements, let alone to those most isolated and marginal. With such a limited reach, governments may be hard-pressed to implement the standardized policies they often seek to promote, let alone react flexibly to the particular needs of diverse communities. These limitations may be particularly acute in increasingly expensive and complex educational systems where central governments attempt with great difficulty to control the daily life of literally thousands of schools.

Inflexible procedures of planning, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, accountability, etc. These can lead to the design of quick solutions to complex problems, the rapid assessment of quantifiable output, and the desire for immediate success. In such a

system, there may be little exploration of alternative approaches and little advantage seen in attempts to encourage messier, more complex, and potentially less immediately and less visibly successful activities. This generally rigid approach is often reinforced by the importance given to national goals of unity and integration and by the necessity imposed by both internal auditors and external funders for detailed planning and budget cycles, work schedules, and target dates.

Such pressures can make it difficult to adapt to local circumstance and therefore tempt a ministry to finish a given project, declare it a success, and move to yet another rather than reinforcing the operations, maintenance, and sustainability of the first (Korten, 1981). This approach has been called the 'blueprint approach', reflecting "the textbook version of how development programming is supposed to work...[with]...clear-cut orders, allocation of funds for precisely-stated outcomes, reliance on 'hard' data and expert judgement, and the clearly-stated implementation schedules [which] make project justification easy in budget presentations" (Korten, 1981:4).

In such a system, evaluation of staff performance may be based on the number of development projects completed or the amount of budget spent rather than the extent of local capacity developed, and personnel end up being accountable solely to superiors within the bureaucracy and not to the so-called beneficiaries. And as long as members of the bureaucracy "remain unconvinced that they need the willing co-operation of local-level people to improve their performance in ways significant to their careers, they are unlikely to facilitate 'animation techniques' and they may well sabotage them" (Charlick, 1980:6).

The particular weakness of the intermediate (regional, district, sub-district) level of government. This level is necessarily a crucial actor in any kind of educational change, especially given the variety of important roles it can play. These include:

- providing professional assistance and technical support to schools and their personnel,
- promoting the exchange of information across schools,
- mediating and channelling communication between the top and the bottom and passing information both up and down the system,
- participating in the selection, placement, and promotion of teachers and principals, and

- given its links to a community beyond that of a particular school (e.g., intermediate-level offices of other development sectors such as health and agriculture), connecting the school to this wider range of potential partners and resources.

But such levels of the system - even more than central levels - tend to be inadequately staffed, poorly financed, and limited (often willingly) in their authority to act.

> "The typical district office operates...solely as a 'mailbox', transmitting guidelines, decisions, and rules from the central offices down to the lower layers of the administrative machinery....There are no incentives to encourage the intermediate levels to report mis-management, violation of rules, or, on the other hand, the good performance of institutions, requiring rewards or encouragement. Nor are there incentives for the intermediate levels to promote, at the lower levels of the system, initiatives, innovative attitudes, or educational experiments with a risk element". (Hallak, 1992:3)

(ii) The school: heads and teachers

> "I don't feel like I see some of these parents real often. But I don't feel a need for it and I don't feel I have the time for it...You have to keep things under control and manage things on your own. But sometimes you *have* to resort to talking to the parents...They feel like they can come in and tell the school what to do...I mean, I'm not going to go in and tell my dentist how to drill my teeth" (school teachers quoted in Hulsebosch 1991:194, 198).

The school, as the major actor in educational development, is composed of both teachers and managers. Both are included in this heading, though their roles in various contexts are often quite different. In some systems, head teachers are seen as the lowest end of the government bureaucracy, trusted to carry out its administrative tasks and deliver its educational instructions to teachers; they therefore tend to share many of the characteristics of the government administrators

described above. In other contexts, however, headteachers are seen more as senior teachers - above all responsible for pedagogical issues, with administrative tasks added on, but generally treated in the same way as teachers by the bureaucracy.

Though there is, of course, a huge variety of conditions in schools within and across countries of the developing world, there are certain *common characteristics of schools of poorer countries and for marginal and disadvantaged populations.* A quote from a study of rural Chilean schools portrays such conditions:

> "The poverty of the schools in the sample is striking. In addition to being located in poor neighbourhoods, in the case of the urban schools, and in isolated rural areas, the school buildings are visibly deteriorated. Peeling walls, flimsy construction material and unfinished classrooms, permeated by the smell of bathrooms without running water. Playgrounds are generally dirt-covered, treeless, and two narrow to run or play freely in. In southern Chile, some of the playgrounds have roofs to protect the children in winter, which makes them dark and enclosed..."
>
> "In the classrooms, there are rows of broken and worn-out desks, the wrong size for different ages, some collapsed and useless, piled in a corner; windows are often patched with paper for want of glass, the floor cracked or simply dirt-covered. Most classrooms are cold, dark, small and barely isolated from outside noise. Blackboards are not always painted black or dark green for better visibility and are often worn out, grey or pale green smudged with poor quality chalkdust. Few of the schools visited have a room where children can consult books outside class hours or when they need information for an assignment. In some schools, the principals had students leafing through dictionaries in their offices.
>
> Teachers' rooms also lack conditions for rest periods or team work. They are small and frequently lack enough seats, coatracks or hangers, or shelf space for books and materials.

> Teachers go in and out between classes, but it is clearly not easy to teach and learn in these conditions.
>
> Some children erase the first pages in their notebooks in order to write on them again. Some children go around the class trying urgently to borrow a pencil to do an assignment.
>
> The teachers seem tired, even at the beginning of the school day. Many of them come from other schools where they work in the morning. They are modestly dressed and often look as poor as their pupils. The men teachers, only one or two in the lowest grades, wear shabby suits or well-worn sports clothes. Some of the women teachers wear smocks over their clothes, but, like the children lining up before class, their clothes reveal them as impoverished professionals, disciplined in the rituals of the school and the recent history of silence and authoritarianism that is only just beginning to change"
>
> (Cardemil, 1991: 24-29).

In this and many other settings typical problems include the following:

Shortages of books and materials and inadequate or deteriorating facilities. Many schools in many countries of the world suffer from the lack or complete absence of even the minimum facilities and materials for education.

Underpaid, overworked, and demotivated teachers. Many teachers must work with insufficient and irregularly paid salaries, poor promotion opportunities and living conditions, the burden of excess subject content, reduced prestige, and either low enrolment and often absent pupils or overcrowded classrooms.

> "Nearly everywhere [teachers] suffer from a sense of grievance. One reason for this is that their rates of pay are usually not so favourable as those of many others who have received the same amount of education. Another reason in many countries is that their prestige, which once was high in

> rural areas when they were the only educated person, has inevitably slumped with the spread of education"
> (Griffiths, quoted in Bude 1985:259).

The result can be heavy teacher absenteeism, an erosion of self-confidence (and of community confidence in teachers), a feeling of non-accountability to parents and the community, and a general decline in respect (Williams, 1989). This can all lead to a lack of teacher involvement as 'interior' actors in the school.

Lack of competence, experience, and authority of headteachers and other supervisors. Heads of schools, as well as supervisors and inspectors, are often chosen more for seniority of tenure (and nearness to retirement) than for expertise and thus may have neither the knowledge nor the status to assist their colleagues professionally. Mechanisms of teacher support, let alone of administrative or pedagogical consultation, are therefore often weak.

The ambiguous position of teachers and headteachers. Both teachers and head teachers are much like a kind of 'extension agent' of the Ministry, facing many of the particular dilemmas of such agents in other departments. Are they merely part of an 'extended elite', representing the top of the bureaucracy to the bottom ? Are they go-betweens and mediators between top and bottom? Or are they champions of the communities and populations in which they work? In other words, do they consider themselves to be primarily accountable to the bureaucracy above them or to the community below? A lack of clear answers to these questions puts many teachers into difficult, ambiguous, even conflictual situations.

The isolation and indifference of teachers. One result of such ambiguity is that teachers often consider themselves masters or mistresses of their classrooms, fully trained and certified, and therefore feeling little responsibility for the failure of their pupils and little interested either in receiving advice from superiors or in sharing experience with peers. For a similar reason, they also often 'disqualify' the experience of parents, especially those from low-income, marginal, and minority ethnic groups, and reject or even fear their involvement in school, having the attitude

that parents, generally 'unaware' of the benefits of education, should 'surrender' their children to the school from the age of six or seven and thereafter not get involved in its activities.

Some teachers have considerable knowledge of their pupils, of the local environment and of what is feasible and useful in the context of the local school. There are many so-called 'high involvement' teachers who "equate professionalism with the ability to maintain a dialogue between the in- and out-of-school lives of both their students and themselves" (Hulseboch, 1991:183).

But many others are 'low-involvement' teachers for whom:

> "being a professional means separating and protecting their work with students from thoughts, experiences, and people beyond the classroom walls....Not only do low involvement teachers maintain themselves in a position that is distant and autonomous from parents, they also envision themselves in an authoritarian position in relation to the mothers. The low involvement teachers deal with parents hierarchically, as though the parents are not as smart, not as moral, or not as worthwhile. Furthermore, to the low involver, there is a superior status that rightfully belongs to teachers - a sense of entitlement that the low involvers convey when they talk about teaching: entitlement to respect, trust, and irreproachability"
>
> (Hulsebosch, 1991: 198).

Getting such teachers more actively involved in school, as interior participants in educational change, may be particularly difficult.

The 'loosely coupled' nature of schools in relation to the larger education system (Cohn; Rossmiller, 1987). While schools are part of a network of central, regional, and local interests and are heavily dependent on complementary institutions and sub-systems (training colleges, examination systems, curriculum development centres), they are often only weakly linked, at the end of a long chain of command, to this bureaucracy. This makes problematic both their constructive input to any reform process and the relevance and feasibility of any decision made by

the top about the bottom - and thus imperils the success of any central and standardized reform at the school level.

(iii) The community: parents and local organizations

> "There exists an enormous gap between the power and authority of the educational administration at the national level and that of parents....The educational administration represents a wide and stable organization....Its personnel have extensive experience in mobilizing resources and public support for the execution of their decisions. Parents, in contrast, constitute an unorganized body which lacks a common ideological stand. Furthermore, the period of time during which a given parent is involved in the system is short...and sporadic"
> (Goldring, 1991:219).

> "Traditionally, parents were seen but not heard in the school"
> (Foster, 1984:28).

The nature of the 'community' and of the conditions which determine its fate are perhaps even more varied than those of the 'school'. Communities can be defined by law and geography, culture and language, class and caste, 'interest' and 'attachment' (Walt n.d.: 200). They can be heterogeneous or homogeneous, united or conflictive, poor or rich, sunk in fatalism or vibrant with optimism (and the last are not necessarily correlated with levels of prosperity). They can be governed and managed by leaders chosen democratically (informally or through formal channels) and acting relatively autonomously from other levels of government, or by leaders imposed from above and representing central authorities. Such leaders may either serve as effective catalysts between development agencies and the local population, or be loathe to let loose their traditional and often monopolistic hold on local communities.

Many communities, also, especially in disadvantaged areas, lack cohesive, homogeneous social units and even informal local organisations which might be mobilized for greater participation (Korten, 1981). Others may have quite active local associations (e.g., for women and youth, for cooperative economic and cultural activities, and for religious and political purposes). Each of these characteristics will influence the

degree to which communities themselves, their leaders, and any existing community-based associations are involved - or are able and willing to be involved - in development and in education.

In general, especially in socially and economically marginal regions, *communities are not deeply involved as external actors in formal education.* Depending on the nature of the community, this may be also true for parents of children in school. There are several reasons for this:

1. a lack of the time, energy, and sense of 'efficacy' required for such involvement;
2. a lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education and a mis-match between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing;
3. the belief that education is essentially the task of the State; the length of time required to realise the benefits of better schooling;
5. ignorance of the structure and functions of the school;
6. the school's disinterest or resistance to community or parental invol-vement in what are often seen as specialized and professional matters; and
7. an underestimation by parents of their own competence in educational issues and the fear of being blamed for their children's 'backwardness' (UNESCO/PROAP, 1990).

The involvement of parents and the community in school is largely extractive in nature; that is, community (especially parental) participation is limited to the provision of resources - money, materials, labour. Other, more substantial involvement in terms of consultation or management or control - in the diagnosis of needs, the development and implementation of school policies, the design of educational content, or the delivery or evaluation of such content - is usually seriously constrained.

But communities often have strengths of their own - energy, resources, knowledge, and experiences - rarely used in centrally- and bureaucratically-determined development programmes. "That the rural poor continue to survive under the most extremely unfavourable circum-stances is testimony to the fact that they possess a good deal of technical and social knowledge relevant to their condition - knowledge of which many a university trained technician may be unaware. The best solution to any given village level problem is likely to be one to which

both the technician and the villager have contributed their respective knowledge" (Kortenl981a:210).

More involvement in education might therefore permit families and communities to accept that:

> "their accountability in the education of children extends beyond the provision of material requirements for schooling; that it includes the main responsibility of assisting, guiding, and extending whatever help their children need to harness their potential; and that they equally share the burden of education children with the teachers"
>
> (Carino; Valisno 1992:80).

(iv) Non-Government Organisations (NGOs)

> NGOs see development "not merely as an activity geared towards producing a certain output but as a process of developing community motivation and awareness, of promoting people's abilities so that they can help themselves and, in turn, create a self-reliant community and nation". (Hadad 1983: 10). Governments often see NGOs as "being unprofessional, dogging, poorly organized, non-comprehending gaggles of usually undisciplined, if well-meaning, civilians".
>
> (Mahabir, 1992:81).

In 1987 $2.2 billion (or 5 per cent) of the world's official development assistance was provided by donors to non-government organisations; another $3.3 billion was added to this total through NGO efforts (OECD, 1988:82-3). This considerable sum and percentage have no doubt increased over the last few years. As NGOs play an increasingly large role in the collection and distribution of development assistance, their involvement in the planning and delivery of development programmes also mounts.

There is no universally accepted definition or classification of NGOs (or PVOs - private voluntary organisations - as they are often called).

- Some classifications include under one label organisations ranging from small village-level associations through national institutions operating in thousands of villages to international agencies with

hundreds of staff and dozen of regional and national branches (Hall, n.d.).

- Others distinguish between grassroots organisations of the poor and 'popular' sectors (such as peasant movements, tribal associations, women's clubs, and labour unions) and more 'intermediate' agencies or non-government development organisations (NGDOs) - 'nonprofit private organisations staffed by (semi)professionals who are engaged, full-time, in the design and implementation of grassroots development projects and programmes with and for the poor in the third world' (Wils, 1990: 1).
- Yet other classifications include profit-making organisations, foundations, churches and missions, medical organisations and hospitals, unions and professional organisations, business and commercial enterprises, and co-operatives and cultural groups (OECD 1988, Pinney 1983).
- NGOs can also be classified as "sectoral, integrative, action-oriented, research-based, educational bodies, policy organizations, politically focused, or any combination of the above" (Hall, n.d.:5).
- Another typology distinguishes among conformist, reformist, and transformist or emancipatory organizations (Fakih 1991).
- Others would insist that NGOs be seen very much as public rather than private institutions - as "part of the public domain of governance by Civil Society" (Tandon, 1992:31).

Recent literature has developed more precise classifications of NGOs through an analysis of their evolution. In one kind of analysis, NGOs have developed from agencies primarily concerned with relief, welfare, and service delivery activities, to those encouraging small-scale, self-reliant local development projects and processes, to those more directly involved with community empowerment and social transformation (Elliott, 1987; Anello, 1991).

Further evolution has led to two other categories (Bhatnagar 1990). One is the type of large, umbrella, 'policy-advocacy' NGO, which forms networks or federations of advocacy organizations and develops distinct social, political, and economic functions and influence within the policy-making processes of a country. Another is the 'service provider' organisation which sees its role more in terms of supporting, protecting, linking, and developing the capacity of a myriad of action-oriented but often weak and relatively powerless grassroots NGOs - "more in the

manner of a foundation, directing its attention to facilitating development by other organizations, both public and private, of the capacities, linkages, and commitments required to address designated needs on a sustained basis" (Korten, 1986:12).

Such diversification of roles should not obscure *a general commonality of characteristics and functions.* In ideal terms, NGOs are most often described as people-centred, flexible and responsive, creative, democratic and non-hierarchical, cost-effective and pragmatic, with rather large margins for error, and often independent and non-aligned (Hall n.d.). They generally develop as the result of community support, are able to tap local knowledge and resources, and usually have a small core of paid staff and (often) many volunteers.

But NGOs may also have quite rigid and bureaucratic structures (perhaps the result of too much success) and be understaffed and poorly managed, with limited financial accountability, a lack of professional training, a concern for only short-term change and a narrowly-defined clientele, and an agenda closely tied to political ends and organizations. Whatever their characteristics, NGOs generally seek to carry out several functions:

- *providing development services* in those fields, activities, or regions either underserved by government or parallel to those provided by the government, often with greater effectiveness and equity. More and more frequently, they also work directly *with* governments (and sometimes with donors) in the provision of services, often as an intermediary between government agencies and the poorest levels of society (PRISMA, 1983, Annis, 1987);
- *experimenting and testing new approaches to*development and service delivery;
- increasingly, within individual countries and internationally through networks and federations, *exploring new issues of social concern and serving as advocates and 'noise-makers'* in regard to issues such as the environment and health, human rights, women's issues, and peace (Tandon n.d.), and helping to build consensus and initiate policy change around such issues (Bhatnagar, 1990);
- *empowering the poor and the oppressed* and building and strengthening people's organisations and community associations; and

- *"strengthening civil Society* in its relationships vis-a-vis the State and the ruling elites" (Tandon, 1992:31; see also Tandon, n.d.) by re-energising and rejuvenating social movements; promoting democratic practices and processes; and encouraging citizen engagement with public policy issues.

Given these functions and characteristics, there can easily be a clash of organisational norms and cultures between government and aid agency bureaucracies and non-governmental organisations - a clash which can often lead to adversarial relationships and to government intimidation and regulation (Tandon n.d.). One problem is the differing unit of activity the discrete, defined, elaborately planned and budgeted, and carefully timed 'project' of governments and aid agencies versus the more interactive, unbounded, often vaguely-defined and open-ended 'process' of NGOs.

Other problems include the sheer distance among the various actors - social, ethnic, political, cultural, even geographic; differences in perceptions, working styles, personalities, and approaches; hidden agendas and previous negative experiences; even a difference in salaries (donor, government, NGO) among those meant to be working as equals. And there is ingrained suspicion between the various ' sides' . Governments believe NGOs encourage division and sow discord between the people and government agencies, expose government shortcomings, and confuse people concerning government aims. They fear that too much NGO criticism of the policies and programmes of the State might weaken it in relationships with foreign countries and donors. And they feel that NGO activities, by raising questions concerning economic distribution, social control, and the accountability of power - and even the very models and frameworks of development in use - are a challenge to State authority; this may particularly be the case in one-party states where the party itself is seen as the 'voice of the people' and therefore the channel through which all community-level work should flow (Tandon n.d.).

NGOs, on the other hand, often believe that government officials and bureaucracies are inefficient, cautious, and slow, with a limited capacity for intellectual and technical inputs, more interested in personal gain than social welfare, dominated by corruption, biased toward support to the elites and other civil servants, and ignorant of the real problems of the people (Pinney 1983, Picon 1990). The result of all of these factors

can be jealousy, the inability or unwillingness to seek compromise or clarify respective responsibilities, and the taking of refuge in technical approaches by government and in ideological rhetoric by NGOs.

NGOs also have fears concerning their links with governments:

- the fear that increased funding of NGOs may lead towards the privatisation of services to the poor and thus the withdrawal of the State from its social responsibilities;
- the risk that the increasing co-ordination of NGOs, either through government regulation or donor preference, might harm their principal focus on decentralized, community-based initiatives;
- the belief that more frequent legislation and regulation concerning NGOs in the developing world may cripple rather than support their activities; and
- the belief that as NGOs become sub-contractors for development programmes designed and funded by others they will lose their role as creative, responsive actors in their own right.

This last is the fear of some NGOs of the possibility of dependency and co-optation - that too close an approach to government on the part of NGOs, and too great an acceptance of funding from national governments and international donors, will make them lose their identity and their (often) hard-won autonomy. But others fear that if NGOs are too small in scale, they become insignificant; if too independent, powerless; if too low-cost, of low quality; and if too innovative, temporary and unsustainable (Annis, 1987:129). NGOs therefore need to "learn to sup with a long spoon and to balance co-operation and confrontation in their dealings with officialdom" (Duke, 1990:209).

2. *The ideal partnership or 'hybrid'*

> "[In regard to] the distinction that is made between 'top-down' and 'bottom up' development. The former is [considered] bad and to be avoided; the latter, good, and to be promoted. This rather polarized, and absolutist view of the two approaches commonly leads to the perception that they are mutually exclusive. Most aspects of development, by their very nature, must be disseminated from the top, New technology, education, modern health facilities, credit organizations and marketing structures rarely develop at the

> grassroots. The point, surely, is that policies and programmes implemented from above must be balanced by a flow of information (and participation) from below....A balance of local and expert, supported by exchange of information between the top and bottom, is required" (Rigg 1991:208).

Given the usual (and often limited) patterns of interaction among the various actors in education at the school and community level, the complexities and potential disadvantages of greater participation described above, and the quite profound differences between government agencies and non-government organisations, it should be clear why it can be difficult to develop and maintain collaboration and genuine partnerships in education. The technocratic, centralized, uniform, supposedly 'scientific' authority usually imposed by the State - with all of its related values, priorities, and approaches - is not easily wed to, or even tolerant of, the more culturally-based, decentralized, diverse, supposedly traditional authority derived from the 'people'.

Such differences are reflected in differing views of how schools can best be managed:

> "Those who champion democratic participation in education believe that communities will be served best when decision-making is decentralized and when people - teachers, parents, and students alike - are encourage d to participate directly in making the decisions that affect them....In contrast to this view, the notion of administrative leadership is one which implies hierarchical elevation of the...principal to an extraordinary level of power, centralising decision-making and control of resources in the hands of the few....lt. is assumed that strong leaders, with their expertise, technical know-how and experience, can solve administrative problems more efficiently than could cumbersome and wasteful community participation in decision-making". (Rizvi, quoted in Gregg 1989: 19).

The ideal compromise between such views - the ideal partnership or 'hybrid' of such forces (Hallak 1490) - would accept the need for some kind of central government authority and framework to:

1. establish common goals, general policies, and national planning processes;
2. determine basic curricular content and uniform achievement standards;
3. guarantee basic inputs;
4. collect basic system statistics and evaluate educational outcomes;
5. compensate for imbalances across schools and regions; in other words, "co-ordinate local action, reconcile divergent interests and protect the weak, the losers, and, sometimes, minorities" (Stiefel; Racelis 1990:3);
6. serve as the principal negotiator and communicator "in an educational landscape featuring many decision-making centres both in and out of government" (Caillods 1991:14); and
7. plan for and explore the long-term future through enrolment and flow projections, the programming of public investment, the generation of scenarios to assess the consequences of policy changes, etc. (Caillods 1991).

At the same time this hybrid would recognize the right of school personnel, *local authorities, and the popular sectors to*adapt and implement the national framework and fill it with local content. It would encourage a distribution of power in which each side has an equal opportunity to influence the other (Gregg 1989), and it would respect the traditional wisdom of local communities, the experience of teachers and principals, and the legitimacy of non-government organisations. It would also encourage the exchange of experiences, information, techniques, approaches, and resources among government offices, NGOs, and community groups.

Most importantly, perhaps, this ideal partnership would see the usual 'controllers' of development - governments and the donors which support them - rather as the 'enablers' of development. They would be charged with permitting other actors, from the bottom up, to assume both the rights and the risks of being partners in educational development (Myers 1991, Garilao 1987, Duke 1990) and with "preserving, protecting, opening or creating necessary 'spaces' - political, legal, social, economic, and cultural - for participation to emerge and thrive" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:3).

An ideal partnership would also help facilitate participation by these actors (e.g., through parent training programmes), in order not only to

share responsibility with them for the failure of projects and programmes, but also to build the capacity of otherwise marginal groups in assessing needs, designing and managing programmes, and making decisions. Finally, it would reduce the "constraints to local initiatives imposed by absolute and unresponsive administrative forms" (Hollnsteiner 1982: 14); guarantee enough autonomy at the local level to encourage school and community partnerships in formulating, implementing, and evaluating school improvement programmes; and search for the optimal, if ever-changing, mix of centralized and decentralized structures and procedures (Rondinelli et al 1990).

In more concrete terms, such a mix might see central governments retaining responsibility for establishing:

- a core curriculum;
- standards of financial accountability;
- minimum levels of teacher qualification and compensation;
- a minium number of schools days per year; and
- minimum levels of centrally-provided school financing.

Transferred further down or out of the system might then be such items as curricula design, the publishing and/or procurement of textbooks, and the production of locally-relevant teaching and learning materials; the collection and management of local resources; adjustments to the school calendar; inspection and supervision; and the hiring, training, and promoting of teachers. The case of the State of Victoria in Australia illustrates one such mix of powers.

Box 1. The division of powers in decentralized school management in Victoria, Australia

Beginning in 1971 the government of the State of Victoria explored the potential of regionalization as the mechanism for having administrative decisions in education made closer to their point of implementation. From a tentative and rather confused beginning, full devolution has almost been achieved. The schools are autonomous units with full decision-making and management authority in certain matters. But they must still function within statewide policy guidelines and accept centralized control of levels of staffing, salary structures, promotion and transfer procedures for teachers, and other controls negotiated as part of the terms and conditions agreement with teacher unions.

Operating funds are provided on a per capita basis, but large-scale spending requirements (e.g., salaries, major building projects) are centrally controlled. Representative bodies have been established at three levels in the system as part of the process. Schools councils are the principal means of relating each school to its community.

The council provides the primary means of involving parents, community members, teachers, students, and the principal in participative decision-making processes and are now statutory bodies with defined responsibilities for the determination of school policy, the management of finance and facilities, the employment of ancillary staff, the promotion of school-community relationships, the selection of the principal and deputy, and other areas of school operations.

The council is accountable to the Minister for its overall performance, within statewide policy guidelines, for financial management, and for carrying out its statutory responsibilities. It is also accountable to the school community through the election process. A state Board of Education has members drawn from various groups with a legitimate concern for the future of primary and post-primary education in Victoria. A continuing function of the Board is to assess the needs of all schools, to indicate where needs are not being met, and to recommend changes. Regional boards of education have been established with a key role in the development of regional plans for the delivery of resources and services to schools. General managers consult with regional boards on resource priorities and allocations and inform boards about management decisions.

Also, a two-tiered structure has emerged for the Schools Division - a unified administration comprising centre and regional offices, and the schools themselves, each with roles and responsibilities clearly established.

Additionally and importantly, community participation in significant areas of decision-making relating to the operation of schools has been enshrined in legislation. Schools have become responsible through their councils to the community, establishing their own evaluation procedures, with programme budgeting being gradually introduced across the state.

New attitudes and roles must be learned by many persons throughout the system. For example, parents involved in the participatory processes do not possess 'expert' knowledge about schools, or have access to necessary information. They do not have confidence in meeting procedures. Principals without preliminary training were directed to run their schools in accordance with new policies which were neither fully articulated nor understood.

The case of Victoria demonstrates how difficult it is to mandate major new approaches without full information being given to, and preparation provided for, those who will be most affected.

(Taken from *Implementation mechanisms for facilitating community participation in school management in Victoria, Australia: an overview case* [study by Colin Moyle).

There are several important implications of such a 'centralized-decentralized' hybrid. First is *the need todecentralize from a position of strength* - in other words, from a relatively strong central system. "Central strength based on anemic [local] institutions is an illusion; and it is also unlikely that there can be effective [local] institutions in the absence of strong central support" (Uphoff; Esman 1974:80). This requires that the divisions of labour and responsibilities among various levels are clearly understood and the systems of communication and reporting, up and down the system, are clearly established; that local administrative units clearly have (or are provided) the management capacity to handle the functions transferred; and that the necessary resources (financial and otherwise) can be provided to these units to make them viable and productive (Prawda, 1992).

Second, it is in this context that *the role of the mediating institution* often becomes important. If it is accepted that the "State represents macro, aggregated, cumulated formations and structures in a country [and] as a result, State policies, agencies, officials operate at a level far more macro than the level of the family" (Tandon, 1992:30), then the relations between the State and the family often need to be mediated, especially in more coercive or totalitarian contexts. In some cases very local organizations such as community or neighbourhood associations, churches, and voluntary organisations can play such a role; in others, stronger, more organized NGOs (local, national, international) may help to ensure such mediation and thus guarantee the balance of power between the family and the State.

Third, such a mix or partnership in education implies *the increased participation in school both of teachers and of parents and the community* (directly or via community associations and NGOs). There will be a variety of patterns of such participation, depending on the context, with some partners having only *input* into some issues (e.g.,

curriculum, administrative decisions) and others having *final authority* over these issues (Williams, 1991). But no matter what the pattern, the important point is that a more collaborative partnership should be developed.

Finally, this hybrid of responsibility requires *a greater emphasis on school-based management,* where individual schools have considerable autonomy in decision-making. In such management, "the school becomes the principal entity of any change in the educational system. It is the epicentre for the implementation of educational reforms". This, in turn, requires "the sharing of responsibilities among all those who participate in the life of the school" (Hallak, 1992:5).

The chapters which follow will provide greater detail concerning where and how "in the life of the school" such responsibilities can be shared.

Chapter IV

Areas of potential collaboration in education: where to do it

> "The educational system should not be regarded as a branch of the bureaucracy. Instead, it should be a subsystem highly interactive with all other parts of the social whole. The point is to give pupils, parents and teachers responsibility over their own affairs, to the point of enabling them to administer the educational system on their own within the context of natural or contractual communities. This assumption of responsibility must necessarily embrace three indispensable areas: participation in design and decision-making processes; regular, structured involvement in the processes of management and evaluation; and finally financial accountability with regard to both income and contributions". (Ki-Zerbo,1990:86)

Participation in education can be analyzed in terms both of the degree of participation and the areas of education in which greater participation can occur. The first can be examined in relation to the earlier analysis of the 'ladder' of participation in development. It posits a range of involvement in education by various actors from both inside and outside the school. For those from outside the school (parents, community members, NGOs), the range goes from:

1. complete non-participation and exclusion from school affairs, except (usually) in the provision of resources; through
2. involvement (at home) with motivating children and helping them with homework; to
3. involvement as an 'audience' and passive supporters at school-run meetings or assemblies; and to 4. participation as 'consultants' on school issues;
5. as 'partners' in teaching or training;
6. as implementors of delegated powers; and, ultimately,

7. as citizens or a community in control of the school (Gregg, 1989, Stallworth and Williams, 1983).

The range can be quite similar for those already inside the school. Teachers themselves may be kept ignorant of non-classroom school programmes and policies; may be involved merely as an 'audience' to activities and as passive supporters of decisions arranged by others; or may be more active participants in providing input to school policies, planning and implementing school curricula and programmes, and controlling more directly the management of the school.

Note that the first few levels of such a range of participation are limited to 'involvement', defined as "implicating, including, and entangling or wrapping up in" (Hedley Beare quoted in Fraser, 1992:79) - where parents generally help in activities organized by the school - and thus are "of a rather formal nature and school- rather than parent-oriented. Parents visit schools when invited for parent/teacher evenings, open days and occasionally to discuss problems, often of a disciplinary nature....The parent appears to be interested only in his or her own child's progress, and the school in how the parent can support their efforts to maximise this" (Morgan et al l992:16-17). Such meetings are usually "few in number, well-defined in content and objective, and are of a technical nature...it is the teacher who initiates contact. She controls the content and direction of communication; the teacher reveals information, which the parent absorbs....The meetings are institutionalized, routine, and ritualistic" (Goldring, 1991 :234).

A higher level of involvement - of 'participation', defined as "having a share in, having a part in, being part of" - is achieved farther along the range, where parents take a more active part in the activities of associations, perhaps help in the classroom, and assist in other work. "In this way, the focus of their relationship with the school widens from that of the parent concerned with his/her child's education per se, to a more global concern with the school as a whole" (Morgan et al 1992: 17). For teachers, as well, such expanded participation can widen the focus of concern from his/her classroom and pupils to a broader interest in the quality of the entire school and of its relationship to the surrounding community.

The last levels imply for both parents and teachers a more specific, formal, structural involvement, more managerial in nature. This relates to participation in governance and policy decisions and in the actual

conduct - planning, managing, and implementing - of school programmes. It is worthwhile repeating from an earlier chapter that the more participatory end of this ladder, especially as it relates to parent and community involvement, represents an ambitious goal likely unreachable (at least in the short-term) in many societies of the world. The degree of participation able to be achieved in any given society at any given time will vary considerably based on its political, social, cultural, and economic context. Given this fact, achieving the greater participation of more partners is clearly an evolutionary process and will proceed at varying speeds depending on a number of factors and conditions (institutional and individual commitment, resources, appropriate mechanisms, personal expertise) which will be examined in later chapters. This possible range of collaboration with outside actors, as well as the more active participation of teachers within and across schools, can also be analyzed in relation to participation in several different areas of education:

1. the diagnosis of educational conditions, needs, priorities, and resources
2. policy-making and governance (the setting of goals, planning of programmes, and managing of personnel and budgets), and
3. the instructional programme, both the determination of educational content (the curriculum and teaching materials) and teaching and training (the pedagogy and teaching methods).

1. Diagnosis

> "The initial household survey [of the PROPEL project] involved the Panchayats and local youth groups; in some villages primary teachers also helped conduct the surveys. Group meetings held by the project staff to explain the survey schedules and the use of the information collected were extended to discuss village problems. The semi-educated village youth and young women came forward in such large numbers tohelp conduct the household survey that selection became necessary. By offering a small payment and limiting the number of households to be surveyed by each, a large number of young persons were involved whom the researchers

> could orient as supporters of NFE. Their participation created interest in education and propagated the feeling that the community must begin to look into its primary education problems. The surveys also prepared a large number of people for the planning and organizational activities undertaken later for implementing the innovations". (Naik, 1991)

The first- *the diagnosis of educational conditions, needs, priorities, and resources* - is of particular importance. Depending on the extent of autonomy available to communities, schools, local government, and local education offices, it can serve as the basis for more relevant educational planning, programming, content, and methods. Just as importantly, it can begin the process of getting potential partners - parents, community members, even teachers - more deeply involved in local education, caring more about it and feeling more 'ownership' of it.

A more participatory process of diagnosis entails two things: (1) the creation of a data-based development 'profile' of the community (of perhaps of the sub-district or district), especially in the sector of education, and (2) the development of mechanisms to encourage the involvement of members of the community in the process. The first can help clarify the development problems of a community and the potential role of education in resolving these problems. It requires the surveying of a variety of different issues as illustrated below. These include:

(i) The creation of a community profile

The first requires the surveying of a variety of different issues. These include:

(a) indicators and needs of general development
- population dynamics and health status
- economic development, income levels, and employment patterns
- housing and transportation
- the existence of disadvantaged areas or groups

(b) indicators and needs of educational development
- absolute totals and rates of enrolment, graduation, and literacy
- pupil-teacher ratios

- the magnitude and causes of non-participation, of both pupils and teachers (absenteeism and drop-out)
- gender imbalances in education
- the absence of education opportunities for particular groups (pre-school children, illiterate adults, unemployed youth, ethnic minorities)
- the status of mother-tongue education and of traditional knowledge in school

(c)available local resources
- available educational programmes and facilities, in and out of school
- financial and human resources
- local organizations and other sectors involved in education

(d) educational processes
- patterns of school management
- teaching-learning processes

(e) the nature of participation in education
- the motivation and activities of teachers
- the extent to which parents and community organizations are involved in education

(f) educational needs and priorities
- what is more important: greater quantity (more places) or higher quality (better teaching, more relevant content)?
- where should new schools be located (school mapping)?
- what are priorities
  - by level (pre-school, primary, secondary, adult?)
  - by type (academic or vocational?)
  - by pupil gender (a special focus on girls?)

Mechanisms and procedures to gather data on these issues (especially those relating to educational processes, priorities, and existing resources) may not exist at all in a given area. If they do, they may be the exclusive domain of local government, of officials of another sector such as health or agriculture, or of the local education office and may produce data not made available to other sectors. District health offices, for example, may gather periodic data concerning population changes, but this information may not be shared with the education office responsible for locating new primary schools. Local education officials may gather data from school questionnaires for regular transmission to higher levels

of the bureaucracy, but the data might not be available or used for determining local needs and priorities; e.g., whether imbalances exist in enrolment and drop-out rates among villages or between boys and girls. And officials of public and private school systems (or formal and non-formal education programmes) in the same area may not be aware of the needs or the available resources in each other's system.

(ii) The involvement of more actors in diagnoses

The second part of this process of diagnosis relates to the roles and responsibilities (if any) of teachers, parents, and members of the community at large in any assessment which is carried out. Such involvement may not exist at all, may be limited to responding to occasional questionnaires, or be restricted to only certain (perhaps elite) groups within the community. But a more sensitive and accurate profile of a community's conditions and needs and the setting of more relevant educational priorities will likely only be achieved to the extent that those who actually do the teaching (teachers) and the learning (pupils), those who indirectly or directly finance much of the schooling and gain quite direct benefit from it (the parents), and those who are meant to benefit more generally from the education provided (the community) are involved in the process of diagnosis.

Several mechanisms might be used to enhance the participation of these partners in such an exercise. Some relate to the collection of data whereas others are more concerned with data analysis and priority-setting.

(a) more consistent, systematic, and integrated data collection. On the assumption that in many countries considerable data related to the issues discussed above is already gathered at the local level by many different agencies and sectors (local government, health clinics, agricultural extension agents, education offices), ways can be found to ensure that the data are gathered in a more consistent, systematic, and integrated fashion. At a minimum, data gathered through separate mechanisms and therefore likely available only in dispersed locations (village offices, health clinics, education offices), should be consolidated in one place. In most villages in Indonesia, for example, the office of the head of the village contains basic development data gathered from the various social services which operate at the sub-district level. Even more

useful would be joint data collection exercises among the various agencies and services present in the community. This could be done via regular joint household censuses or more specific, ad hoc surveys and questionnaires. This is especially important for education in regard to data on health status, population changes, enrolment and drop-out rates (by gender), and the existence and problems of particularly disadvantaged areas or groups.

(b) the seeking of parent and community opinion. In addition to the often regular diagnosis of development needs, special emphasis could be placed on collecting the opinions and aspirations of parents and other community members concerned about education - both in general and also on more specific issues (such as the location of new schools or the kinds of skills children require from schools). In-depth interviews and focus group discussions (group interviews) may help in this regard. In the BRAC Non-Formal Primary Education (NFPE) programme in Bangladesh, for example, community members are responsible for deciding what kind of programme is most appropriate for the community and where the NF PE centre should best be located.

(c) the involvement of other actors in diagnoses. As a kind of 'extension agent' of the Ministry of Education and, in many communities, still among the most educated and respected of its members, teachers may not only have something useful to say about education; they may also be particularly able to gather and synthesize the needs and priorities of the community. Officers of whatever school/parent/community association exists may also help in this regard. Thus, as in the PROPEL project in India described above, teachers alone, or with parents and members of the community and even pupils, can be trained and helped to carry out local surveys of what people perceive to be their educational needs, establish mechanisms for determining priorities among these needs, and then assess what community resources are already available to meet these needs. Such processes will be encouraged to the extent that there is a viable, continuing, and active dialogue among the various actors at the community level.

(d) fora synthesis of data and the setting of priorities. A variety of informal or more formal mechanisms (e.g., the

school/parent/community association) may be developed as fora for the analysis of the data collected, the synthesis of the data into felt needs, and the determination of priorities among the needs identified. The COPLANER project in Indonesia, for example, gives as one of the tasks to the newly-established Community Forum for Educational Development (CFED) the responsibility for identifying and prioritizing educational needs of the community (Box 2).

Box 2. Diagnosis through community fora for educational development in Indonesia (COPLANER)

Decentralization of the education system in Indonesia began 15 years ago and has steadily been reinforced. The process was aided by an earlier project of the Ministry of Education and Culture's Planning Bureau which trained district officials in bottom-up planning processes. The current COPLANER project is a Ministry project which began in March 1991 with UNESCO and UNDP assistance. It operates with the objective of working even more closely to the local level -- in sub-districts, villages and schools - to build a needs-based system through joint decision-making between the school and the community.

Ways are sought to utilize community resources of all kinds in education through community participation in the planning and management of primary, secondary (public, private and religious) and out-of-school education at the sub-district level, in the framework of improving the quality of education. In the short term, school-level planning mechanisms are being developed to improve identification and prioritization of needs, the management of resources, supervision and evaluation; organizational mechanisms are being designed to encourage community participation in a bottom-up style process; and training programmes and orientation meetings are being organized to en sure that administrative personnel at all levels and community level participants, have appropriate knowledge and skills in project management, programme evaluation and financial management.

The most important tool in this process is the Community Forum for Educational Development (CFED) which plan and implement innovative activities within the framework of developing community participation in the planning and management of educational resources and carry out monitoring and evaluation activities. CFED bring together village leaders, principals, teachers, supervisors, parents and other community participants The forum is directly linked to the local cluster of public, private and religious schools in primary, secondary and out-of-school education.

At present, the project operates through a series of working and advisory groups at the provincial and district levels and the forum at the sub-district level. Twenty-four sub-districts have been identified for the project in four provinces. With the CFED in place, the sub-district acts as the administrative unit for the school community and all the schools in the community are considered as one vertically organized group or cluster. The community fora to be formed co-ordinate and forward annual plans for the resource needs of all schools and out-of-school education units within the sub-district.
In order for this process to succeed, it is important that attitudes change visibly. This has been encouraged through participatory training and real devolution *to*the provincial level, with guidelines and some major components determined at the central level, but with much room for exploration by the fora in how tobring the school and community together. Evaluation has helped in identifying possible conflicts and potentially useful practices.
Through the project, sources of funding have been encouraged other than those granted by the central level or received directly from parents. More established planning systems have led also *to*greater utilization of available resources

(Taken from *Community participation in the planning and management of educational resources (COPLANER)* by Simanungkalit, Colin Moyle; Doran Bernard)

2. *School governance*

"A more decentralised governance structure is needed so that schools, as unique educational entities, can offer their local communities the services, programmes, and activities which they desire....If adults are going to develop this ownership and commitment to their local schools, the governance of education must be decentralised so they can participate in decision-making activities, at the local school level, which directly influence the quality and quantity of education offered to children. The school committees, school councils or parent-teacher groups established to facilitate participatory decision-making must be based on a collaborative management philosophy of governance" (Sander; Murphy, 1989:41).

The second area where greater participation is possible involves *policy-making and governance - the setting of school goals and targets, the planning of school policies and programmes, and the managing of school budgets and personnel.* In this regard, both teachers and parents cam play a more important role.

The term 'governance' can cover a wide range of activities. For our purposes it includes:

1. *"the establishment, modification, and implementation of schools' goals and objectives.* This type of involvement would allow parents [and teachers] to shape the tone of their school, have it conform to their value systems, and truly address their perception of the type of schooling their child receives" (Gregg, 1982:46). This process might be done only occasionally or more regularly, perhaps annually.
2. *.the selection of specific targets* related to areas such as:
   • enrolment, attendance, and retention rates
   • academic results
3. *the development of school policies* in regard to:
   • pupil enrolment, attendance, absenteeism, and promotion pupil discipline
   • staff (especially teacher) management such as the setting of required qualifications, recruitment, training, monitoring, disciplining, and remuneration
   • school calendars and class timetables
   • class size and allocation
4. *the planning of school programmes* designed for:
   • improving school quality (reducing class size, organizing in service training for teachers, buying additional textbooks)
   • providing remedial/special education for disadvantaged groups
   • encouraging productive work
5. *the determining* of *a .school's annual financial requirements and budget,* including costs of:
   • construction and maintenance
   • materials and textbooks
   • staff development programmes
   • funding special programmes (see #4 above)
6. *the collecting of funds* from sources such as:
   • the central Ministry

- local government
- parents and community groups
- private enterprises
- NGOs
- productive activities of the school

7. *the managing and accounting for school finances* One author has described three models of educational governance. "The *administrative* model leaves educational governance to the central office or other offices down the hierarchy where power has been delegated. *The professional* model leaves governance to the professionals at the school site on the grounds that they are the best to determine the needs of learners and best capable of developing structures to satisfy such ends. The *participatory* model is one which aims at involving 'lay' people or communities and parents" (Chimwenje, 1992:8). The last two models imply some kind of devolution of authority from the centre to the regional, district, and, above all, school levels. It is such devolution which leads ultimately to greater school based-management and reform - bringing the authority to create better learning conditions closer to the spot where teaching and learning occur.

> "The most effective policies are those that either have originated on site or use the input from and participation by teachers, administrators, and the community to support teachers and the school. Policies implemented or adapted by the school community to respond to teachers' needs (and their students') in context have proven more effective in the long run than those implemented by other entities. The participation of teachers and school staff in their own process of change has been proven to have a positive effect on the development and implementation of policies directed at teachers"
>
> (Tatto, 1992:52.)

Such a process involves several principal ideas:

1. the school, operating on a relatively autonomous basis, becomes the principal entity of any change in the educational system;
2. co-operation and the sharing of responsibilities of all of the different actors are required in order to solve local problems;

3. new structures of participation (forums, councils) and information exchange need to be established as centres of interchange and decision-making;
4. any reform needs to be considered globally, involving the institution as a whole and considering all of its objectives and functions; and
5. self-monitoring and school-based evaluation by and for the major actors are essential, based on a set of goals or a mission statement, objectives, tasks, a calendar of activities and action plans, etc. (Hallak, 1992).

Mechanisms to permit such school-based management- allowing the *individual* school to set its own goals, 'tone', and targets; to design policies and programmes in response to site-specific needs; and to plan, collect, and manage school resources - may not be given a very high priority in a given education system. In many countries, the goals and curricular objectives - are set by the State or, in private systems, by the sponsoring agency and are assumed to be standard for all schools. Enrolment targets, school calendars, or policies in regard to pupil promotion may be the same for the entire system, for example, and there may be little scope for their amendment or adaptation.

In addition, schools may have neither the autonomy nor the capacity to address locally important issues, being expected instead to focus on the implementation of centrally-determined reforms and programmes such as student-based active learning or the adoption of a new curriculum on family life education. And they may receive all of their funds from school fees and/or from the central ministry, based on a standard, predetermined method (e.g., per pupil), and be required to disburse them according to predetermined categories, with little authority or ability to seek funds from other sources or allocate them to areas of particular need.

Even if mechanisms for more autonomous school governance do exist, they may be centred largely in the hands of headteachers, local education officers, a small group of senior teachers, or a hand-picked executive committee of the local PTA. Teachers, parents, and the community surrounding the school may have little role to play in these processes.

But because greater participation in school management by a variety of interested partners can increase the demand for, and 'ownership' of, the education which occurs in the school, governments should move

towards a policy of strengthening school-based partnerships. This is especially important in the area of school improvement activities. Educational innovations - Especially those which depend on teacher support and participation - are difficult to implement in any event. Greater teacher involvement in their design and management may help to ensure their implementation. By the same token, greater involvement by parents and community members in school governance can increase their demand and support for education school.

And teachers, parent groups, and school committees can play a more active role in school governance. A variety of mechanisms exists which can be used to enhance their participation (for more detail see Chapter 6). Some of these are restricted to actors within the school - i.e, the greater involvement of teachers - while others include the participation of partners from outside the school: parents, community organizations, NGOs, private enterprise, and other local actors.

1. At the *school level* (see Box 3), three mechanisms for greater participation are available:

- *school management councils* or headteacher-teacher committees, perhaps based on a division of labour among senior teachers, assistants, deputies, academic department chairs and committees for such areas as pupil discipline, guidance and counselling, and extracurricular activities
- *school clusters* - the collective management of several schools, usually relatively close *to*each other in location and often quite homogeneous in nature
- *district/sub-district level organizations* such as headteacher councils.

Box 3. Teacher empowerment and management in the USA

In Santa Fe, New Mexico, the restructuring programme was initiated by the school superintendent and centres on teacher empowerment and voluntary re-professionalization. Part of the intent is to shift the responsibility for initiating and implementing educational change from the state and district to the teachers. Interviewing and hiring of personnel have been shifted *to*the school site. Teachers are even being empowered to select their own principals in a process similar *to*faculty search committees. When the principal of one of the elementary schools resigned, she was no replaced. The school is now run by committee.

The psychic rewards of greater control have notably increased teacher and administrator efforts in some schools. Central office staff is reduced to only five key people. There is no personnel office. District decentralization means that only three per cent of the district budget goes to central office expense. The role of the principal becomes to make teachers content that they can initiate and carry through changes in curriculum and delivery and let go of the innovation process once the teachers take responsibility (Carnoy, MacDonell 1990:60).

In Jefferson County, Kentucky, great strides have been made in translating the rhetoric of restructuring into reality. Teachers and administrators there are slowly and thoughtfully reinventing their roles, restructuring their schools, and redefining schools processes (Harbaugh 1990:52). Staff development is the concept around which restructuring in the county seems to be organized. They have formed a Professional Development Centre which in just a few years has grown from an idea to a staff of 60 while providing a broad spectrum of professional development activities for teachers and administrators. The Center has managed to keep the district personnel informed of the changes in the field specifically focusing on the recent reports on educational reform. In that they have been able to encourage experimentation with new instructional and organizational approaches, the Center has created an environment that is conducive to change.

In Fairdale High School, the teachers decided to team up for interdisciplinary courses. According to the principal, "Learning how to learn is the point" As one of the ninth grade teachers put it, "f love the changes. We finally have an opportunity to voice our opinions and make decisions about student learning". (Tifft, 1990:57).

In Rochester, New York, teacher roles have changed considerably through restructuring. Teachers have used their authority to institute programmes such as the elimination of half-day pre-first grade in favour of a more intensive all-day kindergarten. They have also increased expenditures on language instruction.

(Taken from *The school restructuring movement in the USA: an analysis of major issues and policy implications* by George Papagiannis, Peter Easton and J. Thomas Owens)

2. Outside of school, it may be *the parent/teacher association or the village education committee* which has a say in the governance of individual schools or groups of schools. In the core BRAC non-formal primary education centres, for example,

> "before a school opens in a village, community and parents decide where the school should be. They themselves select a place to rent as a school. If this is not available, the community itself builds the classrooms. There is a Managing Committee in each school consisting of five members: two parents, one community leader, the teacher and the PO [programme officer]. Managing committees and parents' meetings are held monthly. In the parents' meeting, attendance is high, on the average of 80 per cent BRAC, as a policy, adopted a number of measures to ensure effective participation of the parents and other community leaders in school affairs. These measures emphasize personal contact of teachers and Pos with parents and the community. In the monthly meeting important issues are discussed. The teachers, parents and community take responsibility together to solve problems". (Sarker, 1992:9).

Such associations and committees can do a number of things. This can include first *the establishment and implementation of school targets and workplans.* Parents and even pupils from schools in the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil are involved in the so-called SECOM project (Box 4) in selecting headteachers on the basis on candidates' proposals in regard to a future work plan and school improvement; later. through a School Council, they work with the chosen headteacher in its implementation (Namo de Mello 1992).

Box 4. Community selection of school principals based on school improvement workplans in Minas Gerais, Brazil

SECOM (Internal Competitive Selection of School Principals), an innovation forming part of a wider-scale reform begun several years ago in the Brazilian state of Minas Gerais, is a new way of choosing school principals, combining the criteria of knowledge and professional competence with leadership and the development of school improvement plans, which implies wide participation from the school community and communication with society through the mass media.

The selection of principals was designed in three stages with each of them divided into different phases which demanded legal, technical, political and administrative measures. The first stage was made up of tests to evaluate degrees, knowledge and management ability of the candidates. The second stage was devoted to proving leadership skills in regard to the development of a long-term workplan for the school. The third stage was focused on the successful candidate s training to carry out the principal's position in regard to school improvement and autonomy and joint work with school councils. The implementation of SECOM demanded an intense political preparation jointly with the legislature and with the professional education labour unions, specifically with the Association of School Principals. In this preparatory phase, the government also began a systematic alliance with the Parent's Federation of Public Schools in the state of Minas Gerais, explaining to them the new way of electing school principals and finding in them great acceptance of the proposal. In this period, the Education Secretary's office conducted studies to develop the evaluation stage of the candidates' knowledge, skills, and administrative capacity; these were carried out with the help of the university and tried to establish the professional profile of future principals within the guidelines of educational policy.

Once the necessary legislation had been approved and the technical studies concluded, norms and guidelines were prepared that gave rise to the following development strategy of SECOM:

- criteria to identify who could be a candidate for school principal were established;
- starting from the professional profile prepared for principals, specialized institutions designed tests to evaluate knowledge and administrative capacity
- the Secretary's office carried out a survey of the vacancies existing in the school system and made them known as well as the way of electing, its stages and the proposed evaluation criteria
- it was decided that the three best qualified in the evaluation would be nominated;
- three days after the announcement of the official results of the evaluation, the candidates of each school should present and defend before school employees, parents and pupils, a work plan for the school
- electoral advertising with the name of the candidates would not be accepted. The decision about leadership capacity would not become personalistic, but rather be a selection among different work plans. The presentation and discussion of the plans in the assembly would be the only criterion for the election and the candidates would have the same time and conditions for their presentations;

- the election of the candidate that had presented the best work plan would be carried out by direct and secret vote. All public employees of the school, all families of the school (having only one vote per family, independent of the number of children registered in the school), and all students with a minium age of 16 would have the right to vote
- the candidate with the largest number of votes would be elected to be principal and the one in second place would be the vice-principal of the school.

Approximately 15,000 teachers fulfilled the requirements with regard to capacity and teaching experience. After registration, and when the existing vacancies and the criteria for the selection had been confirmed, more than 5,000 candidates requested to be registered.

A basic bibliography for the preparation of the candidates was given which also served as a way of stressing the content of the changes that were being proposed for school reform. The problems and possibilities of the reform and of new autonomy for schools and more active participation of the School Councils in the management of the school became subjects of discussion and debate among the candidates, and, through them, other problems were introduced into the agenda.

Before the end of the 1991 school year, assemblies were carried out in almost all state schools where the future directors and sub-directors were chosen by direct vote. The average participation of those who were authorized to vote was approximately 85%. To have a clear idea of the dimension of the innovation, more than 700,000 people were involved in the process, including voters and the other actors.

At the beginning of 1992, SECOM began its third and last phase: to train new principals in the implementation of their workplans in collaboration with the school councils.

(Taken from *Competitive selection of school principals: case study of an innovation in Brazil* by Guiomar Namo de Mello and Rose Neubauer da Silva)

Teachers, parent groups, and even multi-sectoral school committees can also play a more collegial role in *setting policies related tostaff development, school-community relations, and specific school improvement activities.* This may include policies regarding school calendars and timetables (so as to interfere as little as possible with family and community economic cycles), pupil enrolment and promotion, and educational content. Community groups, through the suasion of

traditional authority, can also help encourage or even compel school pupil enrolment and teacher and pupil attendance (Bude 1985, Singhal et al 1986). In Viet Nam, for example, members of parent associations visit the homes of non-enroled children or absent pupils in order to encourage their further schooling.

And such committees can help to ensure as well *the greater collaboration between the school and other, more non-formal educational activities* of the community, either run through the Ministry of Education (literacy programmes, vocational training), other sectors (health campaigns, agricultural extension), or NGOs. Thus, for example, in India:

> "the interconnected programmes conducted in the PROPEL project since its inception in August 1988 are: (a) Child Recreation Centres (CRCs); (b) Women's Development Groups attached to the CRCs; (c) NFE centres; (d) Adult Education Centres as well as a volunteer-based literacy programme; (e) Jana Shikshan Nilayams (People's Education Houses) for providing reading materials to neo-literates and semi-skilled readers (adults and children) and recreational opportunities to the community; (f) women animators' camps for boosting the education and development of women and girls; (g) a child-to-child programme in health education; and (h) training of VECs for micro-planning and development of education at the grassroots level". (Naik, 1990).

Pupils, too, can play a role in school governance. In the Escuela Nueva of Colombia, a pupil-based school government sets up committees, sometimes linked to community groups and projects, which help teachers to manage the school in areas such as the control of attendance, the welcoming of visitors, and discipline (Arboleda, 1992).

In some areas, also, village education committees help *identify candidates for teaching posts and assist in interviewing, selecting, orienting, and monitoring them* (Tatto, 1992). This can lead to more focused 'field-based teacher training' where teachers, principals, teacher educators, the school community, and parents are brought together in teacher preparation programmes (Dove, 1982). In the Shiksha Karmi project in India, for example, grass-roots NGOs are involved in the

selection of local residents to become the school's 'shiksha karmi' or educational worker (Methi et al 1991, see also Naik 1991), and in both the BRAC programme in Bangladesh (Sarker, 1992) and the SERVOL pre-school education programme in Trinidad (Mahabir, 1992), the community-based management council selects the teachers of their schools (Box 5).

In terms of another area of governance -financial management- participation is often defined as extraction; that is, parents, the community at large, and even teachers are seen as sources of financial and material support and of physical labour. This can include land, labour, and materials for the building; the repair and maintenance of facilities; the donation of equipment and learning materials; and the raising of money. In Zambia, the Self-Help Action Programme for Education (SHAPE) has encouraged both teachers and parents to contribute more of their resources to school activities. These funds, in combination with money gained from productive units in schools, are used to support almost all school improvements, physical or, through participation in local upgrading courses, educational (Shaeffer et al 1993). But in neither of these programmes is there much encouragement to participate in other ways in budgeting activities.

Box 5. Teacher selection in SERVOL pre-school training programme

Servol, a non-governmental, community-development organisation which was founded in Trinidad and Tobago in 1972, has, in the intervening years developed effective system of pre-school education and programmes to assist adolescent drop-outs in attitudinal development and parenting skills. In 1988 Servol entered into an arrangement with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago through the Ministry of Education, whereby, in two joint ventures they would take over all public pre-schools and would set up training centres for those adolescents between the ages of 17 - 22 for whom there was no place in the formal educational system. Servol in the early years was to provide the administration for the projects, the teacher training the furniture and equipment, and teachers's salaries for the schools.

The communities in which the schools were located provided the housing for the schools, community Boards of Education, and candidates to be trained as combination teachers/community leaders. The Government provided its moral support and, as the project progressed, it provided on an increasing annual basis, funding towards the payment of the teachers' salaries. A technical committee was set up to supervise the progress of the pre-school programme.

At the present time there are 195 Ministry of Education/Servol centres operating throughout the country. One hundred and 154 of these are early childhood care and education centres (pre-schools) where parents and community get involved in the child-based educational programmes. Forty-one of these centres are Adolescent Development Life Centres where the community and parents are brought in to the programme which teaches socially rejected young people in the 17 - 23 age group how to be responsible parents and helps them develop attitudes which will enable them to go on to successfully complete the vocational training and entrepreneurship opportunities provided by Servol and a sister organisation Fundaid.

The choice of pre-school teachers to be trained is left up to each community. Usually they choose a girl, or two girls, who are active in church, mosque, temple, or other religious organisation's affairs, who is known in the community to be responsible and of good character, and whose family is part of the community.

Each Board of Education has its own means of canvassing the community for candidates, but the candidates finally chosen for training at the Servol Teacher Training school will have had the majority support of the Board of Education from that district, and the Board will be financially responsible for their schooling expenses during the year's training course. There is no rigid educational qualification for entry to the course. In some cases a community has chosen someone who already runs a small nursery school in a manner approved by the community; in other cases it will be a girl with secondary education who appears interested in the field. Most of the candidates chosen have at least three years' secondary education when they start. In a number of cases, once trained by Servol and working as preschool teachers, they go on to finish their secondary education via evening classes. Servol's early childhood educator training is on an unusually high level. It is culture specific, not derived from systems or concepts developed in metropolitan areas alien to the Caribbean way of life, needs and interests. It includes the responsibility of each pre-school teacher to become a community leader, bringing community concerns and involvement into the school and providing counselling and education to adults in the community particularly to the parents, not just to the children in her care. This produces a change in the teacher's approach to education and to the community, as well as a change in the community's approach to education and to the children in its midst.

The teachers are teachers, public educators, community mobilizers and executive managers of the orogrammes all at once. The choice of girls from the communities is generally based on their interest in the job, the regard with which they are held in the community and their own inherent abilities. Most of them, as a result, have been good' choices from the point of view of an in-built community support and a reciprocal unwillingness to let the community that chose them down. Communities vary in the extent of their responsiveness, but the vital back-up that the teachers get from the field officers keeps them motivated and encourages them to keep on trying to overcome difficulties as they arise.

(Taken from *SERVOL pre-school and adolescent training programmes in Trinidad and Tobago* be Diane Mahabir.)

This does not need to be the case. Another essential principal for governance is the ability and authority of local educational officials and perhaps the school itself *to plan a budget, generate funds, and use funds allocated at their discretion* (Chimwenje, 1992). Thus, both teachers and parents (the latter through school committees or parent groups) can assume a larger role in examining and approving school budgets and, in collaboration with school managers, in deciding how resources, both parental and governmental, might be spent. Although such a role may be rather meaningless in small schools with small budgets, this may not be the case in larger schools with sizeable resources. The Boards of Management of schools in Papua New Guinea, for example, have quite extensive powers in terms of helping to select school teachers, collecting resources, maintaining the school, and managing, and reporting on, the school's budget (Preston, 1991).

In some school clusters in Thailand (Case 2), the community plays a role with the headmaster in deciding how school funds should be spent; such budgets are then reviewed by the local cluster offices. Also, the BP3 (the parent association) in Indonesia is meant to have the authority to develop its own work plans (e. g. , for extra-curricular activities or school improvement), to levy and collect extra-budgetary resources from parents, and to decide how they are to be spent for items such as additional facilities and teacher incentives. In practice, however, this appears to happen more often in private than in public schools where the associations are often dominated by school staff and a small group of officers nominated by them. The COPLANER project in Indonesia (Box 2) is meant to alter this process quite radically, with community

fora of many interested parties helping to shape a budget and manage the resources for education programmes of an entire sub-district (Shaeffer, 1992b). And the 'basic school' in Mali often puts the community fully in control of school financing (Box 6).

The above cases show that various management mechanisms inside or outside of school exist or can be established and strengthened in order to promote more participatory approaches to school governance. But the choice about what kind of mechanisms to establish and what powers to invest it with is not necessarily an easy one. A variety of issues must be explored and decisions made before these mechanisms have any real impact on how schools are run and financed. These include decisions regarding:

Box 6. The "Ecole de Base" or Basic School in Mali

Formally speaking, the basic school is a school of the lower elementary grades which - like all public and private schools of the same level - has the mission to transmit to young children basic knowledge and skills. But it differs from these other schools in certain characteristics related to its functioning and its creation.

The 'basic school' is defined as a school created and managed by a village or a group of villages, a neighbourhood or a group of neighbourhoods, or a group of parents - thus, by local communities. Such a definition is possible within a system where some authority is deconcentrated to the level of the village or neighbourhood. The basic school is the initiative and the fruit of labour of a community - rural, urban, even corporate - which becomes its sponsor. According to the words of one informant, "the basic school is a school decided on, desired, and accepted by the people, created by them and supported by them".

More recently, many of these schools are organized by new categories of sponsors - teachers and young graduates without work who, because of difficult economic conditions, organize basic schools, especially in urban areas. There are also teachers and researchers who wish both to increase the quantity of education in Mali and to experiment with new pedagogical methods and techniques and thus improve the quality of basic education. In one type of community basic school, there is virtually no external intervention. One-room schools are built and opened at the initiative of villagers for their own children. Teachers are recruited and paid by the villagers who furnish them with millet, cultivate their land (with the help of pupils during the school holiday), and give them a small amount of money for other needs. This money is collected from a modest fee paid by each parents.

The teachers use the official curriculum of the first cycle of basic education and teach the pupils until their graduation into the second cycle. In one such school, neither of the two teachers had received any special training (one was a catechism teacher, the other a former secondary school student, but they obtained such good results that the public authorities especially the school administration, became interested in their experiences. More and more such schools, especially since the middle of the 1980s have been formed at the initiative of young unemployed graduates. They associate themselves and 'negotiate' with the people of a village or a neighbourhood to open a basic school. The school itself often belongs to the community which is responsible for its management. The parents of the pupils also pay modest monthly fees to ensure the maintenance of the teachers and the functioning of the school.
(Taken from *Collaborer pour changer l'education: la participation des familles et des communautes* a *I'amerlioration de l'education de base en afrique occidentale francophone* by Irenee Zevounou.)

1. **Where the level of greatest autonomy should be -** in other words, the level to which the greatest devolution of authority will be implemented. If, for various reasons of politics or management, a centralized, unified, standardized system is desired so that school goals, targets, policies, programmes, and budgets are meant to fit closely to a national standard, then there will be little scope for worrying about individual school or district differences.

On the other hand, if decentralization and greater school autonomy are encouraged within a given system, authority for determining goals, targets, policies, and programmes could be devolved to one of two levels:

(1) to the individual school - which might lead to considerable flexibility and differences across schools, or
(2) to the level of a district or sub-district - in which case two things might happen. Schools may end up following policies established *across* several schools and communities in the district, or they may have the opportunity to develop integrated programmes and budgets across schools and even across other local education programmes (i.e., an integrated budget for the entire community covering both formal and non-formal education activities).

2. **Who the most important actor(s) at that level should be.** Once the appropriate level of some autonomy in governance is decided, then where does the power of governance lie? With an expanded and animated teacher-based council *within* a school or cluster? Or can it also be out of the school or even the system, in PTAs or village education committees?

3. **How much variety and diversity are acceptable** across units and between individual units and the 'national standard'. In other words, to what extent do individual schools (or clusters or districts) have some degree of freedom to set their own goals and targets, plan school- and community-specific programmes, and design and implement their own budgets, including searching for additional funds?

4. **What degree of participation in governance other partners are allowed to attain.** Are teachers within a school or a cluster, or individuals within parent associations or village education committees, permitted merely to hear about, and approve of, goals, targets, policies, programmes, and budgets established and designed by others, whether at the centre or at the local level? Does this participation focus mainly on the seeking (or extracting) of 'contributions' from partners? Or is their advice actively sought (e.g., through the surveys, diagnoses, and focus groups discussed in the previous module)? Is their consent required or requested? And are they actually asked to participate actively in the shaping of the school's long-term plans?

5. **How much 'transparency' is desirable and feasible** in such school governance, especially in the area of finances. To whom do funds from various sources belong? Who manages them? And who (the headteacher, the executive of the PTA) is financially accountable to whom (the local education office, the PTA membership, the larger community) in this regard?

6. **What can be done to help headteachers fulfil their critical role in school improvement?** Given the importance of headteachers in school management and in mobilizing teachers, parents, and other partners in working toward a more effective school, what kinds of actions can be taken to ensure their better selection and training?

3. *The Instructional process*

> "The very definition of community [a group of citizens bound up in a social system with common identity for survival'] suggests community participation in managing the structures of education, i.e., governance, work culture, and, in instructional organization, most particularly, the curriculum....Some school administrators believe that the local people are not knowledgeable enough to take part in curriculum building at the local level. This is an erroneous impression. Community citizens have bona fide interest in the local school. They have invested their money, time, and effort in the building of the school. Besides, their children attend the local school. They deserve to know what is taught at the school and also should take part in the building of the curriculum. They should be directly or indirectly involved in the teaching and learning process as resource persons".
>
> (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1992:58, 62).

The third area of potential participation is *involvement in the instructional process,* comprising both educational content (the curriculum and teaching materials) and teaching and training (the pedagogy and teaching methods). It is in this area - the determination of what should be taught, using what materials, and in what ways where greatest collaboration can often occur.

The phrase 'instructional process' covers a wide range of activities. For our purposes it includes:

1. *determining the content* (curricula, syllabi) of what is taught in schools,
2. *developing appropriate teaching materials* (the selection, design, and writing of textbooks and other materials)
3. *delivering the required content* (developing and implementing teaching-learning methods)
4. *training and upgrading the teachers who deliver it*
5. *monitoring and evaluating school quality,* including:
   (a) inputs
   - pupil enrolment, attendance, and behaviour;

- teacher attendance and behaviour (punctuality? abuse of pupils)
- the availability and quality (size? healthiness? adequacy) of educational facilities;
- the availability and quality (relevance, adequacy) of curricula, materials, and texts.

(b) processes

- the quality of teaching and learning (time-on-task, teaching methods, programmes for special needs);
- general school improvement programmes;

(c) outcomes

- the achievement of the school's goals and targets;
- pupil academic achievement (daily learning? for promotion or graduation);
- pupil socialization (to community and/or to national norms and values).

In comparison to other areas of education inside and outside the school already ex amine d , the participation of other actors in the instructional process is potentially more difficult to promote. This is so because its deals with three intensely political issues: (1) what children learn (e.g., political philosophy, community values, economic knowledge and skills); (2) how well they learn (and, therefore - according to popular wisdom - where they end up in the world); and (3) 'pedagogy', traditionally the exclusive prerogative of the teaching profession and, in some societies, of the individual teacher- usually formally certified and not always willing to open his/her classroom and reveal his/her performance to the comment of peers or outsiders. Parental and community 'gazing' at such pedagogy, let along intervening in it, is seldom welcomed.

But given what is often a general lack of understanding about the culture, experiences, and motivations of its children, there is a need to encourage greater cultural articulation between the school and the community, "to give recognition to the children's experiences at home and in the community by integrating these into the content and learning activities in school" (Filp, 1992: 15), and to promote some kind of broader partnership in teaching and learning. Such a partnership can also ultimately produce education more relevant to the needs of the community and of ?heir children and greater demand and support for

education. Also, unlike the area of school governance, where centralized systems may severely limit the autonomy of schools in setting individually their goals, planning new programmes, and even managing budgets, many schools may have considerable freedom to alter and adapt the nature of their instructional processes.

Schools may be given national curricula, syllabi, and textbooks; their teachers may be provided common pre-service and in-service training in 'proper' methods and required content; and there may be standard criteria and processes for evaluating issues of quality such as school facilities and pupil achievement. But schools - partly because of their 'loosely-coupled' nature - may also have considerable autonomy, with or without central ministry encouragement, to insert local material into the curricula, develop site-specific teaching materials, upgrade and monitor the performance of their teachers, and improve both their own physical plant and, ultimately, their academic results. If individual schools find it difficult to implement such changes, collaboration across schools, in school clusters or teacher clubs, may make such grass-roots improvement feasible.

One issue in looking at the current nature of participation in the instructional process is the extent to which individual schools or groups of schools can, through the greater involvement of their own personnel, try to improve the quality of this process. Another, of course, is the extent to which others outside of the school - especially parents but also other community members, agents of other development sectors (e.g., health and agriculture), private enterprises, NGOs, etc. - participate in this process.

There is a variety of mechanisms available to make greater collaboration in various aspects of the instructional process possible. Some of these (school clusters, teacher clubs) are limited to members of the school community; others involve individuals or groups from among parents or from the larger community. Some involve the 'partners' as observers and listeners; others as more active consultants, managers, and even teachers. These mechanisms can be of use in the following parts of the process:

(i) Determining the content of what is taught in school and developing teaching material appropriate to students

There are a number of reasons why teachers and the community should be more involved in areas related to the curriculum and material development. In general,
(a) the involvement of teachers in developing teaching materials and especially in filling in national curricula and syllabi with content more relevant to local conditions and needs can help ensure the presentation of material of direct use to their pupils. It can also make teachers feel greater 'ownership' of the school and of what they teach in it;
(b) the involvement of pupils, parents, and community leaders in the collecting, processing, analysis, and interpretation of local information may help to ensure the use of local content, the greater articulation between school and community and the inclusion of family and community culture in the school , the marriage of traditional and modern knowledge, coverage of local culture and history, and the inclusion of economically-relevant practical subjects (Punch and Bayona 1990);
(c) because participation calls for actual hands-on experiences by resource persons in the local community, their involvement in curriculum design informs them better as to their possible instructional role (Commonwealth Secretariat 1992:59); and
(d) involvement in such an activity helps convince both teachers and the community that they have some 'ownership' of what goes on in the school.

Such involvement can be encouraged in two ways:

- *surveys or studies of knowledge and skills useful for children of the community.* This includes knowledge in regard to cultural beliefs and events, health and nutrition, the local economy and environment; and
- *the development of syllabi and teaching materials* (lesson plans, exercises, examinations) through teacher, parent, and/or community curriculum panels.

In the first instance, even quite uneducated parents in rural areas of Colombia work with teachers in the Escuela Nueva to gather simple information on the community for use by students in the classroom

(Arboleda 1992). Another experiment in Indonesia created local panels of community leaders and teachers to determine what kinds of local content should be presented to pupils and where in the syllabus such content should be inserted. In a project in West Java (Box 7), this led to the inclusion in the curriculum of information on the natural and social environment, village organisation, and local culture (Moegiadi et al 1991).

The village education committees of the Indian PROPEL programme play a similar role. They contribute to and comment on the relevance and usefulness of curricula developed for local schools, particularly in reference to knowledge needed by girl students. Such materials are discussed with community members, including women, and modified to reflect their viewpoints (Naik, 1991:57). The experience of the SIMAC programme in Guatemala is particularly interesting in this regard. Through local community workshops, teachers, parents, students, and community members carry out research on local conditions and adapt curriculum to local needs, interests, and problems; similar workshops plan and develop specific learning units for school and development projects for the community (Camey et al, n.d.).

Box 7. Community participation in curriculum development in West Java

Parent and community interest to participate in the development and application of local content in curriculum at the primary school level is an important aspect of educational implementation. Such a programme is the result of the delegation of authority from the central government to the regions to help preserve local culture. The policy of placing local content in the curriculum began with pilot projects in East Java, South Sumatra, and West Java. The West Java pilot project is located in the districts of Tasikmalaya and Sumedang. Almost all local issues are included in the school curriculum in Tasikmalaya, such as the natural environment (farming), the social environment (**pesantren** - non-formal Islamic education), the local way of life (e.g. **gotong royong** - close voluntary co-operation among community members), village organization, local needs, and culture (customs, arts, etc.). The pilot project in Sumedang focuses only on cultural aspects.

The majority of the population of these districts are farmers, although others work m the private sector, the Army, as civil servants, traders or labourers. Most are literate - they read, write, have basic knowledge and know Bahasa Indonesia. Although the majority of people are Moslems, they still follow traditional ceremonies and believe in animism. Traditional customs are centred around their life, the building of a house, rice planting and harvesting, and thanksgiving rituals to avoid dangers or crises.

Parent participation in the primary schools (SDs) in Tasikmalaya and Sumedang is formally channelled through the parent organization or BP3. However, the support given is generally in terms of a BP3 'contribution' only - other forms of support are seldom given and direct participation is low, although parents are always willing to provide additional funds or materials if required.

Up to 75 per cent of the SDs in both districts have developed local content in the school curriculum. The type of content chosen depends upon the natural environment and potential, local needs, and the social and cultural conditions of the community. The sub-districts in Tasikmalaya have placed farming, land fisheries and home industries such as handcrafts and food production into their curriculum. The sub-district in Sumedang focuses on cultural aspects such as customs and traditions, religious ceremonies, ethics and folklore.

The process of developing the local content requires co-operation among the teachers and their working group (KKG), between the principal and the working group of principals, and among the kindergarten/primary inspectors in the sub-district. Resource personnel from the community are also involved, such as parents, handcraft workers, and religious and cultural leaders.

The involvement of parents and the community in developing local content works as follows:

1. The community assists the school staff (teachers and the headteacher) by providing information and suggestions during the stage of identifying local content.
2. The BP3 and community leaders (culture, religion, business) make consultative judgements and have formal and informal discussions to determine whether the content of the local curriculum is in accordance with certain criteria.
3. The teachers as well as the KKG often request the BP3 and other leaders to provide information on the details and interpretation of the local content as the teachers may not know how to teach them.
4. Some schools employ resource persons/community leaders to help teach in the schools or demonstrate certain aspects of local content.

(Taken from *Community participation in primary education in Indonesia by* Moegiadi, et al.)

Once local content has been selected, the development of teaching-learning materials and even texts can also be done in more collaborative ways. Teachers themselves, as in Thai
clusters and teacher clubs in Indonesia, can be given more responsibility to adapt or enrich centrally-determined curricula and material. Academic cluster teachers in Thailand, for example, work with regular teachers to demonstrate teaching methods, develop materials, and design tests (Wheeler et al 1991). And one of the major tasks of the teacher clubs and teacher resource centres in Indonesia is the preparation of lesson plans and student exercises by teachers of the same grade and subject across the schools in a given cluster (Djam'an Satori, 1991).

In the MINDSACROSS project in Uganda, the pupils themselves become active in writing short stories which are later edited, collected, and cheaply published as texts for younger children (Box 8).

Box 8. The MINDSACROSS Project in Uganda

MINDSACROSS was a literacy project developed through the collaboration of a small NGO and a national teacher training college in Uganda. The project staff, most of whom were active teachers and lecturers, worked with foreign donor agency funding, to promote methods in which pupils, aged between five and 14 years in four primary schools in Uganda, in both urban and rural environments, practised and consolidated their developing literacy skills through writing for themselves and their peers. The main tasks in writing - planning, writing and displaying the written products - were not of themselves innovative, since these are tasks that pupils are expected to undertake as part their normal teaching-learning activities. The innovative components were:

1. the audience for the written texts were the authors themselves, their peers and the community rather than the classroom teacher. In addition, the purpose for writing was more for improvement and self-satisfaction as authors rather than for the award of grades;
2. authors added value to normal classroom writing by writing more and better, and by compiling the written texts into unpublished and published books for children by children;
3. books for general and supplementary reading in a variety of formats can be written and 'published' by pupils, and be made available to as wide an audience as possible for the purposes of debate and improvement through the use of simple techniques of display and compilation; and

4. all schools, with a large number of new literates, are an important national reservoir of authors of simple, locally relevant supplementary reading resources.

The project's innovative strategies were successful to the extent that:

1. at classroom and school level, teachers involved their pupils in writing outside conventional classroom mandates, topics and times, and pupils produced a wide array of texts in different genres and sometimes for differing audiences. Participating teachers were more critical of their instructional techniques and were much more likely to doubt the efficacy of these techniques in equipping every pupil with a full complement of basic literacy skills;
2. pupils became much more aware of the kinds of skills they acquire through gathering information and writing creative texts, and they expressed the desire to continue as authors' and as agents disseminating ideas of MINDSACROSS in their schools and other schools;
3. Ministry of Education personnel came to regard some of the materials produced by pupils as part of the evolving curriculum on health education health to encourage schools and pupils to consolidate classroom concepts; and,

(Taken from *A case study of the participation of government, NGOs and the community in the improvement of basic education through MINDSACROSS, a school literacy project in Uganda* by Katherine Namuddu)

(ii) Delivering the required content.

Parents and other members of the community can be encouraged and even tutored and trained to participate more actively in the teaching learning process. This may be limited to motivating or helping their children at home and include:

- encouraging children to do school work at home
- helping to organize a study timetable
- establishing a time and a quiet, well-lighted place for regular study at home
- listening to children tell about their day at school
- monitoring their progress in school
- reinforcing positive attitudes about school and learning
- reading to children (if the parents are literate) and listening to them read

- encouraging enrolment, retention, and attendance (Redding, 1991, Williams, J. 1992)

Other partners may also get involved in activities in the school itself (Zainal Ghani, 1990) through the involvement of parents and community members in teaching, as tutors and assistants to the teacher or for specialized subjects (local culture, craftwork). In Viet Nam, for example, parents help teachers prepare teaching aids, offer suggestions on how to improve teaching, arrange special classes for gifted students, and make special efforts to keep up teacher morale (Thinh, 1992). They may also help in the library or canteen; collect materials for projects, craft and other skills; repair furniture; gather information on community resources; and help slow learners (Fraser, 1992).

In the Parent Learning Support Service in the Philippines (Box 9), parents often begin their exposure to school through school and homeroom PTA meetings and classroom observations. Some, however, go further than this and begin to participate in training courses and parent education seminars, and in organising field trips and other school activities, both extra-curricula and curricular.

Box 9. Parent participation in schooling through the parent learning support system (PLSS) of the Philippines

The PLSS is a school-based initiative which aims at organizing parents, guardians, and community members to assist in the upgrading of the quality of elementary education generally, and in the raising of achievement levels of pupils specifically. Operationally, the PLSS is a grass-roots strategy which represents collective effort in co-ordination with the principal and teachers.

The PLSS has the following objectives:

a. to support and co-operate with the school staff in improving the pupils' learning capacities and in developing desirable values, attitudes, and behavioural change
b. to identify home factors that affect cognitive and affective development of the pupils; and
c. to conduct regular fora for discussion and group decisions in providing assistance and support to pupils' learning experiences.

The organizational phase of the PLSS starts with the convening of parents of pupils from all grades to set up the parent-teacher groups in each of the six grades. Then the broad concept of the PLSS programme and its ultimate aims are discussed by the assembly of teachers and parents. A second meeting is convened to plan and discuss the various activities of the programme that will be carried out in the school year.

During this meeting, parents fill in questionnaires about their particular socio-economic circumstances and support for their children's learning. These surveys aim to determine study habits, socio-economic status of parents, and pupils' activities after class hours or during non-school days. The information collected from Parents is supplemented by the pupils' academic profile data generated from two standard tests administered by school guidance counsellors with the assistance of teachers. The pupils' academic profiles are used for deciding and selecting which class or grade level will implement the PLSS programme.

After the programme is launched, implementation of planned activities in each of the PLSS class or grade starts. During this phase the parent-teacher group's capability is strengthened. Participating teachers are given the necessary orientation in handling the programme, particularly in dealing with parents and community members. The upgrading of parents is achieved through a series of parent education seminars where resource speakers are invited to discuss specific topics on parents' roles and on how they can effectively perform these in the total development and education of their children.

Also included is a parent guidance seminar which involves both parents and pupils. This seminar is designed for parents to share their own insights into the learning problems and to make them aware of their child's feelings, attitudes, expectations and hopes. The insights drawn from this seminar series are expected to be applied by both parents and teachers in implementing PLSS activities, e.g. parents' tutorial work, helping children with their assignments at home or in school, helping them read or practice mathematics, assisting teachers manage class conduct and monitoring the performances of their children. The seminars not only strengthen the capability of parents and teachers in performing their respective roles, but more significantly also make them highly sensitive to each others' needs and especially to pupils' problems.

During the lmplementation, parents are drawn into the teaching-learning processes inside the classrooms as observers or teacher aides. Parents are also allowed to observe their children's behaviour at work or play. After these observations, parents write down their comments on their children's behaviour and on teaching methods and styles. Teachers then schedule meetings with parents to discuss the comments and suggestions, and collectively agree on specific measures.

This activity, the teacher-parent conference, occurs regularly after parent observation and during the periodic evaluation of pupil's performance (i. e. after each grading period, and after each semester or end-of-year evaluation).
The finale of the programme is the awarding of certificates at the year end in recognition of participating parents.
Another important activity during the programme implementation is the teacher's home visit. This *IS* regularly conducted by teachers to familiarize themselves with the pupil's family situation. This visit also allows teachers to discuss more fully means by which parents can assist their children, especially in subjects where pupils exhibit low performance.

(Taken from *The parent learning support system: school and community collaboration for raising pupil achievement in the Philippines* by Isidro Carino; Mona Dumlao Valisno.)

In the 900 Schools project in Chile, community youth are employed as 'monitors' to help particularly disadvantaged fourth graders in arithmetic and language, largely through non-formal, popular education techniques which focus on local cultural content.

> "The educators are young people from the same community who have been previously trained as monitors. They are provided with specially prepared teaching manuals, and each student has a workbook. A participatory educational approach is used in the training as well as the workshops, which are conducted after normal school hours. This is one of the ways in which positive discrimination is applied, in that the lowest achievers spend more learning time in the school. The manuals and workbooks incorporate the daily experience of the children at home and in the community as an essential ingredient for educational interaction". (Filp, 1992:1).

Parents and other community members may also teach specialized subjects, such as local crafts and trades, customs, and history, principles of chieftaincy, sex education, and health and agricultural practices. For example, in the Colombian Escuela Nueva, "the local artisan able to prepare clay is asked to teach the small children to manipulate the clay for moulding their first letters. As a result of such activity, the artisan

participates in school activities and his work is valued, the teacher gets learning materials, and the children learn to read in an interesting way". (Arboleda, 1992:37).

(iii) Training and upgrading teachers.

Both teachers themselves and the community can also be more active in the actual training of (other) teachers. This can be done through:

(a) in-school or in-cluster upgrading, including the assessment by teachers of their own training needs and subsequent peer training, and

(b) participation of parents and community members in professional development programmes.

First, teachers can work together to evaluate each other's teaching, assess training needs, design and test upgrading activities, and therefore develop among themselves greater personal and professional capacity (Vera et al 1986, Shaeffer 1990). Again, the school clusters present a good example of such a process. In Thailand clusters have subject matter specialists, usually senior teachers in one of the cluster schools, who are assigned the task (and thus given a reduced teaching load) of helping younger and less experienced teachers in their work. The teacher clubs and resource centres in Indonesia, with less of an infrastructure to support them, help teachers to discuss their particular problems (e.g., by class or subject) and then develop methods and materials to resolve them (Box 10).

Other examples are more experiential in nature. In Colombia's Escuela Nueva project, teacher workshops, demonstration schools, micro-centres, and manuals train teachers in how to mobilize human and material resources of the community for the improvement of the school, how to encourage innovation within the community as well as within the school, and how to bring the community into the school and take the pupils into the community. Teachers, for example, are trained in how to prepare a map, an agricultural calendar, and a monograph of the local community with students and parents (Arboleda, 1992).

The 900 Schools project in Chile also encourages teachers and their trainers to work together in more interactive, experiential ways, again emphasizing the role of the teacher in the community. And the SERVOL

pre-school project in Trinidad trains teachers to see themselves as public educators and community mobilizers as well as teachers and programme managers (Mahabir, 1992).

Box 10. Indonesian school clusters, teacher clubs, and teacher resource centres

A project of qualitative improvement through professional support for teachers in primary schools, known as the Active Learning and Professional Support (ALPS) or the 'Cianjur Project', aims to construct support systems to explore means of advancing the quality of instruction through the improvement of professional support to primary school teachers at the local level. The project also aims to strengthen the supervisory role of primary supervisors and principals to improve their competency to help teachers professionally.

The project has developed a working model of support by enhancing professional collaboration among educational personnel to continuously improve the quality of instruction in primary schools. Activities include in-service training as a regular feature of teachers' corporate lives. These are organized at the school level, and include school-based discussion and local/sub-district organizations such as teachers' principals' and supervisors' clubs, and teachers' centres. These allow local initiatives and active involvement of educational personnel in planning, implementing and evaluating in-service programmes. These practices have shown that, within the learning community of local educational personnel, needs can be identified more easily and in-service experiences can be devised and related more closely to these needs.

(Taken from *Qualitative improvement of primary schools through professional support for teachers - Indonesia (Active Learning and Professional Support - ALPS)* by Djam'an Satori)

The community can also be involved in some kinds of teacher training. Such involvement is particularly useful in training teachers about local language and cultural requirements of pupils and in introducing new teachers to the tradition, habits, and facilities available in the community where they will teach (Tatto, 1992).

(iv) Monitoring and evaluating school quality, achievement and results

Parents and community groups, though usually kept clearly away from what are considered 'professional' matters of teaching processes, may also have a role to play in monitoring and supervising classroom performance and teacher absenteeism (Durning, 1989). This includes:

(a) the regular opening of the school and its 'products' to parents and the community (e.g., observation of classes, open days, school fairs). They may also serve as an 'audience' for demonstrations of pupil achievement, such as student writing ;

(b) regular status/progress reports from the headteacher on school conditions and results;

(c) the involvement of school-community organizations in monitoring school quality (e.g., in areas such as the adequacy of facilities, the attendance and behaviour of pupils and teachers, and the achievement of school targets); and

(d) helping to identify indicators of success, participate in data collection and analysis, and then use the results for subsequent programme planning.

The Philippines PLSS is a good example of these activities. Parents are regularly invited into the school to observe school classes, thereby both becoming acquainted with the school and its teachers and, more informally, serving as a kind of check on teacher performance. The PROPEL project in India has another way of involving parents in assessment. Every few months a set of PROPEL schools holds a school fair at which pupils are expected to demonstrate the learning gained since the previous one. This allows for both a less stressful testing context for the children and a public display of school achievement for the parents and the community Naik, 1990).

The fact that such mechanisms and processes of greater participation in the instructional process exist and work in at least some contexts does not mean that they are necessarily easy to put in place. There are a number of specific issues which will inevitably affect their implementation. These include the following:

(a) *The relationship between the required national curriculum (and teaching materials) and those more relevant locally.* Major issues in this regard include what percentage of the curriculum

(and what subjects and items) should represent an essential national 'core' curriculum and what percentage should be 'locally-weighted' or devoted to local issues. If more relevant local curricula and syllabi are to be developed, responding to the context and needs of the 'community', then *which* part of the community (by class, language groups, ethnicity, etc.) is the point of reference?

(b) *The tension between teacher prerogatives and parental interest (and intervention). As* mentioned above, one important issue in this area is the rather natural conflict which can arise between the common view of teachers that they are the master/mistress of their classrooms and the occasional (and , in some places, increasing) desire on the part of parents to know what is happening in the classroom. This relates to how transparent the school is, and how visible its practices are, to the community.

(c) The extent to which communities, almost as pressure groups, should be able to oversee issues of school quality and apply sanctions, formal or informal, on defaulting schools and teachers. This is a major question in regard to the possible powers of parent-community organizations. Should the community be able to monitor and perhaps even discipline teachers for poor teaching methods, low teacher attendance, abuse of pupils, and poor examination results?

(d) *The choice of goals, standards, and values against which inputs, processes, and outputs will be assessed.* If. there is to be more locally-based monitoring and evaluation of quality, an important issue becomes the reference measure - national goals and standards or those of the local community? What is the risk that parents will use as central criteria either examination scores and promotion to higher levels of education and/or socialization to local cultural or religious values while the education system places equal value on more practical, vocational skills and on socialization to national, more sectarian values?

In summary, there are major roles which teachers within schools and parents, community associations, and NGOs from outside of schools - can play in attempts to improve educational quality. The conditions

necessary to introduce some kinds of collaboration (the establishment of school committees or PTAs, for example) may appear quite simple to put in place. But to guarantee genuine participation as we have defined it to empower teachers and the community to gain the necessary knowledge and skills to participate in education and the necessary power to take action - requires a considerable change in the way education is planned and managed, the conscious enhancement of those factors and conditions which encourage participation, and the development of concrete mechanisms and procedures to guide planners and managers in developing such participatory activities. These will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter .

Chapter V

What participation in education can achieve

> "...any school that implements an active programme to stimulate community involvement will be rewarded. The rewards can range from voluntary labour to improved school grounds or enhanced pupil study habits, to financial resources and subsidies for school athletic and cultural events. Community involvement also results in substantial improvement in learning". (Cummings et al, 1992:39).

As discussed in an earlier chapter. it is not always easy to demonstrate the effectiveness of participatory approaches to development. Clear, concrete results in regard to enrolment and achievement gains or increases in resources provided to education - measurable in quantitative terms - are less often available than more impressionistic evidence of changes in processes and procedures, attitudes and values. Anecdotal information of programme 'success' abounds in the literature, but much of this is brief and lacking in detail. And evidence of such success is not necessarily proof of generalizability or replicability, since achievement may depend greatly on the particular context of participation.

The conclusions and arguments of this book are based on somewhat stronger and more systematic evidence - sometimes quantitative in nature but more often the result of intensive, more qualitative case studies of a number of formal and non-formal education programmes based on participatory approaches in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean. From these cases, it is possible to describe several ways in which the more active participation by a wider range of actors in a variety of educational activities can lead and has led to changes both in the nature of education and among the actors themselves.

First, *more participatory approaches to development- in a context of supportive norms and facilitating mechanisms - can result in the*

involvement of more partners and more sectors in development activities , particularly at the micro-level.

For example, as the result of a large programme in Kenya which brought together AMREF (a regional health NGO) and the Ministry of Health, government extension agents began to work more actively with local NGOs and community organizations on developing health education projects (Nyamwaya et al, 1992) - previously the domain of the Ministry alone. Another Kenyan programme, among the government, an NGO, and private enterprises, encouraged these enterprises to become actively involved in, and supportive of, family planning and other health services (Nturibi, 1992). This led to the greater participation of employers, employees, their families, and the surrounding community. And in the area of pre-school education (see Box 11), the long-term support of a foreign donor and several Kenyan ministries and government agencies resulted in the participation in many districts of a large variety of actors - local authorities, parents, community leaders, and school teachers - in opening new pre-schools and training new and better pre-school teachers (Njenga, 1992).

In formal education, also, more participatory approaches can encourage greater involvement of more people in schools; for example, with members of the community serving both as tutors in a visiting teacher model programme in isolated schools of Central Kalimantan in Indonesia and (see Box 7 in Chapter IV) as resource persons to enrich the curriculum developed locally in West Java (Moegiadi et al 1991). Parents and other community members work with teachers and pupils in the Escuela Nueva programme in Colombia to do simple tasks such as making community maps. The first experience with the so-called SECOM programme in Minas Gerais (Brazil), which involves parents and pupils taking part in the election of headteachers, brought out some 85 per cent of the potential community electorate - some 700,000 people (Box 4 in Chapter IV). And community 'monitors' - often unemployed youth - have been brought into the 900 Schools programme in Chile to provide special tutoring and individual attention to fourth graders with learning problems (Box 12).

Box 11. Partnerships within district centres for early childhood education in Kenya

The DICECE programme was launched by the Ministry of Education in 1985. Government policy on partnership in pre-school education advocates an enabling environment for the implementation of the programme. It has defined roles for each of the partners involved (government, parents and communities, NGOs, religious bodies, and private enterprises) and has clearly highlighted parents and communities as being the most important partners. Between them, they manage over 75 per cent of all pre-schools in Kenya.

The programme has led to a model of pre-school education which emphasises in-service and on-the-job training for both teachers and trainers the use of participatory approaches in training; close integration among training, curriculum development, and research; and evaluation. Teachers and trainers receive training consisting of residential sessions alternated by field experience. The participatory approaches adopted during training provide opportunities for trainees to contribute to their own training, thus encouraging greater commitment, creativity, initiative, confidence, and independence among them. The knowledge and skills they acquire help them to interact better with, and to mobilize, parents and communities to participate in the provision of quality services in pre-schools and in curriculum development. This has led to the adapting of curriculum to specific community requirements through the development of locally designed play and learning materials and through the collection of local stories, poems, riddles, songs, and games.

Through dialogue and awareness meetings, people have come to see that there are numerous roles in education for various partners and are more aware of what those roles are. As a result, there is greater involvement in school life by primary headteachers and school inspectors and a warmer interaction between teachers and pupils. There is also collaboration with nutritionists and officers from the Ministry of Health, and NGOs and local authorities are beginning to accept responsibility for the payment of teachers' salaries, one of the most serious problems facing the programme. For such effective collaboration to take place, the government must allow for and respect the decisions made by other partners. It must recognize that other partners, when tapped and motivated, may play important roles in improving the quality of pre-school education.

(Taken from *District Centres for Early Childhood Education (DICECE)* by Anne W. Njenga.)

Box 12. Community Monitors in the 900 Schools Project

With the return to democracy in Chile in 1990, there was evidence of serious deficiencies in the quality and distribution of education, with grave consequences for the most impoverished sectors of the country as well as for national development. This situation prompted the Ministry of Education to design and implement a Programme for Improving the Quality of Primary Schools in Poverty Areas of Chile, aimed at improving learning conditions in the 10 per cent poorest schools in the country and raising the achievement levels in language arts and mathematics of students in grades one through four.

The work has been organized along five lines of action:

(1) Learning workshops for third and fourth graders with learning problems, led by monitors from the community. These are young people chosen by the school and trained by supervisors and a team of specialists. The workshops consist of two-hour sessions held twice a week, using a 'popular' participatory educational approach with emphasis on appreciation of community culture. This approach is based on the principles of learning by doing, learning from the environment and from one's own experience, and learning in a group. The monitors teach five subjects that are organized into 31 sessions. The objective is to raise self-esteem, develop oral and written language, increase basic skills to learn mathematics, and develop an interest in learning. In a recent evaluation of the project, the monitors themselves showed substantial changes as a result of the programme, not just in their own work but also in their personal goals. At the present time, several monitors have begun teacher training degree programmes.

(2) In-service workshops for teachers, led by supervisors from the Ministry of Education who have participated in national training workshops. These workshops focus on teaching and learning language arts and mathematics.

(3) Preparation of textbooks for the children and manuals for teachers, supervisors and monitors.

(4) Classroom libraries and didactic materials developed by the central team of specialists.

(5) Improvement of school facilities, involving construction and repairs essential to providing an adequate and protected educational environment.

Work began in 1990 with 969 schools, extending to 1,376 in 1992. The programme reaches 222,491 children from first to fourth grade and 7,267 teachers. On the basis of scores obtained on the national achievement test, the poorest schools with the lowest scores were selected. The programme has utilized existing administrative structures, especially the supervisory structure, with an aim to strengthening human resources through permanent training strategies. The cost of the programme (not including building improvements) is currently US $2,300 per school annually, or US $12 per student. One of the principal achievements of the programme has been professionalization of the supervisors whose effectiveness has been enhanced as they have identified more with the activity. Another important achievement has been the acceptance and appreciation of the learning workshops and the work of the community monitors, especially considering initial resistance to this component.

Other achievements include:

1. Improvement in the language arts and mathematics achievement levels of first, second and fourth grade students.
2. Improvements in school facilities which contributed to a better quality educational environment and generated a new sense of the 'right to quality' in the poor communities.
3. Elaboration and provision of educational materials,

(Taken from *The 900 Schools Programme: Improving the Quality of Primary Schools in Impoverished Areas of Chile* by Johanna Filp.)

In the PLSS in the Philippines (Box 9 in Chapter IV), as elsewhere, such fostering of direct and strong relationships with the community and the families which schools serve, often through the mechanisms of conferences, meetings, and public fora, has:

> "brought parents and community members closer to schools, leading to long-term gains such as: (i) minimization of discontinuities between schools and communities, and between schools and families; (ii) minimization of conflicts between schools and communities, schools and families, teachers and parents, and what is taught in school and what is taught at home; (iii) easy transition of pupils going from home to school; (iv) good preparation of pupils to engage in learning experiences; and (v) minimized 'cultural shock' of new entrants to schooling". (Carino and Valisno, 1992:6).

Second, more resources have also been gathered and, often, have been more efficiently used. Government resources, as well, have been increased in some cases, and more local resources also gathered. For example:

- pre-school teachers and their tutors have been able to mobilize more financial and other support from parents, communities, and local government in Kenya;
- the SERVOL project has been able to do the same for both pre-school programmes and adolescent, family-life education programmes in Trinidad;
- successful school clusters and primary schools in Thailand, able to work closely with local temples and surrounding communities, more easily win additional resources from their 'partners'.

More importantly, perhaps, more of these local resources have gone directly to local communities rather than being expended on central programmes.

The resources needed and provided for these activities have often been rather modest in size compared to the results. The 900 Schools programme in Chile - already a national programme of 1200 schools, 7000 teachers, and 200,000 pupils - costs (without including infrastructural improvements) US$2,300 per school per year, or $US 12 for each pupil (Filp, 1992:12). The PROPEL programme in India, through means such as sharing books, organizing local supervision, and employing local volunteer instructors, has made it possible for learners to acquire in 1000-1200 hours the achievement levels obtained by pupils of full-time schools in grades III or IV - at about one-third the cost of full-time primary education (Naik, 1992:8).

Very similar results have been achieved in the BRAC non-formal primary education centres. The average cost per child per year is US$15, including rental of facilities, teachers' salaries, training, recruitment, supervision, monitoring, materials, curriculum development, and management. This compares to the per capita costs of the government primary schools of $US13.50 (in 1989-90) - not a great difference in relation to the much lower drop-out rates and higher achievement levels of the BRAC centres (Sarker, 1992:5).

Third, the quantity of services provided has also increased. Greater involvement in education and other social services by more actors can

lead to the greater demand for, supply of, and use of, these services. For example:

- in Kenya the growth of community involvement in pre-school education, in connection with government and donor funding and support, has meant that 24 out of 35 districts are now served by district-level early childhood education specialists and centres; 1,100 teachers are trained annually; and over 12,000 trainers and supervisors have already received training (Njenga, 1992);
- the AMREF/Ministry of Health programme has supported health education programmes in 55 communities in 32 different districts in Kenya (Nyamwaya et al, 1992);
- the FPPS in Kenya has worked with 60 different kinds of organisation, leading to 135,000 new acceptors of family planning and some 20,000 users of these services per month (Nturibi 1992); and
- in Zimbabwe, two manuals on community development and economic development have already been printed, and others are being published or planned. All 55 districts of the country have been involved in this process, and nine local bookteams have already produced three local books and 11 technical pamphlets. More importantly, perhaps, various kind of networks of community agents and organisations have been established (Bond-Stewart, 1992).

In the formal education sector, similar expansion of more participatory models of schooling has occurred. The visible success of cluster activities has led to the slow but steady expansion of this kind of innovation in both Indonesia and Thailand. In Indonesia, in fact, the original programme developers have had difficulty containing the rapid 'bush-fire' replication of the project, a process often carried out with few controls and little training (see Box 10 in Chapter IV). The 900 Schools programme in Chile has already expanded to 1200 institutions and is still growing, and Escuela Nueva in Colombia is now the model of use in 18,000 of the 27,000 rural primary schools in the country and, with the help of an NGO dedicated to the sustaining of the Escuela Nueva approach, is now being adapted to urban schools. SERVOL serves almost all parts of Trinidad in 154 early childhood care and education centres. And the BRAC programme in Bangladesh, at 12,000 non-formal

centres by the end of 1992, now has plans (and funding) for 50,000 centres by the end of the decade (Sarker, 1992).

Fourth, *the quality and relevance of the services provided have also increased.* As people become more active in development programmes, they have a larger interest in ensuring their quality and relevance and therefore can begin to both contribute directly to this process and oversee the work of other development agents.

> "The community can play a vital role as a watchdog body for educational administrators, local politicians, and the teachers, who, for their selfish motives, tend to ignore the interests of young learners....The community at large has a significant role in terms of...acting as a countervailing force in areas where the traditional bureaucratic control on educational services fail or become less effective". (Aggarwal, 1992:31).

There are many examples of how community participation has helped make development programmes more relevant to local needs and conditions:

- The Kenyan health education programme of AMREF, through the involvement of local leaders, artists, and musicians, has been able to develop messages much more closely tied to the cultures of the target communities.
- The books produced by community members and local development agents in the Community Publishing Programme in Zimbabwe speak directly to local communities in terms of how to establish local enterprises in their areas.
- The pre-school methods and materials developed through the District Centres for Early Childhood Education in Kenya also relate much more directly to local folklore, theatre, and music (Shaeffer, 1992a).

The involvement of family and community in education can also have effects on the learning environment for children. In the Philippines, it was found that the PLSS programme:

> "transforms schools into friendly, non-alienating, familiar places for children where they can work, play, and study without fear. The learning opportunities being generated and

> planned collaboratively by parents, community members, and school personnel, such as field trips, parent-teacher-pupil conferences, summer camps, etc., have greatly enriched the learning resources available to pupils".
>
> (Carino and Valisno, 1992:6).

The hiring of community members (usually young women) as teachers in the BRAC centres also clearly helps to enhance the friendly, playful, child-centred atmosphere of these centres in contrast to the harsher, more severe environment of government schools.

In more formal schools, community involvement can also lead to better quality and greater relevance:

- The school work plans proposed by candidates for the position of headteacher in schools in Minas Gerais, are focused on the needs of individual schools for quality improvement. They are then revised and implemented jointly by the successful headteacher and the community-based School Council.
- In Uganda the MINDSACROSS project proved to the education system the potential and the availability of indigenous reading material, developed by pupils, and so to some extent de-mystified the process of book production - so much so that the government has explored ways to produce even more such materials, across a wider sample of pupils (Namuddu, 1991).
- And in Thailand the presence of clusters and supportive district offices has made available to schools "a wide range of capacity-building initiatives" and a greater repertoire of innovative school activities from which a motivated principal, especially with the help of the surrounding community, can "create his own richer blend of policies...to promote internal improvement" (Wheeler et al 1991:51,57).

Of particular interest has been the effect of participatory approaches in private systems on public systems. In the PROPEL project in India, public primary school teachers have noted the mobilization of the community for the PROPEL schools. As a result:

> "NFE has made a strong impact on the formal school. The family sees the NFE pupils learning faster and better. formal school pupils come to the evening NFE centres and insist on

> being admitted. The teachers of formal schools are ready to become acquainted with the NFE pedagogy, and they sometimes approach the education co-ordinators for NFE materials. Principals of primary schools have come forward to give facilities for children's fairs, women animators' camps, youth camps and experimental children's camps for pupils from the upper primary classes in order to establish closer relations with the schools" (Naik, 1992:10).

BRAC has also recently been working to train government headteachers and inspectors in some of the managerial and pedagogical methods of its non-formal education centres, most notably in how to mobilize greater community support for education.

Fifth, there is evidence of *more skilled teachers and development agents* - more confident, flexible, interactive, facilitating, and responsive to people's conditions and needs, and able to be trained in these skills through systematic programmes which focus on practical work, participatory approaches to training, and community involvement.

Studies in Thailand and Indonesia, for example, describe a greater realisation among school and local office personnel concerning the need for, and the potential benefits of, collaboration. Wheeler *et al* talk of an "ethos of constant improvement" (1991:33) which has been developed through greater teacher-teacher collaboration. Receptive headmasters, particularly within well-run clusters, have been able to develop a greater academic focus and more efficient and collaborative management systems and to encourage greater teacher involvement in materials development, test construction, and community development (Box 13).

A study in Indonesia reports on more professional satisfaction of teachers and headteachers, in part through their greater identity within a group (Djam'an Satori 1991). And in Uganda, Namuddu speaks of enhanced skills among teachers in curriculum development and an increased respect for a variety of feasible writing genres (1991).

Intensive, interactive, participatory methods of teacher training with the full involvement of supervisors as pedagogical advisors rather than administrative monitors - in both the Escuela Nueva programme in Colombia and the 900 Schools programme in Chile have led to the adoption of more active- and child-centred learning and have increased the teacher's role in some aspects of decision-making such as the

adaptation of the curriculum, the organization of the school calendar and schedules, and the flexible promotion of children (Arboleda 1992).

Box 13. Capacity-building through school clusters in Thailand

Time on task, teaching practices that actively engage students in the learning process, and principal leadership characterized the major aspects of school life in one high achieving primary school. Throughout the day, both morning and afternoon, students were involved in academic instruction. This is because teachers were seldom absent, came on time and taught content during each of the six periods of the day. They did not leave their classrooms to socialize. Lunch was used as a time to discuss academic issues, although some non-academic issues were also occasionally topics for conversation. This focus was deliberate: the principal saw ongoing conversation about the academic purpose of schooling as central to school improvement. His style of supervision stimulated teacher collaboration, where they observed one another's teaching. In so doing, he argued that, "I wanted to make the teachers more intelligent, so I got them to observe each other and share ideas." As a result of this and other practices discussed in greater detail below, staff morale was high and their willingness to contribute to the school was considerable.

Teachers used a combination of instructional strategies ranging from teacher-centred to group work. They prepared lesson plans, used materials and tested student understanding, re-teaching individual students or the entire class if they did not understand. For grades I -IV there was one teacher per class; for grades V-VI three teachers shared instruction, specializing in different subjects where their expertise was strongest.

This school became a high achieving school with collaborative relations among the staff only during this principal's tenure (the last eight years). Social disorganization in the community (characterized by gambling and drinking), an alcoholic teacher who constantly disrupted the educational process, and a legacy of non-intervention by the former principal were some of the conditions that greeted this principal when he came to this school.

Upon his arrival, the principal immediately became involved in community discussions about making a dirt road through the village. He lent his support in favour of the project and joined the villagers m the construction, an act that impressed the community deeply. Once the road was built, the more conservative members of the community experienced its advantages and came to be strong supporters of new principal, along with the rest of the village. The village committee (with principal support) worked with the local police to stop the gambling. Meanwhile, the principal succeeded in having the district office release the alcoholic teacher from his responsibilities.

The morale of this school improved because of the principal's style of leadership, and it is here that the resources of the school cluster became important. This cluster is the most active one studied, pursuing both accountability and capacity-building policies, but with a clear emphasis on capacity-building initiatives. Three innovative programmes (a programme to improve internal management practices, a quality control (QC) system, and a programme to stimulate teachers to develop and use lesson plans) fit with the principal's approach to school administration and he used every initiative In his efforts to improve the school. For example, his style of supervision fitted nicely with the management practices encouraged by the cluster where principals and teachers jointly were to develop the criteria for observation and to discuss the results. He also implemented the component whereby teachers would observe each other. He encouraged teachers to use programmes offered by the school cluster to improve their pedagogical and content knowledge, such as the QC system, where teachers at each grade level across the cluster would meet on a regular basis to discuss teaching practices and problems with specific children. He also encouraged his teachers to take advantage of cluster-sponsored sessions on how to develop lesson plans, which all teachers in this school now do as a matter of course. He encouraged teachers to take cluster tests seriously, reflecting his interest in using accountability as a tool for reform. In this regard, he used a modified rotation system by including student test scores as one criterion in his recommendations for double promotions. This meant that while all teachers in the building eventually would get a double promotion, those whose students consistently scored better on cluster and district tests would get such a promotion more often. In short, he used cluster initiatives as a resource to further his own reform agenda.

Taken from *Improving basic education through collaboration and co - operation: school clusters in Thailand* by Christopher Wheeler, et al.)

Studies of BRAC teachers - relatively uneducated and poorly paid (compared to their government counterparts), but chosen from within their communities and then intensively and systematically supervised and trained - show that they are well-motivated, punctual, and affectionate with their pupils. Their drop-out rate from BRAC schools is less than two per cent; teachers resign only if their husbands move away from their village (Sarker, 1992:5-6).

Sixth, *effects on the output of schooling* can also be shown. These include changes in academic achievement and in pupil attitudes and behaviours.

Results from the experimental implementation of the Parent Learning Support System in the Philippines showed significant change in the scholastic performance and attitudes of pupils whose parents had been involved in PLSS activities and had been trained to assist and guide their children in their school work (Carino and Valisno, 1992). Likewise, after one year of operation, the 900 Schools project in Chile showed increases in pupil performance levels in both Spanish and mathematics. Pupil self-esteem and their ability to express themselves and interact with their peers were also higher, especially in the learning workshops run by community monitors (Filp, 1992:10).

In an evaluation of the Escuela Nueva in 1988, comparing traditional and new schools, children of the latter scored considerably higher in mathematics, Spanish, socio-civil behaviour, and self-esteem. Of particular interest was "the analysis of self-esteem which shows that girls equalled boys in this dimension, demonstrating the equalizing effect of a participatory methodology. It could be argued that a factor in this result is the participation of boys and girls in the school government and in group work within the classroom" (Arboleda, 1992:58-59). The same study showed that 89 per cent of the teachers thought that the Escuela Nueva system was superior to other schools despite the heavier workload placed on teachers.

In terms of other kinds of outcomes, the BRAC non-formal primary education centres report average attendance at 96 per cent, with a dropout rate of less than 2 per cent. In a recent year, 98 per cent of the NFPE programme graduated, and 89 per cent of these were admitted to formal primary schools. And through 1991, 72 per cent of the pupils enrolled in the NFPE centres were girls (Sarker, 1992:5).

The BRAC Facilitation Assistance Programme in Education (FAPE), where BRAC is assisting government personnel in adopting some BRAC supervision and teaching methods, has preliminary data about increases in pupil attendance rates pre- and post-FAPE (from 65 per cent in 1989 to 73 per cent in 1990), in the percentage of children enrolled in school who sit for the final examinations, and in the number of drop-outs retrieved into the system as a result of closer links between the school and the community; these results are assumed to be at least partly due to greater attention paid to potential and actual drop-outs, more interesting co-curricular activities, and a generally healthier educational environment (Latif, 1991:65-69).

More generally, the studies speak of greater pupil creativity and pride in their work and more enjoyment in their learning. The results of the PROPEL project appear particularly interesting in this regard. Graduates of the non-formal education centres are said to be able to succeed in formal system examinations and to read to their parents and siblings, write letters, and keep accounts - all skills which, according to the project's rules, must be demonstrated in their homes every day. Pupils are also encouraged to speak in village meetings, and do so with a certain 'social etiquette'; for girls, especially, who are often shown to be learning more rapidly than their brothers who are usefully put in government schools, this has led to greater respect in their communities and greater demand for further education (Naik, 1991:112-115).

Seventh, these projects have also had a *demonstrable effect on communities.* This relates to:

- the knowledge and skills of community members
- attitudes and behaviours
- power and control over development activities

(i) Knowledge and skills

In India, the training of various partners through the PROPEL project has made members of village committees and panchayats more fully informed about the nature of education, its problems, the rationale of decentralisation, and the importance of micro-planning. They have also gained skills in educational organization and management and in pedagogical strategies - thus, the skills essential for carrying out their own educational responsibilities. Members of school councils in Minas Gerais and in Boards of Management in Papua New Guinea are also taught new skills in reporting and accounting. In the PLSS programme in the Philippines, parents attend a series of parent education seminars where resource speakers discuss specific topics on parental roles and on how they can effectively perform these in the total development and education of their children (Carino; Valisno 1992). A similar, though less sophisticated process, is organized in the Escuela Nueva programme. In the words of a parent:

> "We were also involved in workshops, so we could see how children study with the guides. They came here with their homework and talked about objectives, activities, guides, and

> we could not understand. The teacher gave us an objective and some activities (in a demonstration to parents) and thus we parents understood how it is that the children work" (quoted in Arboleda 1992:59).

(ii) Attitudes and behaviour

Parents and community members can also gain new ways of thinking and acting and new attitudes about development, particularly about their role in education. For example, both the health education programme of AMREF and the family planning programme of FPPS in Kenya resulted in positive changes in regard to local health behaviours, at least partly the result of more community-centred health education.

The visible improvement of the physical infrastructure of the school in Chile's 900 Schools project led to a kind of 'virtuous circle' of greater community pride in the school, a new sense of the 'right to quality' at the community level, and new kinds of demand on local social services (Filp 1992). Also, through the school clusters in Indonesia and even more so in Thailand, there is greater visibility of the school in the community and a concomitant greater awareness in parents and local community members of the need to support the school; the building of such awareness is an explicit part of the Thai clusters, where good relations among the school, community, and temple are essential for school improvement (Wheeler et al 1991). Such efforts can lead to greater awareness of the potential of education and greater ownership of, more cooperation with, and less resistance to, the school (Williams, J. 1992).

Similarly, the act of involving parents in the Escuela Nueva in Colombia has offered:

> "parents, relatives, and the community at large the opportunity to participate in debates on schools activities, for them to feel that they generate culture..., that their culture is fully valued in daily school activities (through the many local examples included in learning experiences), and that they have opportunities for key contributions" (Arboleda 1992:36-37).

(iii) Power and control

Participation in education has also led to greater community control of other development activities and organizations. For example, the increasingly powerful role played by school councils in the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil, in part through their stronger role in the selection of headteachers and their collaboration in the implementation of school work plans, has both reinforced, and been reinforced by the existence of, state-level parent organizations. The organizational skills and infrastructure developed in the management of SERVOL education projects in Trinidad have also been used in the implementation of other community development projects such as building a sports field and repairing a common road (Mahabir, 1992:58). In Bangladesh, there is evidence of more PTA and school management committee meetings, and greater parental participation in, and control of, these meetings (Latif, 1991:66- 67).

And while the PROPEL project has admittedly not radically changed the strong power structure of communities in its target areas of India, it does claim that:

> "the increased participation of women and youth has had an effect on candidatures for Panchayat memberships. In a few villages, educated young men and some of the women trained as animators have become 'Sarpanch' (head of the village council). The social atmosphere, created for support to UPE, has had an impact on the political power structure, local administration and the status of women. The evidence of girls in the 9-14 age-group learning faster than their brothers attending full-time school, the change in the bearing of these girls, and their mastery of language and etiquette have surprised the villagers, and their attitude towards girls and women has begun to change. The girl graduates of NFE centres are between the ages of 13-14 years and cannot fit into the formal system nor do they desire to pursue formal education. But they are asking for some kind of useful education up to the age of 18 years because that is the minimum age of marriage prescribed by law. To fill the interim period with useful education is a perceived need, and their desire for education which can make them self-reliant is a good sign of social change" (Naik, 1992:9).

Eighth, as more and more partners become involved, there is also *more community and NGO influence on the nature of education and development* In other words, experience with community participation in more than an extractive sense can have an impact on how development activities - especially of the government - are planned and organized.

The government-supported Community Publishing Programme in Zimbabwe, for example, involved community members in bottom-up discussions of problems facing rural and marginal communities (Bond-Stewart 1992); this led to the development of manuals for community development workers addressing the particular needs of these communities (see Box 14).

While programmes developed by the NGOs in Bangladesh and India have not yet achieved national dissemination, they have managed to have considerable impact on the public systems of education in those countries. Partly as a result of the PROPEL project, the government of India has agreed to support fully some innovative NGO projects in primary education. The PROPEL project itself, much like the BRAC programme in Bangladesh, is also now beginning a process of working with local education offices and schools to develop ways to 'non-formalize' the formal system. This may lead to an integrated system of rural primary education among non-formal education centres, the more 'non-formal' primary schools, and the host of other non-formal education programmes in the village (Naik, 1991).

Box 14. Participation in the community publishing programme in Zimbabwe

The Community Publishing Programme (CPP) was initiated following independence in Zimbabwe in 1980, in a difficult social and political context, where the decision-making process was highly centralized and undemocratic and where the majority of the population lived as subsistence farmers, crowded on poor land, with very little access to agricultural, health, and educational services and no role in decision-making.

Initiated as a training section of the Ministry of Community and Cooperative Development, the broad goal of the CPP is to promote development through books, other media, and workshops which build up the practical and analytical skills, confidence, and creativity of development workers at all levels, especially in regard to community development and the coordination of different agencies working in development. Community development methods are applied in the production of materials so that trainees involved not only read about community development but also actually experience this through their participation in book production. The material produced is thus created ABOUT the collective process and BY it.

Personnel employed through the project include a national book team of five persons. The team has established working relationships with other government ministries, non-government organizations, and communities. The CPP is based on working creatively with existing structures rather than on developing an elaborate structure of its own.

The team involves a wide range of development workers in planning, researching, writing, testing, and distributing development education books, and there is regular contact with client groups who have an important role to play in shaping the books. Every effort is made to ensure that target groups are involved in all stages of a book or other activity, from planning through evaluation, using practical participatory methods.

Several books have been completed in the CPP, including books on community and economic development and on the situation of women in Zimbabwe. Books published are done at two levels: (1) through a national book project, where the national book team collaborates with participants from all 55 districts, and (2) through the local book project, where members of the local book team - development workers who have not necessarily completed formal education - work with people at local levels to complete books appropriate to that level.

Participatory methods give all collaborating agencies and individuals a strong sense of ownership of the books and of the process. This accounts for the unusually positive response by all involved, from village community workers to high level government officials and donors. But community publishing is not replicable in the sense of simply transferring it elsewhere. It requires a political will and social context which is sufficiently open to recognize the value of such a democratic approach to development. Collaboration above all requires that initiators base the programme on reality, knowing that reality is so complex and many-sided that no educational or development agency by itself can be very effective.

> Knowledge is built up slowly through very widespread consultation with people from different backgrounds.
>
> (Taken from *The community publishing process, Zimbabwe* by Kathy-Bond)

As a result of regular and systematic involvement of parents in school and classroom PTAs, the PLSS in the Philippines found that school administrators had changed, becoming more sensitive to the need of pupils and their families, and that teachers had become "occupied with planning and organizing lessons for children. , programming and scheduling activities for parents and the community. and co-ordinating various activities and projects that enhance and keep the involvement sustained" (Carino; Valisno, 1992:7).

Finally, within the educational administration, the experience of Ministry officials with the innovations analyzed in the case studies appears to lead slowly to *a greater willingness to permit even greater experimentation and autonomy.* A benign circle begins to operate in some settings so that greater Ministry flexibility leads to greater autonomy at lower levels of the system and among a wider range of partners, which leads to further experimentation and greater evidence of success, which lead in turn to the provision of greater autonomy.

This is the case in the Thai and Indonesian cluster programmes where the evolution, with some 'to-ing' and 'fro-ing' in the process, has been one of increasing authority being given to (if not always taken by) district offices, school clusters, and cluster offices in the development of structures and mechanisms supportive of their work (Wheeler et al, 1991). A similar dynamic has operated in the Escuela Nueva and 900 Schools programmes where initial success with rather unorthodox methods of promoting collaboration within schools and with communities led to the granting of greater autonomy and authority to lower levels of the system.

In the projects in India and Bangladesh, the relative success of the activity has convinced many government officials, often against considerable opposition and suspicion, of the need to co-operate with, rather than fight against, such initiatives. In the Indian case, this was easier to do with local government officers who find community involvement helpful in the achievement of their targets and who see

participatory planning and development as a relatively 'stress-free' way of shifting the 'onus of decision-making' to all partners (Naik, 1991:154). Such co-operation has been less successful with local *education* officials who see their work considerably complicated by such processes.

Assuming that more participatory approaches to educational development can lead to many of the changes described above - and that the extent of such changes will relate very much to the nature of the approaches used and the context in which they attempt to work - an important question remains: how to facilitate the participation and collaboration which may produce such change? This question is the focus of the following chapter.

Chapter VI
Facilitating participation and collaboration: how to do it

> "...community participation cannot be looked at in isolation from the macro-system; the structure of the state and its level of tolerance set the agenda for participation and produce a culture of politics which reaches down and affects what happens at the local level whether in villages or urban neighbourhoods. Participation has to be understood within this context of political culture, because the latter defines the extent to which participation is imposed, a token, or a genuine mechanism for change". (Walt n.d.: 200).

Greater collaboration and greater participation by the under-represented do not occur because they are willed or legislated. "Success requires major transformations in the way an agency performs its task, in the way the community relates to the agency, and in the way the society views the poor and their rights. Such transformations are inevitably slow and filled with set-backs" (Korten,1981:199-200). These transformations have been called "micro-policy reforms" which "depend on the accomplishment of highly complex and difficult institutional changes commonly involving the development of significant new capacities and norms and a redefinition of institutional roles. Needed re-orientation of existing professional and managerial practice may depend on achieving changes in deeply held personal and professional values" (Korten, 1986).

Such transformations are neither easy to achieve nor amenable to the dictates of universal implementation. What they look like and how they can best be put in place will be different in different contexts. And, if implemented at all, they will likely be the result of evolutionary processes, as societies proceed up the ladder of greater participation, at different speeds and with different results at various levels of governance. But in many societies it is likely that such an evolution is occurring - or will occur. The transformations required for greater participation and

collaboration in development can be facilitated by the encouragement of new norms (a different 'political culture'), the creation of new mechanisms and strategies, and the inculcation of new knowledge, skills, and attitudes among the various actors in development.

1. Social, political, cultural, and organizational norms

> "The relationship between the school and the community will depend very much on the type of social relationships prevailing in the country concerned. In a closed and hierarchically segmented society, it will be very difficult to establish participatory relationships between the school and the community. Relations will be 'closed' and not very proactive, since the community would either identify with the school which becomes its school, or it considers that this school belongs to the government and thus generates the same 'respect', 'fear' and 'expectations' felt vis-a-vis all exogenous institutions." (Hallak, 1992:9)

In order to change, institutions must want to change. Clearly, many innovations related to increased collaboration in education have been successful because individual schools, clusters, and district offices wanted to provide better education and were willing to work collaboratively to achieve it. More particularly, the following norms and the resulting bureaucratic 'climate' seem to be critical in the development of more participatory approaches to education.

(i) Institutional and individual openness

The first norm is *openness to the outside world, to new ideas and new ways of doing things, and to change.* Such openness should characterize individual schools and their staff, the education system and the bureaucracy which supports it, and ultimately the national political and cultural environment.

(a) The national political and cultural environment

Nations differ in the extent to which a dominant culture (or cultures) and the existing political and social system permit or welcome pluralism, involvement with the world outside of their borders, unfettered research and the free exchange of ideas and information within and across society, and experimentation with innovative approaches to the solution of traditional problems. They differ particularly in regard to the kind of structural openness permitted; e.g., laws and practice related to the existence and nature of political parties, non-government organizations, and civic associations.

The process of encouraging participation will be enhanced to the degree that the national environment is an open one. Many would argue that genuine participation is "feasible only in a political system in which efforts are undertaken to remedy economic and social injustice" (Bude, 1985:275) - where there is some 'space' provided for communities and NGOs to act and explore and where greater participation in development is encouraged in all social sectors. But even in less open societies there may be certain geographic regions, certain administrative levels of the nation, or "certain historic moments in the life of a nation [where] democratic spaces open up" (Picon, 1990:5). Seizing these where available, and attempting to extend their reach, become important tasks in the encouragement of more participatory approaches to development.

It is important to make clear that any description of the relative openness of a system should not be done judgmentally. Different cultures and political systems, at different periods in their evolution, are characterized by different degrees of complexity and stability. They therefore have, and require, different degrees of openness, transparency, permeability, and flexibility. These differences are reflected in a variety of political and bureaucratic systems. The important thing for policy-makers and planners wishing to facilitate more participatory approaches to educational development is to recognize the nature of the systems in which they work, to be able to analyze the current 'openness' of these systems as characterized above, and to see where and when 'space' exists for an expansion of participation and collaboration in education.

(b) The education system

Experience gained in the Parent Learning Support System in the Philippines showed that schools and the systems in which innovations

flourish need to be both 'permeable' in their receptivity to, and willingness to accept, new ideas, and flexible in adapting to them (Carino and Valisno, 1991). Within a given society, individual systems and sectors both reflect the nature of the macro-political and cultural system and may differ within it. Bureaucracies and institutions carry their own socio-cultural norms and reflect different levels of openness, transparency, permeability, flexibility, and 'readiness' for change. They have different capacities to adapt and adopt new forms of work behaviour, new skills, and new ways of relating to others, and different abilities in gathering, listening to, and being influenced by new ideas and actors inside and outside their particular system. Such different capacities may derive from historical factors (e.g., the legacy of the colonial period and whatever reactions to this period ensued during the move toward independence). The education system, as often a major 'holdover' from a colonial administration, may be particularly influenced by this legacy.

Especially important in the analysis of the openness of the education system are four things:

- the extent of openness to input from, and collaboration with, other sectors of development, such as health and agriculture;
- the extent of openness to ideas and actors at lower levels of the system (at the district office, clusters, and schools) where genuine change needs to take place;
- the extent of the system's adaptability to the local context in which education takes place - to working towards a match between delivery/content of schooling and local values and needs, economic constraints and cultures; in other words, a willingness on the part of the system's managers to "modify their conceptions of what a school must be like" (Williams, J. 1992:55); and
- the extent of openness to change and innovation. In this regard, a system can more actively publicize the need for innovations, loosen regulations that prevent them, actively hunt for innovations, stress the need for innovation in training programmes, provide incentives for innovations in the system's career track, and make available small grants to start innovations and facilitate expansion of small-scale projects (Williams, J. 1992).

(c) Schools

> "Schools, in the pursuit of excellence and relevance, should be encouraged to develop a more complex picture of their community. On the one hand are the parents who supply children. On the other hand are firms and government services which will employ the graduates of the school system. Both parties should be invited into the schooling process as supporters and decision- makers". (Cummings,1992:27).

Individual schools, too, can reflect, and also differ from, the dominant political and bureaucratic behaviour of a given society. The extent of this reflection or difference can depend both upon the particular a region or area in which they exist, and also, very much, on the particular personalities of the school personnel. There are several important issues in this regard, including the extent to which schools:

- are 'welcoming' to parents and the community and seek to have a dialogue with them in order to understand each other's conditions and needs, or rather 'disqualify' community experience and so are seen as places to which parents 'surrender' their children at the age of school entrance;
- are open to the "gaze, support, and appropriate intervention" of parents and the community (Naik 1991:104);
- are 'permeable' - listen to, accept, adapt, and experiment with ideas coming from other sources, especially those which may be more non-formal or non-traditional in approach; and
- get involved with the community, other educational programmes, and other development sectors.

This includes opening of the school to collaboration with other educational programmes and processes (pre-school education programmes, adult literacy); to more non-formal approaches to education (e.g., less age- and grade-bound); and to the opinions and needs of the surrounding community. In the Secondary Schools Community Extension Project (SSCEP) in Papua New Guinea, for example, "the more successful SSCEP schools had extensive parent and community information meetings prior to the initial stages of implementation....those SSCEP schools which invested more energy than others in gaining

parental and community support for the project were more successful" (Wicks, 1991:6).

One potential benefit of opening the school to the community is to establish more clearly and directly the link between good education and greater parental and community demand and support for education. In other words, both the more visible ways of making the school and its achievements 'open to the gaze' of the community (e.g., PTAs, parents' days, the observation of classes by parents) and the less concrete (e.g., policy and practice that make parents feel welcome in the school) may increase parental interest in, and support for, the school.

Teachers must share this norm. They need to reach a point where openness to change and development is seen as a regular and continuing feature of their professional lives.

> "Continuous improvement...reflects an expectation that improvements in teaching are continuous and life-long (rather than limited only to beginning teachers)....Schools where such norms are present and salient are characterized by frequent talk among teachers about the practice of teaching...; frequent observations by teachers; and teachers working together to plan, design, research, and prepare materials for teaching"
> (Schwille, 1986:16).

(ii) Commitment to participation

The second norm is *a consistent, system-wide commitment and support to collaboration, participation, and partnerships,* across and among various actors in schools and communities and within the central government. This should include a commitment to "removing obstacles to participation - ideological, structural, and administrative" (Stiefel; Racelis 1990:2), especially to the participation of parents and the community in the life of the school. Such a commitment needs to be reflected in both 'administrative will' and 'political will' - a co-incidence of support from both "senior system administrators and their political masters" (Moyle; Pongtuluran, 1992).

Even lower down in the system, there must be continuous commitment to collaboration, from the district office and from school and cluster officials, especially the head teacher. This implies comprehension

of, and commitment to, the principle of greater participation throughout the system. This implies also the commitment to encouraging among the various actors in education a common sense of ownership of the system and a common accountability for its quality. The idea of joint activities, at all stages of the development process and all levels of the system, is very important in this regard. Collegiality and partnerships at the school level -"the notion that the work of teachers is shared, not to be done exclusively in the isolation of a classroom" (Schwille et al 1986:16) are also very important.

This norm is generally premised on the belief that the 'community' has something useful to say in regard to education and development. It must be understood, in other words, that people from quite different traditions, disciplines, levels, and sectors can exchange perspectives, share experiences, and learn from each other. This implies also the willingness to build upon traditional participatory processes. The role of 'harambee' in East Africa, for example, especially as developed in Kenya, is a case in point. Although now often used merely to extract further resources from rich and poor alike, harambee was originally (and is still occasionally) a method of genuine collaboration and therefore may be useful in facilitating partnerships.

What is necessary, in other words, especially in strongly centralized and hierarchical systems, is commitment to the principle that good school management and good teaching, *by definition,* must be more collaborative and participatory in nature. As a Thai study puts it, "the major determinants of effective school performance reflect collaborative, participatory relationships within schools and between schools and their communities" (Wheeler et al 1991:2). Thus, teacher training colleges and principal training courses must train personnel in how to mobilize and work with the community; curriculum development centres must develop guidelines for how to involve communities in the development of local curricula; and national staff colleges must teach the same message - to be sensitive to community collaboration and participation - to officials at all echelons of the system.

(iii) Autonomy and empowerment

> "In a development organization that seeks to be responsive, the dominant goal must be to facilitate self- determination among

its clients or within the community with which it is dealing.The role of a government agency in this case is to provide support for community initiatives and to make available modest amounts of unrestricted resources. Beneficiaries are seen as independent initiators of activities". (Rondinelli, 1983:127).

The third norm is *greater professional and social autonomy and empowerment* both down to lower levels of the system, especially at the school level, and out to other actors, at the community level. Nations, political systems, education bureaucracies, even schools, may be 'open' institutions, permitting outsiders to look in; allowing the free flow of information down, across, and even up the system; encouraging change; even facilitating the passive involvement of other partners in education. But they may still be strongly centralized entities, retaining ultimate control of, and responsibility for, education; restricting the extent of autonomy and local governance; and discouraging the genuine participation of other potential partners in education.

Thus, any attempt to encourage greater participation in development must begin from an analysis of:

(a) the nature of the distribution of power over education
- *down* the system,
- *out* to other actors,
- *to the unit of the school,* and

(b) the role of the centre in regard to controlling, enabling, and/or empowering its potential partners.

A commitment to greater autonomy implies the willingness of central government agencies to surrender some control to other partners, other sectors, and lower levels of the system; to feel somehow accountable to both national and local levels of the system; to treat the community as responsible for education and as a capable partner in helping to provide it - and to actually do this rather than merely preach it. This can include various kinds of financial autonomy (e.g., for everyday expenses, material and equipment, school improvement activities), autonomy in regard to personnel management (e.g., teacher benefits and workload), and, more recently, autonomy in searching for their own ways to solve their problems and prepare their individual work plan. In recent activities of the 900 Schools project in Chile and the education reform in Minas Gerais state of Brazil, this includes the ability

(and resources) to buy technical assistance and consultancy services from universities, research foundations, and private school systems (Namo de Mello, 1992).

The centre's role in such a process is played out through a variety of instruments. Some are legal and legislative, defining the nature of centralization/decentralization and of government/civic society. Some are related to ministerial policies defining the roles of various groups of actors - teachers, headteachers, supervisors, professional and parent associations, NGOs. And others are reflected in more specific guidelines for whether and how different actors get involved in education and in the school. Whatever the nature of these instruments, they give to the centre a certain relationship in regard to the other actors. This relationship can be:

(a) *controlling* - where the actions of lower levels of the system and of other actors are prohibited, restricted, carefully monitored, and/or controlled by the centre

(b) *enabling* - where the centre actively attempts "to provide the political, administrative, and policy framework within which communities and non-governmental agencies can implement activities" (Nyamwaya et al 1991:42). This would include permitting greater participation in education by trying to remove ideological, structural, and administrative obstacles to participation and -to providing a policy framework and programme guidelines which both provide leadership in the process of school improvement but also limit the role of the state sector in this process so that communities and non-governmental agencies can implement their own activities .

(c) *empowering* - where the centre actually surrenders considerable control to other partners, other sectors, and lower levels of the system, to give them a greater opportunity to play a larger role in development activities and gain some 'ownership' over education

These more participatory approaches to development - those which 'enable' and 'empower' - imply that the role of government is not to control all aspects of development but rather to develop a new balance or hybrid of powers among the various levels and actors and so to facilitate the devolution of some authority and responsibility for education down and beyond the system.

Getting this fact accepted often requires the sensitization and training of government staff in the ability to work with, and permit some autonomy to, community groups - even, in some contexts, a willingness, at least among some levels of the government, to trust and support NGO activities. This commitment to autonomy may imply the need for legal or quasi-legal frameworks to make the school relatively free of unnecessary administrative rigidities and "to limit the role of the state sector and give more opportunity to the community sector to take a larger role in development activities" (Hadad, 1983: 19). This leads then to new bureaucratic norms and a new political culture; to greater tolerance of political competition, both national and local; greater trust and delegation of authority to lower levels of the bureaucracy; and greater value placed upon group expression and group demands.

2. *Mechanisms: collaborative structures and organizations*

It can be argued that genuine and systemic collaboration will only ultimately be achieved when the norms discussed above are internalized and accepted throughout the bureaucracy. Achieving this often requires a variety of political, cultural, even economic developments well beyond the powers of a Ministry of Education.

But there is a variety of mechanisms and strategies which can be implemented by the Ministry and which are needed both to support and strengthen these norms and to encourage specific innovations related to collaboration. Underlying all of them, however, are two requirements, seemingly contradictory: (1) for more adaptive and flexible 'hybrid' structures and procedures needed to open the system to the gaze, intervention, and support of others, and (2) at the same time, for commonly understood objectives, a 'shared vision' of the programme at hand, and clear, systematic, and consistent guidelines concerning participation and collaboration. Formal rules and regulations may not always be necessary, especially at the village level, but the innovations and their purposes, and the new mechanisms and strategies meant to support them, must be explicitly understood and endorsed by each participant in the process, at each level.

Another very important requirement is the strengthening of horizontal relationships across a wide range of actors at all levels of the

system. Experience with the Escuela Nueva project in Colombia makes this point very clearly (Box 15).

Box 15. Participation and partnership in the Colombian Escuela Nueva

The goal of the Escuela Nueva or New School, an educational innovation developed in Colombia over a period of fifteen years, is to find solutions to the Persistent problems of access, equity, and poor quality of rural education in Colombia. In particular, the innovation has found ways to make it possible for incomplete schools in low population density areas to offer all five grades of primary education.

The New School is a system of primary education that integrates curricular, community, administrative-financial, and training strategies to improve the effectiveness of rural schools. Essentially this system provides active instruction, a stronger relationship between the schools and the community, and a flexible promotion mechanism adapted to the lifestyle of the rural child. Flexible promotion allows students to advance from one grade or level to another at their own pace. In addition, children can leave school temporarily to help their parents in agricultural activities, in case of illness or for any other valid reason, without jeopardizing the chance of returning to school and continuing with their education.

The government of Colombia adopted this innovation in 1987 as the strategy to universalize primary schooling in all 27,000 schools of rural Colombia. Currently, the plan has reached about 18,000, and it is expected that by 1995 all rural schools will have adopted this innovation.

One particularly salient dimension of the New School is the promotion of horizontal relationships and collaboration within the school system, among students, between students and teachers, among teachers and between the school, parents and other members of the community. it can be said that collaboration and participation are engrained in the New School and operationalized in the study guides for students and the manuals for teachers. The school government is a structure for children's participation through which they collaborate with the teacher in the management of the school .

During the development and evolution of the innovation, multiple partnerships were established with other levels and agencies of the public sector, including the local administration and specialized agencies of the rural sector, and with institutions external to the school system such as universities, producer associations, social-development oriented foundations, regional development corporations, the church, specialized publishing companies, international bilateral and multilateral donors, and international NGO's. In addition to funding, these partnerships provided technical and political support and legitimation at the national level with decision makers.

Evaluations of the New School show higher levels of academic performance, satisfaction and self-esteem among students; a high level of satisfaction among teachers and parents- and greater levels of support from the school to community activities such as non-formal education agricultural extension, local festivities, and athletic competitions compared with traditional schools. The analysis of this innovation leads to the following recommendations to facilitate the development of other educational changes: identify and understand local conditions; process and adapt the innovation instead of transferring finished products; start where people are and rely on local know-how-study the viability of going to scale as part of the process; set up a good team with a strong leader able to facilitate collaboration; make it visible to potential supporters and show them the local experience directly; and maintain contact at all levels and cultivate stakeholders.

(i)- At the provincial- and national-levels of the system

At the top levels of the bureaucracy, planners, managers, administrators, and policy-makers can be encouraged to implement two kinds of mechanisms and strategies related to the facilitation of greater collaboration for educational change: (1) those structures and procedures needed to make possible such collaboration at their own levels, and (2) those needed to encourage it at the school level.

Before looking at what might be done to encourage greater collaboration at the central level, we need to understand more clearly current policies and practices in regard to such collaboration. These include the following areas of potential partnerships:

(a) Across departments and units of the Ministry. Collaboration among different departments of a Ministry of Education is often required (and often not easy to promote); e.g., between the Ministry's research and development centre, often the site of innovation development, and the line directorates (e.g., for primary education) eventually required to disseminate a given innovation through the system. The research centre may wish to promote greater PTA influence over school budgeting, but the finance division of the Directorate of Primary Education may resist the transfer of any budgetary control down or out of its control. Or the directorate itself may be trying to disseminate a new programme (e.g., teacher involvement in materials development) and may find it difficult to gain the support of complementary agencies (e.g.. curriculum development centres, teacher training institutions) which need to alter

their activities in order to increase the chances of the programme 's success.

The reasons for why greater collaboration does *not* exist among these various potential partners can be quite complex. There are individual and institutional jealousies and rivalries; competition over scarce government or external funding; the desire to develop one's 'own' innovation; differences in professional languages spoken (e.g., the language of the researcher versus the language of the administrator). The important thing is to see what can be done to reduce such destructive rivalries and determine who, at what level of the bureaucracy, must play the primary role in doing so. Here there is perhaps a role for ministry staff training institutions. As the one ministry unit perhaps most consistently and regularly in contact with officials at all levels of the system, it could often do much more to encourage greater collaboration.

(b) *With other development sectors and ministries.* There is often even less co-operation with other social sectors. Thus, for example, the Ministry of Education may develop an extensive school health programme (or agricultural activities) without using the medical expertise of the Ministry of Health (or the experience Of the Ministry of Agriculture). Or the opposite may occur: the Ministry of Health may develop such a programme with little input or support from the Ministry of Education. Again, the problem may be institutional rivalries and competition over scarce funding; differences in languages (e.g., medical jargon versus pedagogical jargon; even different patterns of historical development (e.g., a long-established Ministry of Education still closely tied to a colonial past and a new Ministry of Community Development more associated with a revolutionary present).

(c) With non-government organizations and professional associations. As discussed earlier, collaboration between government and non-government organizations may be the most difficult to encourage. Systems of public and private education (the latter run by religious groups or private enterprises) may run in parallel, duplicating services and competing for scarce community resources. Teachers' unions and Ministry personnel may end up in confrontation rather than collaboration in attempts to solve difficult educational problems. And NGOs or other local community associations may have considerable interest and expertise in various aspects of education but are never called upon to participate in its implementation. The problem relates in part, again, to

the politics of NGOs: the nature of relationships among NGOs and between NGOs and the government(co-operative, competitive, or confrontational) and the extent to which foreign NGOs and donor agencies play a role in encouraging or making difficult greater collaboration.

But there are mechanisms that might be tried by the Ministry in order to encourage more practical, daily co-operation within and across the government and with agencies outside of the government. At the central level, *strong administrative structures* are often needed to implement more collaborative approaches to education. At this level, it may first be necessary to ensure strong *vertical* administrative structures (between various levels of the bureaucracy). These should be designed not to impose centralized, standard decisions from above but rather to clarify national policies, standards, and basic content; guarantee the implementation of the procedures by which local actors can adapt and implement such patterns; and serve as a conduit for information up the system as well as down.

Equally strong *horizontal* structures and networks are also required, of public, private, and non-government organizations, at both national and provincial levels. These include:

(a) intra-ministerial task forces, between units of the Ministry, to ensure co-ordination in the planning, development, and implementation of projects and programmes. In the ambitious COPLANER project in Indonesia, for example, an inter-ministerial task force has been set up, and a set of guidelines has been established within which all aspects of COPLANER are being developed. Provincial implementation units have come into operation, evaluation plans and systems are being organized, and a reporting and control system has been set in place;

(b) inter-ministerial committees, etc. (e.g. Education For All committees), to encourage co-operation across ministries in achieving shared goals and co-ordinating joint projects (see Box 16). For example, many countries of the world now have National Aids Control Programmes, which, though often housed in the Ministry of Health, have representatives from other affected ministries, including education;

(c) NGO coalitions, as have recently been established in several African countries following on the World Conference on Education For All,

to encourage collaboration among NGOs, help them establish a common position in regard to the government, and aid in the division of labour among them;

(d) as the result of more systematic contact with NGOs, some kind of co-ordinating unit for NGO activities in the Ministry of Education in order to encourage NGO participation and seek ways of identifying appropriate representation from the NGO community;

(e) provincial or national parent groups established to provide support to local PTAs and education committees;

(f) the use of the mass media (print, radio, television) both to disseminate information about successful partnerships and to mobilize governmental and community participation. The state government of Minas Gerais in Brazil recently used such media effectively to mobilize community participation in the public selection of primary school headteachers; and

(g.) joint planning, budgeting, implementing, training, and monitoring activities, across and among various actors to ensure that collaboration goes beyond rhetoric into actual practice.

Activities and fora such as these can provide a place where all the possible partners in education can meet to exchange opinions and move towards a clear understanding of the process and their roles within it. They can also lead to the more informal discussion of problems and policies in education - such as conflicts between ministries responsible for various aspects of basic education and the greater involvement of non-government organizations and other community-level associations in education.

The SIMAC programme in Guatemala and the COPLANER project in Indonesia, with their quite complex, inclusive, and inter-related units (managing councils, steering committees, technical units) at various levels of the bureaucracy, are trying to achieve just such effective horizontal and vertical collaboration (Camey et al n.d., Moyle and Pongtuluran 1992).

Box 16. The National Council for Literacy and Adult Education in Benin

In 1992 the Government of Benin created a formal structure of collaboration, the National Council for Literacy and Adult Education. This is a forum for meeting, listening, and exchanging and sharing experiences. It attempts to encourage collaboration and the creation of authentic partnerships among the different categories of actors who operate in the sector of education. The Council consists of members from:

1. governmental institutions, including nine different ministries (i.e., culture national education, planning, health, youth, finances, social affairs, rural development, and defense) and various technical units such as the Directorate of Literacy and district centres of literacy
2. technical co-operation agencies, including the Swiss, several UN agencies, donors represented by the World Bank, and technical co-operation NGOs; and
3. representatives of civil society, including district development associations, a national federation of NGOs operating in Benin, women's associations, and religious groups.

The purpose of the Council is to assure the collaboration of units of the different ministries involved in education and of all public and private organizations and associations concerned with literacy and adult education. Collaboration is encouraged both within each category (trans-sectoral) and across the different categories (intersectoral), and activities includes informing all partners about ongoing activities, soliciting their support and involvement, defining practical modalities of implementing national policies, and discussing constraints to such implementation.

Interaction, however, is not limited only to the central level. In fact, it appears more active and favourable to collaboration and Participation at the middle and local levels (down to the village and neighbourhood) which have put in place committees of literacy and adult education.

These committees are composed of representatives of the units of the various ministries, development organizations, and language groups and attempt to encourage greater intersectoral collaboration, define modalities of such collaboration at the local level, and activate local literacy groups. These committees also are meant to work closely with the men and women who have volunteered to become literate and who understand that the mastery of literacy can given them new capacities, skills, and aptitudes for survival and development.

Although there is some fear that the weight of the bureaucracy may constrain the dynamism of the committees (government officials are in charge of the committees down to the sub-prefecture level, and only village and neighbourhood committees have elected chairpersons), it is hoped that the various initiatives which are now developing at the lower levels of Benin society, often in isolated fashion, will be able to exploit the opportunities offered by this new mechanism of collaboration.

(Taken from *Collaborer pour changer l'education: la participation des familles et des communautes a l'amelioration de l'education de base en afrique occidentale francophone* by Irenee Zevounou.)

(ii) At the micro-level of the school and the community

In addition to the structures and mechanisms which can be established to encourage greater participation at the central level, others can be established or strengthened at the level of the school and the community. In many, if not most, countries of the world, various kinds of organizations exist which are meant at least to bring together parents of children in the same school, These organizations also often include teachers and sometimes representatives from the wider community surrounding the school as well. Such organizations differ greatly in terms of membership, mandate, and level of activity.

In the Philippines, for example, some schools have PTAs based on classrooms, grade levels, and the school itself; in Indonesia only organizations of parents are allowed to exist (except in its capital, Jakarta, where both parents and teachers may join the school association); and in Papua New Guinea boards of governors and of management also include representatives from other parts of the community.

In many countries, these organizations exist within some formal framework of laws and regulations which are meant to govern their structure and functions. A decade ago in the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil, for example, a 'Congress of Education' that consisted of a wide consultation of teachers, employees, students and parents made possible:

> "the organization of councils in the schools as an auxiliary instrument of their management. The council, which was a body belonging to a larger professional association made up of representatives from all the employees working in the school,

> parents, students and community groups, legally had advisory character and could deliberate on affairs regarding school life and its relationship with the community. Among other things, it could decide on school regulations, the timetable, curriculum planning and the attendance of the students. The presidency of the council belonged to the principal of the school and its members had to meet at least once a month...There were councils in which half the members were representatives of the teachers and the employees, and the other half of the students' parents, all of them elected". (Namo de Mello,1992:3).

Laws and regulations about such organizations may be up-to-date and reflect the current context of development, or they may be out-of-date and appropriate to conditions of many years ago. They may be quite specific in their definition of what the organization can or cannot do, or they may be very general in nature, allowing for considerable flexibility in their application. They may also be quite contradictory.

In Indonesia, for example, a regulation developed 20 years ago both prohibited teachers from being members of parent associations and discouraged parent associations (BP3) from getting involved in 'technically educational' issues - at that time reflecting concern for parental interference in pupil evaluation and promotion. Their role has therefore been largely limited to fund-raising. Partly as a result, many of the associations are weak and inactive:

> "Formally, the association's executive] committee is elected for one year, but many schools violate the rule by electing it for longer as they believe a one-year period is too short to implement its programmes. The BP3 should hold a general meeting at least twice a year, but this does not always occur owing to the large number of absentees. In practice, only a small percentage of parents attend these general meetings; most are too busy or have no interest in the function of such meetings. This is especially the case in schools of low socioeconomic status". (Moegiadi et al, 1992:2).

A new national education law in Indonesia now calls for strong partnerships of parents and teachers in school affairs, but relevant

regulations implementing this law and altering the previous rules have not yet been issued.

Such organizations cannot simply be set up by fiat and expected to flourish; they require, instead, animation, resources, and continuous recognition and support (Bray 1986, Bude 1985). They also require the development of an atmosphere conducive to wide, free, informal discussion, thus improving the chance that even illiterate, disadvantaged parents may be willing to participate in their activities. And essential to collaboration at the level of the school and community, is some kind of clearly defined community (by geography or social group) to which the school can relate.

Whatever the structure or mechanism chosen (preferably already existing ones), what is important is to have some regular, structured communication - a "public forum which serves as a clearing house for all collaborators to either air their views or contribute to the debate regarding their collaborative activities" (Namuddu, 1991 :45).

At the school-community level three types of structures and mechanisms can be identified which can help to encourage greater participation: (1) within and across schools, (2) between the school and parents, and (3) more generally between the school(s) and the community and local government.

(a) Mechanisms within and across schools

This kind of activity or organization is limited to the 'school community'; that is, those people involved in the school itself. This includes:

- regular staff meetings in schools,
- subject-specific panels or committees,
- local branches of teacher unions or associations able, for example, to run in-service training courses,
- various kinds of school discussion groups, teacher clubs, headmaster clubs, and teacher centres
- school clusters, with or without 'nuclear' or model schools and supporting cluster offices (such as in Thailand with full-time staff to assist in cluster activities)

School clusters of various kinds play an especially important role today in many education systems of the world, often providing both

economies of scale and helping to overcome the isolation of individual schools and teachers through collaboration across schools. Clusters in combination with teachers' clubs and resources centres are extensively used now in Indonesia. The so-called Active Learning/Professional Support (ALPS) project there has developed:

> "a working model of support by enhancing professional collaboration among educational personnel to continuously improve the quality of instruction in primary schools. Activities include in-service training as a regular feature of teachers' corporate lives. These are organized at the school level, and include school-based discussion and local/sub-district organizations such as teachers', principals' and supervisors' clubs, and teachers' centres. These allow local initiatives and active involvement of educational personnel in planning, implementing and evaluating in-service programmes".
>
> (Djam'an Satori, 1992).

Demonstration schools and 'micro-centres' in the Escuela Nueva programme in Colombia help both to disseminate the ideas of the programme and reinforce desired teacher behaviour across the schools in their 'cluster'. Clusters in Thailand are especially well-developed, with their own offices, co-ordinator, staff, and subject matter advisors, but many other models of clusters also exist (Box 17).

Box 17. The school cluster movement

Many countries around the world face conditions similar to those which led to the development of the cluster movement in Thailand and have responded by creating analogous organizational structures. Some of these conditions include: the existence of many small rural schools, each having insufficient resources for effective management; the disparities between small, remote schools and larger, in-town schools; a scarcity of educational supplies and equipment, so that individual schools cannot be self-sufficient; under-trained principals and staff; and a large *de facto* sphere of autonomy for individual schools from district, provincial and national efforts to promote greater accountability.

Given the shortage of resources at the national level to improve education and the inherent difficulties of stimulating improvement from district levels, which are often far removed from the level of individual schools, the school cluster creates an administrative organization closer to schools so that principals and teachers can be more involved in local efforts to improve quality. The school cluster movement, the administrative grouping of schools in close geographic proximity for educational purposes, has proven especially prominent in Latin America and has taken root on other continents as well. In Latin America, clusters are usually called 'nucleos'. Other names include 'complexes', 'zones' and school learning cells'.

School clusters share many common purposes:

- economic (sharing resources)
- pedagogic (staff development and curriculum improvement);
- administrative (accountability through testing and monitoring, reporting information to higher administrative authorities, acting as conduits for national policy to schools)- and
- political (raising awareness of problems of economic and social development and of government programmes to meet such problems, stimulating local involvement in and contributions to schools, and reducing inequalities by reducing the disparities in performance among schools).

School clusters differ in important respects as well. Some include only primary schools, such as in Papua New Guinea- others integrate primary with secondary schools, such as in Sri Lanka, India, Peru and Costa Rica. Clusters differ in terms of geographic coverage. In Thailand (primary) and Sri Lanka (primary and secondary), all schools are required by law to belong to a cluster- in Colombia and Guatemala, clusters have been introduced as part of initiatives for disadvantaged areas; in Darts of India,. cluster programmes have covered only schools that have chosen to join. Cluster size also varies. In Thailand between seven and ten schools make up a cluster; in India's Rajasthan State, school complexes contain up to five secondary schools and up to 25 primary schools.

In some systems, like Thailand, cluster officials are elected for fixed periods; in other countries the cluster head is appointed by the government and holds the position indefinitely. In terms of financing, some systems, such as Thailand's, are allocated both administrative staff and an extra budget- in others they are expected to subsist on existing resources. Where school clusters include all schools at the primary and secondary levels and perform the functions described above, they take on characteristics similar to those performed by local school districts in the USA. Where their authority is more limited, they represent more of a consortium for sharing resources, similar to the role of Intermediate school districts in some US states.

(Taken from *Improving basic education through collaboration and co - operation: school clusters in Thailand* by Christopher Wheeler et al.)

(b) School/parent/community activities

There are a variety of ways through which the school can open itself to parents and the community through specific activities rather than through organized associations. While relatively low on the range of participation (with parents largely an 'audience' at school-organized events), such activities might be useful in mobilizing parental interest in what is happening in school and as a first necessary step towards the evolution of greater and more meaningful participation. These include activities such as:

- open days, speech days, and sports days;
- explanations to parents of methods used in schools;
- parent observation of classes;
- school programmes seen as being of benefit to local social, cultural, and economic life (e.g., school libraries open to the community, as in the Escuela Nueva programme in Colombia);
- training parents in how better to assist and encourage their children at home.

(c) Structures between the school and parents.

These include *parent associations and parent-teacher associations.* These may be formed around individual classes, grades, and/or the entire school and may, depending on their mandate, have the power of a school management committee or a school board. Parent groups may also form into alumni organizations or private foundations in support of the school.

These organizations may do little more than provide a chance for a few interested parents to listen to news about school activities and appeals for additional resources or serve as a rubber-stamp to plans and budgets developed by school personnel. Or they may be considerably more active, helping to establish some kind of forum for dialogue between school and parents and a means to build and strengthen parental involvement in school life. Some of these, such as those developed through the Parent Learning Support System in the Philippines, may be based on classrooms, grade levels, or the school as a whole and, as in Brazil, may be part of much larger state-level federations. In the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil, school councils are made up of representatives of a larger school association of all school teachers and other employees,

parents, and students and empowered to decide on various school regulations, the timetable, curriculum planning, and student attendance policies (Namo de Mello 1992).

Thus, more than merely being money-raising agencies, such associations can also encourage the substantive involvement of parents in the school. Even in small schools with very small budgets, school committees can develop ways to utilize local labour, if not resources, for school improvement. They can also help to maintain student enrolment and discipline, help formulate school policy, and get involved in the development and adaptation of curriculum to local conditions so that context-specific factors and local expertise may be used. To do so, greater dialogue between the community and the school may be needed so that parents understand the need to improve the curriculum, clarify their needs and aspirations (perhaps after some collaborative information gathering process), and then, within any existing national guidelines, help in drafting new curricula (Commonwealth Secretariat 1980, Bude 1989, Adams 1978). This is precisely what occurs through local community workshops for curriculum adaptation in Guatemala (Camey et al n.d.).

Ultimately, perhaps, this kind of organization can become what has been called the 'school community' which "brings families and school personnel together for a central and noble purpose - to enhance the academic and personal development of the children they share" (Redding 1991:153). Such a community is based on several precepts:

- that children learn more, and more children remain in school to learn, when a sense of community prevails among families and school personnel;
- that school can create such a community bound together by attachment to a common institution and by adherence to explicit educational values;
- that a school council of the principal, teachers, and parents, nurtured through the education of parents and teachers, good school-home communication, common experience, and association, can adopt such values, transform them into goals, establish and define expectations for all community members, and help ensure that the practices of both families and school personnel are congruent with the values of the community (Redding 1991).

(d) School and community organizations: beyond the PTA

One argument against limiting partnerships to the school community itself is that these are difficult to sustain, especially after a particularly active cohort of parents withdraws from the organization when their children leave school. Such turnover may affect the continuity and strength of the organization. Another argument is that education should be seen as an integrated, location-specific whole, involving all sectors of the community in some shared responsibility and accountability for educational activities inside and outside of the school. Both of these arguments call for the inclusion of more 'stakeholders' in these organizations; that is, people from the surrounding community who are, or should be, concerned with the quality of schooling provided to, and received by, the community's children.

Such organizations may have different names and structures. They can be *a school management committee, a board of governors, or a school board.* Their members can be nominated representatives of important formal institutions in the community (such as local religious bodies, local government, and NGOs), individuals selected in some kind of community-wide election, or community members chosen as representatives of often less organized interest groups, such as women's organizations and traditional cultural societies. In Papua New Guinea every government school, primary and secondary, has a board of some kind with far-ranging authority over land and building provision and maintenance, student enrolment and discipline, school policy formulation, staffing, and quality control (Preston 1991). In the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil, school councils are made up of representatives of a larger school association of all school teachers and other employees, parents, and students and empowered to decide on various school regulations, the timetable, curriculum planning, and student attendance policies.

Any of these groups may have several functions (which may also be taken on by more limited PTAs):

- developing a general educational policy for the school;
- formulating annual programmes in terms of enrolment, retention, and achievement;
- supervising, maintaining, and improving school grounds and buildings (perhaps through contractual arrangements with village residents);

- making arrangements concerning joint use of school facilities;
- participating in the selection of principals and deputies;
- employing ancillary staff;
- administering grants and resources;
- mobilising additional resources (e.g., for teacher housing, extra classes for teachers);
- monitoring and evaluating ongoing programmes;
- generating and sustaining awareness among the village community, particularly of the non-participating segments of the population;
- serving as a channel for school accountability to the community;
- being a source of innovations and new ideas.

Bodies similar to these may have even broader responsibilities, however, and so may become more like *village education committees,* concerned not only with what goes on in the school but also with other educational programmes in the community such as adult literacy courses, kindergartens, early childhood care activities, and private schools. Such organizations have as a purpose to integrate more effectively and efficiently these various programmes so that they complement and mutually support, rather than ignore or even oppose, each other.

Village Education Committees established in Maharashtra State in western India are a good case of this (Box 18). These committees serve to co-ordinate activities of child recreation centres, women's development groups, non-formal and adult education centres, people's education houses, women animators' camps, and a child-to-child programme in health education (Naik 1992). Experience with these committees demonstrates the complex nature of the methods which can be used to encourage participation.

Box 18. Village Education Committees in the PROPEL Project in India

In 1979, in support of part-time, non-formal education (NFE), especially for rural areas where girls and children from the deprived sections of society generally remained without schooling, the Indian Institute of Education (IIE.) launched an action-research project on non-formal primary education in 100 villages. This was the first part, concluded in 1985, of a three-phase project.

In six years it generated an inter-related cluster of innovations covering curriculum, materials, pedagogical techniques, selection and training of teachers, monitoring, supervision, evaluation, and collaborative action among various agencies and community members.

In the second phase, the extent of community involvement was tested in two environmentally difficult areas: 20 villages in a drought-prone region and 15 small habitations situated in the hills. These areas were also educationally deprived because parents would not send girls to school. This phase emphasized establishing and strengthening Village Education Committees (VECs) as local motivators and managers of primary education. During the second phase, it became obvious that if the triple target of good enrolment, retention, and achievement was to be reached easily, several support interventions would be needed. Adult literacy was an obvious necessity, especially for women. Continuous education for all was also essential for creating a learning climate in the community. A demand for pre-school education and further education came from the VECs, primary teachers, youth groups and women's groups.

In the third phase, a comprehensive action-research project for universalizing primary and elementary education (the PROPEL project) was launched in a compact area of 137 villages and habitations in Pune District. Three types of environments (rain-fed, hilly with heavy rainfall, and drought-prone) are covered in this sample which contains a population of about 97,000 people in 18,000 households.

The name PROPEL (Promoting Primary and Elementary Education) implies moving faster towards the goal of universal primary education (UPE). In the village-level micro-planning approach adopted by the project the major programmes are: (a) coverage of drop-outs through NFE; and (b) increasing enrolment, retention and achievement in formal schools by concentrating on the improvement of the teaching-learning process in grades I and II.

In PROPEL, the role of women in the Panchayat (village council) and the VEC is particularly emphasized, with a view to promoting the participation of girls in primary education. In addition, collaboration of district and sub-district level officials and elected representatives is achieved through district, block, and 'circle' (sub-area) Advisory Committees. The major responsibility of the last is community mobilization for education and development. Its members also serve as resource persons for training, conducting community meetings, holding mobilization camps, and evaluating activities in the Panchayats.

Certain methods were adopted in the project to develop the conditions necessary for community involvement in analysing: (a) the nature of the primary education system; (b) possible alternatives manageable by the community with technical support from outside and human resource support from government and non-government individuals; and (c) the inter-linkages, both short-term and long-term, of UPE with activities for better

The methods consisted of: (a) participatory surveys and study of the educational status of each village, leading to preparation of systematic micro-plans by each Panchayat with guidance from project personnel; (b) involvement of secondary schools, the grass-roots personnel of government departments, and others in the informal planning activity; (c) Advisory Committees involving officials from the level of the Director of Education to that of the education (extension) officer; (d) political support of the idea of UPE through alternative channels; (e) inviting the Panchayats and other community organizations to actively engage in united action towards UPE; (f) enabling the community to organize youth groups, women's groups, children's squads, etc. to participate in overall village development, including formal and non-formal education; (g.) drawing together non-professional educated people from each village, in consultation with the villagers, and training them not just to teach but to study further for their own development- (h) selecting education co-ordinators (to be substituted at a future date for education inspectors in the education system) from the rural areas, known to the communities as 'their own people'; (i) intensively training education co-ordinators as agents for educational and social change; (j) concretizing the programme of establishing VECs; (k) mounting a support programme for UPE by setting up pre-schools, literacy groups and people's education houses, and holding orientation camps for women, youth and children; (l) preparing and providing well-designed training materials for the partner; (m) designing curricula and teaching-learning materials by inviting the community and other collaborators to check the cultural and developmental relevance of the content and suitability of language; and (n) allowing the formal school teachers and inspectors to gradually come under the impact of these activities to make the primary school more functional.

(Taken from *Promoting primary and elementary education in India* by Chitra Naik.)

A related experiment is the Community Forum for Educational Development in the COPLANER project in Indonesia. This is meant to include representatives of various kinds and levels of schools, local government, NGOs, religious groups, community associations, and government offices. Such education committees also often include representatives or minority or usually under-represented groups (such as women).

Thus, moving beyond the PTA and its limited focus on parental participation in this way brings one to a considerably more complex world of potential collaboration. Here appear links with schools and education activities at other levels (pre-schools, secondary schools,

literacy programmes); with NGOs and religious bodies (the temple, church, or mosque); with local councils or development committees and autonomous or council-appointed local education committees; and with officers and agencies of other sectors such as health and agriculture.

Here one also enters into the world of 'community schools' where the school becomes a genuine *community* facility, a centre where the community can learn and get something of quite direct benefit from the school. This can simply be education and training programmes for out-of-school youth and adults or care for pre-school children, but it can go further. Some primary schools in Thailand, for example, offer information and counselling services, lunch programmes, a co-operative store, and insurance - and schools elsewhere are able to help communities to build roads, organize religious festivals and cultural activities, share resources, offer instruction to adults, find alternative ways for dropouts to get certification, and provide ideas, leadership, and labour for development projects. Whatever the nature of services offered, such community schools usually need to work with local education committees and councils and agree on shared goals, responsibilities, resources, and complementarities of purpose. Thus, for example, the school staff might advise and assist the council with education and training activities in exchange for council and community assistance in maintaining the school, monitoring pupil attendance, supervising home study, and focusing special effort on children with learning difficulties.

To achieve such a relationship, "the most important step...to cultivate and promote good school-community relations [is to let] the school participate in the social, economic, and cultural life of the community" (Commonwealth Secretariat et al, 1992:52). This can include simple activities such as community clean-up campaigns and tree-plantings, or can be comprehensive as in the following case from Thailand where a strong relationship was created by a high achieving school with its surrounding community, including the temple.

> "Parents were more involved in school decisions, the curriculum of the school and, probably as a result of such involvement, contributed more to the school, both financially and in-kind services. School was a part of the community, not a separate government institution imposed on the community. Parents felt comfortable visiting the school whenever they

wished. They came to expect the school to educate their children and were willing to support the school in this endeavour. Similarly, the school developed close relationships with the abbot at the local temple. Children participated in religious ceremonies, often with teachers and parents. They would help clean temple grounds. The temple and the school would loan each other materials needed for various ceremonies, such as weddings and receptions, held on their respective grounds. The abbot would often officiate at school ceremonies and sometimes provide religious instruction in morals and ethics to students either in the school or in regular classes at the temple. The temple would contribute financially to the school. Finally both the principal and the teaching staff participated in local community activities, including religious ceremonies".

(Wheeler et al in Shaeffer,1992b:61).

At the extreme, the school-community committees and councils represent the kind of 'total community-oriented approach' discussed by Naik which discards "the selective, individual-target approach which has characterized most of the development programmes and which is totally antithetical to the community-ethos in the rural culture....The community approach fitted into the traditional ethos and revived the spirit of partnership inherent in the interdependent rural community structures" (1991:126-127).

(iii) Putting the mechanisms in place

The planner and decision-maker have a considerable task in the selection of an appropriate mechanism (or mechanisms) for encouraging greater school-community collaboration. In the analysis of the various models of school/parent/community partnerships from which a choice can be made, several basic issues become important to consider.

(a) *The extent of formality and institutionalization* in the organizations. Should they generally have their own bylaws, their own statutory identity, and their own powers, *inter alia,* to raise and disburse funds? Or might such formality discourage the participation of less

educated, more marginal parents, thereby giving the organization over to the control of the local elite?

(b) *The degree of actual participation (or intervention) in school activities.* Should such organizations merely advise or also consent? Only gaze at, or also support, school activities - or actually 'intervene' in affairs of the school by making and implementing decisions? Should they be a forum for listening, for discussion, or also for action?

(c) *The nature of the organization's accountability.* How should the utility of such an organization be measured: by the amount of resources raised, the number of meetings held, or the success of school improvement projects supported? Whom, in fact, does the organization represent, and to whom? Should it be designed primarily to represent the community's interests and transmit its opinions and feedback to the school - and therefore be accountable to the community for how well it does these tasks? Or should it act on behalf of the school, to report (and 'sell') news of the school to the community, to raise awareness of the school in the community, and to mobilize the community in support of the school - and therefore be accountable to the school and the education system?

(d) *The extent to which communities, almost as pressure groups, should be able to provide rewards for 'successful' schools and teachers and apply sanctions, formal or informal, on 'defaulting' schools and teachers.* Should the community, for example, be able to monitor and perhaps even discipline schools and teachers for low attendance, abuse of pupils, financial This-expenditures, poor examination results, etc.?

This leads to a difficult question: the extent to which communities, almost as pressure groups, should be able to apply sanctions, formal or informal, on 'defaulting' schools and teachers - for low attendance, abuse of pupils, financial mis-expenditures, poor examination results, etc. Boards of Management in Papua New Guinea, for example, can monitor teacher performance and initiate disciplinary action locally or through the provincial department of education (Preston 1991). This probably can done only with considerable caution, taking into account the particular

context and the need for a clear definition of responsibilities which could be the basis for such accountability and for clear procedures concerning how it would be exercised.

(e) *The role of the intermediate level of responsibility (sub-district and district) in the system.* This level plays a crucial role in any attempt to facilitate stronger partnerships. Given the range and number of schools this level has responsibility for, it must be able to help exchange information about collaborative activities across schools. Given its links to a wider community beyond that of a particular school, it must be able as well to identify a wider range of partners for schools and identify and lobby for a wider range of resources. Its involvement is especially critical in the development of village (or sub-district, or district) education committees, councils, or fora, and it can help to encourage both 'sides' of such fora - the schools and communities - to work more closely together.

This level is also very often a crucial mediator and channel of communication between the top and the bottom of the system. To the extent it performs this role well, passing information both up and down the system, it can assist in helping to clarify regulations about (and provide information about actual experiences with) community involvement in schools. And because this level of management is very often responsible for the administration of school clusters, it must develop procedures useful in clarifying cluster responsibilities, pushing them to be more active, and facilitating collaboration within clusters and between the clusters and the community.

Finally, this level also frequently has the authority to select, place, and promote teachers and principals, and perhaps to provide other special incentives as well; it can encourage greater collaboration in education by using it as a criterion for such personnel decisions.

Once these issues are decided, the planner and decision-maker can try to select the most appropriate and feasible model(s) of collaboration, whether they relate merely to the encouragement of school-community activities, more formal teacher or parent-teacher associations, or broader village education committees.

They will then need to define the desired structure and operations of the selected model(s), including:

- membership and the method of selecting members;

- the frequency and structure of meetings (e.g., who runs them and how parental participation can be encouraged);
- the statutory nature of the organizations;
- methods to ensure open dialogue, frank feedback, and clear channels of communication among the partners;
- the organization's desired reporting and accountability procedures (e.g., from the headteacher to the organization, from the organization to the local education office); and
- the tasks and functions, rights and responsibilities, and limitations of the organization.

In other words, should such organizations merely advise on policies or also consent to them? Only support, or also be able to 'gaze' at, school activities? Or actually 'intervene' in affairs of the school by making and implementing decisions?

Once these basic decisions are taken, other conditions and requirements for the establishment or strengthening of these organizations, and thus of school-community collaboration, will need to be made in terms of needed legislation; policies, procedures, and guidelines; resources; and training. These will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Chapter VII
Implications for planners

> "The involvement of parents and teachers in school governance should be viewed as a developmental sequence and one that requires support in terms of encouraging policies and procedures, time and money resources, and the knowledge and skills to be effective contributors to school decisions".
>
> (Gregg, 1989:10)

Two important and often fatal assumptions are frequently made by central planners and managers in the implementation of educational innovations. The first is that once designed as an apparently reasonable and feasible programme at the top of the system, the innovation, through various central regulations and guidelines, will automatically and systematically be implemented by schools and officials at the very bottom of the bureaucracy. But schools are part of a complex network of central, regional, and local interests; heavily dependent on complementary institutions and sub-systems (training colleges, examination systems, curriculum development centre); and only weakly linked, at the end of a long chain of command, to this bureaucracy. Such a 'loosely-coupled' relationship - as well as the natural resistance of institutions to change and the possible ill-fitting nature of the innovation itself - makes problematic the success of any top-down reform at the school level.

In reaction to the tenuousness of this assumption has arisen a second - that all change really must begin from the bottom and that the central Ministry can really do very little to influence what happens in schools and communities only loosely coupled to the top.

Both of these assumptions are largely false. The centre is neither omnipotent nor impotent. It cannot dictate change and reform but neither does it have only a negligible role to play in ensuring that change actually takes place. Rather, its principal tasks should be to:

- decide on general policies of system management and change (e.g. in regard to decentralization, school-based reform, partnerships);
- identify the essential system-wide components of proposed changes (e.g. the desired nature and mandate of parent-teacher associations) and the components able to be adapted to local conditions (e.g. membership and selection processes for such associations); and
- create a framework of legislation, procedures, guidelines, training programmes, and resources strong enough and comprehensive enough to facilitate and make possible, if not necessarily to guarantee, the implementation of the desired reforms. Such a framework is particularly necessary for innovations as fundamental as the enlarging and strengthening of partnerships between schools and communities.

Carrying out such a process is not an easy task. Several things must happen at the same time to make more likely the successful implementation of change and, in our case, the successful introduction of a feasible model of school and community partnerships. First, it is necessary to define the specific norms and resources and the knowledge, attitudes, and skills which must be developed at the *local* level, by local officials, in order to promote such a model. It is especially critical for central-level planners to understand the nature of the norms which must be developed at this level, as well as the constraints to promoting them, if these planners wish to develop feasible policies and guidelines to encourage greater participation and stronger partnerships.

It is then necessary to identify the actions which the central planner must take - legislation, policies, procedures, guidelines, training, financing - in order both to develop greater collaboration at the central Ministry level and then to encourage and permit the required changes at the local level. The following sections of this chapter describe the kinds of actions which can be taken by central planners at both of these levels.

1. Legislation, policies, and procedures

> "Make sure that all new projects and programmes include, by design, the participation and horizontal relationships of the direct beneficiaries, and the technical, moral, or financial support of other social actors such as grassroots groups, church and non-governmental organizations, producer associations,

communal action boards as well as other potential collaborators, supporters, or partners., One important lesson of [Escuela Nueva]..is that the participation of students, parents, teachers, administrators is of the essence of the system"
(Arboleda, 1992:81).

(i) By the central level, for the central level

At the level of the central government, a variety of policies and procedures can be implemented to develop more collaborative and participatory processes of government. They include the following:

(a) Procedures and guidelines can be developed which ensure greater inter-sectoral and inter-departmental collaboration in education, in areas such as the development of long-term education development programmes, Education For All plans, etc. Such collaboration might lead to joint planning for educational activities among ministries such as education, health, agriculture, labour, and social welfare, especially in areas such as early childhood education, vocational training, health education, and agricultural extension. This might include government sponsorship of research institutions which specialize in participatory development.
(b) Legislation, policies, and practices concerning the role of NGOs, community associations, teacher organizations, and private schools in the national education system can be reviewed to ensure that their efforts as partners in the improvement of basic education are encouraged and perhaps assisted. Thus, "to the extent that there is a legal framework provided by the constitution, the legislative body, or the plans of an administration promoting collaboration within the given levels of the system or with other actors in the environment, such collaboration may take place" (Arboleda, 1992:66). Such legislation, for example, might make explicit that education is a shared responsibility of government and communities; relevant regulations might then mandate the establishment and implementation of parent-teacher associations in every school.
(c) Intra-ministerial collaboration may also be encouraged to ensure that various units of the Ministry (e.g. the Curriculum Development Centre, teacher training colleges, staff development colleges, etc.)

support new policies related to participation. The issue is how new policies relating to 'partnerships' can be adopted and 'owned' not only by the original proponent (the research and development centre, the directorate of primary education) but also by other parts of the Ministry.

(d) Policies in regard to personnel management and training at the central level, in order to encourage the development of more collaborative practice in the bureaucracy, can also be introduced.
These might include:

- sponsoring efforts to establish professional associations which reinforce and give greater legitimacy to development professionals who are interested in participation (e.g., a credential for extension agents who are practitioners of popular participation);
- the development of new career reward structures, linking them more to outcomes related to participation; and
- the exchange of personnel between government departments and NGOs, such as 'sabbaticals' to permit government personnel to live in developing rural or urban communities (Dichter, 1992).

(e) The national media, especially print and radio, addressed both to officials at lower levels of the bureaucracy and to the general population (e.g., via soap opera type programmes and logo/slogans), can be encouraged to reinforce participation in development activities by creating greater awareness of people's involvement in their own development (Dichter, 1992). Such media were used in Minas Gerais to explain to parents throughout the state the importance of attending headteacher selection assemblies, discussing the work plans of the candidates, and participating in the election (Namo de Mello 1992).

(ii) By the central level, for the school and community

Actions can also be taken at the central level for the sake of encouraging a context more supportive of participation at the micro-level.

These include many significant decisions in regard to the system's general approach to planning and administration.

The first relates to national, system-wide policies and guidelines concerning: (1) desired levels and types of decentralization to, and autonomy for, district offices, clusters, and schools, and (2) the desired role of teachers, parents, and the community in various areas such as needs assessment, school governance, and the instructional process. Here it is necessary to define whether and how much local adaptation and variation to allow in implementing central policies. In other words, what is the 'hybrid' of management and the most appropriate division of responsibility in regard to the implementation of these policies among national provincial, regional, district, and school levels? What is the essential 'core' or minimum requirements of the model of collaboration selected (i.e. which must be safeguarded at all costs, through efforts of the central government)? And what aspects are subject to flexibility and adaptation (e.g. over time or from site to site) by other levels of management?

Thus, for example:

- In Zambia, the so-called SHAPE teacher centres are part of government policy to encourage collective responsibility for professional development among teachers, administrators, and inspectors. Centres at various levels of the government have been given particular responsibilities for the implementation of this policy, with considerably authority for professional development remaining at the school level.
- New policies in Guatemala and in Rajasthan (India) permit considerable adaptation of central curriculum through the participation of local NGOs and communities (Camey et al n.d., Methi et al, 1991).
- School clusters in Indonesia are allowed, even encouraged, to develop and alter components of the innovation to make them more suitable to local needs.
- While operating within certain guidelines issued by the sponsoring agency, the schools established in BRAC (Bangladesh) and PROPEL (India) communities are permitted to be quite different in organization, staffing, and schedule, even to the extent of the community being able to hire its own teachers and headmasters (Latif, 1991; Naik, 1991).

Such systems seem able to respond flexibly to the needs and context of individual communities, clusters, and schools and to move towards both a clear division of labour and responsibility among various levels of the system and clear patterns of expected behaviour and tasks among the various actors in education. Even more might be done in this regard. Naik indicates that to accelerate a collaborative enterprise, it "would have to be released from antiquated financial rules and centralized administrative authority" (1991:129), thus releasing as well "grass-roots level officials from their bondage" to the central system (Naik, 1991:126).

The second set of actions to be taken at the central level in order to encourage greater collaboration at the micro-level, within and across schools and with the community, include policies and procedures related to:

(a) the nature, structure, responsibilities, and functions of parent-teacher associations, school management committees, and/or village education committees;
(b) the possible implementation of a system of school clusters;
(c) the involvement of the community in issues related to needs assessment, governance, and the instructional process;
(d) the development of handbooks or manuals outlining the various roles of whatever kinds of associations and committees are established, such as a handbook outlining the roles and functions of Boards of Management/Governors developed in Papua New Guinea (Department of Education, Papua New Guinea, 1991:12);
(e) the possible hiring of teachers in their communities of origin, on the assumption that one problem in encouraging school-community relationships is the fact that many teachers often do not come from, or live in, their school's community and that local teachers are more likely to remain in their communities (e.g. by admitting underqualified applicants from these communities into teacher education programmes and providing them remedial training as required);
(f) mechanisms (e.g. routine school questionnaires, reports of the inspectorate, etc.) to monitor the establishment and functioning of school and community organizations by adding data regarding partnerships into the Ministry's ongoing management information system; and

(g.) the development and use of a personnel assessment system which rewards personnel (promotions, salary increases, etc.) for working with other partners and mobilizing parental and community involvement in schools.

This last item is at least one criterion for assessment in the 'capacity-building' approach of the Thai clusters, and was the basis as well for the selection of participants in both domestic and foreign training programmes held in conjunction with the Indonesian professional support programme (Shaeffer 1992b). Gibson and Iamo urge that teacher inspections in Papua New Guinea "be broadened to include the teacher's effectiveness as a mediator between the community and the classroom" (1991:186), and Naik suggests strongly that something similar be done in India. "The whole system of performance assessment of officers and teachers at the field level needs drastic changes . At pre sent, performance norms are based on achievement of numerical targets and not on action to mobilize people for self-development" (1991:38).

(iii) At the school and community level

Under more decentralized conditions, and based on the policies and procedures established at the centre, methods can also be developed at the micro-level of the school and community which lead to greater collaboration among teachers and with headmasters and supervisors; to more systematic communication and interaction with parents and the community; and to more community consultation and collaborative planning in regard to the development and revision of school goals and objectives and the implementation of school programmes (UNICEF 1982, Bude 1989, Fullan 1985). Schools or local district offices (as well as other levels of the system), for example, can encourage:

(a) more regular, open-ended staff meetings in school permitting, for example, the more collaborative planning of school-improvement strategies;

(b) in large enough schools, the sharing of administrative responsibilities with teaching staff (e.g., as committee chairs, in charge of discipline and guidance) and even with students and members of the community in areas such as communication, discipline, and school sanitation;

(c) professional development activities attended by parents as well as teachers and administrators including the training required for members of parent and community associations (e.g., on budget planning and bookkeeping);
(d) guidelines to ensure both better candidates as officers of parent associations and the clearer accountability of headmasters to the associations in regard to the utilization of financial contributions; (e) mechanisms for developing collaboration in tasks such as writing community profiles and surveying local needs, setting goals and priorities, mobilising and managing resources, selecting and monitoring teachers, setting timetables and calendars, developing curricula, assisting in teaching and tutoring, helping to guarantee pupil enrolment and continuation, and monitoring student and school performance and the achievement of goals; and
(f) the development of school improvement plans to assist schools to reflect on total practice and improve the learning of all students.

The important thing in all of this process is to ensure transparency and clarity, This requires the following:

- clear, but flexible guidelines, rules, and frameworks for collaboration and participation;
- open dialogue, frank feedback, and clear channels of communication and information transfer among the participants;
- for each of the participants, clearly defined (and written) policies, guidelines, and parameters regarding tasks and functions, rights and responsibilities, limitations and resources, procedures and formats for reporting and accounting; and
- "the regular conduct of meetings and programmed activities for parents and community members...coherent work flow, functions and responsibilities that are consistently required of the participants, who need to be informed exactly when, what, and how they should contribute to the...activities taking place in the school" (Carino; Valisno, 1992:8).

2. Resources

As resources "arrive at their destinations, local people have to make decisions as to how they are to be managed....local

> elders, including NGOs and women, have to get together to reach agreement on and monitor the various allocation options. While initially the local elites may get the better part of the bargain owing to traditional attitudes of deference to wealth and authority, with time and effective training in organizational skills, the poorer and more powerless groups begin to speak out". (Racelis, 1992:8).

Legislation, policies, procedures, and guidelines supportive of greater participation will do little good without at least some minimal level of resources. The resources required specifically for the establishment and strengthening of school/parent/community organizations can vary as greatly as the nature of the organizations themselves. The scope of needed financial resources, in particular, will depend largely on two issues: (1) the extent to which funds may be required to make such organizations viable and to make parental and community participation both feasible and attractive, and (2) the extent to which such organizations are given the authority to formulate budgets and spend money.

Of special concern is whether funding is needed to ensure that these organizations get established in the first place, and then function with some degree of effectiveness. This will depend a great deal, of course, on the economic condition of the community. In general, the more desperate the condition is and the more occupied parents and the community (as well as school personnel) are with simply surviving, the more difficult it will be to develop time- and energy-consuming partnerships. This will be especially the case where such partnerships are seen largely as ways to extract additional resources from the community. To the extent that school-community collaboration leads to some genuine sense of 'ownership' and clear evidence of efficacy (i.e., parental involvement is seen as leading to better pupil and teacher attendance, more satisfied pupils, a healthier school compound), parents may be willing to spend their limited free time (and perhaps more resources) on school activities.

The funds or other resources that may be required at the local level for establishing and animating local organizations include the following:

- expenses for the organization's meetings (refreshments, lighting, announcements, publication and distribution of reports, transport, etc.);
- fees for the organization's officers and school personnel overtime;
- training or professional development activities for parents and community members;
- activities designed to strengthen interaction between school and community members (e.g., open days, sports days, field trips); and
- project and programme money (for the various activities implemented by the organizations).

In order to pay for such expenses, there must be some guarantees that local governments, schools, and communities have their own sources of finance (e.g., from the central government, local tax revenues, or voluntary contributions). This might include allocating additional resources directly to individual schools and/or communities, as is being done, for example, to many of the schools in the 900 Schools project in Chile and in the COPLANER project in Indonesia - in both cases on the basis of a competition among schools in regard to school improvement proposals. While some government may be able to provide additional funding for these kinds of activities, others, suffering financial constraints, may need to consider re-allocating funds from national to more local programmes, beginning with a reduced set of possible activities for local schools and associations, and/or concentrating on particular regions of the country.

3. Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours

> "It would be wrong to force through a policy of decentralization before the demonstrated capacities to act responsibly and to exercise initiative are there. Obviously, precise guidelines, clear manuals, and appropriate training are essential".
> (Department of Education, Papua New Guinea, 1991:11)

> "It is not skill or knowledge in an academic subject but attitude of the programme personnel which is really important. The

> development workers must believe in people's participation was a strategic input in the development process. They must have faith in the capacity of the people and their role in development. They must believe that democratic methods are necessary for operationalization of participatory programmes. They must develop the attitude of working with the people rather than working for the people". (Abed, 1992:8)

A change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours - the instilling of new capacities, roles, and values - is essential for the effective operation of new and reformed mechanisms and strategies (Hollnsteiner, 1982; Allen, 1982; Bhasin, 1979; Roy, 1984; Rondinelli et al, 1990). Training which can produce such outcomes needs to focus on developing the basic norms discussed above: a commitment to institutional openness and adaptability; to collaboration and participation across actors in education, especially of the community; to some greater devolution of control to, and autonomy for, other partners and more joint, multi-sectoral procedures, at all levels of the system; a greater willingness to become facilitators rather than controllers of development; and the sensitization of staff to encourage the internalization of these norms.

As one observer notes, "the task of educating the communities toward participation is less difficult than that of educating administrators to accept it as a strategy" (Allen, 1982:2). There is thus the need to retrain government officials - administrators, politicians, technocrats, fieldworkers, and extension agents - to become what has been called 'social development managers'. These are people who need a capacity to take on "new roles as collaborators in innovations as opposed to enforcers of regulations" (Williams, 1992:57) - not only "to break a problem down into its components, but also to view it in context - to examine the characteristics of the system in which it is embedded; to be comfortable with diversity, multiplicity, simultaneity, uncertainty, and paradox; to pursue complex strategies involving multiple outcomes and simultaneous facilitating actions; to sense where there is harmony or 'fit' between two or more elements of a system and where there is discord; and to identify where, when, and how to intervene to improve fit or to generate a desired tension" (Korten, 1981a:218-219).

There is a variety of skills related to these capacities, both skills more generally needed to encourage participatory approaches to

development and more specifically for those at lower levels of the education system and in schools and communities themselves. Many of these are the characteristics of good managers anywhere. Others, however, are particularly important for the encouragement of greater participation in education and therefore need to become the focus of specific pre-service and in-service training programmes.

1. The more *general skills relating to participation* include:

a) the ability to work collaboratively with people; that is, to be:
   - able to listen and give credit to the views and needs of others;
   - willing to share plans, procedures, and information openly and, especially, laterally;
   - tolerant both of conflict, dissent, and compromise and of active behaviours from active partners (rather than the usual passive 'recipient');
   - willing to see knowledge as residing in both professionals and beneficiaries; and, especially,
   - willing and able to respond especially to the needs, knowledge, and experience of women - those often most marginal to development processes but most critical to the development of education.

b) the ability to focus on process rather than on final products; to reflect, re-examine, explore alternatives and confront novel situations; to revise plans and adjust to changing conditions; and to accept the necessity of trial and error, a slower pace of development, and the complexity and uncertainty of change (UNICEF 1986, NFE Exchange, 1981).

More specifically, at the national level, the objectives and activities of orientation and training with respect to collaboration, participation and partnerships could include the following:

- direct observation and discussion of successful collaboration or partnerships within the system or with other actors, including parents and community members, NGOs, producer associations, grassroots organizations, text-book companies or specialized agencies of other sectors;

- familiarization with the main recommendations of the WCEFA regarding the expanded vision of education; and
- familiarization with the norms concerning educational innovations, the policies and priorities of the development plans, and the official literature on decentralization and municipalization with particular reference to education (Arboleda, 1992).

2. *Officials at lower ends of a bureaucracy* (supervisors, inspectors, teachers and teacher trainees) have a particular need for skills in their role as 'extension or change agent' and also as "links between national agencies and their communities in such areas as health, agriculture, commerce, and youth affairs. [They] need to see their role as intermediaries as an integral part of their jobs and critical to their success in developing a mutually supportive relationship between school and community" (Gibson; Iamo 1991:180). But the work of such agents is very complicated. They need to share loyalties between officials above and clients (parents and pupils) below, to divide their sense of responsibility and accountability in many directions, and to decide whom they represent to whom.

Such officials, responsible for developing and monitoring the growth of school-community collaboration, also need particular skills in a number of areas:

(a) the preparation and utilization of village profiles for the assessing of educational needs;
(b) the estimation, allocation, and administration of resources devolved to their level, or collected at their level, for school-community activities; and
(c) the analysis, evaluation, and screening of school improvement proposals or other school-community plans.

3. Skills in schools

> "...building-level educators are expected to work as partners with parents heretofore considered as clients, or at best, passive participants in the educational process. Not only does this 'new' working relationship mean developing different frames for thinking about the parent role in education, but it also

> requires new or expanded knowledge, understanding, skill, and experience in collaborating with parents....parent involvement must be the 'warp and woof' of any programme fabric to improve student achievement and to enhance education. This suggests that both teachers/administrators and parents will need to adopt new attitudes, approaches, roles and responsibilities regarding parent involvement. We need to train teachers and administrators in the facilitating of increased learning and school success through parent involvement".
>
> (Williams, 1991:339, 340-341)

Certain knowledge, attitudes, and skills (and educational and career status) are particularly required of school personnel (especially of principals) in order to ensure the effective operation of the mechanisms and strategies designed to facilitate greater collaboration within and across schools and with communities.

One writer has analyzed these as relating to three kinds of 'frameworks':

- conceptual framework - theories, research, history, and developmental nature of parent involvement;
- personal framework: teachers' knowledge about parents' beliefs and values, their understanding of the school, their comprehension of the diversity within the community, importance of individual differences among parents; and
- practical framework - various models of parents involvement, effective methods, interpersonal communication skills, potential problems in developing parent involvement programmes. (Williams, 1991:349).

More specifically, the skills required at the school level include:

(a) knowledge of local conditions (e.g., economic and cultural) which influence educational demand and achievement, of local social and political relationships and organizations, of the dynamics of the communities in which they work, and of the local education system and its problems. The Escuela Nueva programme in Colombia, for example, trains teachers on how to prepare a community map, an

agricultural calendar, and, with students and parents, a monograph about the local community (Arboleda, 1992);

(b) simple research and planning skills: the ability to facilitate and carry out community-based surveys, studies, and interviews, to analyze the data collected, and to organize and implement the micro-planning of school and cluster needs;

(c) attitudes and behaviour which encourage an open, transparent, collegial environment in the school and open channels of communication and interaction between the school and the community (e.g., frequent and open meetings with other staff and parents);

(d) school management skills - the ability to:
- encourage shared, more participatory decision-making, in regard to issues such as assessing needs, setting school goals and planning school programmes, carrying out school operations, collecting and managing resources, designing the instructional programme, evaluating success, etc. (a management style of 'inclusion' (Cummings et al 1992);
- define clearly the policies, practices, and expectations of the school and the responsibilities and functions of each participant;
- plan, organize, conduct, and report on meetings;
- manage and account for government and community resources provided to the school;
- encourage teachers and the community to assist in developing and adapting curriculum relevant to the local environment; and

(e) supervisory and leadership skills: the ability to develop more collaborative skills in other school personnel and within the community and delegate responsibilities to other staff;

(f) human relations skills: the ability to gain the trust of parents, NGOS, and other partners in the community; to communicate, collaborate, and build consensus with them; and to animate them and encourage activities which promote student welfare and strong school-community relations - a 'client orientation' (Cummings et al 1992);

(g) resource mobilization skills, and strategic and political skills: the ability to mobilize resources from the various interest groups and power centres in the community; and

(h) skills to animate and guide school-community organizations.

The last is especially important:

> "The professional literature on effective schooling indicates that a greater involvement of lay people in school management usually produces improvements in the cognitive and affective development of children. Consequently, school effectiveness in the future will be influenced by how successful school councils and governing bodies function. If parents, teachers, and members of the public, who become involved in school affairs, do not receive adequate and on-going in-service, school management will be reduced to a 'muddling through' decision-making activity" (Holt and Murphy n.d.:l).

> "[There are] two dimensions of group capacity: the first is learning now to manage resources collectively, or the 'internal' dimension, while the second is learning how to negotiate with and make claims on the government, banks, and other power holders, or the 'external' dimension....Common to both dimensions is the capacity to work effectively as a group, interact democratically, reach a consensus, manage conflict, limit corruption and free-ridership, and forge networks.

It will likely be the teachers and headteachers of a given community who will need to ensure that the local groups involved in education have such skills, both internal (planning and goal setting, resource mobilization and management, conflict management, information and data management) and external (understanding the external environment, making external linkages and alliances, mobilizing for claim-making, and negotiating with the government) (Carroll 1992: 6). This will require the training of parents in skills for involvement in more participatory activities. "Parental involvement is a developmental process that must evolve over time with the traditional activities of audience, home tutor and school programme supporter at the beginning of the continuum, and with shared educational decision-making at the other end" (Williams D. 1991:350). Thus, training can begin in the areas of discipline or behaviour management, to become home tutors with their children, to see

that homework is completed, and to understand better specific issues of child development and mental health and then move on to the skills needed for greater responsibility in school governance and teaching and learning

(iv) Training methods

Several methods might be useful first in sensitizing higher-level officials to the development of relevant norms: well-chosen case studies concerning the role of collaboration in solving educational problems; the dissemination of information about successful experiences elsewhere in the world; the implementation of policy seminars on these issues; and the development of high-level task forces and pilot projects using more participatory and collaborative approaches. There should also be more joint, multi-sectoral training programmes with participants from various levels, sectors, and partners in development (including articulate 'guides' from local communities). These should be implemented both horizontally (with participants from different sectors, at a particular level) and vertically (from various levels of the same sectors). Thus, training programmes or national seminars on a particular issue could include participants from the top of a ministry down to the community levels.

These programmes should lead not only to more technical expertise and more efficient systems - nor even only to better analyses of development problems and more appropriate interventions. They should lead also to a greater understanding of the need for the transfer of some control over development processes to actors lower down, and even outside of, the government system and to a more useful mix or 'hybrid' of responsibilities among these actors in the development process.

At lower levels of the system, it should be clear that these kinds of attitudes and skills cannot be taught in the traditional top-down, 'cascade' style of teacher upgrading and principal training. The training itself will need to be more participatory, experiential, and based on practical experience, with the trainees (perhaps including community or school committee members) playing a more active role in self-analysis identifying needs, discussing and solving problems, and evaluating results (Bhasin 1979). Several specific suggestions can be made in this regard:

(a) simulation games designed to develop collaborative skills in tasks such as setting goals and designing alternative means of reaching these goals;
(b) role plays of parent-teacher conferences and meetings (e.g. PTA meetings) designed to gain a consensus, resolve conflicts, divide responsibility for solving a particular problem, and encourage collaboration;
(c) case studies of collaborative experiences in order to examine what was achieved or not achieved and why;
(d) practical exercises, including preparing meeting agendas, proposals for school-community action, and minutes; keeping records and accounts of school-community activities; and encouraging group dynamics (e . g. , stimulating active participation in group activities through task assignments, discussions, and reporting the results of group work);
(e) training in interviewing techniques, questionnaire design, and the analysis and interpretation of resulting data;
(f) actual experience in collaborative projects, and perhaps in the observation of successful collaborative activities; and
(g) guidebooks, handbooks, manuals, etc., providing guidelines on specific topics (e.g. how to carry out village surveys, how to conduct meetings and animate PTAs, how to delegate tasks and evaluate results, and how to analyze and overcome the passivity of long-ingrained poverty (Bray, 1987).

Such training could obviously benefit from a range of materials (videos, games, case studies) and activities (simulations, role-playing, brainstorming, parent-teacher dialogues) considerably different from that found in most upgrading courses, and therefore requiring special expertise and careful preparation and testing.

In order to organize the training required for developing more participatory approaches to educational development, planners and managers - taking into account their country's particular financial and administrative constraints - will need to define the priority target groups to be trained, including:

(a) parents and community members, in areas such as the importance of schooling, knowledge and skills relating to child development, discipline and management of children's behaviour, encouragement of children to attend school and complete homework assignments,

and, where possible, assistance provided to children in their school work; and

(b) teachers, headteachers, inspectors, and other local education officials, in areas such as being able and willing to work more collaboratively with other local actors.

They will then need to define the desired knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for strengthening partnerships at the local level (for example, from those outlined above), organize the design of appropriate training materials and methods, and enlist the support of pre-service and in-service training programmes and institutions and the ministerial staff development 'college' in the development and use of these materials.

In summary, innovators concerned with facilitating greater teacher and community participation in school improvement must have a particular competence in over to innovate - knowledge of what to do, skills to do it, and a willingness to experiment, fail, and try again. In the most successful of education reforms, such competence has been available. Well-trained, experienced, and politically astute animators know how to work with community groups and parents and how to gain the support of political and administrative figures, and people in certain critical government positions are willing to trust and work with otherwise suspect NGOs. In the best of such reforms, headmasters, teachers, district officers, and cluster staff have learned how to work in flexible, collegial, and supportive ways - to adopt a 'mindset' more democratic and less bureaucratic in nature. They have learned to accept new ideas, use knowledge of good practice that already existed (instead of trying to impose knowledge from above), and seek the help of teachers and the community in the assessment of needs and the design of alternative solutions.

3. Institutional change

The changes required within systems to make them genuinely and enduringly supportive of greater participation by the various partners in development cannot be brought about merely by the occasional and short-term training or upgrading of administrative staff. Such training leading to new knowledge, skills, and attitudes - is an essential but not sufficient condition for organizational change. It must be accompanied by intensive, longer-term, more experiential exposure to new ways of

analysing problems, designing possible solutions, and acting on them and then, in many cases, by the re-organization of the bureaucracy itself.

Thus, this summary of the potential mechanisms and strategies by which collaboration within and across schools, and between the school and the community, can be encouraged, and the skills and knowledge required to do so leads to a very important further question: how can these mechanisms and strategies, these skills and knowledge, and the longer-term change which would sustain them be institutionalized within often large, inefficient, and conservative bureaucracies? This is the much larger question of how to change bureaucracies and the culture which supports them. How can they be made more willing to adapt and adopt some new forms of work behaviour - more professional and less bureaucratic, more open and permeable to new ideas, less rigid and more participatory in their work, and more supportive of bottom-up planning?

Several ideas can be explored in this regard:

1. the possible intervention of creative high-level administrators committed to change;
2. the staggered, large-scale training of staff, followed by some reinforcement through specific projects in which new skills and attitudes can be tried out;
3. a support system of some kind to continue to encourage and help those newly trained in performing their tasks differently; and
4. the establishment of a 'think tank' - an autonomous, innovative commission, under the Minister perhaps, charged with exploring creative ways to resolve problems in the bureaucracy.

There is also what is called the 'learning process approach' (Korten 1981), where programme development progresses through stages in which the focal point is the bureaucracy's successively learning first to be effective and then to be efficient.

> "This approach is opposed to the centralized bureaucratic planning and blueprint approach. Here development programming starts with a small project where the people and project personnel share their knowledge and resources to create a programme. The process emphasizes developing the capacity of the people and assisting people's organizations to grow. At the initial stage there may be errors which can gradually be removed through a learning process approach. The next stage

> is expansion or larger scale operations. As the organizational capacity increases, management systems develop, and a cadre of workers get trained, the programme can be expanded to wider areas effectively and efficiently". (Abed,1992:6)

In summary, there is evidence from current practice that collaboration and partnerships can lead - under certain conditions - to more effective and relevant education, greater equity of such education, greater demand for and acceptability of education, and more resources for education. There are mechanisms and strategies of a wide range which can be established to assist in this effort - an effort made easier by the extent to which there are clear, systematic outlines of the functions, goals, and responsibilities of the various collaborating partners and clear accountability mechanisms up, down, and across the system. There are also new kinds of knowledge and skills about collaboration and in regard to shared decision-making, needs analysis, budgeting and planning, etc., which can be developed, as well as very practical skills such as how to hold meetings. And there are methods to sensitize higher levels of a bureaucracy to the potentials and practice of educational partnerships, training materials and methods which themselves are more participatory in nature, and specific manuals to assist the newly trained in carrying out their work. The task now will be to see how and under what conditions such training can be carried out, and whether it can bring about the changes in organizational norms, mechanisms, skills, and behaviour required to facilitate the greater participation of teachers and the community in school improvement.

References

Abed, F.H. 1992. Promoting popular participation: some issues. Paper presented at the World Bank Workshop on Participatory Development, World Bank, Washington, D.C., February 26-27.

Abreu de Armengol, M. No date. Non-formal and alternative approaches to provide primary level education for out-of-school children. Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Adams, R. S. 1978 . *Educational planning: towards a qualitative perspective.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Aggarwal, Y. 1992. Education for All: internal efficiency and community participation - the Indian experience. Paper presented at the SAARC Workshop on Educational planning and management, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

Allen, J. 1982. Some operational issues relating to community participation. *Notes, comments...child, family, community,* N.S. 102, Paris, UNESCO.

Anderson, M.B. 1988. *Improving access to schooling in the Third World: an overview.* Series No. 1, BRIDGES Research Report, Cambridge, Harvard University.

Anello, E. 1991. NGOs in Latin America. Occasional Paper Series: Non Governmental Organizations, Centre for International Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Annis, S. 1987. Can small-scale development be a large-scale policy? The case of Latin America. In: A.G. Drabek *(ed.), Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs,* supplement to *World Development,* Vol. 15, pp. 129-134.

Arboleda, J. 1992. Participation and partnership in the Colombia Escuela Nueva. Manuscript. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Arnstein, S.R. 1976. A ladder of citizen participation. In: E. Ingram and R. McIntosh (eds.), *Adaptive Processes in Educational Organizations,* Edmonton, University of Alberta.

Bernard, A.K. 1990. Learning and intervention: The informal transmission of the knowledge and skills of development. Paper presented at the World Conference on Education for All, Thailand. Ottawa, International Development Research Centre.

Bernard Van Leer Foundation. 1990. Newsletter. No. 57, January.

Bhasin, K. 1979. *Breaking barriers: The South Asian experience of training for participatory development.* Bangkok, Food and Agricultural Organization.

Bhatnagar, B. 1990. Lessons learned: Non-Governmental Organizations and World Bank-Supported Projects in Asia. Washington, D.C., World Bank.

Bhatnagar, B. 1992. 21 priority questions for the Bank-wide learning process on popular participation. Paper presented at the World Bank Workshop on participatory development, World Bank, Washington, D.C., February 26-27.

Bloomer, K. 1991. Decentralising the education system. Commonwealth Secretariat Program. Paper presented to the Commonwealth Secretariat/Zimbabwe Ministry of Education and Culture Teacher management meeting, Kadoma.

Bond-Stewart, K. 1992. The Community Publishing Process in Zimbabwe. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change in Non-formal Education.* Report of an IIEP Seminar. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Bray, M. 1986. *New Resources for Education: Community Management and Financing of Schools in Less Developed Countries.* London, Commonwealth Secretariat.

____, 1987. *School Clusters in the Third World: Making Them Work.* Paris, UNESCO-UNICEF Co-operative Programme.

Brownlea, A. 1987. Participation: Myths, Realities and Prognosis. *Social Science and Medicine,* Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 605-614.

Bude, U. 1989. *Developing Instructional Materials for African Primary Schools.* Bonn, German Foundation for International Development.

____*1985. Primary Schools, Local Communities, and Development in Africa.* Baden-Baden, German Foundation for International Development.

____, 1989 (ed.). *The Challenge of Quality in Primary Education in Africa.* Bonn, German Foundation for International Development.

Bugnicourt, J. 1982. Popular Participation in African Development. In: *Assignment Children,* UNICEF, Vol. 2, No. 59/60, pp. 57-77.

Caillods, F. 1991. The Local Dimension of Education and Training and the Role of Educational Planning. Paper presented at the conference on Education and Training in the Third World: The Local Dimension, Hornbaek, Denmark, October 3-5, 1991.

Camey, R.; et al. n.d. SIMAC: A System for the Improvement of Education in Guatemala. National System of Human Resources Improvement and Curriculum Adaptation. UNDP/UNESCO/ HOLLAND.

Cardemil, C. 1991. E1 Proceso Pedagogico. Evaluacion del Programa de Mejoramiento de la Calidad de las Escuelas en Sectores Pobres en Chile. Santiago, CIDE.

Carino, I.; Valisno, M. 1991. The Parent Learning Support System: A School and Home/Community Collaboration for Raising Pupil Achievement. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Carnoy, M.; Macdonell, J. 1990. School District Restructuring in Santa Fe, New Mexico. In *Educational Policy,* 4(1), pp. 49-64.

Carroll, T.F. 1992. Capacity-Building for Participatory Organizations, paper presented at the World Bank Workshop on Participatory Development, Washington, D. C. , February 26-27.

Charlick, R. 1980. Animation Rurale: Experience with 'Participatory' Development in Four West African Nations. *Rural Development Participation Review, Vol. 1,* No. 2, pp. 1-6.

Chimwenje, D. 1992. Decentralised Decision-making in Education: An International Perspective. Draft paper, Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

Cohn, E.; Rossmiller, R. 1987. Research on effective schools: implications for less developed countries. *Comparative Education Review,* Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 377-399.

Combes, J. 1992. *Parent Run Day Centres: The Growth of a French Community Initiative.* Studies and Evaluation Papers 8, The Hague, Bernard van Leer Foundtion.

Commonwealth Secretariat. 1980. *Participation, Learning and Change.* London.

____; UNESCO; SIDA. 1992. Better Schools: Draft Resource Materials for the Professional Development of School Heads. Module Seven: The Governance of Schools (draft). London.

Cummings, W.K.; et al. 1992. The Indonesian School Principal: Broadening Responsibility. Paper presented at the IEES-EPP Workshop, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 28 June-2 July, 1992.

Cummings, W.K.; Gunawardena, G. B.; Williams, J.H. 1992. *The Implementation of Management Reforms: The Case of Sri Lanka.* BRIDGES Research Report Series, No. 11, Cambridge, Harvard University.

Dave, R.H.; et al. 1990. *Meeting the Basic Learning Needs of Out of School Children: Non-Formal Approaches.* Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Department of Education, Papua New Guinea. 1991. *Education Sector Review, Vol. 1, Executive Summary and Principal Recommendations.* Port Moresby.

Dichter, T.W.. 1992. Demystifying Popular Participation (Institutional Mechanisms for Popular Participation). Paper presented at the World Bank Workshop on Participatory Development, World Bank, Washington, D.C., February 26-27.

Djam'an Satori. 1991. Qualitative Improvement of Primary Schools Through Professional Support for Their Teachers. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Dove, L. 1980. The Role of the Community School in Rural Transformation in Developing Countries. *Comparative Education,* Vol. 16, No. 1.

____, 1982. The Deployment and Training of Teachers for Remote Rural Schools in Less-developed Countries. *International Review of Education.* Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education.

Drabek,A.G.(ed.). 1987. *Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs,* supplement *to World Development,* Vol. 15.

Dubbeldam, L.F.B. 1990. Mobilizing Resources for Basic Education. Paper prepared for a meeting of the International Working Group on Education, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.

Duke, C. 1990. *Grassroots Approaches to Combatting Poverty Through Adult Education. Adult Education and Development* supplement, No. 34, Bonn.

Durning, A.B. 1989. Mobilizing at the Grassroots. In: *State of the World 1989,* Worldwatch, pp. 154-173.

Elliot, C. 1987. Some Aspects of Relations Between the North and South in the NGO Sector. In: A.G. Drabek (ed.), *Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs,* supplement to *World Development,* Vol. 15, pp. 57-68.

Fakir, M. 1991. NGOs in Indonesia. Occasional Paper Series: Non Governmental Organizations, Centre for International Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Filp, J. 1993. *The 900 Schools Program: Improving the Quality of Primary Schools in Impoverished Areas of Chile.* Monograph 9, Increasing and Improving the Quality of Basic Education. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Fordham, P. 1991. (No title). Paper presented at the Oxford Conference on the Reform of Educational Systems to Meet Local and National Needs, Oxford University, 1991.

Foster, K. 1984. Parent Advisory Councils: School Partners or Handy Puppets? *Principal,* Vol. 63, pp. 26-31.

Fraser, B.J. 1991. Parent Involvement and Participation In the Primary School in Australia and the United States. *East West Education.* Summer, pp. 76-105.

Fullan, M. 1985. Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level. *The Elementary School Journal,* Vol. 85, No. 3, pp. 391421.

Garilao, E. 1987. Indigenous NGOs as Strategic Institutions: Managing the Relationship with Government and Resource Agencies. In A.G. Drabek (ed.), *Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs,* supplement to *World Development,* Vol. 15, pp. 113-120.

Gibson, M.; Iamo, W. 1991. The Teacher As Broker. In: B. Avalos and L. Neuendorf (eds.), *Teaching in Papua New Guinea: A Perspective for the Nineties.* Port Moresby, University of Papua New Guinea Press.

Goldring, E.B. 1991. Parents: Participants in an Organizational Framework. *International Journal for Educational Research,* Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.215-228.

Greenland, J. 1990. Findings From the Aga Khan Foundation Projects. Paper presented at a meeting of the International Working Group on Education, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.

Gregg, D. 1989. *Collaborative School Management in School District 56 (Nechako).* Victoria, British Columbia, University of Victoria.

Hadad, I. 1983. Development and Community Self-Help in Indonesia. *PRIS - MA,* Vol. 28, pp. 3-20.

Hall, B. n.d. The Role of NGOs in the Field of Adult Education. Toronto, International Council for Adult Education.

Hallak, J. 1992. Managing schools for educational quality and equity: Finding the proper mix to make it work. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Hallak, J. 1990. *Investing in the Future: Setting Educational Priorities in the Developing World.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Hamadache, A. 1990. Education and Non-Formal Approaches to Primary Education. Address given at the International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.

Harbaugh, M. 1990. Big Ideas for Better Schools. In *Instructor,* pp. 52-56.

Hart, R.A. 1992. *Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship.* Innocenti Essays, No.4. Florence, UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

Hollnsteiner, M.R. 1982. Understanding People's Participation. In:
Notes, Comments...Child, Family, Community, N.S. 119, Paris, UNESCO.

Holt, A.; Murphy, P.J. n.d. School Effectiveness in the Future: The Empowerment Factor (no publication information).

Hulsebocsh P.L. 1991. Beauty in the Eye of the Beholder: How and Why Teachers Involve Parents. *International Journal for Educational Research,* Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 183-200.

Kirst, M. 1991. Accountability: Implications for State and Local Policymakers. Quoted in How Should Schools Be Held Accountable? Stanford Educator Looks at Six Methods, *Stanford Educator,* Stanford University, Fall 1991, p. 10.

Ki-zerbo, J. 1990. *Educate or Perish: Africa's Impasse and Prospects.* Dakar and Abidjan, UNESCO and UNICEF.

Korten, D.C. 1981. Rural Development Programming: The Learning Process Approach. *Rural Development Participation Review,* Vol. 1l,No.2,pp. 1-8.

____,1981a. Social Development: Putting People First. In: D. Korten and F. Alfonso (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the Poor: Closing the Gap.* Manila, Asian Institute of Management, pp. 201- 221.

____,1986. Micro-Policy Reform: The Role of Private Voluntary Development Agencies. Working Paper No. 12, Washington, D.C., National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.

____, 1987. Third Generation NGO Strategies: A Key to People Centred Development. In: A.G. Drabek (ed.), *Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs,* supplement to *World Development,* Vol. 15, pp. 145-159.

____; ALFONSO, F. 1981. *Bureaucracy and the Poor: Closing the Gap.* Manila, Asian Institute of Management.

Korten, F. 1981. Community Participation. In: 1D. Korten and F. Alfonso (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the Poor: Closing the Gap.* Manila, Asian Institute of Management, pp. 181-200.

____. The Working Group as a Catalyst for Organizational Change. In: F. Korten and R. Siy, Jr. (eds.), *Transforming Bureaucracy: The Experience of the Philippine National Irrigation Administration,* Hartford, Connecticut, Kumarian Press.

Kouassivi A. 1991. The Roles and Responsibilities of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Grassroots Communities. *Journal of the African Association for Literacy and Adult Education.* Vol . 5, No. 4, pp. 18-30.

Latif, A.H. 1991. A Case Study of Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee's Facilitation Assistance Programme on Education. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Leslie, J.; Jamieson, D. 1990. Educational Consequences of Health Problems Among School Age Children. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin,* Vol. 12.

Madan, T.N. 1987. Community Involvement in Health Policy: Socio-Structural and Dynamic Aspects of Health Beliefs. *Social Science and Medicine,* Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 615-620.

Mahabir, D. 1993. *SERVOL Pre-school and Adolescent Training Programmes in Trinidad and Tobago.* Monograph 10, Increasing and Improving the Quality of Basic Education. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Menon, P. n.d. District Institutes of Education and Training: Planning and Management of Lab-Area. Delhi, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.

Methi, S.N.; et al. 1991. The Shiksha Karmi Project, Rajasthan.

Moegiadi; Jiyono; Haris Mudjiman; Sutarno; Iskandar Agung; Karmidah; Tedjawati; Philip Suprastowo. 1991. Community Participation in Primary Education in Indonesia. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Morgan, V.; Fraser, G.; Dunn, S.; Cairns, E. 1992. Parental Involvement in Education: How Do Parents Want To Become Involved? *Educational Studies,* Vol 18, No. 1, pp. 11-20.

Moyle,C. n.d. Implementation Mechanisms for Facilitating Community Participation in School Management in Victoria, Australia: An Overview Case Study (mimeograph).

Moyle, C.; Pongtuluran, A. 1992. Involving the Community in the Local School. In: J. Chapman (ed.), *Institutional Management: School Decision Making and Management in the Asia/Pacific Region,* Paris, UNESCO.

Myers, R. 1991. *The Twelve Who Survive*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Naik, C. 1991. Collaboration for Educational Change. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement*. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Namo de Mello, G.; Neubauer da Silva, R. 1993. *The Competitive Selection of School Principals: Case Study of an Innovation in Brazil*. Monograph 11, Increasing and Improving the Quality of Basic Education. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Namuddu K. 1992. Collaboration for Educational Change: Improvement of Basic Education Through MINDSACROSS: A School Literacy Project in Uganda. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement*. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

NFE Exchange. 1981. Can Participation Enhance Development? East Lansing, Michigan State University, Institute for International Studies in Education, No. 20, pp. 1-7.

Njenga, A. 1992. A Case Study of District Centres for Early Childhood Education in Kenya. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change in Non-formal Education*. Report of an IIEP Seminar. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Noriega Chavez, B.M. 1992. Case Study on "Community Rural Education". Manuscript. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Nturibi D.N. 1992. Promotion of Community Health: A Case Study of the JSI/Family Planning Private Sector Programme in Kenya. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educan'onal Change in Non-formal Education.* Report of an IIEP Seminar. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Nyamwaya, D.; Muia, E.; Okedi, W. 1992. A Case Study of the Education for Community Health Action Programme in Kenya. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educanonal Change in Non-formal Education.* Report of an IIEP Seminar. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 1988. *Voluntary Aid for Development: The Role of Non-Governmental Organisations.* Paris.

—. 1989. *Development Co-operan'on in the 1990's.* Paris.

Ogun, B. 1989. Internal UNICEF Memo, 26 October.

Papagiannis, G.; Easton, P.; Owens, J.T. 1991. *The School Restruenuring Movement in the USA: An Analysis of Major Issues and Policy Implications.* Monograph 6, Increasing and Improving the Quality of Basic Education, Paris, International Institute for Education Planning.

Pearse, A.; Mathias, S. 1980. *Debaters' Comments on «Inquiry into Participation: A Research Approach».* Geneva, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Picon, C. 1990. *Principal and Intermediate Strategies in Adult Educan'on and Popular Educan'on for Participation in Civil Society.* Manuscript.

Pinney, A. 1983. Partners in Development? The Government and Non-Govemmental Organizations in Indonesia. *PRISMA,* Vol. 28, pp. 33-45

Prakasha, V.; et al. 1986. *Extending Basic Learning Opportunities: Challenges and Responses.* Digest 16, Paris, UNESCO-UNICEF Co-operative Programme.

Prawda, J. 1992. *Educational Decentralization in Latin America; Lessons Learned.* Washington, The World Bank.

Preston, R. 1991. Organisational Perspectives on the Local Management of Schools: Papua New Guinean Case Studies. *International Journal of Educational Development,* Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 275-288.

PRISMA. 1983. Jakarta, Vol. 28. LP3ES.

Punch, K.; Bayona, E. 1990. Teacher Participation in Curriculum Development: A Model and Field Study in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development,* Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 253-268.

Racelis, M. 1992. People's Participation: the UNICEF Experience, paper presented at the World Bank Workshop on Participatory Development, World Bank, Washington, D.C., February 26-27.

Ranaweera, A.M. 1990. *Innovative Approaches to Delivering Universal Primary Education and its Democratization: A Synopsis.* Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Redding, S. 1991. Alliance for Achievement: An Action Plan for Educators and Parents. *International Journal for Educational Research,* Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 147-162.

Reichenbach, G. 1992. Adult Education and Self-Help Support in Machinga District, Malawi. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change in Non-formal Education.* Report of an IIEP Seminar. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Rigg, J. 1991. Grass-Roots Development in Rural Thailand: A Lost Cause? *World Development,* Vol. 19, No. 2/3, pp. 199-211.

Rondinelli, D.A. 1983. *Development Projects as Policy Experiments.* London, Methuen.

Rondinelli, D.A.; et al. 1990. *Planning Educational Reforms in Developing Countries: The Contingency Approach.* Durham, Duke University Press.

Roy, A. (ed.) *1984. Education of Out-of-School Children.* London, Commonwealth Secretariat.

Sander, B.; Murphy, P. 1989. *Administration and Management of Education: The Challenges Faced.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Sarker, S.C. 1992. The BRAC Non-Formal Primary Education Program. Unpublished terminal paper. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Schwille, J.; et al. *1986. Recognizing, Fostering and Modeling the Effectiveness of Schools as Organizations in Third World Countries.* East Lansing, Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, draft.

Shaeffer, S. 1990. Participatory Approaches to Teacher Training. In: Val Rust and Per Dalin (eds.), *Teachers and Teaching in the Developing World,* New York, Garland Press.

Shaeffer, S. 1991. *A framework for collaborating for educational change.* Monograph No. 3, Increasing and improving the quality of basic education. Pans, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Shaeffer, S. 1992a. *Collaborating for educational change in non-formal education.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Shaeffer, S. 1992b. *Collaborating for educational change: the role of tea - chers, parents, and the community in school improvement.* Monograph. Increasing and improving the quality of basic educa- tion. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Shaeffer, S.; Kaabwe, S.; Kaluba, H.; Nkamba, M.; McGivern, T.; Pawar, P. 1993. *An Evaluation of the Self-Help Action Plan for Education (SHAPE).* Lusaka, Zambia, Ministry of Education.

Shrestha, K.N. 1992. Problems and Issues Concerning People's Participation in School Management. Paper presented at the SAARC Expert Group Meeting of Educational Planning and Management, New Delhi, March 9-12, 1992.

Simanungkalit; Moyle, C.; Bemard, D. 1992. Community Collaboration in the Planning and Management of Educational Resources (COPLA- NER). In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for educational chan - ge: the role of teachers, parents, and the community in school impro - vement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Singhal, R.P.; et al. 1986. *School Inspection System:* A *Modern* Atiefel. Delhi, Vikas Publishing House.

Stallworth, J.T.; Williams, Jr., D.L. 1983. A *Survey of School Administrators and Policy-Makers.* Washington, D.C., National Institute of Education.

Stiefel, M.; Racelis, M. 1990. The Role and Responsibilities of Government and Development and Donor Agencies. Paper presented at the International Conference on Popular Participation in the Recovery and Development Process in Africa, Arusha, Tanzania.

Sturman, A. 1989. *Decentralization and the Curriculum Effects of the Devolution of Curriculum Decision Making in Australia.* Hawthorn, Australian Council for Educational Research.

Tandon, R. 1992. Civil Society, the State, and the Role of NGOs. *ASPBAE Courier,* Asian-South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education, No. 54, August, pp. 23-34.

Tandon R. No date. NGO-Government Relations: A Source of Life or a Kiss of Death. Toronto, International Council for Adult Education

Tatto, M.T. 1992. Policies for Teachers in Peripheral Areas: A Review of the Literature, draft, Michigan State University.

Tifft, S.; Cronin, Mt 1990. Power to the Classroom. In *Time, p.* 56.

Thinh, B.G. 1992. Qualitative Improvement in Basic Education Through the Collaboration and Co-operation of Parents' Associations. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *School and Community Collaboration For Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar,* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

UNESCO-PROAP. 1990. Qualitative Aspects of Primary Education. Occasional Papers No. 18, Bangkok.

UNICEF. 1982. *Community Participation: Current lssues and Lessons Learned. Assignment Children,* Vol. 2, No. 59/60.

UNICEF. 1986. Community Participation: Now You See It, Now You Don't. *UNICEF News,* Issue 124, pp. 2-3.

____,1978. *Participatory Research and Basic Needs, Assignment Children,* Vol. 41.

UNICEF International Child Development Centre. 1990. *Innocenti Update.* No. 7.

Uphoff, N.T; Esman, M.J. 1974. *Local Organization For Rural Development: Analysis of Asian Experience.* Special Series on Rural Local Government, Ithaca, Cornell University Rural Development Committee.

Varghese, N.V. 1992. Internal Efficiency, School Effectiveness, and Learner Achievement. Paper presented at the SAARC Expert Group Meeting of Educational Planning and Management, New Delhi, March 9-12, 1992.

Walta, G. n.d. Community Involvement, no publication information.

WCEFA (World Conference on Education for All). 1990. *Meeting Basic Learning Needs: A Vision for the 1990s.* New York, WCEFA Inter-agency Commission.

____, 1990a. Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs. New York, WCEFA Inter-Agency Commission.

Webster, N. 1992. Panchayati Raj in West Bengal: Popular Participation for the People or the Party? *Development and Change,* Vol 23, No. 4, pp. 129-163.

Weiler, H.N. 1990. Comparative Perspectives on Educational Decentralization: An Exercise in Contradiction? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* Winter, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 433-448.

Wheeler, C.; Jaithip C.; Pragob K. 1991. Improving Basic Education Through Collaboration and Co-operation: School Clusters in Thailand. In Sheldon Shaeffer (ed.), *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents, and the Community in School Improvement.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

WHO (World Health Organization). 1981. Development of Indicators for Monitoring Programs Toward Health for All by the Year 2000. Geneva.

Wicks, N. 1991. International Educational Cooperation: CUSO and Papua New Guinea's Secondary Schools Community Extension Project: An Executive Summary. Unpublished.

Williams, JR., D.L. 1991. Training Teachers and Administrators for Parent Involvement: Implications for Public Choice Schools. *International Journal of Educational Research,* Vol. 15, No. 3/4, pp. 339-352.

Williams, J. 1992. Improving School-Community Relations in the Periphery. Cambridge, Project ABEL, Harvard Institute for International Development.

Williams, P. 1989. African Education Under Siege. In: U. Bude (ed.), *The Challenge of Quality in Primary Education in Africa.* Bonn, German Foundation for International Development, pp. 93-108.

Wils, F. 1990. *Income and Employment Generating Activities of NGDOs: An Overview.* Working Paper Series No. 88, The Hague, Institute of Social Studies.

Wood, A.W. 1991. Community Mobilisation. In: *Bernard Van Leer Foundation Newsletter,* No. 63, July.

Zainal Ghani, 1990. The Use of Participatory, School-Based, and Community-Supported Innovation in Formal Basic Education. Paper prepared for the World Conference on Education for All, Thailand. Ottawa, International Development Research Centre..

Zevounou, I.B. 1993. Collaborer pour changer l'education: la participation des familles et des communautes a l'amelioration de l'education de base en afrique occidentale francophone. Manuscript. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

IIEP publications and documents

More than 750 titles on all aspects of educational planning have been, published by the International Institute for Educational Planning. A comprehensive catalogue, giving details of their availability, includes research reports, case studies, seminar documents, training materials, occasional papers and reference books in the following subject categories:

Economics of education, costs and financing.

Manpower and employment.

Demographic studies.

The location of schools (school map) and sub-national planning.

Administration and management.

Curriculum development and evaluation.

Educational technology.

Primary, secondary and higher education.

Vocational and technical education.

Non-formal, out-of-school, adult and rural education.

Copies of the catalogue may be obtained from the IIEPPublications Unit on request.

The International Institute for Educational Planning

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) is an international centre for advanced training and research in the field of educational planning. It was established by UNESCO in 1963 and is financed by UNESCO and by voluntary contributions from Member States. In recent years the following Member States have provided voluntary contributions to the Institute: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, India, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela.

The Institute's aim is to contribute to the development of education throughout the world, by expanding both knowledge and the supply of competent professionals in the field of educational planning. In this endeavour the Institute co-operates with interested training and research organizations in Member States.
The Governing Board of the IIEP, which approves the Institute's programme and budget, consists of eight elected members and four members designated by the United Nations Organization and certain of its specialized agencies and institutes .

Chairman:
Victor L. Urquidi, (Mexico) Research Professor Emeritus, El Colegio de Mexico, Mexico.

Designated Members:
Arturo Nunez del Prado, Director, Latin American and the Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning, Santiago.
Christian Ossa, Director, Development Policy and Analysis Division, Department of Economic and Social Development, United Nations.
Visvanathan Rajavopalan, Vice-President and Special Adviser to the President, The World Bank.
Allan F. Salt, Director, Training Department, International Labour Office.

Elected Members:
Isao Amagi (Japan), Special Adviser to the Minister of Education, Science and Culture, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Tokyo.
Mohamed Dowidar (Egypt), Professor and President of the Department of Economics, Law Faculty, University of Alexandria, Alexandria.
Kabiru Kinyanjui (Kenya), Senior Programme Officer, Social Sciences Division, International Development Research Centre, Nairobi.
Tamas Kozma (Hungary), Director-General, Hungarian Institute for Educational Research, Budapest.
Yolanda M. Rojas (Costa Rica), Academic Vice-Rector, University of Costa Rica, San Jose.
Michel Vernieres (France), Professor of Economic Sciences, University of Paris I, Pantheon-Sorbonne, Paris
Lennart Wohlgemuth (Sweden), Director, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala.

Inquiries about the Institute should be addressed to:
The Office of the Director, International Institute for Educational Planning,
7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France.