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PRESENTATION OF THE SERIES

This publication is the second in a series on ‘Trends in school supervision’, which accompanies the implementation of an IIEP project on ‘Improving teacher supervision and support services for basic education’. The project, which began in 1996, is one of the main research components of the Institute’s Medium-Term Plan for 1996-2001.

Earlier research, at the Institute and elsewhere, has pointed to the need, in an era of increased decentralization and school autonomy, to strengthen the skills of personnel involved in supervision and support at local level and in schools.

Two related points are worth mentioning here, as they form both the background to and the rationale for the IIEP’s concern with this area of management. Firstly, professional supervision and support services for teachers, although existing in almost every country for a long time, have been ignored, increasingly so since resources have become more scarce. This neglect has, until recent times, been reflected by a similar indifference among researchers. Secondly, one important reason why the quality of basic education has deteriorated in many contexts is precisely related to the weakening of these services.

The IIEP project, which has been developed against this background, consists of research, training and dissemination activities. Its specific objectives are to assist countries in diagnosing and reforming their existing services of supervision and support, and to identify promising strategies for the reorganization and strengthening of these services.

1 Other titles in the series include:
   Current issues in supervision: a literature review.
   Teacher support through resource centres: the Nepalese case.
The series of publications, of which this monograph forms part, is the result of research, implemented in several regions, to address a number of questions, such as:

- How is supervision and support organized in different countries? What have been the major trends in the recent evolution?

- What are the principal problems which supervision and support services are presently facing in terms of: organizational structures; overall management of the services; and their daily functioning?

- To what extent and under what conditions do these services have a positive impact on the quality of the teaching-learning processes in schools?

- What are the major innovations taking place, mainly in respect of the devolution of supervision and support to the school-site level? How do these innovations operate? What are the main results?

In order to formulate answers to these different questions, the project elaborated the following operational definition of school supervision and support services: all those services whose main function is to control and evaluate, and/or advise and support schoolheads and teachers. The main focus of the project is on external supervision and support, that is to say on the work of inspectors, supervisors, advisers, counsellors, etc. located outside the school, at local, regional or central levels. A common characteristic of all these officers is that regular visits to schools are an essential part of their mandate.

However, many countries, in their attempts to reform and innovate supervision, are increasingly relying on in-school or community-based strategies (such as resource centres, school clusters, in-school supervision by the principal or by peers, school-based management) to
complement, if not to replace, external supervision and support. The project therefore also pays attention to a number of such innovations and, in more general terms, to the strengths and weaknesses of strategies aiming at the reinforcement of internal quality-control mechanisms.

This series: ‘Trends in school supervision’, thus consists of a variety of titles: national diagnoses on supervision and support, comparative analyses of the situation by region, case studies on innovative experiences, and monographs and discussion papers on specific management issues. It is hoped that this series will fill a gap in education research as well as be an inspiration, in particular to policy-makers intending to reform supervision, and to supervisors who want to improve on their practice.
INTRODUCTION

Improving the quality of education is a challenging task. Many programmes and projects, with that objective, have worked on training teachers, constructing or improving school facilities, providing textbooks and other equipment, or changing the curriculum. Success has not always been guaranteed, as these interventions have had relatively little impact on the teaching/learning process, in particular not in the most remote schools. The reasons for this relative failure have been explored elsewhere (Carron and Ta Ngoc, 1996; Dalin et al., 1994).

The project, which this monograph presents, has taken up the challenge of improving teaching and learning in ‘disadvantaged’ schools, by squarely aiming at changing the school culture and, in the first place, the attitudes of the principal and the teachers. Such a cultural change demands time and, more crucially, a balance between allowing schools autonomy and giving them support. Precisely how the project has intervened in schools to achieve such a change, is described in detail in the second part of the monograph. This is preceded by Part I, which contains two background information chapters: the first providing a historical review of professional support to schools in Sri Lanka, and the second outlining the role played by the Department of Education Management Development (DEMD), which is part of the National Institute of Education (NIE), Sri Lanka, in improving school functioning in general, and in this project in particular.

Part II, after a description of the project’s different components, discusses the effects of this endeavour on schools by analyzing its achievements and the results of an impact study. Furthermore, it addresses the issue of external support and the institutionalization of the project, by examining how to integrate this innovative strategy into Sri Lanka’s ‘everyday’ education policies, and thus how to transform all schools, including those not part of the project. Finally, the last chapter presents some more general conclusions.
PART I

PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS IN SRI LANKA
I. A HISTORICAL REVIEW

Until Sri Lanka gained its independence in 1948, it had been occupied successively by the Portuguese, Dutch and British. Its population of 18.1 million is multi-ethnic in character: according to the last census in 1981, the Sinhalese constitute the major ethnic group (74.0 per cent) followed by Sri Lankan Tamils (12.6 per cent), Indian Tamils (5.5 per cent), Muslims (7.1 per cent) and others (0.8 per cent).

With a GDP of US$760 Sri Lanka belongs to the group of low-income economies. It is still a predominantly rural society, with 72.2 per cent of the population living in rural areas, 6.3 per cent in the plantation regions and the rest in urban centres. Its population growth rate (1.4 per cent) is one of the lowest among developing countries. Since independence its successive governments have taken a great interest in improving education. The primary and secondary gross enrolment rates stand respectively at 105 and 74 per cent. The share of females in education at all levels is approximately 50 per cent, which is encouraging. Internal efficiency of the primary education system is high, with over 90 per cent of primary pupils reaching grade 5.\(^2\) In 1995 education expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure was 10.0 per cent.

The overall pupil-teacher ratio is 22. The literacy rate which, according to The Finance and Socio-Economic Survey of 1986/87, was 89 per cent, is one of the highest in South Asia. Recent studies, however, reveal that the literacy rate has declined and measures are being taken to remedy this.

First steps

According to the available evidence educational activities in Sri Lanka started in 308 BC with the introduction of Buddhism into the country. From that time the education system was centred around Buddhist monasteries, where religion was taught by the elder monks to the clergy and the laity, and the teachings in the temple were supervised by the chief priest of the temple. When the Portuguese invaded the country in 1505, the schools established by the Roman Catholic church were supervised by the ecclesiastical authorities. The Dutch, who took over in 1656, established schools controlled by the state. During this period the governor appointed two inspectors, a clergyman and a layman to submit reports to him after annual inspection of the schools. During the British period which followed, schools were supervised either by clergymen or government servants. A commission of inquiry, led by W.M.G. Colebroke in 1829, pointed out that the government servants and the clergy resident in various districts in the island could “inspect and supervise the schools in their respective divisions and report on the efficiency of management” (Senanayake, 1969, p. 678).

Though the clergy might have supervised the schools managed by them, full-time government servants could hardly spare time to do likewise, the result being that “the government schools, for want of efficient control and supervision were far behind the schools established and managed by missionary bodies who took a personal interest in this work” (Senanayake, 1969, p.679).

In the year 1869, with the establishment of the Department of Public Instruction, inspections became an annual feature. By this time there were two types of schools: the government schools and grant-in-aid or vernacular schools. Inspection of these schools had different purposes — in grant-in-aid schools, inspectors came to examine the pupils: “On the day of the examination, the school generally assembled at 9 a.m.;
ordinary work was laid aside, and the children waited in eager expectation for the arrival of the Inspector. The Inspector, if he arrived early, would devote some time to the inspection of the Attendance Register, and then commence the annual examination of the pupils at the foreseen time. Except where the numbers were very large, there was no difficulty in getting through a Vernacular school in one day” (Nanayakkara, 1969, p. 690).

External supervision of government schools was carried out with a much wider purpose than in the grant-in-aid schools. “The Government school inspections served an entirely different purpose. The Inspector was the actual Manager of all Government schools in his division. He had to assure himself, for the information of the Department, that the correct teacher-pupil ratio existed; that there was a proper division of the work-load between the teachers and the pupil-teachers; that every subject was taught in accordance with the best approved methods, with the help of the best obtainable books and apparatus; and, above all, that the teachers were skilled, efficient and energetic in getting children into school, and conscientious in keeping all registers and records” (Nanayakkara, 1969, p. 691).

The linking of examinations to the annual inspection of grant-in-aid school, however, was widely deplored. As Arthur Van Cuylenberg (1899), Inspector of Schools, stated: “I almost feel that a revolution to the decisive advantage of our children would result if we could only be courageous enough to pull down the Dragon of examination that we have set up for universal adoration, and return to the practice of the period when the school master had a free hand and worked with no thought of examinations to cramp and hamper his efforts on the boy’s behalf” (Nanayakkara, 1969, p. 695).

By 1925, the system was changed and the responsibility of pupil assessment fell on teachers. School inspections were carried out more
for maintenance of educational standards. The change is highlighted by Nanayakkara (1969, p. 696): “Inspectors had more time to inspect methods of teaching, school records, and pupils’ exercise books, and also to inspect the general condition under which work was done. They gave demonstration lessons and set standards for teachers to follow. There was also an enormous increase in the self-activity of pupils which was a happy contrast to the previous lethargy”.

Efforts were made to redefine the functions of the inspector towards the role of a guide and a counsellor. The Inspectors’ Manual issued by the Department of Education, Ceylon, in 1956, outlines the following as the functions of an inspector.

“The Inspector may be regarded first as a guide and counsellor, second as an examiner and third as an assessor and reporter. As a guide and counsellor he will do well to observe the following maxims:

- discuss freely with the teacher his problems and difficulties;
- discuss with the Head of the School the larger problems of administration, the nature and appropriateness of the curriculum, adjustment of the timetable, introduction of extra-curricular activities, experimentation with new methods, progress of his assistance, adequacy and suitability of buildings and equipment, problems of discipline and punishment and suggest improvements;
- at staff meetings discuss findings, specifically avoiding personal reference to individual teachers as far as possible;
- organize circuit, district and provincial conferences as well as refresher courses for the benefit of teachers;
- encourage teachers to organize among themselves discussion groups, study circles, guilds;
- remember that good work deserves commendation;
- never criticize a teacher in the presence of the class;
- remember that you are a bearer of the torch of learning as well as of culture. Hence in personal appearance and manners you should set a high standard”.
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Circuit education system

The introduction of the free education scheme in 1945, and the population increase, led to a growth in enrolments and an increase of nearly 60 per cent in the number of schools. To meet the new administrative demands, decentralization of educational administration took place in 1961 by creating 10 educational regions. This was increased to 14 educational regions in 1964.

The Regional Director of Education, who was in charge of the Regional Department of Education, was assisted by a Chief Education Officer, an Administrative Officer, an Accountant, a School Works Engineer and one or more Specialist Education Officers. In the field, the Circuit Education Officer, under the direction of the regional director of education, was responsible for the implementation of the government education policy and the supervision of some 30 to 50 schools. Providing requisite resources, communicating ministerial policy to the schools, and the organizing of effective programmes of school supervision, in-service education and evaluation, were tasks entrusted to the circuit education officer. For team inspections, the circuit education officers were joined by specialist education officers based in regional offices.

The role of the circuit education officer was thus multiple: “The field of activity for an inspecting officer or supervisor is large and needs clear determination of priorities among the many functions involved. Routine checking of inventories, special enquiries, evaluation of teaching, and in-service training are but a part of his responsibility as he interprets changes in policy at a national level and relates the activity of the classroom to the goals of national development” (Samarapala and Bandaranayake, 1975, p. 113).

However, several shortcomings were identified in this supervisory system, among them were:
“(i) supervisory personnel pre-occupied with routine administrative work;  
(ii) unorganized and unco-ordinated supervision;  
(iii) unhealthy attitudes and relationships;  
(iv) lack of proper follow-up” (Piyadasa and Liyanage, 1984, p. 23).

Since the Ministry of Education thought that the circuit education system was not providing the supervisory support needed by schools and teachers, it was gradually replaced by the school cluster system, from 1981 onwards.

**School clusters**

A group of both primary and secondary schools, within a defined geographical area, were made a cluster for the purpose of better organization and management, and to enable better utilization of the resources of both the state and the community. The cluster was a fully fledged administrative unit, having a leader of its own (principal of the core-school), with delegated powers to administer the unit. A cluster was to have a total pupil enrolment of about 3,000-5,000.

This system is explained in the 1981 Education Proposals for Reform as follows: “Each cluster will function as an administrative entity to meet the educational needs of the entire area it serves. Pupil admissions, requisitions of supplies, capital expenditure and allocation of teachers will be on the basis that each cluster is one organizational unit. Thus the smallest unit of the school system will henceforth be the school cluster” (p. 9).

With the introduction of the cluster system the circuit education officer was redesignated Assistant Director of Education and was based in the newly established Divisional Education Office. The clusters were encouraged to move towards greater self-reliance so that they might
shoulder heavier responsibilities and also be vested with greater authority with regard to the management of the cluster activities.

The objectives of the cluster system could be summarized as follows:
1. To achieve qualitative development in education through intensive and systematic supervision, evaluation and follow-up action of the schools within the cluster.
2. To upgrade the neglected, underdeveloped remote schools by making them participate in cluster activities.
3. To enable schools to be managed by a body of more competent personnel. The functions of planning, management, supervision and administrative duties will be delegated to the cluster principal.
4. To minimize/eliminate duplication in the provision and use of facilities and to achieve optimum utilization of scarce resources, both personnel and physical, within school clusters.
5. To obtain the maximum participation of the community and ensure the maximum contribution of the public to the upgrading of the educational facilities of their school complex area.

When the circuits were replaced by clusters there arose new administrative problems. Various studies (Staff College, 1986; Staff College, 1989; Cabral, 1989; Perera, 1989) revealed that many cluster principals lacked the required administrative experience. The frequency of supervisory visits to schools did not visibly improve and supervisory techniques in most cases remained the same. There were also marked imbalances of resources among clusters within the same district. In one district comprising 54 clusters, three clusters had more than 15 schools each, while another three clusters had less than five schools each. In this district one cluster had more than 8,000 students while another had less than 500 students. Even within the same cluster there was reluctance to share resources. There was a concentration of resources at the core school. The basic aim of the cluster, that of sharing resources and helping the backward schools, was often not realized.
On the other hand, some core schools did not have enough facilities even for themselves. However, there were several clusters that achieved the objectives expected from the cluster system.

On the whole, the cluster system led to some disappointment, as cluster heads seemed unable, and external officers seemed unwilling, to offer the necessary support and supervision. A study conducted by the Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Education (SLAAED) notes that: “A complete change has taken place after the abolition of the circuit system and its replacement by the cluster school system. It appeared that departmental officers make no visits to schools except very infrequently and that only to secure the participation of schools in the organization of various functions which invariably have a political flavour” (1993, p. 27). The same study goes on to say: “It could be safely inferred that the lack of supervision has led to a fall in teaching standards” (p. 28).

Devolution of power in educational administration

The enactment of the 13th amendment to the Constitution, followed by the Provincial Council Act of No. 42 of 1987, led to the establishment of Provincial Councils. Provincial Ministries were set up and Provincial Secretaries were appointed who were responsible to the Provincial Minister. Under this system, the provincial secretary had to follow national policy guidelines issued by the line ministry, and provincial guidelines laid down by the provincial council.

Under the provincial council the regional education offices were replaced by Provincial Departments of Education, headed by the Provincial Director of Education. The provincial director is responsible for the planning, implementation, management and direction of all education programmes in the province. Divisional Education Offices were established between the provincial level and the schools to facilitate the process of devolution to the periphery.
Silva et al. (1993) identified several problems that arose in educational administration with the establishment of the provincial councils. Since the provincial director was made accountable to the provincial secretary, his authority and his responsibilities were greatly reduced with the emergence of the provincial ministries. The divisional office was subjected to dual control, which resulted in confusion. There were instances where both the provincial ministry and the provincial department effected teacher transfers.

Present administrative structure

In the administrative structure proposed in 1995 the provincial office became the apex of the provincial education administrative structure. Furthermore, between the provincial and the divisional office a zonal office was set up which has been assigned duties pertaining to quality improvement and all administration and establishment work. Generally a zone will consist of a number of divisions, comprising a total of approximately 150 schools.

“Supervision of schools, which was earlier carried out by circuit education officers will be entrusted to divisional directors of education in charge of divisional education offices. They will be required to carry out school supervision, collect annual returns and guide the relevant master teachers in quality improvement activities. For this purpose a team of master teachers will be appointed to each division and they will work under the guidance and supervision of the Divisional Director of Education /Assistant Director of Education. However, the implementation of their programme of activities will be subjected to the approval of the relevant Zonal Director” 3.

3 See circular No. 3/PPR/PP/GA-110 issued by the Ministry of Education and Higher Education on 22 March 1995. To supplement the above, another circular, No. 3/PPR/PP/GA-110A was issued on 21 April 1995, which outlines the functions of the divisional education officer. A closer review of these functions reveals that they are mostly a list of duties.
**Master teacher scheme**

Sri Lanka is one of the first countries to have introduced the Master Teacher scheme. At its inception in the 1970s, master teachers were entrusted with the task of conducting one-day per term per-teacher education courses, which came to be known as study circles (Ariyadasa, 1976, p. 18). The status and the role of the master teacher has been subject to change over time, but at present, the role and functions expected of the master teachers are as follows:

1. To conduct in-service seminars in:
   (i) subject content and methodology of teaching;
   (ii) improvisation and development of teaching aids and materials.

2. To make school visits, which:
   (i) help the teachers to upgrade their teaching competencies, and the master teacher plays the role of friend, philosopher and guide, to increase their confidence;
   (ii) assist in team supervision programmes;
   (iii) are a follow-up to team supervision.

3. To provide information on the availability and use of teacher guides in schools to the relevant authorities.

4. To assist in designing pupil evaluation programmes.

5. To organize school-based teacher development projects.

6. To generate low-cost equipment for classroom teaching.

However, it appears that, with the exception of a few areas, the master teacher scheme is beset by several problems which mainly relate to the status of the master teacher, lack of role clarity, lack of direction and co-ordination, lack of required cadre, irregularities in recruitment and lack of training (Bandara, 1992).
The need for a coherent professional support system

The different systems and procedures of supervision discussed above and the implicit distribution of roles and functions has failed to offer concrete professional support to principals and teachers or to the school as a whole. Sri Lanka, though it has initiated decentralization in education in a substantial way during the last four decades, has failed to institutionalize a significant supportive supervisory scheme at the school level to guide schools in all aspects of their improvement, while maintaining their autonomy and helping staff to realize and utilize their potential.

Jayatilleke (1994, p. 10) points out that it is external factors that result in poor functioning at the classroom level: “The primary reason is not the inattentiveness of the teacher and the child. The causes of failure can be traced to the level immediately outside the school and to the level at the top”.

This is especially the case in remote schools, which are severely disadvantaged. The identification of their problems and formulation of remedial programmes, where necessary, hardly occur. In remote schools, lack of involvement of the local education officers in the formulation of appropriate educational programmes considering local characteristics and resource endowments, have a strong bearing on the standard and quality of education provided by these schools.

The following sections will examine an intervention initiated in a group of selected disadvantaged schools, by the Department of Education Management Development of the National Institute of Education, to ‘empower’ schools, at the same time making them more accountable.
II. THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Education Management Development (DEMD), which is also known as the Staff College, is the premier institute in the provision of educational management training in Sri Lanka. It forms part of the National Institute of Education (NIE). The Staff College commenced its activities on a modest scale in 1976, when its services were mainly limited to the provision of management training for education officers. In 1984 a more significant role was envisaged for the Staff College by the Ministry of Education. Training of all Sri Lanka Education Administrative Service (SLEAS) personnel and principals of schools came under the purview of the Staff College.

The world of education in recent years has shown a significant interest in the relevance, application and practice of general management principles. It has been noted by many that the head’s role is crucial to the success of any educational institution (Brookover et al., 1979; Pareek and Rao, 1981; Morphet et al., 1982; Everard, 1986; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1986; Duignan, 1987; Griffin, 1987). Moreover, there is a growing realization and acceptance that heads ought to be given formal management training to help them perform effectively. This was acknowledged, within the international context, by Leithwood and others (1987, p. 188):

“... a growing body of findings from research in effective schools suggested that a strong positive relationship existed between effective schools and effective leadership. One consequence of these findings was a surge of interest and effort in the training of school leaders”.

---

4 The National Institute of Education (NIE) was established in 1985 by the National Institute of Education Act, No. 28 of 1985. In 1986, the Staff College became one of its main departments and was renamed the DEMD.
A similar perspective has influenced the thinking on management of education institutions in Sri Lanka. Based on an intensive survey of a random sample of schools, the Ministry of Education, through its Report on Management Reforms (1984) highlighted several management problems prevalent at school level: “The problems of management at the school level are multifaceted; deficiencies in basic aims, planning and programming practices, inefficient implementation of work, poor structural designs, counter-productive behavioural practices, incompetent management, weak environmental linkages, etc.”

As a result of these conclusions, a growing importance is placed, nationally, on management development, in its widest sense, as a means of improving the quality of institutional performance in schools. It coincided with the emergence of educational management as a distinct field of study within Sri Lanka. This impetus gave the DEMD a new role. From 1984 it had a clear national responsibility to provide management development opportunities for school leaders. Since that time it has extended its range of activities, broadened its client base and built up its staff expertise.

Consequently, the mission statement of the DEMD reflects this broad national role: “Its mission is to develop management knowledge, skills and competencies in the personnel of the total education system by training, by offering consultancy services and spearheading change through research so that the efficiency and effectiveness could be enhanced and sustained throughout the system”.

The DEMD implements its capacity-building role in two ways. Firstly it is responsible for providing training directly to selected personnel in the system. The DEMD mainly conducts certificated courses and research. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, it trains other trainers, who conduct management training courses at provincial level.
The courses conducted by the DEMD are as follows:

(i) Postgraduate Diploma in Education Management (PGDEM)
This is a one-year course. Candidates should be graduates with a Postgraduate Diploma in Education or an equivalent qualification. They should be educational administrators at national, provincial, divisional, zonal or school level.

(ii) MSc. in Education Management
The MSc. course is linked to the PGDEM. It is specially designed for the candidates who obtain distinction or merit passes in the PGDEM.

(iii) Diploma in School Management
This course is designed to provide specialized knowledge and skills in managing schools. The duration of the course is 18 months and it is conducted in the distance mode, with 12 three-day contact sessions.

(iv) Short courses for officers in Sri Lanka Education Administrative Service (SLEAS)
- Three-day workshops for the Directors working in provincial, zonal and divisional education offices.
- Six-month sandwich course for the new recruits to the SLEAS.

(v) Thematic courses in Education Management
The course is designed to provide an in-depth knowledge of selected themes in education management. It is open to educational managers at all levels and is of three days’ duration.

(vi) Training of trainers at provincial level
The trainers who conduct management courses for principals are trained at intervals by the DEMD to carry out their tasks.
In 1993 the DEMD understood the necessity of widening the scope of its activities and adopting a more strategic role in order to improve the quality of its services. The DEMD took steps to revitalize and broaden the base of all its educational management development functions. The DEMD realized that, if it is to bring about a change in the system, it has to intervene in the long-term institutional development of schools. Since the concept of management development in education cannot be confined to the various modes of training personnel in education management, the DEMD designed and implemented an intervention strategy in the area of institutional development of schools, based on the principle that: “Management trainers launching isolated training projects will not have any meaningful impact on the problems and weaknesses in the education system” (Fernando, 1984, p. 117).

Training should have a specific approach which should help principals to sustain, refine and develop methods of management. Training is effective only by applying oneself actually to one’s own situation, and reflecting on past experience in order to develop one’s own practice. Training needs to be practice-based, reducing didactic bias, enabling management theory and practice to go hand-in-hand.

The DEMD realized that if the real needs of the schools are to be met, informal leaders have to be trained. This is important because, if the main consideration of training is not only to change the individual but, more importantly, the organization, a group undergoing training may be more effective in implementing change. To sustain the effect of training several staff may need to be trained. The same point is made by Njerre (1983, p. 128) in relation to Norway: “Transforming knowledge and skills from leadership training to individual schools is difficult, and many participants claim this would have been simpler if a larger number of teachers participated in the programme”.
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Many authors have therefore emphasized the need to develop a focused on-the-job training programme, where all staff members undergo training in the school itself. In doing so, the DEMD thought that priority should be given to disadvantaged small schools.

Inequalities and disparities of educational opportunities in the sphere of education have been repeatedly highlighted in Sri Lanka (Jayasuriya, 1988; Jayaweera and Gunawardana, 1980). Equal opportunities have been strongly emphasized over several years, and this should be applicable even in the provision of management development of schools. In Sri Lanka nearly 44 per cent of the schools cater for children in the age-groups of 6-11 years and 6-14 years and, until 1993, very little emphasis had been given to the management development of these schools.

A characteristic of most of these schools is that they are small, with less than 200 students. Principals of these schools cannot be provided with institutional training without causing serious disruption to schoolwork. In the small schools the number of teaching staff, including the principal, is very often less than five. In addition to their managerial roles the principals have to do many hours of teaching. The withdrawal of the principals and the staff from their schools for training elsewhere, will inevitably have an adverse affect on those schools.
PART II

THE PROJECT

‘IMPROVING THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY OF DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS’
I. THE PROJECT COMPONENTS

The DEMD initiated a project entitled ‘Improving the institutional development capacity of disadvantaged schools’ in a group of selected schools in 1993. The project aimed at school-based development and started from the principle that the individual school is the key organizational unit in improving the quality of education. The school itself must be a primary force or energy source for any genuine educational change. For change and improvement to be effective, the entire staff has to be involved.

‘Institutional development’ is a process of organizational renewal that helps schools to develop their internal capacities: to sense and identify real organizational problems, establish goals, objectives and priorities. A central factor of successful innovations at school level is the school’s capacity to effectively accommodate the educational changes designed and packaged at the central level and to creatively initiate, develop and implement innovative ideas and practices, after careful analysis of the school’s needs and other organizational factors. The internal capacity of the school for self-renewal, which is the central theme of ‘Institutional development’, cannot be achieved without a conscious effort on the part of the staff and the local community.

Background

The Ministry of Education selected a group of disadvantaged schools in October 1986 to be developed through a Sida (Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency) supported aid programme. The schools chosen were those from economy plantations and rural villages, where the literacy, education and health levels were the lowest in the country. The majority of these schools had less than 100 pupils and not more than one or two teachers.
Two separate units at the Ministry were established to implement the two programmes, one for the plantation sector school development and the other for the rural sector school development. The Plantation School Education Development Programme (PSEDP) covered all the plantation schools in the country, and the Primary School Development Programme (PSDP) chose as target schools, for intensive support, the primary schools of the two most disadvantaged and remote districts, and primary schools situated in remote and sparsely populated areas in two other districts (MOE: PSEDP and PSDP, 1986).

The two programmes came into existence in 1987 and schools were introduced in phases. In addition to being located in unfavourable social and economic conditions, the schools had inadequate infrastructure and teaching cadre. They lacked basic physical facilities such as classrooms, staff quarters, safe water and sanitation, as well as a stimulating learning environment. Many school buildings were in a state of disrepair. These schools tended to have a high incidence of absenteeism and early school leaving. Access to secondary education was in most cases unfavourable. Even the few teachers that were deployed in these schools were poorly qualified and had very little experience in teaching.

Both programmes provided schools with a package of measures for quality improvement and infrastructure development. They aimed at improving and expanding the provision of elementary and vocational education, increasing teacher supply, expanding enrolment, improving attendance, improving health and sanitation, and developing school-community relations.

Internal and external evaluators alike of the PSEDP and PSDP programmes noted that promising progress had been achieved by these schools. The needs in terms of space, furniture, health and sanitation, of this so far neglected set of disadvantaged schools, have been met. Basic
curricular materials, along with a package of supplementary reading and learning materials, were also given to the schools. As a result, teachers seem to prepare more and more teaching aids. In many schools teacher and pupil attendance has improved. Provision of teacher quarters has increased the number of hours of work a teacher offers to the school. A proportion of the non-school-going population has been absorbed into the educational stream.

However, evaluators were concerned about the sustainability of these achievements and suggested that appropriate measures need to be taken in this regard. To quote from two such evaluation reports: “Once the Sida aid package and the related activities end and when the schools fall back into the normal school system, there is the inherent danger of gradual decline of standards so painstakingly achieved” (Kulasena, 1991, p. 108). “Sida support over the years has no doubt contributed greatly to educational development in disadvantaged areas but the corresponding preparedness in the system to take over has not been created. In some cases, the opposite tendency of dependency can be noted. There is a great danger that the phasing out of Sida support will leave a vacuum and that there will be a general relapse or backslide unless determined efforts are made to make Sida support reproductive in the sense that the special experiences, competencies, and routines developed under the Sida projects are institutionalized and integrated into the existing structure, and this can only be done with the help of more money and more people” (Kotalawala et al., 1991, pp. 42-43).

The Ministry of Education, the PSEDP and PSDP project directors, and the Sida authorities were of the view that the DEMD should get involved with the schools, when the PSEDP and PSDP are being phased out, to help them sustain what has been achieved. In this vein, the DEMD believed that it could be of great assistance in helping schools to optimize the support that they had already received. In particular, the DEMD was interested in answering several questions:
• Have these schools developed any dependence culture? If so, how can they become independent?
• Can they generate their own resources through environmental linkages, without waiting for others to inject resources into their schools?
• Is it possible to bring about behavioural changes in the staff of these schools in order to make them more accountable for school progress?

Identification of school needs

The identification of the needs of the project schools was carried out by the DEMD in several stages. The central pivot was a baseline survey, conducted by specially trained personnel, in order to determine the characteristics, problems and needs of each school. The baseline survey was carried out by the DEMD staff and students following certificated courses, who considered exposure to such an exercise as most beneficial. The baseline survey included interviews with principals and teachers, principal and teacher questionnaires, as well as structured and unstructured observations. One of the instruments used for the baseline survey was ‘the structured observation schedule’. This schedule has five parts, each one examining one area of the school’s functioning:

1. school management and the principal’s role;
2. implementation of the curriculum and co-curricular activities;
3. human resource development;
4. physical resource development; and
5. human relations within the school and school-community relationships.

More details about this schedule are given in Appendix I.

A file was then opened on each school containing the collected data. The data collectors spent three to four days in every school carrying
out this exercise, which had two purposes. The first was to use the data by the implementing institute (the DEMD) to formulate the objectives of the project across the schools. This is further explained in the next section on problem analysis. The second purpose was to enable each trainer to understand and identify in detail the specific needs of each individual school for which they were responsible. When the trainers go to the school for the first in-house session, they already have some knowledge of the school. The trainer, together with school staff, will carry out a needs analysis during this first session. This is further deepened as the in-house sessions progress. In fact the project aims at making the principal and staff more sensitive to the needs of the pupils. Such sensitivity is expected to become a part of school culture.

**Problem analysis**

The DEMD staff studied the material collected, by reading and analyzing each school file. In addition to ‘on-the-spot investigations’, carried out in schools, the contents of the files provided insight into the real problems found in schools or encountered by the school staff. The analysis, among other things, revealed the following factors.

The individual school is submerged in an all-island set of general macro-programmes. The principal and the staff do not seem to make a conscious effort to diagnose their organization and initiate essential organizational changes. There is enough research evidence to indicate that some of the vital factors that influence teaching are the home background of pupils, and the socio-economic status and education of the parents. In remote areas, the sociocultural characteristics of the community, the economic base of the community, and the literacy level of parents are different from urban, semi-urban or even other rural areas. Therefore the school has to recognize this and contextualize the school’s objectives accordingly.
The mere provision of physical resources, or even recruitment of more teachers, have left the basic fabric of the school unchanged. When schools are provided with new infrastructure, equipment, etc., either these are not well maintained or not put into optimum use.

In most of the schools the reservoir of potential energy has not been identified and hence not put to effective use. Community support is a high impact factor for school improvement. In most remote areas the parents and the community are considered incapable of providing a worthwhile contribution, therefore encouraging supportive attitudes among parents and community leaders is essential. For parents to strengthen the education of their children they have to be guided. In fact some communities were supporting teachers to perform poorly.

In some schools there was a readiness for improvement, but there were no well-supported management intervention schemes. Most schools were not regularly visited by the officers of the divisional or zonal office. Some schools in remote areas had not seen a local officer for nearly two years. School personnel complained that they were hardly visited, and in schools where visits were made, they were formal administrative visits which did not concern in-school activities. For schools to be effective, officers must be in constant touch with implementation: working with the principal and teachers, offering them support and also combining it with stressing the importance of achieving standards.

Most programmes at school level do not involve a wide range of individuals from the institution itself. Delegation within the school is a key factor for improvement. Some principals knew very little about their teachers. Teachers had many under-utilized talents but were considered mere subject teachers. The hierarchical, rigid, centralized system of management inhibited the teachers from getting involved in management.
In some schools it was not understood that the educational management process is the central instrument for institutional development. Most principals of schools where the survey was carried out, lacked skills to create an atmosphere for open, constructive dialogue, where challenges are jointly faced and coped with. They did not attempt to solve problems on their own, but passed them on to the hierarchy.

Some examples are quoted to elaborate the above factors.

- A school had received a new building. A few months later a branch of a tree had fallen and had slightly damaged a few tiles. After one year it had not been repaired, even though water was leaking into the classrooms. The principal said that he had informed the office and was awaiting a reply, but he could have simply solved it by getting six tiles replaced.

- Through an aid project, four latrines were built in a school which had nearly 400 students. It was observed that only two were used and two remained closed. The principal, when questioned, said that the latrines are not properly used by students and as such it was difficult to maintain them on a day-to-day basis.

- A school had no teacher’s guides in most subjects. The school would just wait to receive them and had not attempted to explore the possibilities of how to get them.

- An urban school had water facilities from the municipality, but due to a failure in a pipeline was not receiving water. Thirteen months had passed and the municipal office which was responsible for repairing the pipeline was just 100 metres from the school. But neither the principal nor any other staff member had reported the matter to the municipal office. Instead they had written a letter to the education office.

- A primary school with 29 students (in five classes) had four teachers (including the principal). When all four were teaching, they concentrated on four classes and gave an assignment to the other class or left it unattended. When the principal had management functions to attend to, two classes were left without a teacher. The school had failed to adopt the concept of multi-grade teaching.

- Teachers who had a couple of kilometres to walk to reach the school often arrived late. Some schools were closed early on a regular basis. In almost all these schools, the teachers’ register had the arrival and departure times wrongly entered. In some of the schools the community had accepted the late arrival and early departure of teachers as a normal occurrence. A school had two teachers, and both were arriving two hours after the scheduled start. It was noticed that they often took turns; that is, on most days one person kept away. There was a school which was closed one hour earlier than the scheduled time. Malpractices were possible as schools were hardly visited or monitored by officers.

- An urban school was considered disadvantaged due to the fact that pupils were from disadvantaged poor families. The school just continued with the national curriculum, although the survey revealed that its content did not correspond to the pupils’ needs.
The school analysis highlighted the need to develop, among the principals and teachers, the capacity to understand the real organizational dynamics of the schools, the true nature of educational development, and to initiate genuine institutional development attempts.

**Objectives and indicators**

Based on the aforementioned problems and factors, the DEMD developed eight objectives that are to be achieved at the end of the project period of two and a half years.

1. To have developed the capacity of each of the participating schools to conduct continuous self-assessment of the total organization, including the goals, objectives, functions, strategies, structures and values.

2. To have developed among the participating schools the awareness that each school possesses distinct organizational features which make them respond to a unique development strategy.

3. To have developed in each of the participating schools the capacity to conduct self-renewing activities based on school and community needs.

4. To have developed among each of the participating schools the ability to draw resources from the community and to generate its own resources.

5. To have developed among each of the participating schools the capacity to conduct studies related to school development and use the findings for their own organizational improvement.

6. To have developed in each of the participating schools the capability to raise its standard of academic performance.
7. To have developed a pool of trainers who can provide consultancy services in improving schools.

8. To publish documents, conduct seminars, and disseminate new knowledge on institutional development of schools.

In order to determine whether the objectives are realized an indicator and ‘units of measurement’ were developed for each objective.

Objective 1
Indicator:  *schools conduct self-assessment regularly*

Units of measurement
- self-assessment committees organized in the schools
- list of participants and recommendations of workshops
- self-assessment forms and reports
- list of goals, objectives, functions, etc.
- more responsibilities, authorities delegated to teachers
- more favourable attitude of teachers towards the principal and towards each other
- specific talents and potential of teachers identified and harnessed

Objective 2
Indicator:  *schools implement development plans which are unique to their context*

Units of measurement
- a list of problems, strengths and weaknesses
- action plans developed for school improvement
- school profile charts
- supervision reports

Objective 3
Indicator:  *schools involved in innovations in response to local needs*

Units of measurement
- special problem-solving activities undertaken by the schools
monitoring and evaluation instruments
agenda and minutes of school development associations
alumni and well-wishers’ meetings
increase in the number of school activities

Objective 4
Indicator: **schools generating resources from its own community**
Units of measurement
principal and teachers who are competent in identifying and harnessing the resources of the community
list of parents who visited the school and records of meetings
number of home visits
involvement of parents and the community in school affairs
local groups assist the schools in various ways
parents encouraging the education of their children
better health and nutritional habits at homes

Objective 5
Indicator: **schools conduct studies related to school development and apply information for school development**
Units of measurement
file of research tools
study reports
number of teachers trained in research methods
increase in the number of years of schooling for students
increase in student enrolment rates
decrease in student drop-out rates
decrease in student absenteeism
decrease in teacher absenteeism
reports of studies carried out by schools
Objective 6
Indicator:  *students in the school perform well academically at public and internal examinations*

Units of measurement
- high achievement rate among students
- copies of audiovisual aids
- number of techniques identified to improve academic performance
- a profile of each child is available
- self-evaluation format for the teachers
- faster writing and reading ability among students
- increase in the number of students participating in co-curricular activities
- increase in the number of students using sports and library facilities

Objective 7
Indicator:  *education management trainers provide regular consultancy to schools*

Units of measurement
- local trainers competent in facilitating in-house school sessions
- local education officers make regular contact with schools

Objective 8
Indicator:  *DEMD publishing documents, conducting seminars and disseminating knowledge on improving schools*

Units of measurement
- activity books, published documents, number of seminars
- report on policies and recommendations on the improvement of schools
- DEMD staff competencies enhanced.
Strategies

To achieve the objectives, the following strategies were planned.

(i) In-house school sessions

The core of the project is the in-house sessions held in the project schools. Ten such in-house sessions are held over a period of two years. A specially trained person facilitates these sessions, in which the whole school staff are present. They are held on non-working days, generally from 9 o’clock in the morning to 4 o’clock in the afternoon. Each participant is paid 200 rupees (approximately 4 US dollars) a day as an allowance as the in-house sessions are held on non-working days. When schools have less than eight members of staff, they will join the neighbouring schools, which is often the case.

The in-house school sessions aim at:

(a) Individual development of each participant;
(b) Inter-personal development where a team-oriented approach to work is strengthened;
(c) School development.

- Individual development of each participant

It is evident that quality of education is directly related to the quality of teachers. The quality of teachers depends not only on their academic and professional qualifications, nor on their competencies; the decisive factor is their dedication and commitment to making students learn. An indifferent teacher, however well qualified, is unlikely to bring about any quality improvement. The in-house sessions are designed so that teacher professionalism and accountability are enhanced. Another important consideration is to make the teacher a ‘reflective practitioner’. More than ever before, students need to develop high-order problem-solving skills and creative and critical thinking skills. Teachers, unless they themselves develop such skills, are unable to impart them to their students.
- **Inter-personal development**

    Schools are people organizations. Schools need to prepare students to live in harmony in family and society. Schools too have personnel problems and do not seem to make a conscious effort to solve them. There are many schools where the staff have little or no trust in the principal. There are also problems among teachers. This has resulted in the formation of cliques and cabals. Conflicts among teachers affect student learning. It is natural that conflicts arise, but they should be addressed, which is not always the case. Only if there is harmony among staff does each member develop a sense of belonging. It is only then that each member of staff can feel that he/she is needed by the school and by other staff. When an atmosphere of unity is built, one’s presence or absence is felt. The sessions, if well facilitated, bring out the potential of each individual and thereby the dynamism in the group. The group becomes motivated, alive and vibrant.

- **School development**

    The ultimate aim of the intervention is school improvement. The in-house sessions are designed in such a way that after each session the staff will engage in school improvement activities, for which no outside assistance is needed, such as setting up programmes for pupils with special needs, establishing libraries in schools, school maintenance, holding regular staff meetings, etc. These activities may be short-term or long-term. Certain activities thus become integrated into the school’s daily functioning. It is expected that specific projects will become institutionalized in the daily running of schools and result in school improvement.

    The trainer and a representative from the school keep records of the in-house sessions. This helps the trainer in planning the next in-house session, and the school to carry out the work agreed during the session.
Reports, kept by a trainer, of the first two in-house sessions of one school with 18 members of staff, are presented here.

Report 1 - First in-house session

9.00 a.m. Getting to know one another — a game is introduced by the trainer. Participants who already know each other get to know others more intimately including their strengths, weaknesses, expectations.

9.30 a.m. Why are we here? — discussion initiated by the trainer, who briefly outlines the objectives of the intervention.

9.45 a.m. Individual exercise — If I am to work better in this school, what is the transformation (changes) I would like to see happening in the school? Participants list them on a piece of paper individually.

10.00 a.m. Group sharing on the above — one member of the group writes on the blackboard, while others present their own expectations to the group. Several expectations are repeated. After some editing by the writer, with the help of the trainer, the final version reads as follows:

1. Better unity among staff.
3. Classes must be better organized and equipped.
4. Lack of space — more space must be found.
5. Lack of teachers — more teachers must be recruited.
7. More interest in students for learning.
8. Decision-making must be participatory.
9. Lack of parents’ interest — parents must show more interest.
11. Students have no textbooks — they must be provided with textbooks.
12. The teachers’ quarters must be built.


14. Sports facilities must be available.

15. External relations must be developed.

11.00 a.m. Tea break.

11.15 a.m. Participants select one problem stated above, and try to develop a plan to overcome it. The problem selected is: How to improve the condition of classes?

First, each one lists three main characteristics of a good class-room and, finally, the group arrives at a consensus, selecting five main issues to work upon.

1. Class size — 30 students.

2. 30 desks/chairs, teacher’s table, teacher’s chair, cupboard, blackboard must be available for each class.

3. Class must have space for group work.

4. There must be light. The classroom must be airy.

5. Classes must be partitioned.

12.15 a.m. Three discussion groups are now formed and the three groups discuss as to how the following could be achieved.

1. Partitioning, creation of space, having more light and air.

2. Making small classes with a maximum of 30 pupils.

3. How to find the necessary equipment.

1.00 p.m. Lunch.

1.45 p.m. Presentation of group findings by the three groups, followed by discussion. They decide to implement the first activity, i.e. partitioning, creation of space, more light, more air. They develop a detailed implementation plan.

2.30 p.m. Tea break.

2.45 p.m. Discussion on curricular issues - need to contextualize the syllabus, being sensitive to school needs. Trainer presents the theme and participants present their views.

3.30 p.m. The participants present what they would like to achieve through in-house sessions.
• Need to develop inter-personal relations, acquiring skills for the same.
• Developing a futuristic vision for the school.
• Improving relations with students.
• A sound knowledge of education concepts.
• Learn how to work in a group.
• Teaching skills to be developed.
• Classroom management must be improved.

3.45 p.m. A group building game introduced by the trainer.
4.15 p.m. Principal summarizes the day’s proceedings.
4.30 p.m. The end.

Report 2 - Second in-house session

9.00 a.m. The in-house session started with a participant sharing the deliberations of the first in-house session and another stating what had happened in the school since.

9.45 a.m. Then there was a brainstorming session. The participants were asked to identify the characteristics of a good teacher. The characteristics listed are as follows.

Characteristics of a good teacher:
kind tactful
active qualified
self-disciplined genuine
patient mature
devoted tolerant
understanding forgiving
clear voice interested in work
humble attentive (sensitive)
confident good tone
enthusiastic innovative
humane fair
duty-conscious responsible
well prepared  honest
good memory  helpful
energetic    healthy

10.00 a.m. Each one silently thinks and identifies two characteristics
from the list above, one being their strongest characteristic,
another their weakest characteristic. They write the two
characteristics on a piece of paper.

10.05 a.m. Each one chooses one person whom they know best. Once
everyone is paired, they write the strongest and the
weakest characteristic of the selected partner according
to their personal opinion.

10.15 a.m. Each one shares with the other person what they have
written for themselves and what others had written for
them. They also try to reflect upon what they have heard.

10.30 a.m. The trainer now synthesizes the exercise, using ‘the Johari
Window’.  

11.00 a.m. Tea break.

11.15 a.m. The participants in the big group discuss problems in the
Sri Lankan education system. They identify three major
issues:

1. Lack of a relationship between school education and
   the world of work.

2. Lack of contextualization of the curriculum at the
delivery level.

3. Limitations in the pupil evaluation system in the
country.

---

5 The Johari Window (Source: Luft, J. and Ingham, H., 1955) is a framework developed by
two psychologists to help people to understand the development of differences between their
self-perception and others’ perception of them. The Johari Window is divided into four areas:
the open area (known to self and others); blind area (unknown to self but known to others);
hidden area (unknown to others but known to self) and unknown area (unknown both to self
and others). The open area gets enlarged and the other areas become small through self-disclosure
and feedback from others. This framework can be used by the trainers during the in-house
sessions as and when the need arises.
During the discussion they perceive that several things must be done in the school. The participants, with the help of the trainer, sum up and arrive at a common understanding regarding what can be done through their teaching.

1. Syllabus coverage.
2. Examination preparation.
3. Teaching skills for daily living.
4. Producing good citizens with proper values.

12.00 a.m. The participants now work in three small groups and share with each other how some of these system problems are related with their own school and share how the school could help to improve the situation. They agree on the importance of doing all the four, as doing one without the others is useless. They develop projects to achieve these targets.

Group 1- works on syllabus coverage and examination preparation.
Group 2 - teaching skills for daily living.
Group 3 - producing good citizens with proper values.

1.00 p.m. Lunch.

1.45 p.m. The three groups present the outline of the projects they have planned in detail.
Questions are raised by others and the trainer.

2.15 p.m. Presentation — by the trainer on developing and implementing a project. The trainer uses examples from the previous exercise in which the groups were involved. He points out errors and limitations. Participants ask for clarifications.

2.45 p.m. Tea break.

3.00 p.m. Groups develop two specific projects:
‘The reading project for pupils’ and ‘Keeping the environment clean project’.
These projects are believed to help achieve the above-mentioned targets.
4.00 p.m. The projects are presented.
4.30 p.m. The principal explains what he/she believes are the administrative implications in the implementation of projects as he/she sees it, and the trainer makes some remarks.
4.40 p.m. A representative of the group summarizes the day’s proceedings.
4.45 p.m. The end.

(ii) Activity books

Since school-based in-house sessions are held once every two months, there is a need for a more regular process to follow up the outcome of these sessions. This is done through the activity books, which contain activities designed on different aspects of management. These books have more of a practical nature, and in this regard the principal and the staff get together for one to one-and-a-half hours per week, on school days, after school hours. The activities in the book are done either individually or collectively. The learning takes place by experience sharing, group interaction, experiential learning, job redesigning, individual assignments and group assignments.

(iii) School visits

To monitor the activities that the schools carry out, the trainers visit their respective schools in between two in-house sessions on working days. This helps the trainers to find out the school reality, as the in-house sessions are held on non-working days. During the school visits, the trainer (at times supported by the divisional director), assesses the progress made by the school after each in-house session. During the visits one can observe the indicators and hence to what extent the objectives are achieved over a particular period of time.
Trainers

A key factor for the success of this programme is the role played by the trainer. The task of the trainer is by no means an easy one. It is a delicate role. How the trainees perceive the trainer is very important. He/she must have the ability to cope with difficult situations and moments. He/she must provide the atmosphere for professional interaction and enable participants to make the best use of their potential. One can compare the task of the trainer to that of a coach of a team game, for example that of basketball or soccer. Coaches do not really play the game but play it in their mind. They are always alert, deliberative and feel responsible. Their role is one of facilitation and of a process guide. In the same way, the trainer is expected not to provide solutions or ready-made answers, but to help in the deliberation process of the school staff.

All the members of the DEMD are involved as trainers and are assigned to districts. Other trainers are handpicked from areas where the programme is in operation. As the DEMD has the advantage of knowing local personnel who have followed its courses, it can, through a process of deliberation, choose the ones whose profile fits that of facilitator/trainer. Discussions are held with the local authorities before making a final decision. Trainers have postgraduate qualifications in education and most of them have more than 20 years' experience working in different capacities in the education system, i.e. as teacher, sectional head, deputy principal, principal, lecturer at teachers' college or college of education, divisional or zonal officer. Therefore they are substantially competent, in both theory and practice.

The trainers follow a three-day orientation workshop at the DEMD at the beginning, and are given, at regular intervals, further orientation. They will work with a senior trainer for one full cycle, that is for ten in-house sessions. ‘A handbook for the trainer’ has been prepared by the
DEMD staff along with the other trainers, and is used as a guideline for the in-house sessions. The trainers working in the same area meet each other before and after every in-house school session. In the meeting before the in-house session, they plan the in-house session together, and in the meeting after, they evaluate and share specific experiences. This has helped remarkably for each one to grow as a facilitator. However, it must be noted that the centre can only partially prepare the trainer. The trainer has to decide on the type and extent of support needed by each school depending on specific situations. Therefore, what matters, is not only the preparation of the trainer, but also his or her selection. The right type of person, who will intervene at the right time, to the right degree, for the right purpose, is rarely found. The trainer must have the instinct and be able to change ‘gears’ and settle to the right disposition that will suit a given situation.

The principals and the teachers are given an opportunity to evaluate their trainers (see *Appendix II*). The trainer’s involvement reduces as sessions continue. Over time, regional pools of facilitators have emerged, who will have to take over eventually.
II. THE IMPACT

Though the lifespan of this project is too short to undertake a final impact evaluation, direct observations during the in-house sessions, visits made in between the sessions, and, after the completion of all ten sessions, documentary surveys such as session reports, records kept by schools, interviews with principals, teachers, parents, students and trainers, and questionnaires administered to principals and teachers, were used to find out the effects of the intervention on schools.

On the whole, outcomes are positive and encouraging. Collegial relationships have developed in most schools and participatory approaches are evident when faced with problems and developmental tasks. Attempts are being made to tackle problems at school level rather than passing them to higher levels in the hierarchy, and stronger links have been built with the immediate community for mutual benefit. In the in-house school sessions, two or three schools come together. This has reduced the isolation of very remote schools and developed a sense of inter-dependence. School members have become more accountable than before.

School-based development projects

A considerable number of school-based development projects have been initiated by school members. Among the numerous projects that were carried out, there were some standard ones:

The reading project;

The creative writing project;

The resource-generation project; and

The school garden project.
There was one school which had implemented all of the above projects. As explained by the project leaders, they followed several steps, which are outlined below.

Reading project for pupils

(i) identification of reading levels of students by reading tests;
(ii) maintenance of reading diaries by students;
(iii) remedial reading carried out by teachers for weaker students;
(iv) checking of reading-speed improvement by students over regular intervals.

The creative writing project for pupils

(i) children write stories, poems and dramas;
(ii) these are presented at school competitions;
(iii) a ‘creative writing club’ has been established in the school;
(iv) changes visible in children by participating in the above activities are perceived by teachers and records are kept.

The resource-generation project

(i) the school looks out for donors in kind;
(ii) records are maintained on contributions that are received;
(iii) programmes are carried out where parents and well-wishers take part in activities at the school at the weekends, such as white-washing buildings, building fences, etc.

The school garden project

(i) pupils tidy the garden daily in the morning before school starts;
(ii) they prepare flower beds and water the plants after school hours;
(iii) plant hedges are planted to prevent soil erosion.
Some specific achievements

During the intervention, visible improvements or changes had occurred in different schools:

- One school had two teachers. They travelled about 20 kilometres by bus and, after that, had to walk about 6 kilometres to reach the school. The community made arrangements for transport by bicycle to the school every day in the morning and in the afternoon. This prevented late arrival and early departure.

- The school roof was repaired by two parents free of charge. It was the principal’s initiative that enabled this.

- Pupils’ parents in a school were not participating in parents’ meetings. The school got the teacher in charge of cultural dancing activities to organize a variety entertainment show, and the school arranged a parents’ meeting along with the variety entertainment. There was a remarkable increase in participation. All students were involved and parents greatly enjoyed seeing their children perform. From then onwards the parents started taking part in school activities with enthusiasm. The school also continued with diverse but interesting activities to attract parents.

- A school uses space and walls in the most constructive way by providing an atmosphere which helps students to learn. Visual aids are exhibited on walls and strings are drawn across classrooms to hang learning aids and exhibits.

- A school set up a library (reading cell) by inviting teachers and pupils to bring books which they could find in their own homes or obtain from neighbours. The teachers had written to bookshops, well-wishers, and voluntary organizations, requesting them to donate books, and they received several favourable responses.

- Teachers have become more accountable for student achievement. They took the initiative and were responsible for organizing special learning programmes for pupils. Weekly class meetings were held
with parents to identify specific pupil needs. Art, essay writing and handicraft competitions were held in the school, and this has improved student performance.

• A school has become a curriculum leader. Student assessments are held; the records are kept; homes are visited; specific needs of each student are identified and remedial help is provided. Teachers prepare for lessons, and use diverse methods and techniques. They enjoy their work and give their best.

• In another school, teachers speak more favourably of their students. The teachers’ concern for students has grown remarkably. One principal said: “We take individual care of each pupil. The pupils come to me more than before and also approach the teachers freely. It is a new feeling for us and I believe it is even a better feeling for students”.

• Teachers in a school are of the view that their principal has changed her leadership style. A teacher said: “She not only listens to us, but also consults us on all important matters. We feel relaxed. We speak more genuinely now. We are a team, a real team”.

Results of an impact study

A questionnaire was administered to a total of 87 teachers and head-teachers in 12 schools. The questionnaire had five open-ended questions: three on the in-house sessions, and two on the activity books. Sixty-five participants in eight schools answered the questionnaire immediately after the tenth in-house session. The remainder did so between 12 and 18 months after the tenth session. For each question, the answers received from the first group of schools are stated first, followed by answers received from the second group. Since the questions were open-ended, it must be noted that all answers originate from the respondents, who regularly gave more than one answer per question. In order for the reader to appreciate the variety of responses, all are listed below, categorized in sub-headings.
**Question 1: What did you gain out of the in-house sessions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers received from the first set of teachers (65)</th>
<th>Answers received from the second set of teachers (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became more committed to my work.</td>
<td>I understood the role of a teacher better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The in-house sessions made me more oriented to my work.</td>
<td>I understood the task of my school better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personality has developed.</td>
<td>I have developed knowledge in different aspects of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I developed self-confidence.</td>
<td>I gained a better knowledge of school management and the skills involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear knowledge of my task now.</td>
<td>I became more accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became more integrated in my school.</td>
<td>I understood the importance of self-assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I derive more satisfaction out of teaching.</td>
<td>I learned how to co-operate with the community to develop the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My creativity has improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have widened my vision on education.</td>
<td>I was motivated to learn more about various aspects of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My knowledge has increased.</td>
<td>I understood in what aspects I should develop myself as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a teacher I discovered the areas in which I need to improve.</td>
<td>I developed positive attitudes and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This session helped me to know myself better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curricular</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curricular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can manage my classroom better.</td>
<td>I have developed my teaching skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed my teaching skills.</td>
<td>I learned how to utilize environmental resources in the teaching-learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned how to utilize resources better.</td>
<td>I developed skills in multi-grade teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am better prepared for my lessons.</td>
<td>I adapted my teaching style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer students a broad-based curriculum now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in a specific project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help children towards better living rather than just teaching them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towards pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>Towards pupils</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became more child-centred.</td>
<td>My teaching has become more pupil-centred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became more sensitive to children’s needs.</td>
<td>I am more attentive to pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay more attention to pupils with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I began to admire the talents of pupils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-personal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inter-personal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have grown by sharing with teachers of other schools.</td>
<td>I have grown by sharing with other teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more open to others on the staff.</td>
<td>My openness to the outside world has grown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned to work in co-operation with the other teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2: What improvements have taken place in your school as a result of in-house sessions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular</th>
<th>Curricular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-learning process has improved.</td>
<td>Teaching-learning process has changed for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The schools now contextualize national aims.</td>
<td>Audiovisual aids are widely used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has been able to broaden the curriculum it offers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids are exhibited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects have brought a new dimension to school life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has beautified its garden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has started a resource-generation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects have been developed for pupils with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has started a reading/writing project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has started a food project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has started a library project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils have developed better health habits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil attendance has improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils have developed better behavioural habits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils read and write better now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils give more attention to learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden talents in pupils have been identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil performance has increased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary problems among students have decreased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are better inter-personal relations among staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers pay more attention to pupils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attitudes have become positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have become more committed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are better aware of school aims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers received from the first set of schools</th>
<th>Answers received from the second set of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-community relations have improved.</td>
<td>School-community relations have improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School receives better community support.</td>
<td>School involves the community in school activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has better relations with parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has identified resource persons from the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Managerial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management has become more participatory.</td>
<td>School management has become more participatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School is engaged in the generation and</td>
<td>School office has become more education-development oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better utilization of resources.</td>
<td>Teachers share responsibilities with the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School office has become more attractive.</td>
<td>Classroom management has improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more direct contact between pupils and teachers.</td>
<td>School has learned to handle difficult moments better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better relations have developed between</td>
<td>Problems are better solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the principal and teachers.</td>
<td>Planning and implementation of annual programmes are done more methodically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is better school management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has developed a self-evaluation scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display charts are evidently used in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has developed as an organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has developed a positive attitude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms are better arranged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is better planning in the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 3: What improvements could make the programme more effective?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers received from the first set of schools</th>
<th>Answers received from the second set of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend the programme to other schools as well.</td>
<td>Extend the number of in-house sessions. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There must be regular monitoring between in-house sessions.</td>
<td>Close monitoring between in-house sessions. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that the schools carry out must be regularly monitored.</td>
<td>More emphasis should be given to the teaching-learning process. 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make participation compulsory for all the teachers.</td>
<td>Let other schools participate in a similar in-house programme. 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation of all needs to be increased.</td>
<td>More frequent visits to schools by trainer/divisional officer. 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house sessions must concentrate more on the teaching-learning process.</td>
<td>Do not leave too much time between two in-house sessions. 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house sessions must be held more frequently, i.e. once a month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of in-house sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the in-house sessions to parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education officers/Master teachers must be made aware of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision by divisional/zonal office must be linked to the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make in-house sessions singular school based as more time could be spent on the specific needs of each school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More visits to other schools must be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The in-house sessions must lead the school to have a welfare scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates for in-house sessions must be planned at the beginning of the year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house sessions should be made more activity-based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have in-house sessions on working days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get key speakers for in-house sessions to present specific themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: Give suggestions as to how the Activity Books could be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers received from the first set of schools</th>
<th>Answers received from the second set of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplify the activities.</td>
<td>Have more activities dealing with the teaching-learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase group-based activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities must provide more opportunities for discussion.</td>
<td>Have more activities dealing with the teaching-learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities in the book must be parallel with the in-house session themes.</td>
<td>To one-teacher/two-teacher schools, the activity books are not so appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give guidance on the activity books during in-house sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5: How were the Activity Books useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers received from the first set of schools</th>
<th>Answers received from the second set of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since activities are carried out in groups they bring about togetherness.</td>
<td>Helped to broaden our knowledge and skills on school management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made us more activity based in our teaching.</td>
<td>Group Activities helped to bring about unity in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were exposed to management aspects we were not aware of earlier.</td>
<td>Helped in developing community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped in overall school improvement.</td>
<td>Helped to improve office management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We learned how to better utilize school resources.</td>
<td>They provided an opportunity to understand complex concepts and issues in a simple manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They contain daily activities known by all, but the actual practice of them helped us to improve ourselves.</td>
<td>We learned how to better utilize resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary

It is rather striking that, in both sets of schools, the answers were somewhat similar. The time elapsed did not seem to make much difference to the perceptions of the respondents. It is evident from the responses that the in-house school sessions have brought a new dimension to school life. The participants have enhanced their professionalism. In addition to their personal growth, they have widened their knowledge on curricular issues. They have developed their teaching competencies. Their sensibility towards pupils and colleagues has grown. The in-house sessions have provided the necessary atmosphere for behavioural changes in the principals and the teachers.

All respondents had at least one positive factor to share regarding the management process. The introduction of participatory approaches to management was particularly appreciated. The school office was also perceived to be a pivotal point for educational development. The respondents felt that their schools had developed the ability to face difficulties and solve them constructively. Some mentioned that school-based planning and in-school evaluation have become a part of school life.

According to respondents, many positive curricular changes have occurred. What has been achieved during the PSEDP and PSDP programmes is further strengthened. The teaching-learning process has improved due to better teacher preparation, increased use of audiovisuals, and use of diverse teaching techniques.

Frequent reference is made to the specific projects that have been implemented. Respondents seem to greatly appreciate these projects, carried out by schools, which take a central position in school development. Such initiatives often have different goals: some are
directly related to improving pupil performance; others aim at the creation of an atmosphere which is conducive to learning; while some have led to improved school-community relations. As a result, many schools succeed in generating resources from the community, both in kind and in labour.

The respondents saw the activity book as a most useful instructional instrument, but some suggested developing a better link between the activity book and the in-house sessions.

It was proposed to make the programme more effective with regard to increasing the links between the trainers and the divisional/zonal offices. In this regard, two concrete suggestions were made:

• first, to improve the monitoring process between in-house sessions; zonal officers/divisional officers/master teachers need to get more involved in the in-house sessions and the project as a whole;

• second, the same officers need to join the monitoring process in between the in-house sessions.
III. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE PROJECT — A CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Several issues cause concern. School cultures that have been developing over a period of time are disturbed when the trainers enter the scene. Already established formal headships are substituted by informal leader-ships, which has occasionally created some confusion.

The role of bureaucracy outside the school, the officers of the education division, zone, province, etc., is another factor to be kept in mind. The ultimate responsibility regarding the schools will have to be shared by them and schoolheads. Yet the officers do not receive adequate exposure to the project because of their heavy schedules and other priorities. The support of these officers will be a key factor to schools when the project ends. This issue is being addressed. When schools are visited, DEMD staff establish contacts with the divisional officers and develop operational networks. Awareness workshops are held for the divisional officers twice a year with a view to making them collaborators in the school development process.

The institutionalization of the project is a matter of concern, so that its success will not depend on outsiders. The crucial factor is whether the external support is being optimized: “There seems to exist an optimal amount of support, not too much and not too little. Too much support from outside may be in some cases counterproductive; it may weaken the efforts of the school to institutionalize an innovation through its own energies. Too little help and support from the outside may lead to burn-out effects inside the school, or sometimes have the effect of ‘drying up’ the ideas of the people inside school” (Ekholm and Trier, 1987, p. 19).
The withdrawal of the DEMD staff, in theory, should not affect the innovation and trainers are made aware of this. The DEMD is in the process of developing a local pool of resource persons that includes local trainers and officers from divisional/zonal offices. It is expected that this pool will provide ongoing support to schools, as envisaged in this intervention.

The project started with 125 schools in January 1993. Another 225 schools were introduced in January 1995. The schools that benefit from the project are less-privileged ones. However, as any school can benefit from in-house sessions and activity books, the question arises how to get schools, which are not part of this project, to start off along the same road.

Based on this experience the DEMD is developing alternative models of school improvement. Through its long- and short-term courses and at other fora it has been able to ‘sell’ the idea to schools and educational administrators. Some principals of schools outside the intervention have already started to bring the staff together one day a term and to invite a resource person to facilitate school improvement.

At policy level the intervention has been appreciated and already two other models have been designed for implementation. In the first model the principal and the whole staff are to spend one to two hours a week after school designing the work for the following week, and also evaluating the work of the previous week. The second is related to the Sri Lanka Teacher Service established in 1995. One of the prerequisites to be promoted to the next class/grade is participation in a training programme of not less than 300 hours duration.\(^6\) It is now proposed that 50 hours of this will be devoted to a programme where

teachers will come together in groups of 40 for five days in order to reflect and deliberate upon their work. The five days will treat five themes, Teacher professionalism, Teacher accountability, Inter-personal relationships, Code of ethics for teachers and Teacher as a reflective practitioner. The programme will be facilitated by a specially trained person using role plays, case studies, structured exercises, discussions and presentations. This programme is expected to bring about ‘teacher dignity’ and ‘teacher commitment’.
IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This project is aimed at convincing the school personnel that, if schools are to function at their best, the principal and the staff have to take the ownership, interpret national aims, make decisions and implement them. Effective schools take responsibility for the success or failure of their students. The staff members make decisions and play a vital role in the school’s development. While school autonomy is increased, it has to be balanced with accountability.

Lockheed and Levin (1993) are of the view that “schools are more effective when they choreograph their own activities (within the framework of a larger effective schools programme) instead of being expected merely to follow a formula or script sent down from higher levels”.

Most of us too believe that schools can do better and to do better they need ‘support’. The fundamental question is: What should the nature of that ‘support’ be? Dalin et al. (1994, p. 260), based on an international study, write: “In the excellent schools the teachers and the headmaster (as well as parents) feel more empowered and more committed and they work more actively to adapt the new curriculum and materials to their needs. At the same time they work more closely with the supervisor and feel pressure to ‘do it right’. In other words, to delegate responsibilities to the school does not mean to leave the school alone”.

Since schools have become rather conditioned and their personnel have become ‘mere travellers in a ship’ piloted by others, they need re-orientation to make them pilot the ship. The trainers try to provide this re-orientation. Their task is one of vision building. In order to institutionalize the concept of ownership, they in fact had to undo or deinstitutionalize the dependency the schools are used to.
The in-house sessions have paved the way or provided an opportunity for an open, ongoing, professional dialogue. Principals, and teachers too, know about education, and they have to be provided with a regular forum to voice their views. Unfortunately no organized or conscious attempts are made to explore their views. In fact the process of obtaining teachers' views in determining education policy needs to be institutionalized. The in-house sessions have met this need to some extent. In the near future other models will emerge with wider participation.

By engaging in an institutional development project at school level, the DEMD itself, as a management development institute, has benefited in many ways. The intervention has strengthened the institutional capacity of the DEMD: the institute is now in a more advantageous position to create new knowledge on institutional development for the use of all school managers in the country. The staff is also in a position to provide new insights and information to policy-makers and planners. Moreover, the institute has been able to enrich all its professional development programmes by using the experience of this intervention. There is a strong focus on staff development in the project. The intervention has added a new dimension to the working lives of the DEMD staff and the staff members have broadened their horizons in institutional development. More than anything else the institute, through its involvement in this intervention, is now engaged more deeply in its fundamental mission.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

The structured observation schedule, used in the needs analysis survey

This instrument has five parts, each covering one area of the school’s functioning. Each part consists of a number of headings, referring to different characteristics which are relevant to that area of the school’s functioning.

The school can perform either satisfactorily or poorly under the given headings. Five possible positions are stated for each heading. The data collectors observe the school for four to five days and will put a tick next to the position they think is appropriate. One will understand this by studying the examples given at the end of the appendix.

The data collector will spend four or five days in the school doing interviews, getting questionnaires completed, gathering other data, and studying documents, and is therefore in an advantageous position to mark the observation schedule.

The DEMD staff designed this schedule. A two-day orientation session was organized for the data collectors before going to the field. Each data collector was a professional and thus had a deep understanding of the concepts mentioned in the observation schedule. It is possible to use the same schedule after the project period to see what changes had occurred in schools by comparing the ‘score’ at the moment of the baseline survey with the ‘score’ obtained at the impact evaluation.
The areas of the school’s functioning

1. **School management and the principal’s role**
   1.1 Goals
   1.2 Planning
   1.3 Leading
   1.5 Instructional leadership
   1.6 Guidance and counselling
   1.7 Motivation
   1.8 Communication
   1.9 Conflict management
   1.10 Supervision
   1.11 Morale and commitment

2. **Implementation of the curriculum and co-curricular activities**
   Implementation of the timetable
   2.2 Syllabuses, textbooks, teacher’s guides
   2.3 Use of syllabuses
   2.4 Classroom arrangement
   2.5 Maintenance of class-records
   2.6 Preparation by the teacher
   2.7 Use of teaching methods
   2.8 Exercises/assignment to pupils
   2.9 Assessment
   2.10 Pupils with special educational needs
   2.11 Supervision
   2.12 Learning process
   2.13 Associations/unions/clubs
   2.14 Sports activities
   2.15 Participation in co-curricular activities
3. **Human resource development**
   3.1 Professional development of the principal
   3.2 Identification of teacher skills and interests
   3.3 Teacher development — internal programme
   3.4 Teacher development — external programme
   3.5 Teacher welfare
   3.6 Student welfare and development

4. **Physical resource development**
   4.1 School surroundings
   4.2 State of buildings
   4.3 Office
   4.4 Maintenance of classrooms
   4.5 Library facilities
   4.6 Use of furniture
   4.7 Latrine facilities
   4.8 School playground
   4.9 Free books
   4.10 Mid-day meal

5. **Human relations within the school and school community relationships**
   5.1 Principal-teacher relationship
   5.2 Principal-student relationship
   5.3 Teacher-student relationship
   5.4 Student-student relationship
   5.5 Teacher-teacher relationship
   5.6 School and the community
   5.7 From the school to the community
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Two examples of assessment

### 1.10 Supervision

| (i) | Principal is of the view that he/she has no time to supervise. |
| (ii) | He/she is involved in random supervision. |
| (iii) | Principal supervises the work alone, but has no supervision plan. |
| (iv) | Multiple supervision methods are used. |
| (v) | Principal has a corporate plan for supervision where the staff join him/her to supervise all aspects. This assures educational development. |

### 3.4 Teacher development — external programme

<p>| (i) | No consideration is given to staff development. |
| (ii) | Teachers’ needs are sometimes considered and they are sent to in-service courses. |
| (iii) | Teachers often attend in-service courses. |
| (iv) | Teachers often attend in-service courses and are regularly guided by master teachers. Some attend distance-training programmes. |
| (v) | A continuous formal programme is implemented for staff development. Principal shows interest and dedication towards it. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Comes prepared for sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes trainees aware of the proceedings at the beginning of the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brings audiovisual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is familiar with the work of trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firm and clear orientation towards the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to convince others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual capacity</td>
<td>A wide knowledge in theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A deep knowledge in theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to develop conceptual frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to relate practice to theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional maturity</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aptitude and ability to listen/attentive understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased awareness of adult psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maturity to overcome difficult moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to handle one’s own perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handles relationships with others smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps others to handle their relationships smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Ability to present complex ideas in simple form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to assure communication with and between all persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility/ability to respond to trainee demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of learning strategies - variety of methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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