

LOCAL AND GLOBAL CONGERIES SHAPING EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA

Mousumi Mukherjee and Kumar Suresh

Educational administration as an applied field of study in many Western country contexts has had a long history. In the 1940s, the field's knowledge base was grounded in the "wisdom of practice" from retired principals and supervisors teaching various programs. From 1960s and 1970s onwards, empirical revolution slowly swept the field. The core areas of study in educational administration were policy and governance; organizational structure; educational leadership; change and innovation in educational institutions; principal preparation programs; higher education and teachers' careers. Because education and administration are two independent fields of study in their own right and education, by definition, is an eclectic interdisciplinary field of study that has applied perspectives and models from social sciences in educational settings, these studies were interdisciplinary in nature, incorporating politics, economics, sociology, and psychology of education (Oplatka, 2010).

Asia Pacific Education, pages 173–186
Copyright © 2019 by Information Age Publishing
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

The field of educational administration, in itself, comprises the managerial and organizational aspects of educational institutions (both school education and higher education). However, education scholars, whose main focus of research tends to be schooling—that is, curriculum and instructional pedagogy directly impacting teaching/learning processes—rarely take organizational and managerial perspectives into consideration to inform their studies. Yet, the way in which educational organizations are run by leaders directly impacts what happens inside the classroom. Educational administrators and leaders are, therefore, key human factors connecting their schools, as micro-social institutions, with the larger society outside. Moreover, since educational institutions and the way in which they operate depends a lot on the larger political, economic and sociological context within which they are embedded, by extension, educational administration has been shaped by historic contexts.

Educational administration is directly connected to the economic and social well-being of people in all countries. Hence, educational administration constitutes a key area of social policy at the national and local/regional level in most countries around the world. In most postcolonial, modern, nation-states, policies related to educational administration have been also strongly connected to the agenda of nation-building (Bhagia, Briggs, & Bhagia et al., 1990). However, there has been widespread concern about this nation-building project and overall educational quality in most postcolonial, developing nation-states around the world.

In recent years, academic scholarship in the area of educational policy and administration has increasingly been concentrated on the adverse impact of globalizing, neoliberal, education policy on educational administration in local contexts (Rizvi, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Stier, 2004; Torres, 2009). Within this larger context, this chapter seeks to discuss and analyze the intersection of local and global congeries historically shaping educational policy making and administration within the Indian context. The following sections will further expand on this historic process.

LOCAL AND GLOBAL CONGERIES

Educational administration within the Indian context has been historically shaped by congeries of local and the global because of the colonial legacy of the Indian subcontinent. Prior to the advent of the missionaries and later the British colonial administration, educational administration of indigenous schools was solely under the authority of the kings and queens of the Princely States. Schools would be run by leaders of various religious groups in temples and mosques patronized by rulers of the Princely States. The teachers or “Gurus” in these village schools were patronized by the ruling

class—the kings and queens. They served the educational training needs of the princes and noblemen and various tradesmen of the local village communities (Diwan, 2015; Seth, 2007).

During the British colonial period following the Wood’s Despatch of 1854, as a result of deliberations with native elites and intellectuals, the colonial state opened government-run and government-aided secular schools for public instruction for the first time. The administration of these schools, opened to educate the natives across the Indian subcontinent, was in the hands of the office of the Director of Public Instruction under the colonial governors of each province of the Indian subcontinent. However, a major problem during this time was a lack of adequate funding for establishing good quality schools and public instruction systems. The colonial government was not very keen on spending much to actually establish good quality educational institutions and high quality teachers’ training, as revealed by historic documents of the colonial era analyzed by scholars such as Sanjay Seth (2007).

The following quote by Sir Alexander Grant (1868) from “Some observations on educational administration in India in a letter to the Right Hon. Sir Stafford H. Northcote (Her Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for India),” after he resigned from the Office of Director of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency, is of great historic interest. It shows the comparative discrimination people in the colony of the Indian subcontinent experienced compared to the population of England, though the needs of the people of the colony were much greater when compared to those of the people in the colonial center.

It is further to be observed, in reference to population, that the educational grant for the United Kingdom, if rightly estimated above at £1,400,000, is fourteen times as large as that for the Presidency of Bombay, which, however, contains a population estimated at 15 millions, or half that of the United Kingdom. Nor must it be left out of sight that in India the State finds next to nothing done to its hand, whereas in England the grants of the Privy Council are mere supplements to the ancient educational foundations existing throughout the country. All these considerations tend, I think, to show that the present educational grant in Bombay of £93,544, out of a Presidential revenue of more than £9,000,000, and for a population of 15 millions, is not excessive, but inadequate, especially since the education and improvement of the natives are frequently put forward among the primary objects of the English government in India. (Grant, 1868, p. 6)

This colonial policy of underfunding education continues to be a pattern within postcolonial India. Although it has increased over the post-independence years, educational investment remains less than four percent of GDP. However, this is barely adequate for the needs of the growing population

of the Indian subcontinent or for India as a modern, postcolonial, nation-state. Despite the Kothari Commission's recommendations in 1964 to make a minimum common investment of 6% of GDP, a piecemeal approach has pervaded educational administration reform within India (Mukherjee, 1970) and the recommendation has not been met.

In 1993–1994, for example, a community-based District Primary Education Program (DPEP) was set up over several phases. It now covers 272 districts in 18 states of the country. The expenditure on the program was shared by the Central Indian Government (85%) and the state governments. However, the Central Government's share was provided by a number of external agencies, including the World Bank, Department for International Development (DFID), and United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF) (Jalan & Glinskaya, n.d.). Besides the DPEP, a number of state programs were also operating with the support of international agencies and external funding. In 2001, all the programs were merged under an all-encompassing flagship program of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) for better implementation of the goal of universal primary education. It is worth noting here that, in May 2014, the World Bank granted a \$1 Billion loan¹ to the Indian Government for its SSA program to promote "Education for All," yet public investment in education by the Indian Government continued to be very low compared to other developing and developed economies, despite the growing Indian economy.

Indeed, India's public spending on education is one of the lowest in the world and is far below the global average. Recently, the Right to Education Act (2010) was passed but none of the funding allocations, as per the Tapas Majumdar Committee (January 1999) recommendation, were made to implement it. It can be seen, then, that the global, neoliberal trends of underfunding education, promotion of privatization and educational entrepreneurship in the field of education are also very locally-driven in the Indian context (Dreze & Sen, 2013; Ganguly-Scrase & Scrase, 2008; Mukherjee, 2015; Srivastava, 2013).

In recent years, since the 11th five-year plan, there is increasing public policy emphasis on public-private partnership models (PPP) for establishing educational institutions and delivery of services. India, of course, has had a long tradition of PPP (in the form of government-recognized private schools) run by charitable organizations and as philanthropic initiatives. But, there has also been a push for encouraging a for-profit model of PPP, whereby the government has been inviting PPP to do normal business in education with huge government subsidies.²

Hence, government-run public schools often lack even basic infrastructure like a classroom and a well-trained teacher (Dreze & Sen, 2013; Ghosh, 2012; Jha et al., 2008; Sadgopal, 2012). It is to be noted here that, though there has been significant increase in teacher salaries in recent years (Dreze

& Sen, 2013), the system still faces a huge shortage of appropriately-skilled teachers and much of the system is run, primarily, by poorly-educated and poorly-paid para-teachers (Chandra, 2015).

COMPOUNDING CHALLENGES OF EXPANSION

Compounding the challenges of funding and poorly-trained teachers, some private and denominational educational institutions in the diverse educational sector in postcolonial India heighten the challenges for educational administration and democratic leadership. As highlighted by Mukherjee (1970, p. 250):

Today the denominational institutions can be classified into four groups, namely, (1) those run by different Christian missions, (2) those run by different religious sects of Hindus and Moslems, (3) those run for different castes, especially orthodox Hindus, (4) those run for linguistic minorities in states other than their own.

So far as serving their own groups, in preserving the culture and heritage, is concerned, they are doing some service to which no one can take exception. The problem arises when they try to influence others by compulsory indoctrination. Though a democratic state cannot object to proselytization or conversion by open propaganda among persons who are under no pressure, one would feel that if they are adopted in the schools where conditions are authoritative, they may involve compulsion. While persuasion may be allowed, indoctrination must be stopped. Likewise, institutions meant for particular castes may not be tolerated when our aim is to establish a casteless society.

With the advent of the 21st century and the expansion of the new Indian middle-class in the age of globalization and transnational capitalism, international schools have expanded their operations across India (Mukherjee, 2015). These schools are affiliated under the International Baccalaureate and Cambridge International Examination Board. This, too, has multiplied the challenges of educational administration within India since, rather than a common-school system, there are now a number of parallel schooling systems (Deepika, 2016).

The education system in India over the past decades has witnessed phenomenal expansion across various levels and sectors. The data relating to the school education system indicates a substantial increase in the number of schools, students, teachers and different kinds of school facilities (NIEPA, 2016; GOI, 2016). This expansion has been more visible during the last decade and may be attributed to a number of . However, the global emphasis on education for all and subsequent policy initiatives by both the

federal and state governments have been major drivers of reforms in the school education system.

The District Primary Education Project (DPEP), initiated in the 1990s with the support of international agencies and in collaboration with both the federal and state governments, was one of programs emanating from the policy perspective of expanding and universalizing primary education. Similarly, *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (SSA), a program for universalizing education at the primary level, and *Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan* (RMSA), a program for universalization of secondary education, initiated by the federal government in 2001 and 2006 respectively, are important interventions in this regard. Many other initiatives at state level, implemented both by the state government and non-governmental agencies, for universalizing elementary education have been instrumental in expanding elementary education in India.

Policy initiatives for reforms and interventions in school education have introduced new dimensions to educational administration and management. One of the significant developments was the introduction of a new and parallel administrative structure at state, district and sub-district levels for managing the massive SSA program. There is also a trend towards gradual change in principles and orientation of educational governance, with added emphasis on changing the paradigm of educational delivery. The ensuing sections substantiate this point. The legislative enactment of the *Right of the Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009* is important here. The RTE Act marks a departure from an incentive- and provision-based approach to education to a rights-based approach to education. It has necessitated reforms in educational administration at district, sub-district, and institutional level as well as alignment of functional responsibilities of field-level educational functionaries (GOI, 2011). Both SSA and RTE are local manifestations within the Indian context following the global movement of Education for All led by UNESCO following the Jomtien Conference in 1990 and the Right to Education movement, once again led by the United Nations agencies and International Human Rights Watch (Daudet & Singh, 2001; Govinda, 2007; Human Rights Watch, 2016; Mehendale & Mukhopadhyay, 2018)

FROM ADMINISTRATION TO GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP

Ensuring accountability and transparency in educational administration and improving efficiency and efficacy of the system are major entry points of change in emphasis of educational administration. There is departure from the rigid form of hierarchy of educational administration towards a more participatory form of school management at the local levels. The 73rd

and 74th amendments to the Constitution of India stipulate mandatory involvement of local bodies. Under the three-tier structure of Panchayati Raj, rural local government groups and urban local bodies, such as municipalities, municipal boards, municipal corporations, municipal councils, and so on, are expected to share the responsibility of managing schools at the local level structure of educational administration. Similarly, the RTE Act mandates participatory school governance through School Management Committees (SMC) at the elementary school level. The elected local bodies have been assigned responsibility to act as the local authority for the purpose of school management (Suresh, 2018).

The changes are being experienced in both school and higher education sectors. The school education system itself has experienced numerous changes at various levels of educational administration—starting from the institutional level to up to the federal level. The state reports of the All India Survey of Educational Administration testify these changes (NIEPA's Reports of the Survey, 1991–2001, 2014–2018). The reports also signal the system level reforms which have been introduced over the years across the states and union territories. Bifurcation of educational administration across different levels and creation of separate ministries and departments have been part of the changes in educational administration. Both federal and state governments have restructured their administrative configurations, especially at district and sub-district levels. The creation of different levels of academic support institutions, such as District Institute of Educational Training (DIET), Block Resource Centres (BRCs), and Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs) and reforms in the system of teacher management (various types of teachers' cadres) are examples of the significant change that is occurring.

The basic intent of the reforms and policy initiatives has been to upscale education in terms of enrollment, retention, completion, and transition of students from one level to another. They have, simultaneously, been intended to enhance access, equity, and quality in education. The following sections map some of the policy reforms initiated mainly at the national level as well as their implications for educational administration and attempt to identify recurring problems and new challenges in field-level educational administration. The identification of challenges could be an important way of identifying an appropriate approach and mechanism for strengthening educational administration.

POLICY REFORMS AND PROGRAM INITIATION

Education in India, especially elementary, has barely been a core concern in the agenda of democratic nation-building except for rhetorically. The financial allocation made to the sector referred to earlier is one of the

important indicators of relative neglect. A major shift can be identified with the transfer of education as a state subject to a subject of concurrent responsibility of national concern. In consonance with this shift, the 1980s and following decades experienced numerous policy and program interventions both at the macro and micro level.

The most important policy reform in education was the Education Policy of 1986 and Program of Action of 1992. The Education Policy of 1986 and Program of Action of 1992 started new discourse in education administration with additional emphasis on decentralized planning and governance. To follow up the policy, the process and practice of educational planning at district, block, and institutional started. The role of local government was also brought to center stage of educational planning and governance. The Central Advisory Board in Education, an advisory cum deliberative body for educational policy and planning under the Ministry of Human Resource Development of the Government of India, also made recommendations in 1993 for decentralized governance of education. This was in tune with stipulated provisions under the 73rd and 74th amendments to the Constitution of India.

Similarly, a number of centrally-sponsored schemes of the federal government and internationally supported programs for educational development made their presence in state education sectors. These included the Lok Jumbish Project in Rajasthan, Shiksha Karmi project in Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh, Andhra and Bihar Education Projects, District Primary Education Project (DPEP), nutritional support program for primary school children (Midday Meal), SSA, RMSA, teacher education, and academic support systems. All these programs contain implementation strategies and mechanisms. One of the strategies was to go beyond the governmental framework of structure and processes of implementing policies and programs. For quick implementation and outcome-oriented processes, alternative structures were set up which provided space for participation of actors and agencies outside the governmental structure. The framework of SSA program implementation is a case in point (GOI, 2011).

The interface of educational administration with the reform initiatives, in states in particular, has been complex because the states' structure of administration as well as their resources were not geared up to respond to policy initiatives in the desired manner. Thus, the states have been raising their concerns through their Chief Ministers in the meetings of the Inter State Council, a consultative federal body, or through their education minister in the meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education. Clearly, the reform processes have significantly impacted educational administration in states including the field level (district, block, and institutional level) of educational administration.

Some of the implications of the reform process include: diversification of structure of educational administration in the form of proliferation of structures of educational administration (SSA, RMSA, and MDM); decentralized planning structure (the concept of District Level Planning); decentralized management of education (centrality of district, block, and institutional level administration along with local bodies); participatory structures at the institutional level and responsibilities related to their management (Parent Teacher Association, Mother Teacher Association, Village Education Committee, School Management and Development Committee in the case of secondary schools, and School Management Committee for elementary schools, which is a mandatory requirement under the provision of the RTE Act etc.); and a variety of academic support structures such as District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), Block Resource Center (BRC), Cluster Resource Centre (CRC).

The diversification of structures has posed new kinds of challenges to educational administration at district, block, and institutional levels. One problem is involvement of multiple actors and agencies and their overlapping jurisdictions. Lack of coordination between them creates a situation of delayed implementation of policies and programs and deficient outcomes. More responsive and participatory governance practices, which recognize and respect the centrality of the need and aspirations of children, parents, and the community at large, are required to be adhered to at the institutional level if multiple actors and agencies are to work in unison for effective delivery of educational needs. This was neither so much a pronounced nor constituted integral part of earlier educational governance principles.

Previously, educational governance and educational delivery was primarily centered around a supply-driven governmental approach of educational delivery. This was not essentially aligned with any need and demand-based approach of the community and has been one of the impeding factors in terms of educational outcomes. Also evident is the change in the principles and orientation of educational governance. As indicated earlier in this discussion, change has been experienced not only in the structure and function of educational administration but also in its orientation and approach. District and block level functionaries of education are expected to provide leadership at their respective levels.

The changing paradigm of educational delivery, from an incentive-based approach to a right-based approach to education, is a significant development. It has been further reinforced by the RTE Act, which mandates free and compulsory education to the children in the age group of 6–14. Enhancing accountability and transparency is another important dimension added to educational administration. Two factors to which this development may be attributed are emphasis on accountability and transparency as a generic concern of good governance and mandated outcome of legal

enactment of the right to information. As per the provisions contained in the Right to Information Act of 2005, government departments, agencies, and institutions are mandated to supply information on demand by the public on various aspects of administration and governance. Though this has increased the volume of work in educational administration, the Act has necessitated increased accountability and transparency in both general administration and educational administration.

Needless to add, all the policy initiatives and resultant changes in structure and functions of administration of school education have been intended to improve the functioning of the school system in terms of efficiency, efficacy, and economies of scale in administration. How far the system has improved is a recurring issue of concern. These changes have not been fully realized in the functioning of the system. Studies and reports on different aspects of educational administration and governance indicate there is a gap between the intent and the practice (NIEPA's Reports of the Survey, 2018; Suresh, 2018; Suresh & Tyagi, 2013).

Among the many persisting problems is meaningful participation of students. Access, equity, and quality are issues that remain to be addressed. Though these are deep-rooted, systemic problems emanating from society and the political economy of schooling, the role of field-level educational administration is important. Since field-level administration is instrumental in implementing policies and programs at the institutional level, a weak administrative structure and process and non-committed educational functionaries can defeat the intent of any policy or program. We find there is a gap between policy perspective (vision and target) and policy implementation. The gap can be attributed to a number of factors—systemic issues as well as grounded realities of implementation. Regarding the gap in policy formulation and grounded realities, the performance of policy, in terms of its outcomes, may not be up to the mark. The policy of mergers and closures of “unviable” primary schools is a case in point (Rao, 2017).

Insights can be gathered from the state reports of the third All India Survey of Educational Administration (State Reports of the Survey, 2018) as well as a large-scale data set. This data was collected from approximately 2,500 district and block level educational functionaries across ten states of India attending the State Level Conferences of District and Block Level Education Officers (conducted between 2012–2018), through structured questionnaires. The results point out many problem areas of field-level educational administration, including inadequate supervision and monitoring of schools; lack of vertical and horizontal coordination in administration, and governance of schools; gap between required number of qualified and trained teachers and the available number of teachers; and workload of the field level (district and sub-district level) educational functionaries, among others. Despite numerous reforms introduced for better functioning of

schools and school administration, effective monitoring and supervision of schools is not happening in most of the states. Educational functionaries barely have time to visit schools. Even if visits are made to the schools and inspection reports are prepared, the follow up action is almost negligible. Decentralization is an area in which there is a vast gap between policy and practice. The policy pronouncement since 1980s, including the National Education Policy of 1986 and Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, have *specifically* highlighted and underlined the importance of the decentralization of educational governance and more focus on involvement of local bodies, the community, parents, and so on, in the framework of participatory governance of schools.

Yet, despite policy pronouncements for decentralized and participatory school governance, there is rarely any meaningful participation of community and local bodies in school governance. The local bodies do not have adequate capacity and competence to effectively participate in educational management of elementary schools (Bhattacharjee, 2014; Guha, 2014; NIEPA, Survey Reports, 2018; Roy & Banerjee, 2012; Suresh, 2018). Similarly, School Management Committees (SMCs) are more of a kind of decorative structure of school governance in most of the cases (NIEPA, 2018 Data Set of State Level Conferences). As per the provision of the RTE Act, SMC, which consists of mainly parents and community, besides teachers and head teachers of the school is empowered and expected to effectively participate in school governance. The formulation of a school development plan is one of the critical responsibilities assigned to SMCs.

The empirical data and research reveals that the participation of the members of SMCs is minimal in most of the states (NIEPA Data Set of State Level Conferences, 2018; NIEPA Survey Reports, 2018; Suresh, 2018). However, there are also variations across the states and regions. Maharashtra, Karnataka, Gujarat, and Kerala are some of the states wherein SMCs are more active and take interest in activities related to governance of schools such as the formulation of a school development plan, preparation of the academic calendar, extra-curricular activities, and so forth. They actively participate in monthly SMC meetings. It is inferred that active and vibrant SMCs ensure better functioning of schools. They are helpful in effective school monitoring and meaningful linkage between the school and its community.

The foregoing discussion on educational administration, especially at the district, block, and institutional level, indicates that educational administration in India has experienced numerous changes in terms of diversification of structure and functions as well as orientation and mode over the past three decades. The policy measures for improving the educational scenario have been major drivers of reforms in educational administration. Despite these reforms, there are recurring problems. Some may be considered the

product of the legacy of colonial administration which was more rigid, hierarchical, bureaucratic, and government-centric rather than people-centric (Ghosh, 2007; Shukla, 1983). The recurring problems necessitate corrective measures in different aspects including supervision, monitoring, and a strengthened decentralized structure of educational administration.

CONCLUSION

It can be argued that, as stated in the title of this chapter, local and global forces continue to shape educational administration within India. There has been a major shift during the postcolonial era, driven by local needs and also mandates of global development agencies such as the United Nations agencies and Human Rights Watch. However, vestiges of colonial structures of administration continue to create barriers for educational administration in India, despite recent reform. Nation-centric analysis of educational administration and its problems may miss challenges presented by the remnants of colonial structures and practices within postcolonial contexts, such as India. Such an analysis runs the risk of becoming ahistorical and, therefore, does not provide holistic understanding of the problems of complex postcolonial settings, let alone find appropriate solutions. Hence, this chapter sought to historically situate the context of Indian educational administration to highlight the challenges of reform initiatives in contemporary times.

NOTES

1. See <https://www.livemint.com/Politics/zS9qkb0ITXOKtoM7SsnSbP/India-inks-1-bn-loan-pact-with-World-Bank.html>
2. See Tilak (2016), *Public-private partnership in education*. Retrieved from [http://www.headfoundation.org/papers/2016_3\)_Public_Private_Partnership_in_Education.pdf](http://www.headfoundation.org/papers/2016_3)_Public_Private_Partnership_in_Education.pdf).

REFERENCES

- Bhagia, N., Briggs, D., & Bhagia, S. (1990). *Educational administration in India and other developing countries—Challenges, tasks & training*. New Delhi, India: Commonwealth Publishers.
- Bhattacharjee, M., Mysore, D., & Sivaramakrishnan, A. (2014). RTE grievance redress in Karnataka. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31(23), 37–41.
- Chandra, M. (2015). The implications of contract teaching in India: A review. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(2), 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210314567288>

- Daudet, Y., & Singh, K. (2001). *The Right to education: An analysis of UNESCO's standard-setting instruments*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Deepika, K. C. (2016). *International schools mushrooming all over the city*. The Hindu. Retrieved from <http://www.thehindu.com/news/cities/bangalore/International-schools-mushrooming-all-over-the-city/article14474320.ece>.
- Diwan, R. (2015). Small schools in rural India: 'Exclusion' and 'inequity' in hierarchical school system. In M. Mukherjee (Ed.), *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(2), 187–204.
- Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). *An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ghosh, J. (2012). Funding, The key. In I. Natarajan (Ed.), *The wings of learning: Will the RTE Act survive?* (pp. 135–145). Bharathi Puthakalayam: Indian University Press.
- Ghosh, S. C. (2007). *History of education in India*. Jaipur: Rawat Publication.
- Government of India. (1986). *National policy on education*. New Delhi, India: Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development Department.
- Ghosh, J. (1992). *National policy on education and programme of action*. New Delhi, Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development.
- Ghosh, J. (2011). *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan—Framework of implementation*. New Delhi, India: Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development Department.
- Govinda, R. (2007). *Education for all in India: Assessing progress towards Dakar goals*. Background paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2008.
- Grant, A. (1868). *Some observations on educational administration in India*. University of Bristol Library. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/60249102>.
- Human Rights Watch. (2016). *The education deficit: Failures to protect and fulfill the right to education in global development agendas*. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/accessible_document/education_deficit0616_accessible.pdf
- Jalan, J., & Glinskaya, E. (n.d). *Improving primary school education in India: An impact assessment of DPEP*. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/Training-Events-and-Materials/india_primaryschool.pdf.
- Jha, P. K. (2008). Public provisioning for elementary education in India. In P. Jha et al. (Eds.), *Public provisioning for elementary education in India* (pp. 35–64). New Delhi, India: SAGE.
- Mehendale, A., & Mukhopadhyay, R. (2018). *The right to education movement and policies: Promises and realities*. Geneva: NORRAG.
- Mukherjee, L. (1970). *Problems of administration of education in India*. Lucknow: Lucknow University Press.
- Mukherjee, M. (2016). From missionary to new middle-class schooling in the era of global capitalism: Dilemmas of inclusive education reform in India. In J. Sprague (Ed.), *Globalization and transnational capitalism in Asia and Oceania* (pp. 228–242). London, England: Routledge.

- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). (1991–2001). *Reports of the survey of educational administration in states and UTs*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA.
- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). (2018). *Reports Third All India Survey of Educational Administration (Mimeograph)*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA.
- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration and Government of India. (2016). *Elementary education in India: Progress towards UEE—Flash Statistics 2005–06 to 2015–16*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA & GoI.
- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). (2018). *Issues and challenges of district and block level educational administration—Data of the responses of the district and block level education officers (Mimeograph)*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA.
- Oplatka, I. (2010). *The legacy of educational administration: A historical analysis of an academic field*. Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Rao, S. (2017). *School closures and mergers: A multi-state policy and its impact on public education system*. New Delhi, India: Save the Children.
- Roy, D., & Banerjee, P. S. (2012). Decentralised governance reforms in primary education: Some reflection on West Bengal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(24), 67–74.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies and Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256–263.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, F. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London, England: Routledge.
- Sadgopal, A. (2012). Right to education vs. right to education act. In I. Natarajan (Ed.), *The wings of learning: Will the RTE Act survive?* (pp. 55–126). Bharathi Puthakalayam: Indian University Press.
- Seth, S. (2007). *Subject lessons: The Western education of colonial India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shukla, P. D. (1983). *Administration of education in India*. New Delhi, India: Vikas.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2, 1–28.
- Suresh, K. (2018). *Report of the study on shared responsibilities and competence of the local bodies in the management of elementary education in Madhya Pradesh and Bihar (Mimeograph)*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA.
- Suresh, K., & Tyagi, R.S. (2013). *Block level educational administration in Gujarat- Karnataka: Emerging challenges and need for reforms (Mimeograph)*. New Delhi, India: NIEPA.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2016). *Public private partnership in education, The Head Foundation Discussion Paper Series No. 3*. Retrieved from: http://www.headfoundation.org/papers/2016_3_Public_Private_Partnership_in_Education.pdf
- Torres, C. A. (2009). *Globalizations and education, in collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press-Columbia University.

CHAPTER 14

DISRUPTING THE NORM?

Implementing Educational Business Improvement Models in Pakistani Public-Private School Partnerships

Venesser Fernandes

This chapter proposes that, through the use of “educational business models” and by adopting “a progressive-reflective approach to educational quality” (Fernandes, 2016), public and private schools in urban and rural areas hold the potential for developing continuous, school improvement frameworks that are contextually relevant; focused on good educational leadership and continuous school improvement; and managed as ethical and sustainable social businesses.

BROKEN: PROBLEMATIZING THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS IN PAKISTAN

There is a deep-rooted crisis in education within Pakistan. This long-standing crisis has continued over the last 70 years since Pakistan gained its