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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study entitled **ROLE OF RESOURCE CENTRE FOR IMPROVING QUALITY EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS** is an attempt to study the role of Resource Centers that are played for the quality enhancement in schools in Nepal. The overall objective of this study was to identify targeted interventions those are effective in retention of students’ in the classroom. The summary of the report along with the organizational structure of the final report has been given here in brief:

**STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT**

The final form of the report is in the following organizational format:

**UNIT ONE: INTRODUCTION**
- Background of the Study
- Resource Centre: A Local Educational Body
- Objectives of the Study
- Scope of the Study

**UNIT TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**
- World History of Resource Centre System
- Some International Practices of the RCs
- History of Resource Centre System in Nepal
- Present Status of RCs in Nepal
- Review of Some Previous Studies

**UNIT THREE: METHODOLOGY**
- Sources of Data
- Study Design
- Sample of the Study
- Tools and Techniques of Data Collection
- Limitations of the Study

**UNIT FOUR: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**
- Role and Responsibility of the Resource Centre
- Review of the Structure and Activities
- Use of Human and Physical resources
- The Role of RC in Educational Promotion
- The Effectiveness of RC Activities
- Mobilization of Community People and Organization
- Role of RCMC
- Qualification, Experience and Selection of RPs
- The Use of RC Hall
UNIT FIVE: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Major Findings of the Study
- Recommendations of the Study
- Action Steps for the implementations of the Recommendations
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ANNEX

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of this study was to assess the role of Resource Center for improving quality education in the school and suggest effective measures for the utilization of resources in a way to improve quality education in the schools. More specifically, the objectives of the study were as follow:

1. To review the policy provisions regarding the role and responsibility of Resource Center for providing quality education in the school.
2. To review the structure and activities performed by Resource Centers in order to uplift the quality of education.
3. To explore the use of human and physical resources available within the school cluster for the educational development of the satellite schools.
4. To identify the role the RC to promote educational awareness of school and community to provide access to education of the disadvantaged and marginalized children.
5. To analyze the effectiveness of RC activities performed by Resource Persons in the distribution of textbooks, Keeping records of primary school teachers and use of teaching improvement plan by the teachers;
6. To assess the effectiveness of supervision system of the RC (Preparation of supervision plan, school supervision, class observation, record keeping etc.) for quality improvement in the schools;
7. To identify the role of RC to mobilize community people, community based organizations and parent-teacher associations to increase the access of girls and disadvantaged children to education;
8. To assess the role of resource centre management committee (RCMC) to perform its responsibility of preparing plans, programs and the budget and mobilizing local resources;
9. To suggest alternative modalities of RC for better utilization of resources and better management of RC activities for improving quality education in the schools;
**SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The following points were addressed and incorporated by the study in its scope:

1. The types of activities performed by RC in relation to improving quality teaching and learning in the centers.
2. Utilization of RC hall in different purposes directed towards improving teacher performance in the school;
3. Utilization of RC for improving quality education in formal and non-formal education;
4. Role of RCMC in regular functioning of the centre including community and CBO mobilization;
5. Cover the three ecological belts, five development regions and the rural-urban locations while selecting RCs as the representative sample for the study.

**SOURCES OF DATA**

Both the primary and secondary sources of data along with both qualitative and quantitative techniques of inquiry were used in the study. Primary data were collected from primary sources like: concerned teachers, head masters, local level stakeholders, RP/RCMC members, SS, DEOs Personnel as well as other district and national level stakeholders. Researchers had made use of secondary sources of data as required. Secondary data were collected from different related secondary sources through document study. They were: related books, previous study reports, journals, news paper articles and the legal and policy documents.

**STUDY DESIGN**

Descriptive, analytical and exploratory study design along with both qualitative and quantitative nature of data was used in the study. While writing the final report, qualitative data were described in narrative style. Quantitative data were analyzed and interpreted quantitatively and were presented and displayed in different tabular and graphical forms.

**SAMPLE OF THE STUDY**

The following Resource Centers, Schools and DEOs from the following districts were studied as sample to collect required primary data for the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Names of the Institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panchthar</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Phidim HSS Resource Center, Phidim, Panchthar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ithunga HSS Resource Center, Panchthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Phidim HSS, Phidim, Panchthar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ithunga HSS, Panchthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>District Education Office, Panchthar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Resource Centers</td>
<td>Resource Centers Details</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautahat</td>
<td>Sarswoti HSS Resource Center, Rautahat</td>
<td>Sarswoti HSS Resource Center, Rautahat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shree HSS RC, Bayarjawa, Rautahat</td>
<td>Shree HSS RC, Bayarjawa, Rautahat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Sarswoti HSS, Rautahat</td>
<td>Shree Higher Secondary School, Bayarjawa, Rautahat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupandehi</td>
<td>Kanti HSS Resource Center, Rupandehi</td>
<td>Kanti HSS Resource Center, Rupandehi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhakadhai Resource Center, Rupandehi</td>
<td>Dhakadhai Resource Center, Rupandehi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Kanti HSS, Rupandehi</td>
<td>Dhakadhai HSS, Rupandehi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rupandehi</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rupandehi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugu</td>
<td>Rauwa SS Resource Center, Mugu</td>
<td>Rauwa SS Resource Center, Mugu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natharpu HSS Resource Center, Mugu</td>
<td>Natharpu HSS Resource Center, Mugu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Rauwa SS, Mugu</td>
<td>Rauwa SS, Mugu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natharpu HSS, Mugu</td>
<td>Natharpu HSS, Mugu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Mugu</td>
<td>District Education Office, Mugu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailali</td>
<td>Likma SS Resource Center, Kailali</td>
<td>Likma SS Resource Center, Kailali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhangadi HSS Resource Center, Kailali</td>
<td>Dhangadi HSS Resource Center, Kailali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Likma SS, Kailali</td>
<td>Likma SS, Kailali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhangadi HSS, Kailali</td>
<td>Dhangadi HSS, Kailali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Kailali</td>
<td>District Education Office, Kailali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
<td>Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS RC Thanhiti</td>
<td>Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS RC Thanhiti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shanti Nikunja SS RC Bhagawatibari</td>
<td>Shanti Nikunja SS RC Bhagawatibari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS Thanhiti</td>
<td>Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS Thanhiti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahankal SS, Mahabaudha, Kathmandu</td>
<td>Mahankal SS, Mahabaudha, Kathmandu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Kathmandu</td>
<td>District Education Office, Kathmandu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES OF DATA COLLECTION**

The following tools and techniques were used to collect data for the study:

- Questionnaire
- Semi-structured interview
- Focus group discussion
- Document study

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The study had the following main limitations:

- It had only included 12 RCs from 6 different districts.
- A sample of 12 schools, each 2 from each 6 districts, was also taken for the study.
- It only included the role of RCs in promoting quality education in the schools.
MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Based on the analysis and interpretation of collected data, findings and recommendations of the study have been presented. For the convenience of study, the findings and recommendations have been presented in two different sub-headings.

Major Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study are as below:

1. After the review of all the policy provisions regarding the role and responsibilities of RCs, the following main roles of the RCs to play are found out:
   - Formulation of strategic plans and their implementation
   - School supervision
   - Data collection and record management
   - Class observation and model teaching
   - Operation of extra curricular activities
   - Enhancement of educational quality
   - Functions related to non-formal educational
   - Conduct a meeting of cluster school (CS) teachers on project issues once in a month (a Friday),
   - Organize co-curricular activities for all CSs,
   - Act as a demonstration school carrying out innovative ideas and practices for all CSs for improving education within the cluster.
   - To mobilize the physical and human resources available within the school clusters for the educational development of the satellite schools;
   - To organize training workshops, and seminars in order to enhance the working efficiency of the teachers and headmasters;
   - To promote educational awareness in the school and the community;
   - To supervise and monitor the activities implemented in the cluster schools; and
   - To reduce disparities between the schools

To conduct and operate these RC functions, the RPs are responsible. Thus, an attempt has been made here to state in brief the major functions/roles of RPs as well below:
   - Management of RC including preparations of annual and monthly plans of the RC,
   - Conduction and follow up training/workshop/seminars,
   - Friday meeting with teachers,
   - Head teacher meetings,
   - RCMC meetings,
   - General inspection of schools,
   - Classroom observation and discussion with teachers,
• Model lesson presentation,
• RC profile preparation,
• Educational data collection and demonstration,
• Organization of extra curricular activities,
• Community mobilization,
• Management of RC Level examinations
• Instructional material preparation/Management,
• Curriculum implementation,
• Selection of model school,
• Participation on district level meetings,
• Co-ordination with different activities and agencies,
• Report preparation,
• Information dissemination,
• Innovative works,
• Others

2. The structure of RC at present is found of vertical position which is top-down bureaucratic as presented below in the Fig.:1. Though it is conceptually associated with the local community, it is found detached from the community as many of the local level stakeholders are found adopting least ownership of RC as their part of daily life. Most of the stakeholders are found perceiving the RC as a hierarchical unit between schools and DEOs.

![Fig-1: Structure of RC in Practice](image)

3. Only 25 percent of RCs understudy are found using local human and physical resources for the educational development of the satellite (cluster) schools. Rests of 75 percent of RCs are not using these in enhancing the educational qualities. According to most of them, they have to engage in the collection of different types of data, their recording and visit to DEO so that they cannot pay enough time to work at those sectors which have
direct influences in quality enhancement of the school education. Further, there is problem to use local human resource as expert due to the intervention in the class that s/he is taking in one hand and in the other hand; it is difficult for them to utilize local human and physical resources due to political problems as well.

4. As RC’s role is to promote educational awareness of the schools and the community to provide educational access mostly to the disadvantaged and marginalized groups, the study found that only 75 percent of them have conducted some sorts of discussion and interaction programs related to it. Total of 33.33 percent have visited the community and only 25 percent of them have visited to the particular targeted community to develop educational awareness of the community people. The RPs said that they have maximum numbers of cluster schools so that they cannot take care of them all in a good way. It is supported by our evidence as the sampled study has 55.75 (i.e., 56) cluster schools under an RC in average.

5. In some of the cases, it is found that the centers are not functioning as Resource Centers but are working only as Data Collection Centers due to the overload of the number of cluster schools. As the effectiveness of RC activities performed by RPs in RCs are concerned, the study showed that RCs have no or very little role played in the distribution of textbook to the primary level students. Only 2 RCs (among 12) were found involved in textbook distribution. However, record keeping of primary school teacher is satisfactory as all the RCs have maintained it in advanced. However, only 16.66 percent of the RCs understudy has kept the record of use of TIP by the teachers in a proper way. Other 33.33 percent of RCs have maintained it simply. Rests of 50 percent have no record of use of TIP by the school teachers. The summary of the major effectiveness activities of the RCs has been presented below:

- Formulation of Plan and Its Implementation-100%
- School Supervision- 33.33%
- Data Collection and Record Management-100%
- Classroom Observation and Model Teaching-16.66%
- NFE Program-75%
- Operation of Extra-curricular Activities-25%
- Functions Related to (the enhancement of) Quality education- 58.33%
- Other Functions- 50%
6. The study found that all the RCs have prepared their supervision plans with the aim to visit schools and supervise their activities in advanced, however, each 8.33 percent of them have simple and poor planning respectively. In total of 12 RCs understudy, 2 of them have found conducting the school supervision visit once in a year. Rest of each 2 have visited the half and the quarter of all the schools respectively once in a year. But rests of 8 RCs have not visited any of the cluster schools even once a time. The study found that only 16.66 percent RCs have observed the classes of the teachers. All the RPs who had supervised the schools according to their pre-set supervision plans had kept the intact record of their school supervision. What is strange is that 25 percent of the RCs have found maintaining the fake record of school supervision.

7. The study showed that resource centers are not found effectively functioning in mobilizing the community people and CBOs/CSOs to increase the access of children from marginalized, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. PTA was found formed almost in all the schools; however, they themselves are not well active. Some of the community based organizations and civil society organizations were also functioning in the local areas but their role to school education do not find so active. Resource centre has not found coordinating among them and mobilizing them for developing access of the target groups, especially the girls. Only 25 percent of the RCs had become able to mobilize community people for enhancing the quality of education in schools. As 41.66 percent of them mobilized the PTA to do so rest of others did not become able to mobilize of CBOs, CSOs, local bodies and other related stakeholders of the school education.

8. All the RCs had their own RCMCs but most of them were not functional. only 16.66 percent of them were actively involved in the RC activities. Total of 50 percent of them were completely passive and only 33.33 percent were difficultly functioning as RCMC. That is, they were becoming only a formal body in the RCs and nothing else. The de-functioning of RCMC is found mainly due to the unclear clarification and statement of the roles and responsibilities of RCMC with appropriate legal connection. The study found that the RCMC had involved only in preparing plans, programs and the budget but not in mobilizing the local resources available there. Their role in plan formulation was also not so active and effective.

9. Regarding the Qualification, Experience and Selection of RPs, the study found the following three main views of the stakeholders:
The RPs should be selected by the free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the recognized government bodies-PSC, TSC, or any other newly formed bodies (according to 50 percent of the total respondents).

They can be appointed/recruited by the competition among the permanent teachers having M. Ed degree or B.Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience (according to 41.66 percent of the respondents).

They have to recruit by fulfilling the definite procedure by the respective DEOs in the district with free competition of M.Ed. graduates (according to 16.66 percent of the informants)

Presently exercised procedure is right but there is the need of some review and definition of policy provision (according to 12.5 percent of the informants).

The key finding of these points is to adopt an alternative procedure to select the RPs in which focus is found in the free competition of M.Ed. graduates having technical and skilled trainings to conduct all the RC activities efficiently.

10. The study found that 7 RCs (58.33%) understudy had their own building and other 4 (33.33%) had only a room(s). Rests of 1 (8.33%) had neither building nor any room. Those who have RC building or room/hall, the RC hall were found using for academic purpose in most of the cases. However, the use of hall was also found for different purpose than for using it in enhancing quality of education in schools. In some cases, the hall was found of using for some other political and administrative tasks. Mainly the head teachers of the schools were found to misuse the RC hall as they certified to provide the hall for the certified purpose which the RPs cannot deny.

Recommendations of the Study
On the basis of the aforementioned major findings of the study, the following recommendations have been suggested for the betterment of the program:

I. Government should clearly specify the roles, responsibilities and duties (as well as the service & facilities) of the resource persons in the RC defining in the Education Act, Education Regulations and in other legal and administrative documents as needed. This will motivate RPs in one hand and solve the problems of ineffectiveness of RC functioning in the other hand.
II. The RCMC should be restructured and provision of including local level stakeholders (local educationists, parents teachers, PTA members SMC members, CBO/CSO members, VDC representatives) in RCMC should be made. This help to make the RCMC actively functional in management and implementation of the RC programs/activities. The role, responsibility, right and duty of the RCMC should be defined legally (by the education Act, education Regulation, directories etc) and execution of the assignment should be obligatory. RCMC should have the right to readjust the programs according to the local need of the RC. The suggested new structure of RC has been given in the following figure:

**Fig-2: Suggested new structure of RC**

III. Necessary legal provision should be made (clearly stating the provisions in the Education Regulation and such other documents) to make RPs accountable to RCMC and DEO not to the head teachers of the schools.

IV. The recruitment of RP (selection procedure) should be changed and new provision of it should be made in order to make the RC activities effective, functional, active and meaningful. For this, it is suggested to recruit RPs from the M. Ed graduates or from the B. Ed. graduates having more than ten years of teaching experience. It is necessary to develop different pre-service, in service and refresher training packages for the RPs and should train them accordingly. RPs should be Resource Persons in reality.
V. One of the different cell should be formed in the DoE (and its constituted cell in each DEOs) in order to manage, guide, operate, supervise, monitor and evaluate all the RC activities throughout the nation as the ineffectiveness of presently observed activities are mainly due to the weak supervision and monitoring of the RC activities. The cell can have the authority of recruiting RP and defining the roles, responsibilities, rights, duties, qualification and experiences of the RPs as well as can conduct the pre-services, in-service and refresher training for the RPs as well.

VI. If the presently practiced RC model is kept in continuation (i.e., if any alternative modalities will not be adopted), it is compulsory to make provision of separate RC building at least having three rooms- one for general administration, another for RC library and the third- a well equipped RC hall for the training, seminar, workshop and Head teacher/RCMC and/or other meetings. The implementation/execution of “one RC-one building” is highly recommended to implement so as to make the RCs as the real Resource Centers. It is also recommended to provide one computer with internet facility to each RCs as far as possible to enhance the quality of school education.

VII. As RPs are the field officer, they must be in the schools in more days. Thus, the provision of an office assistant to assist the RPs in the RCs as well as to open the RCs in absence of them is seen necessary to recruit. If it is defined clearly, assistant can be recruited locally by mobilizing local financial resources as well.

VIII. Present structure of RC (DEO-RC-School) is vertical in nature as a result it has many problems. Thus, it should be re-structured by making almost all the local level stakeholders responsible and accountable to RC and RC activities. For this it is suggested to re-structure the vertical bureaucratic model into the integrative model horizontally (including VDC/VEC, RCMC, PTA, SMC, CSOs, CBOs etc. in its operation).

IX. As it is necessary to rethink about the members of RCMC, it is suggested to appoint the RCMC members including both the teachers and head teachers of the schools as well as other community members, VDC representative, CSOs/CBOs members as well as other local level stakeholders so as to make it functional and efficient working.

X. Teacher training should be school based. For this, RPs should mobilize the locally available physical and human resources in the training instead of involving themselves to make all sorts of subject-specific training effective (as a single person (the RP) cannot be the master of all). Qualified and experienced subject teacher within the cluster schools should be used as the subject export in the training and RPs should coordinate and operate the training. It certainly helps to enhance the quality of education in schools.
XI. RPs are the technical human resources. Thus, they should focus on the technical works in the RCs. But, most of them are found spending their time only in collecting educational data and doing some administrative works as well. Supervision is weak and becoming so called supervision. This can not be strengthened until the integrated structure of RC is not followed. The implementation of yearly operation calendar with strict supervision and follow up program should be made an obligation to RPs.

XII. Above all, an alternative modality of the RC operation has been suggested for the betterment of the RC activities and to make the RC functions effective and efficient. But it does not mean that presently exercised RC system is not good. It is hoped that the suggested modality can help improve RC activities in alternation to it, if this (presently exercised) modality is changed. The suggested modality is the school based modality in which a lead school functions as the RC in those places where the RCs cannot work properly mainly due to the overload of cluster schools. The empirical study and review of related literature both in Nepal and abroad showed three main alternative modalities of RC (in addition to presently practiced modality) as-

(i) Mobile RP for remote area,
(b) Advisory model, and
(c) School based model.
Among them, it is suggested to adapt and employ the school based model as an alternative to the presently implemented model for the betterment of the entire RC activities.

A school based model is an integrated institutional model successfully practiced in different European and American countries in which RC is fully take care, organized, operated and controlled by the school teachers. As geographical complexity, financial crisis and the degrading quality of public schools performance (result) in Nepal is concerned, this can be an alternative mean to address most of the problems related to present RC system. Presently 57 cluster schools are found in average under a resource centre (as our sample is concerned) which is rather impossible to take care, monitor, supervise, train, and collect data by a single RC/RP. If the geographical distance is maintained, it is observed also recommended that one RC can successfully conduct its activities in 8-10 schools in mountain, 10-15 schools in hill and 15-25 schools in terai and valley. If this is so, we need about 5 thousand resource centers throughout the country which is rather impossible to have at present mainly due to the financial crisis of the national economy. Thus, in a school based model, a cluster of 5-7 schools can be made and among the schools one secondary or lower secondary school can be selected as a lead school. And, this lead school should be developed as
resource school. The responsibility of training to the teacher and supervision is of the lead school. There should make provision of some additional tenure to the teacher of lead school so that there could not be any hindrance in regular functioning of the school. The existing RC can coordinate some 2-3 clusters and take the responsibility of providing training to develop the trainer for the clusters, and can collect educational data as well as perform all the set activities as the operator and guidance body of those clusters.

If this is so, present RC would be a unit of DEO working for some administrative, coordinating, and qualitative functions but the supervision and training responsibility should be given to the lead school and its teacher. For financial resources, there should be a sharing modality. The government, the local body, community organizations, and even teachers and schools have to contribute for this in a logical and scientific way. The sharing modality should be stated explicitly in the rules and regulation and should be defined by concerned law. This model can provide adequate supervision and training support to the teacher and schools. From the financial point of view, this could be more sustainable because of higher sharing from different sectors and stakeholders. This investment form the local level brings concern to the local people to observe its effectiveness which certainly increases the accountability of local stakeholders as well. But, in doing so too, there should be the provision of separate RC hall along with sufficient resource materials.
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UNIT ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

According to the national census of 2001, Nepal has total of 23.5 million populations in which total literacy (6+ years) is 54 percent (Male: 65.0 %, Female: 42.5 %). Adult literacy (15+ years) is only 48 percent (Male: 62.7 % and Female: 34.9 %) of the total population. Rural reconstruction Nepal (2010) states that more than 57 percent of the total population of Nepal is from marginalized and disadvantaged group. This is the group of population who face severe discrimination in most phases of development. Minority groups and marginalized population don’t even have access to basic rights, of which Education is a major one. Most people, especially children belonging to these groups are unable to attend school from an early age, which affects their development in various ways. According to School Sector Reform Plan (SSRP) about 10 percent of children belonging to these groups are unable to attend school because of geographical, economic and social reasons. Discrimination to these groups is the major cause for their regress.

The government of Nepal has made different efforts for the education of its people. The three years interim plan has targeted different indicators to achieve regarding the primary education of the pupils. It has targeted to achieve the followings by the end of the year 2009:

- Gross enrolment rate at ECD/PPC: 51
- Percentage of new entrants at Grade 1 with ECD/PPC: 60
- Gross intake rate at Grade 1: 110
- Net intake rate at Grade 1: 95
- Gross enrolment rate at primary level: 104
- Net enrolment rate at primary level: 96
- Gender parity index at primary level: 1

The Department of Education (2010) reports that many of the targeted indicators were not achieved as expected by 2009.

Nepal is facing various challenges in the education sector in terms of achieving the MDGs (Goal No.2: achieve universal primary education), which is to ‘ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere including Nepal, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling’. In this Endeavour, though the enrolment campaign (2005) raised the
enrolment rate, it led to the overcrowding of classrooms in some of the cases, thus adversely affecting the quality of education. Teachers without adequate training and motivation are unlikely to help improve the quality of education in Nepal. One of the main reasons for many children to be unable to enroll in primary school is the lack of financial resources to cover the school uniforms, stationery and examination fees. While 10 percent of children were not enrolled in primary school, they comprise a disproportionately large share of child population from the historically, geographically, economically and socially deprived and marginalized communities (RRN, 2010). Currently 38 percent of our primary teachers are untrained (NCED, 2010). As most trained teachers gravitate towards better schools in urban areas, the vast majority of teachers in rural schools are effectively untrained and unskilled.

The Government of Nepal has handed over management of over 2000 schools to communities; these schools remained without being properly monitored. Though the policy of handing over the management of schools to communities has led to increased interest in and ownership of schools by the community, the EFA documents do not focus on empowering the communities for its proper management. The large-scale programs like the Basic and Primary Education Program (BPEP) have in the past concentrated more on capacity building at the central level, thereby increasing the gap between the centre and the grassroots level, which is yet the same.

The quality of Education in the rural context of Nepal is poor. In addition, the use of traditional teaching methods, lack of effective learning environment, untrained teachers, and stagnant technology impede the dissemination of effective knowledge. In return, this hinders the rural development process, which has a direct negative impact on the minority and marginalized groups. Due to this, they are either compelled to migrate to urban areas or other developing regions of the country for quality education or leave the school cycle. Consequently, a weak community lacks the capacity to mobilize local resources to initiate and implement development programs.

The interim constitution of Nepal, 2006 has declared basic education as the fundamental rights of people. Accordingly, the school sector reform plan (?) has different programs to implement the national policy of education in the country. Nepal's commitment to "Education for All" is based on the premises that education is a fundamental right of all people. As per her commitment, Nepal has to ensure basic and primary education for all children irrespective of their ethnic origin, religion, culture, language, economic status or disabilities. In order to ensure education of these children with special focus on the disadvantaged
groups, the government of Nepal has taken different initiatives and practices to increase access, participation and quality in primary education. These actions intend to supplement and complement the national education program, in particular the recently adopted school sector reform program (SSRP) of the government of Nepal. Introduction and continuation of the provision of Resource Center (RC) has been one of such initiatives in this field. Before entering into the description of RC, it is necessary to talk something about the education system of the country. At present, the structure of education is as given below:

- Early Childhood Program/Pre-Primary Education: 2/1 years
- Primary Education: 5 Years
- Lower Secondary Education: 3 Years
- Secondary Education: 2 Years
- Higher Secondary Education: 2 Years
- Higher Studies: 3+2 Years and above

This structure of national education is run by the following Educational Administrative Structure:

- Ministry of Education
- Department of Education
- Regional Education Directorate
- District Education Offices
- Resource Centers
- Schools

As Institutional Arrangement of the national education is concerned, the following figure can be presented to show the representative stakeholders of the institutional arrangement
The Department of Education is the main executive body to implement all the plans, policies and actions regarding the structure of education, administration and the institutional arrangement. For this, the following structure of different acting bodies is involved in. The figure below has shown it in detailed:
Now, the aforementioned glimpse of structure of education, educational administrative structure and the institutional arrangement and implementation modality of the plans, policies and programs helps us to discuss about the resource centre in more vivid and comprehensible way.
1.1.1 Resource Centre: A Local Educational Body

Government of Nepal has accorded high priority in basic education to all its citizens. For this, it has taken different attempts and initiatives to increase access, participation and quality in primary (basic) education. Currently, Resource Center as a locally functioned educational body is mainly responsible for all these aforementioned three responsibilities.

Nepal has only a short history of RC practice. As its beginning is concerned, it is traced back to 1982. A pilot project, Education for Rural Primary Education Project (PEP 1984-1992) was implemented in six selected districts. Both programs aimed to increase quality in primary education. Similarly, Nepal endorsed Jomtien Declaration (1990) on ‘Education for All’. Among the set goals of EFA, one goal is quality primary education. To achieve the goals, the government has implemented – basic and primary education for all, and quality improvement in primary education in Nepal. BPEP-II (1998-2003) aimed to strengthen district-level management and planning of primary education. From ERD Seti Project to the BPEP-li, Resource Centers in different structures have been involving in the whole process of managing reform in primary schools. The motto and programs of resource centre in the previous two projects ERD Seti project and PEP were to provide help to the teachers in their respective field of teaching. The resource centre in those days were equipped the teachers with skills in preparing teaching materials and use them in classroom teaching, different strategies of teaching, and evaluation techniques. In the present structure of the education in Nepal, resource centre is a local educational body especially working as a bridge to connect the works of schools to the district education office. In fact, the concrete concept of Resource centre in Nepal was developed and implement from Basic and primary education project (2049/50) in the line to integrate the scattered schools in a cluster to enhance their quality education. This schools that RC system was started with a view to guide the school with quality education. However, the emergence of RC concept goes to primary education project and Seti Rural Development project started before BPEP.

Resource center is a local educational body that functions as a leader to conduct and implement all the educational programs that are conducted by district education office. Resource centers are the external arm of the district education offices. Presently, The RCs in Nepal are operating the following main activities related to school education:

- Formulation of strategic plans and their implementation.
- School supervision
• Data collection and record management
• Class observation and model teaching
• Operation of extra curricular activities
• Enhancement of educational quality
• Functions related to non-formal educational

As the major roles of resource persons in a resource centre is concerned the resource centers are the centers for promoting quality education in the schools. As its basic concept is concerned, a resource center is a center for:

• The preparation and use of teaching materials.
• Community discussion.
• Educational exhibition/study
• Skill development training.
• Educational competition
• Supervision and documentation
• Teacher training
• Monitoring non-formal and special education
• Notice broad cost (flow) and so on.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The overall objective of this study is to assess the role of Resource Center for improving quality education in the school and suggest effective measures for the utilization of resources in a way to improve quality education in the schools. More specifically, the objectives of the study are as follow:

10. To review the policy provisions regarding the role and responsibility of Resource Center for providing quality education in the school.
11. To review the structure and activities performed by Resource Centers in order to uplift the quality of education.
12. To explore the use of human and physical resources available within the school cluster for the educational development of the satellite schools.
13. To identify the role the RC to promote educational awareness of school and community to provide access to education of the disadvantaged and marginalized children.

14. To analyze the effectiveness of RC activities performed by Resource Persons in the distribution of textbooks, Keeping records of primary school teachers and use of teaching improvement plan by the teachers;

15. To assess the effectiveness of supervision system of the RC (Preparation of supervision plan, school supervision, class observation, record keeping etc.) for quality improvement in the schools;

16. To identify the role of RC to mobilize community people, community based organizations and parent-teacher associations to increase the access of girls and disadvantaged children to education;

17. To assess the role of resource centre management committee (RCMC) to perform its responsibility of preparing plans, programs and the budget and mobilizing local resources;

18. To suggest alternative modalities of RC for better utilization of resources and better management of RC activities for improving quality education in the schools;

1.3 Scope of the Study

The following points have been addressed and incorporated by the study in its scope:

6. The types of activities performed by RC in relation to improving quality teaching and learning in the centers.

7. Utilization of RC hall in different purposes directed towards improving teacher performance in the school;

8. Utilization of RC for improving quality education in formal and non-formal education;

9. Role of RCMC in regular functioning of the centre including community and CBO mobilization;

10. Cover the three ecological belts, five development regions and the rural-urban locations while selecting RCs as the representative sample for the study.
UNIT TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 World History of Resource Centre System

Before entering into the history of RC system, it is contextual and relevant to clarify the concept of what a resource centre is generally, the term resource centre refers to the centre for overall management and operation of the resources. As educational management is concerned, it refers to a cluster of schools within a region and poking resource together in order to develop and use learning materials more intensely to strengthen teacher’s skills and performance which further helps to improve the educational attainment of the students.

As the first use of the term resource centre is concerned, it is found that the term was begun entitled teachers Resource Centre in the decade of 1960s in Britain. The main purpose of those TRCs was to support teachers’ professional development (TPD) as well as provide access to resources. Further, in service training facilities to the teachers was also provided by the centre (Kumarak et al., 1986). The some model was promoted in various developed as well as developing countries since 1970.

According to Knamiller (1999), In Britain during late 1960s to early 1980s Teachers’ Centers were working as the centre for curriculum development and dissemination, and in service teacher training. As a centre for curriculum development, the Teachers’ Centers organized local groups (including advisors from local level) for curriculum development at school level curriculum materials for classroom use. As the centre for dissemination and training TRCs disseminated developed curricula and materials and conducted in service training for teachers (Knamiller, 1999). The warden was responsible for the management of Teachers’ Center’s activities. The centre got some fund from Local Education Authority (LEA). There were lack of well-defined functions and responsibilities of Warden. Therefore, ‘Centers were only as good as Wardens’ (Knamiller, 1999). The role of Warden seemed confusing as it was neither an advisory, nor as a senior teacher or a local education authority officer and s/he had to be a little of all these things and more besides. The broader roles of Warden (Weanling et al, 1983, in Knamiller 1999) identifies were as follows.

- Managing of centre and day to day running,
- Encouraging curriculum development,
- Organizing curriculum development,
- Organizing in-service training for teachers,
- Responding to teachers needs,
- Working with the centre committee,
- Lassoing and co-operating with the advisory team.

He (ibid) further writes that provision of national curriculum by 1988 in Britain and the introduction of new assessment system influenced the funding modality of Teachers’ Centers. These changes influenced the functions of Teacher’s Centers and relevancy of Teachers’ Centers began to decline. The declining status of the teacher centre was the development of other best alternative strategies for teacher development according to the changing needs of the teachers according as the changes in curriculum policy. Thus, the funding modality had also been changed.

The concept of TRC was expanded in different countries and was practiced in different from and organization later on. It was firstly practiced (and has been practiced yet) in the developing countries mainly as donor aided program. Knamiller (1999) writes although the TRCs model was promoted in many developing countries from Britain, it has never been comprehensively assessed either in Britain or abroad on the effectiveness of RCs in students learning and quality enhancement of education is primary schooling. Considering the cases of some countries, he further comments that there is some confusion on either TRCs are the extended hands of mystery of education or a technical institution for local education consultancy and support for the schools, teachers and other personnel involved in education development. To sum up, what so ever is the effectiveness and practice of TRCs, the RC system in education is practiced in many countries of the world yet.

2.2 Some International Practices of the RCs

Great Britain, the mother of resource centre system in the world, had started the practice of resource centre in the name of teachers’ centre in 1960 aiming with the support for teachers’ professional development; develop access of teachers to the resources and in-service training facilities to the teachers. From 1960s to early 1980s those centers were working as the centre for curriculum development and dissemination, and in-service teacher training. The warden was responsible for the management of all the TC activities and the local education authority used to fund on it. According to Knamiller (1999), due to the non-defined
and confusing role of the warden as well as lack of adequate financial resources the centers could not worked well. The national curriculum (1988) made provision of new assessment system which influenced the funding modality of teachers' centre. The changes influenced the functions of TCs and thus, the relevancy of TCs began to decline. According to him (ibid), now, many TCs have been closed and some local education authorities have established training centers that are not limited to teacher training.

Quoting Knamiller (1999), CERID (2004) analyzed the Indian scenario of TRCs that two projects-District Primary Education Project (DPEP) and the Andra Pradesh Primary Education Project (APPEP) has been working in the modality of teacher support. In Andra Pradesh of India, the teachers’ Resource centre is a meeting place for teachers of a cluster of 7-13 schools. Teachers have to attend six mandatory meetings each year in their resource centers. Some schools have separate meeting halls; others used a classroom for their meetings. The resource school principal works as the secretary of TRC but the assistance secretary is elected from the teachers of the cluster schools. Generally, presentation of lessons prepared by the teachers and discussions on them are the routine activities of the TRC meeting. A very small amount of money was given to the resource centre by the government.

MS-DANIDA (1996) writes referring to the African scenario from Kenya. It is noted that, TRCs ideas were started in 1971 following the British model and was working as the centers for English teachers in secondary schools. Now teacher resource centers have been working in two forms. For primary school ‘Teacher Advisory Centers (TACs)’ can be taken as Teachers Resource Centers and for secondary school ‘Teacher Resource Centers’ have been working. In South Africa, the national Department supports Teacher resource centers, but TRC policies are formulated by respective provincial department. There are 25 TRCs in Kenya. These TRCS have been working to provide reading materials for the English readers and reference books for the teachers. Some occasional small in-service teacher training programs, based on local needs, are conducted. Similarly, Teacher advisory centers (TACs) are working for primary teachers. These centers have been working as the teacher support system thought organizing workshops, providing references and other materials and follow up supervision. There are districts as well as zonal TACs. Tutors of TACs visit teachers of 10-15 primary schools. Tutors are full-time advisers who work with the zonal inspector and facilitate workshops. Workshops are either zonal or school based. After each workshop the TAC tutor provided follow-up visits to the teachers. Under the school improvement program
(SIP), there are a TAC tutor and a program officer (PO), who work with about 12 primary schools within 3-5 km. Each TAC has storage for materials and a meeting room for workshops. Pos and Tutors of TAC organized need-based workshops and support for follow up supervision. This model was regarded as one of the successful model and shared in other developing countries. However, there is doubt expressed that whether a model successful in one demand and context could be used as strategy for improving education elsewhere.

2.3 History of Resource Centre System in Nepal

CERID (2004) writes quoting Khaniya (1997) that the concept of resource centre in the form of clustering schools and supervising could be seen as far back as 1953, when Development Blocks were established in some districts to take care of schools’ development tasks. The main idea behind this concept was develop a local secondary school (called leader school) as the nucleus of local educational organization, and the other schools in the periphery (called feeders) as the cells.

Afterwards in 1980, a rioting project of RC like strategy was initiated in two (Jhapa and Chitwan) districts. Clusters were mode and the head teacher of secondary or lower secondary school was responsible for supervising primary schools within the clusters. But, the project was dropped out without completing the piloting phase as it could not work well. Actually, the practice of resource centre was begun with the implementation of education for rural development (ERD) project in Seti zone which is popularly known as the Seti project. The project was started in 1982 with the assistance of UNESCO/UNDP and UNICEF and lasted for 10 years. The project aimed to promote the role of education for transformation of rural community into a conscious and productive community. Within this framework of this philosophy, the project took initiatives for quality primary education including adult literacy program. This was a pilot project designed to raise the quality of instruction in primary education through improved supervisory system and increased in service teacher training by clustering 6 to 10 schools in one cluster and taking one secondary or lower secondary school as resource centre. There is no any provision of RP in the RC but the RC school was provided with the salary of an extra teacher and some extra allowances for RC school’s head teacher (Shrestha and Maskey, 1987). Functions of RC school under the ERD Seti project was as follows, according to Shrestha and Maskey, (1987). The below mentioned functions of RC in ERD Seti project showed the RCs were not only teacher support agency but also a local venue for project supplies and activities.
- Supervision of teaching in regular schools, adult classes, Chelibeti classes, village Reading Centers at least once in a month,
- Conduct a meeting of satellite school (SS) teachers on project issues once in a month (a Friday),
- Organize co curricular activities for all SSs,
- Arrange to collect the project’s supplies to the schools from the airport or the road ahead,
- Make accommodation and food available to all participants during a training/workshop session in its premises,
- Act as a point to administrator deliver any program package of the project,
- Act as a demonstration school carrying out innovative ideas and practices for all SSs for improving education within the cluster.

The structure of the RC in ERD Seti project was not administrative in nature. It was not kept under any higher authority but there was a multiple monitoring mechanism. The project people in different tires monitored the activities of the RC. It was institutional model fully professional in nature. All the persons involved in the RC works were the teachers, the professionals working to the professional development. The main resources the RC school could get the salary of a secondary teacher. The cause of success was the dedication of the teachers who involved in the RC works, the monitoring system and the quality of the RPs that the project had the provision of quality development of the RPs. That was a new innovation in the country and due to this novelty effect, every one was positive and functioned effectively.

CERID (2004) states that the objectives of the Seti Centre was to function as a training centre, a channel for the supply of materials and to provide supervisory support to literacy programs and clusters of satellite schools. The resource centre was established with three main functional roles: as training centre, supervision centre and supply centre. RC system and its training programs, material construction, supervision system and community development activities have received wide appreciation (CERID, 1986). However, increased workload of RC school affected teaching learning situations of the RC school.
As the history of RC in Nepal is concerned, another donor funded project entitled primary education project (PEP) was started in 1984 and launched in six different districts of Nepal. However, the PEP continued the RC activities in different model than the RED. The main difference was shift from the institutional model to an individual model RC. The project people were responsible for the RC activities. The PEP also implemented school-clustering system with a centrally located secondary or lower secondary school as RC school within the cluster schools. However, RC activities were not the responsibility of RC school and RC school’s Head Teacher, It was the responsibility of a project staff-Resource person (RP) school’s Head Teacher, it was the responsibility of a project staff-Resource person (RP) with the assistance of field co-coordinator (FC). There was a FC for six RCs, responsible for planning, supervising and monitoring the project activities. It became a separate administrative unit. Ultimately, it could be seen in the form of administrative cum professional individual base model.

As soon as the completion of the Seti project, the projects basic and primary Education programs (BPEP I and BPEP II) started in 1992. BPEP continued the strategy of RC implementing the PEP model of RC but the provision of one program coordinator in each project district was introduced to replace the provision of FC. Planning co-coordinating and monitoring the BPEP activities within the district were the main functions of RC. In the BPEP II the same model has been applied with some modifications. In BPEP II, the provision of PC has been dropped out and the responsibility of co-coordinating the activities of Basic and primary education programs has been given to one of the section officers of DEO (District Education Office) and the RCs are under the control of DEO. The functions of the RC are more administrative. The present BPEP RC model is institutionalized bureaucratic administrative with professional in nature. It is more administrative in nature than professional on the basis of its present structure. According to EFA core document (2000) the BPEP-I, and BPEP-II have targets of enhancement of the quality of teaching/learning situation in primary schools, quality of teaching learning materials including textbooks, teacher development and building of support system for the teachers. Each one is the supplementary program to the other for increasing access and retention of primary age children in primary schools. Resource centre and provision for school management committee were adopted in education policy as a tier of education management.

To sum up this discussion, the history of RC system in Nepal is very short, i.e. not more than of two decade. RC system was introduced with the implementation of Education for Rural
Development (ERD project) in Seti zone in 1982. The Seti project has initiated the RC system by clustering nine or ten schools and designing one of the centrally located schools as RC school. The RCs provided a broad range of services to neighboring schools such as in-service training program to primary school teachers, supplying materials to local schools, providing a venue for monthly meetings and supervising and assisting (The BPE Master Plan, 1997).

The RC system was followed by Primary Education Project (PEP) which was introduced in six selected districts of the country for the improvement of quality primary education. The concept of RC was further continued by BPEP in order to make the project successful by providing professional support to the primary school teachers. Quality primary education was the motto of different initiatives introduced by Nepal in different years. It was introduced as a response to the need to bring educational services closure to the schools so as to respond to the needs of local teachers and students. In addition, there was a FC who, in addition to planning, implementing and supervising the PEP programs, assisted coordinated and monitored the activities of six RPs.

Nepal endorsed Jomtien Declaration (1990) on ‘Education for All’ providing quality primary education has been one of the set goals of this Declaration. Government of Nepal has implemented Basic and Primary Education Project (BPEP 1992-1997) and Primary Education Development Project (PEDP 1992-1997) in order to achieve the determined goal. With the introduction of EFA, the role of RC has been changed and more responsibilities have been given to it. In most of the cases, secondary schools have been selected to serve as RCs. Major Functions of the RC as listed in the Resource Centre Operation Handbook (BPEP, 1992) were as follows:

- To mobilize the physical and human resources available within the school clusters for the educational development of the satellite schools;
- To organize training workshops, and seminars in order to enhance the working efficiency of the teachers and headmasters;
- To promote educational awareness in the school and the community;
- To supervise and monitor the activities implemented in the satellite schools;
- To reduce disparities between the schools

The Education for All Plan of Action (2001-2015) has set several programs to address the people who are deprived from the primary education and to enhance quality in the primary
education. The EFA Plan of Action has accorded roles and responsibilities to RC to work as the main actor in some programs as a co-operating actor in others.

Administratively, RCs are linked to DEO in the districts to perform additional support and also providing training to the teachers, supervising schools and collecting educational data for the planning of better management. These days RC is managed by a Resource Person (RP). RP is selected from among the senior teachers of the schools within the cluster. After the completion of their tenure, RPs can be returned back to their concerned schools. It was also used as a training spot for distance mode teacher training as a training center. Thus these centers are used as a venue for professional meetings for teachers and head teachers, worked as a resource center for providing teaching learning materials. In the context of newly introduced teacher professional development (TPD) system in the country, resources available in the centre can be used for continuous and demand driven system of teacher training. Thus, this study attempts to identify the alternative roles of the RC in providing quality education in the school as well as assess the role of RCs for improving quality education in the schools.

2.4 Present Status of RCs in Nepal

Presently 1,053 resource persons are working at 1053 resource centers bearing the responsibility of 40,424 schools in Nepal. The aforementioned review of RC system in Nepal shows that the professional and technical works of RRs are gradually diverted to the administrative functions. Thus, presently, resource centers are working for providing training to the teachers, supervising schools and collecting educational data for the planning of better management. Administratively the RCs are linked to the DEOs in the districts but are responsible and accountable to the head teachers of the cluster schools functionally.

The review of different policy documents in Nepal shows the following main points as the major functions of Resource Centers:

**Major RC functions**

**Formulation of Plan and Its Implementation**
- Make all the schools to form and implement plans
- To form and implement RC level annual plans

**School Supervision**
- Supervision in using teacher guide
- Supervise the availability of curriculum, textbook and teacher guide at schools and make necessary provision of timely delivery of them in schools
- Supervise all the schools (esp. schools having special class) and report to DEOs
Data Collection and Record Management

- To collection educational data
- To update the record of cluster schools and teachers

Classroom Observation and Model Teaching

- Model class demonstration by RP
- Model class demonstration by expert (subject teacher)
- Class observation of the teachers
- Preparing teaching materials & conduct peer-teaching
- Facilities to prepare and use teaching materials

NFE Program

- To collect data of the illiterates
- To supervise and guide the NFE classes

Operation of Extra-curricular Activities

- Conduction of RC level extra-curricular activities
- Exhibition of teaching materials
- Other creative and constructive activities like red cross, scout and so on

Functions Related to (the enhancement of) Quality education

- Mobilizations of natural, physical and human resources for quality enhancement of the pupils at schools
- Conduct different programs for educational development (in assistance with different CBOs/CSOs)
- Be in close collaboration with the teachers and help facilitate the teaching-learning activities
- To conduct RC level short term training, seminar and workshop for teachers, head teachers, SMC members, PTA members, and parents for educational development
- To manage and conduct teacher training related to teaching learning and the contents of the subjects
- To ask for the particulars of necessary classes in the concerned authorities
- To assist in necessary activities for the conduction of NFE classes
- To certify for the appointment of the facilitators and local supervises for NFE classes
- To form village literacy campaign committee (VLCC)
- To supervise NFE program and sending the related record to respective DEOs

Other Functions

- School evaluation and reward
- Functions related to the conduction of special classes
- Conduction of RC level exams
- To manage & conduct educational tour in different times
- To conduct and operate all the other activities, functions and directions received from DEOs

As the RC functions are conducted and operated by the RPs in the RCs, the RC functions can also be studied in relation to the roles and functions of the RPs as well. Thus, the department of education has prepared the RC Development Directory (Srotkendra Vikas
Nirdeshika) in 2059 BS, immediately after phase-out of the BPEP II in 2003. The directory has expected the following tasks to be performed by the RPs in the resource centers:

- Management of RC including preparations of annual and monthly plans of the RC,
- Conduction and follow up training/workshop/seminars,
- Friday meeting with teachers,
- Head teacher meetings,
- RCMC meetings,
- General inspection of schools,
- Classroom observation and discussion with teachers,
- Model lesson presentation,
- RC profile preparation,
- Educational data collection and demonstration,
- Organization of extra curricular activities,
- Community mobilization,
- Management of RC Level examination’s
- Instructional material preparation/Management,
- Curriculum implementation,
- Selection of model school,
- Participation on district level meetings,
- Co-ordination with different activities and agencies,
- Report preparation,
- Innovative works, and
- Others

The aforementioned points related to the functions of both the RC and RP help us to generalize how important the RCs are in quality development of the schools.

CERID (2004) writes regarding the functions of RC/RP that the RC has to perform instructional as well as number of administrative works including social leadership role for the promotion of education in primary school. Moreover, the administrative work may dominate the instructional functions, because it will be luster to perform the administrative duty and exercise administrative power.

The role and function of RCs is increasing day by day. It is now, becoming a necessary wing of the structure of national educational. The development of RC proceeded from professional management model to administrative unit of DEO/government. In the beginning the RC was considered as a concept rather than separate wings in the administrative structure. Teachers
themselves managed and supported each other. For instance in ERD model, school had taken the responsibility. Only the teachers were involved in providing support to the teachers, but due to project base program, there was a supervision of and support to the RC personnel. When the next model PEP implemented, it took administrative flavor. There was a provision of field coordinator and RPs. The RPs had to work under the guidance of FC. There was division of power and hierarchy. Some time there could be seen the conflicts between the two personnel. So, this model tended to be more administrative an individual base. Now the present model has become more administrative and less professional, because it is working as a separate institution among the school, a mid-layer of the educational administration.

In fact, there is a conceptual confusion about the objectives and functions of RCs. On the one hand, heavy involvement of RP is seen in administrative matters at present and on the other hand, official statement shows that RC as an agency working of the professional support of the teachers, and support for school management. In this situation the questions, ‘Should the RCs be developed as an instrument of educational improvement or as an instrument of teacher control?’ has yet to be answered. Presently, the RC is not seen as an institutionalized system, rather the functions of RC seem to be RP’s individual business. BPEP Master Plan (MOE, 1997) argued that if the RC structure is to function as an instrument of decentralization of education many questions still remain to be answered, for instance, can RCs be taken as the structure to support school for administrative as well as educational matter? How do RCs work for supervision, control, planning and reporting? Who are the authorities and who is RP accountable to?

As the present status of RC in Nepal is concerned it is seen that RCs in Nepal have not been able to open the school door. This is also supported by the study of Knamiller (1999) in the effectiveness of RC in Nepal. As RCs are situated outside the school and they generally work outside the school and classrooms, RC is the venue for most of the training, workshops, seminars and discussion sessions, which is generally remote for most schools and thus teacher absenteeism on classroom has negatively affected students learning. Lack of school based training/workshops and follow up programs maybe one of theca uses of failure of RC to support teaching and learning.

The EFA National Plan of Action (2001-2015) has specified RC has a role of main actor or co-operating actor in implementation of the policy and programs set in the plan. To undertake the additional but indispensable responsibility of EFA, it is necessary to rethink on the existing structure and sustainability policy in future. In this regard CERID (2004) writes that however, without school based teacher support system with ‘reflexive practice’ of
teachers, present individual input base teacher support system may not be able to contribute sufficiently to quality learning of students. These all show that RCs in Nepal, it present are more administrative rather than professional and facing different problems in relation to promoting quality primary education in the schools.

2.5 Review of Some Previous Studies

In relation to the effectiveness of RC in Nepal and the role of RC in promoting quality education at schools, some studies have been carried out previously. Here, an attempt has been made to review some of them in brief.

CERID (2004) has conducted a formative research entitled re-conceptualizing resource centre model in the context of decentralization and education for all frameworks of action. The main objective of the study was to explore the guiding concepts/principles of RC in Nepal along with the review of models, structure, responsibility and activities of RC and RC programs. The study has found the following main results regarding the RC system in Nepal:

- The guiding principle of the establishment of RC is of professional development, access to resources and in-service training of the teachers. The same concept is found in introducing the RC in Nepal. The modality of RC changing from Teacher Resource Centre to school advisor/advisory group according to the changes in the education system.

- The basic features of RC practiced in the world are basically in three modalities: i) organized and managed by the teachers themselves with the grant provided by the government, ii) a coordinator from outside the teachers and all the tutors/mentors from the teachers and the budget is provided by other agencies, and iii) organized and managed by the teachers but funding in sharing modality with teachers’ levy, contribution of NGOs/CBOs, local government/state.

- In the practices of RC in the world, the sustainability, ownership and effectiveness of the RC concept not answered adequately yet so some study has suggested some alternatives to the RC conception) Dropping out the idea of supporting teachers for the individual development, and support the children for learning and priority on managing learning and teaching materials for the students and teachers.

- Regarding the practice of the present RC modality, all teachers, Head teachers, and other community members accepted the RC strategy as the most important strategy for providing support to the primary teachers to improve the quality in education. The most positive impact of RC system in schools was regularity of teachers in the schools, training to the teachers, uniform examination and information dissemination.
Awareness was created among the school community in the need and use of educational and instructional planning thought the RC.

The inter school competitions on extracurricular activities and the selection of best school among the clustered schools have brought a competitive feeling and this feeling has brought some positive changes in the teaching learning conditions.

RC has become one of the liaison agency to deliver the information from DEO to the schools and the education data to DEO and has become an agent of providing services and exercising some sort of control to some extent.

Monitoring and supervision function of RC was the weakest aspect in RC functions. Due to this condition there was question over the utility of the RC. Technical supervision services to the schools/teachers were rarely practiced thought RC.

Resource centre is not a resource centre in reality to provide resources to the schools and sharing the resources among the schools. Almost nothing of this service was found in the sampled RCs.

There is a big problem and issue in the ownership, accountability and sustainability of the RC system. Schools and community have not owned RC as their own institution, they have a feeling that it is the government institution and their own institution, they have a feeling that it is the government institution and government should provide every thing to the RC. Other important element lacking is the accountability of RPs in their works. The ownership and accountability problem inherent in the RC system is also creating a problem of sustainability.

Numbers of schools attached in the cluster of the sampled RPs were found comparatively greater in number with respect to the responsibilities and function given to the RP. Similarly the distance between school and RC was found considerably greater in remote and hill areas.

There is a conflict among RPs, and between DEO and RC in undertaking the duties due to power relation.

Due to close monitoring, supervision, and comparatively more financial resources provided to RC, ERD Seti model, and PEP model of RC were effective in the perception of the recipients.

The RCMC in the beginning was constituted in some sampled districts, whereas in other places till now RCMC is not constituted. In those districts where the RCMC was constituted, it was not functioning effectively except with some exception.

There were set criteria for the selection of the best RCs in the district, regional and national level, however, the questions were raised on the transparency and competitiveness of the set criteria.
Another study was carried out by CERES (1995) entitled ‘A study on resource centre structure.’ This study has given some interesting findings that stakeholders had positive attitude to the institution but negative attitude to the day to day management, inadequacy of human resource and unavailability of the RPs in the centers. The other findings are lack of supervision and monitoring, lower representation of the local people in RCMC, personal quality of the RPs in conducting their activities.

Similarly, the University of Leeds school of Education has carried out a research (1999) entitled the effectiveness of teacher resource centre strategy’. The study was conducted with the assistance of DFID/ODA. The scope of the study has included the cases of India, Kenya, Zambia and Nepal. The main purpose of the study was to assess effectiveness of teachers’ resource centre as part of the strategy in helping to improve the quality of education in schools in developing countries. The report states that although the effectiveness of teachers’ resource centers on schools improvement the quality of education in schools in developing countries. The report states that although the effectiveness of teachers’ resource centre on schools improvement and pupils learning n Britain was not done comprehensively, the model was applied in different countries. However, the teachers’ resource centre (TRC) was regarded as a successful strategy for supporting teachers’ professional development in Britain. Since the end of 1980s the teacher centre strategy has got less preference in Britain due to introduction of national curriculum and the focus was shifted to school improvement plans as a whole instead of individual teacher development.

This study has contributed a lot especially in the field of improvement and refers of RC for the enhancement of quality education in Nepal. In the same context, present study’s conducting to assess the role of RC for improving quality education in schools. This study has assessed the role of RC/RP and the effectiveness of their functions mainly it terms of improving quality education in the schools.

Some previous studies have been carried out in the same field. A study conducted on Resource Centre Structure identified some weaknesses in the effective functioning of the RCs. Some of the findings of this study are stakeholders had positive attitude to the institution but negative attitude to the day to day management, inadequacy of human resource and unavailability of the RPs in the centers, lack of supervision and monitoring, lower representation of the local people in RCMC (CERES, 1995 cited in CERID, 2004). A study conducted by CERID (2004) mentioned the basic features of RC practiced in the world as below:
i) organized and managed by the teachers themselves with the grant provided by the government,

ii) a coordinator from outside the teachers and all the tutors/mentors from the teachers and the budget is provided by other agencies, and

iii) Organized and managed by the teachers but funding in sharing modality with teachers' levy, contribution of NGOs/CBOs, local government/state (CERID, 2004).

The above study conducted by CERID also envisioned that all teachers, Head teachers and other community members accepted the RC strategy as the most important strategy for providing support to the primary teachers to improve quality education. It has further explored the positive impact of the RC system as regularity of the teachers in schools, training to the teacher, uniform examination and information dissemination to the teachers and Head teachers. Competitions among the schools in inter school extra-curricular activities and selections of best school among the clustered schools have brought positive changes in the teaching learning activities. This is why, RCs have significant role to play especially in relation to promoting quality education in schools.
UNIT THREE: METHODOLOGY

The researchers have made use of following methodological strategies to complete the study:

3.1 Sources of Data
Both the primary and secondary sources of data along with both qualitative and quantitative techniques of inquiry have been used in the study. Primary data have been collected from primary sources like: concerned teachers, head masters, local level stakeholders, RP/RCMC members, SS, DEOs as well as other district and national level stakeholders. Researchers have made use of secondary sources of data as required. Secondary data have been collected from different related secondary sources through document study.

3.2 Study Design
Descriptive, analytical and exploratory study design along with both qualitative and quantitative nature of data has been used in the study. While writing the final draft report, qualitative data will be described in narrative style. Quantitative data will be analyzed and interpreted quantitatively and will be presented and displayed in different tabular and graphical forms.

3.3 Sample of the Study
The following Resource Centers, Schools and DEOs from the following districts have been studied as sample to collect required primary data for the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Names of the Institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panchthar</td>
<td>Resource Centers</td>
<td>Phidim HSS Resource Center, Phidim, Panchthar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ithunga HSS Resource Center, Panchthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Phidim HSS, Phidim, Panchthar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ithunga HSS, Panchthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Panchthar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautahat</td>
<td>Resource Centers</td>
<td>Sarswoti HSS Resource Center, Rautahat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shree HSS RC, Bayarjawa, Rautahat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Sarswoti HSS, Rautahat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shree Higher Secondary School, Bayarjawa, Rautahat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupandehi</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Kanti HSS Resource Center, Rupandehi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centers | Dhakadhai Resource Center, Rupandehi |  
| Schools | Kanti HSS, Rupandehi |  
|          | Dhakadhai HSS, Rupandehi |  
| DEO      | District Education Office, Rupandehi |  

**Mugu**  
Centers | Rauwa SS Resource Center, Mugu |  
|         | Natharpu HSS Resource Center, Mugu |  
| Schools | Rauwa SS, Mugu |  
|         | Natharpu HSS, Mugu |  
| DEO      | District Education Office, Mugu |  

**Kailali**  
Centers | Likma SS Resource Center, Kailali |  
|         | Dhangadi HSS Resource Center, Kailali |  
| Schools | Likma SS, Kailali |  
|         | Dhangadi HSS, Kailali |  
| DEO      | District Education Office, Kailali |  

**Kathmandu**  
Centers | Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS RC thanhiti |  
|         | Shanti Nikunja SS RC Bhagawatibari |  
| Schools | Shree Shanti Shiksha Mandir SS thanhiti |  
|         | Mahankal SS, Mahabaudha, Kathmandu |  
| DEO      | District Education Office, Kathmandu |  

**Total**  
5x6  
30

### 3.4 Tools and Techniques of Data Collection

The following tools and techniques have been used to collect data for the study:

- Questionnaire
- Semi-structured interview
- Focus group discussion
- Document study

### 3.5 Limitations of the Study

The study has the following main limitations:

- It has only included 12 RCs from 6 different districts.
- A sample of 12 schools, each 2 from each 6 districts, was also taken for the study.
- It only included the role of RCs in promoting quality education in the schools.
UNIT FOUR: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. The data has been analyzed and interpreted in different sub-headings for the convenience of the study.

4.1 Role and Responsibility of the Resource Centre

While analyzing different policy provisions regarding the role and responsibility of the resource centre for providing quality education in the school, the following role and responsibilities of RC/RP have been found.

- Formulation of strategic plans and their implementation
- School supervision
- Data collection and record management
- Class observation and model teaching
- Operation of extra curricular activities
- Enhancement of educational quality
- Functions related to non-formal educational
- Conduct a meeting of cluster school (CS) teachers on project issues once in a month (a Friday),
- Organize co-curricular activities for all CSs,
- Act as a demonstration school carrying out innovative ideas and practices for all CSs for improving education within the cluster.
- To mobilize the physical and human resources available within the school clusters for the educational development of the satellite schools;
- To organize training workshops, and seminars in order to enhance the working efficiency of the teachers and headmasters;
- To promote educational awareness in the school and the community;
- To supervise and monitor the activities implemented in the cluster schools; and
- To reduce disparities between the schools

The points stated above are the roles and responsibility of the RP/RC defined by different policy documents. As these roles are concerned RP/RC has a key role to execute for the
betterment of the quality of primary education. However, the data collected from the field show that RPs in RCs is engaged only in administrative works. As their responses are concerned only 20% time can they allocated for the quality education in schools.

4.2 Review of the Structure and Activities
Resource centre is one of the coordinating institutions at local level among the local level stakeholders. The RC Directly circulated by DoE for the management of resource centre also focuses on the enhancement of quality education at primary level as one of the major functions of the RPs/RCs.

As the review of the policy documents as well as the interaction/discussion among the RPs in the field study is concerned, the present structure of RC is found in the vertical position which is top-down bureaucratic. Almost all the stakeholders perceived it as the hierarchy between DEO and schools. It is detached from the community and regarded as a government unit having no community ownership. Not only the people in the community but also other local and district level stakeholders also perceived it as an extended hand of the District Education Office. Thus, they were found of perceiving RPs as government representative to the schools. Two contradictory statuses were found in the study regarding the structure of the RCs. One, almost all the stakeholders regarded it as a government wing which detached it from the community ownership of RC/RP. The other, though they perceived it as government representative, RPs has no any administrative power to exercise at RCs. The study show that this is mainly due to the confusion in the structure of RC. Presently exercised structure of RC is found as below:

```
As the figure stated above is concerned, it is purely vertical in nature. This shows that RCs/RPs are working as the bridge to link the schools/teachers with the district education offices. They are the representatives of the DEOs and responsible for the assigned tasks from them.
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```
The research team during the field study conducted a detailed discussion regarding the structure of the RC and found that most of the resource centre. By this, neither responsible to each other for the conduction and operation of RC activities. Mainly, community ownership of people in RCs and social (instead of bureaucratic) ownership (perception) of RPs in community is lacking due to this. This status has badly affected the RC activities. Thus, it is necessary to make community participation for the better operation of RC activities as to enhance the quality of primary education.

This discussion and interaction between and among the local level as well as district and/or national level stakeholders during the field study is concerned, the following new structure of RC has been suggested for the betterment of the RC activities:

![Figure-4: Suggested new structure of the RC](image)

This structure is supposed to make the RCs as a coordinating institution at the local level among the local level stakeholders. It may make the local level stakeholders more accountable by developing community ownership of the people/organization in the RCs. This structure is more social integrative in nature. If it is practiced, it can avoid the detachment of community (people) as the owners and active stakeholders accountable for the operation and overall management of the RCs and RC activities.

As the activities performed by the RCs in order to uplift the quality of education in the schools are concerned, presently, they are found of paying very little efforts in the quality related works. According to the field data, the following status of RP’s activities in the RCs is found:
The information presented in the table above shows that RPs in Rcs are spending most of their time in plan formulation and collection of educational data in the RCs. Only 33.33 percent Rcs have found of conducting school supervision visit in which only the half or them (16.16%) percent of them have observed the classes of the teachers. Seven RCs (58.33%) were found contributing little in quality enhancement activities at the schools. This shows that most of their time is spending in plan formulation, data collection, and record keeping which is in fact, hindering the operation of quality related works at schools and RCs. According to them, this is mainly due to the overload of the number of schools, the RCs have to guide, supervise, monitor and observe. The table below shows the number of cluster schools under each resource centers that were studied as sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>No. of RCs studied</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>55.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The data in the table above shows that 1 RC has to guide the academic activities of about 56 schools in which 57 percent of them are community schools. Due to the load of works, they have found of prioritizing administrative works as first, other technical works as second and quality related works as the third. In most of the cases, all the officially scheduled programs had been conducted. Officially scheduled programs are of different types: training (refresher, whole school, multi-grade teaching, grade teaching, material construction etc). Friday meetings, head teacher's meetings, community awareness programs, collection of educational statistics and filing of different forms, and conduction of extracurricular
competitions. Besides these programs, some RCs have managed RC level examination, occasional supervision (inspection) of schools. In these days some RPs do not go to RC, for example, in Mugu majority of RPs do not generally go to the schools. In some cases, RP had not gone to the RC, but there was a report at DEO that all targeted programs were conducted and thus the budget was utilized.

In this regard, one of the weakest parts of RC program is supervision service provided by RP to the teachers. There is lack of planning for supervision and counseling services to the teachers. Most of the RPs inspects schools in the name of supervision. There is a rare case of model lesson demonstration by RP her/himself or by some experience teachers. Teachers commented that such school supervision helped them to be regular and attentive to the class, but the academic/technical supervision services were not found significantly helpful to them. It is also found that, though they rarely visit the schools they do not use to observe the classes mainly due to the lack of time.

School supervision is one of the main functions of the RPs in the RCs that are carried out in improving the quality of education in the schools. The following table shows a glimpse of the activities conducted by the RPs in RCs in relation to the supervision of the schools model teaching and class-observation by the RPs in Schools in the last academic year. This data have been taken from the sampled schools and verified by the respective RCs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparation of supervision plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation of supervision plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervision visit to school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Class observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The information presented in the table above show that all the RCs have prepared the supervision plan for supervising the cluster schools. However, only 58.33 percent of them have implemented that in the real world practice. They (58.33%) have visited the schools and maintained the record of the visited schools. But, only 16.66 percent of them have observed the classes of the teachers. According to the interaction with the RPs in the field study, they would have no time to observe the classes. Even they would have only a little time to visit the schools, the matter of class observation is far beyond their time. These statements of them are also
supported by the school teachers that no RPs observed their classes in almost all the cases. The table below shows the status of school visit and classroom observation by the RPs:

Table No. 4: Status of school visit and class observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>School Visit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Class observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once in 3 month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Once in 6 month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No visit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The information presented in the table above shows that 25 percent of total RPs does not visit the schools and 75 percent of them do not observe the classes of the teachers. Each 16.66 percent of them visit school respectively in each 1, 3 and 12 months respectively. There are 25 percent RPs who visit schools difficultly once in half a year.

**4.3 Use of Human and Physical resources**

A good resource centre has to use both the human and physical resources available locally mainly for the promotion of quality education. The philosophy of RC is to co-ordinate all the best human resources and share among the schools for quality primary education. In all the cases considered in this study, RPs were working themselves very often as resource persons. In some RCs, the RC school's teachers were prepared specialists in primary education and they were utilized during training. No exchange of good teachers between schools has been seen. This type of exercise was not found in the RC. In most of the cases, RPs said that teachers, students, community people have not owned RC as their institution. RCs are hardly generating resources at local level.

Not only the human resource, were the centers not found well-equipped with the physical resources. Neither the books nor any other supplementary teaching and learning materials were there in the centers. Whatever the things as learning materials were there, they were not in the good and usable condition both in terms of appropriateness and relevancy. Only one RC in Panchthar and two in Kathmandu were found having some sorts of materials but they were also not enough for the teachers and students. As a whole, the RCs were not well-equipped with both the human and physical resources. Further, the available resources were not mobilized or shared within the cluster schools.
Thus, a resource centre has to use the human and physical resources available within the school cluster for the educational development of the satellite schools. As our field study is concerned, only 20 percent of RCs understudy are found of using local human and physical resources for the educational development of the satellite schools. Rests of 80 percent of RCs are not using these in enhancing the educational qualities. According to most of them, they have to engage in administrative works and most of their five is pent on it. Further, it is difficult for them to utilize local human and physical resources due to political problems a well.

4.4 The Role of RC in Educational Promotion
One of the major roles of RC is to promote educational awareness of school and community to provide access to education of the disadvantaged and marginalized children. As government of Nepal has made plan and implementing according to educate all the children of the nation by 2015, RCs are the major units to make this successful. For this, the major role of RC is to find out the students who are out of school education and help develop their access to education. As present study is concerned, most of the RPs from the sampled RCs said that they generally do not have sufficient time to conduct admission campaign as well as to aware the local community especially for the access of education of the marginalized and disadvantaged children. According to most of them, they use to mobilize the teachers, and head teachers of the schools for this purpose and they use to coordinate the program. However, informally, they were involved in the promotion of those groups’ education. According to a RP in a RC in Phidim (Panchthar), the RC uses to conduct a month's admission campaign in which emphasis is given in development the access of marginalized groups towards the access of formal schooling.

As we know, one of the major functions of the RPs in RCs is to conduct the activities to promote educational awareness of the school and the community people to provide access to education of the disadvantaged and marginalized children. The table below shows what roles were played by them in reality in brief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Major role played</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interaction/Discussion/gathering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community discussion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visit to the particular community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visit to the disable and marginalized children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No role played to do so</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011
The table above shows that none of the RCs have carried out all of the activities related to the promotion of educational awareness of the people especially of the marginalized and disadvantaged groups. Only 75 percent of them have conducted different discussion and interaction programs related to it. Total of 33.33 percent have visited the particular community and only 25 percent of them have visited to the particular community.

4.5 The Effectiveness of RC Activities
Resource centers in Nepal at present have so many works to do and so many activities to perform. One of the issues raised by other stakeholders of education regarding RC activities is how effective their performance is to enhance the quality of education at schools. Keeping this situation in mind, an effectiveness study of RC activities has been carried out during the field study. The status of the study was as below:

Table No.6: Observational check-list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S N</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Effectiveness indicators</th>
<th>Remarks (In %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Textbook distribution</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>16.66/83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Record keeping of primary school teacher</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Record keeping of use of teaching improvement plan by teachers</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>16.66/33.33/50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preparation of supervision plan</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>83.33/8.33/8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School supervision</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>16.66/8.33/8.33/66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Class observation</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>16.66/83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Record keeping of supervision</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The observational check list above is the integrated whole of the check lists used to observe the effectiveness of RC activities performed by RPs. Seven different tasks related to school supervision, textbook distribution and record keeping were taken into the observation for the effectiveness. The status of the study shows that RCs have no or very little role played in the distribution of textbook to the primary level students. Only 2 RCs (among 12) were found involved in textbook distribution. However, record keeping of primary school teacher is satisfactory as all the RCs have maintained it in advanced. As record keeping of use of TIP by the teachers is concerned, only 16.66 percent of the RCs under study have kept its record in a proper way. Other 33.33 percent of RCs have maintained it simply. Rests of 50 percent of RCs have no record of use of TIP by the school teachers. All the RCs have prepared their supervision plans with the aim to visit schools and supervise their activities in advanced, however, each 8.33 percent of them have simple and poor planning respectively.
what is contradictory is that they have made/set the plans of school supervision visit but they rarely supervised the schools. In total of 12 RCs under study, 2 of them have found conducting the school supervision visit once in a year. Rest of each 2 have visited the half and the quarter of all the schools respectively once in a year. But rests of 8 RCs have not visited any of the cluster schools even once a time. As some as this, only 16.66 percent RCs have observed the classes of the teachers and rests of 83.33 percent of them have not observed any of the classes yet. As record keeping of the supervision is concerned, all the RCs who have supervised the schools according to their pre-set supervision plans have kept the intact record of their school supervision. What is strange is that 25 percent of the RCs have found maintaining the fake record of school supervision.

These overall analyses of effectiveness study of the RC activities in Quality improvement related performance show that resource centers have not playing active and adequate role in quality improvement related activities.

As we know, Twenty-one functions have been set officially for the RC under BPEP programs. The focused areas of the functions are teacher training, school management, educational data collections, sharing resources among the clustered schools for upgrading and maintaining uniformity in the primary education programs and quality enhancement, supervision of the schools, community mobilization for educational awareness, participation, and retention etc. Basically, the philosophy of the RC was to provide professional support to the school. But teachers were not considering RCs/RPs as technical adviser for their profession. In the interview with the RPs, they said that they have not met a teacher in the Resource Centre coming to visit them for professional problems. They come and talk about administrative function, some talk to certify for transfer, some for promotion or for other necessary certification. The image of the RC in the community of teachers was not seen as a technical support agency for the teachers at their immediate distance. The RC, is an administrative unit for controlling the people working under RC.

Until now, RC is not considered as technical support agency for the teachers at their immediate distance. RC because of the nature of the works undertaken was renamed in a denounced sense as data collection centre. Teachers told that the main function of RC is to collect data from schools. In regards of the programs and the functions undertaken at present by RC/RP, DEOs accepted that the technical functions of RC was weaker and effectiveness could not be seen apparently but realized that RPs should be specialized people able to provide technical support to the teachers and schools for the improvement of primary education. One of the great weaknesses in the present system is to consider one person as master of all things.
Similarly, no instance of model teaching demonstration has found. However, the evidences were fine in yearly lesson plans, operation calendar, teaching materials, educational data, achievement score analysis and the uniform examination system within the cluster schools. But in some of the schools such evidences were not found. In the observation of the RCs, it was found that some RCs had displayed programs, achievement, goals of primary education, and schools data in the charts. Such things were not seen in some RCs. Regarding the maintenance of the roster of trainers and the locally available resource persons, the observed RCs had no such thing. But they reported that they use the secondary teachers for giving training to the primary teachers. Those who have neither taught at primary classes, nor made special study on it were the trainers. So in some cases teachers had expressed that the training they received was not good.

As determined by the directly, the other function RC has to undertake is workshop in constructing teaching aids. Teachers said that they constructed teaching aids in the training centre, but the researchers did not see teaching aids in the office and classroom of the schools visited. They did not find enough teaching aids in the RCs even in the best RCs too. The philosophy of resource centre was to manage sharing of resources among the cluster schools. However, there was no resources in the centre and in the schools, how could it be expected that there is sharing among the cluster schools. So actions were found completed in the resource centre but very few were seen introduced into the classroom teaching. This shows that resource centers are not functioning effectively mainly in relation to quality enhancement at primary level schools in Nepal.

To keep it another way, the effectiveness of RC activities can be judged in terms of the major functions of the RCs that they have to implement in real life practice. Resource center are regarded as the extended arms of the DEOs in the local level. They are the local bodies that take care of all the determined activities at schools. Government of Nepal has determined 1091 resource center to take care 40424 schools (1:37 school-RC ratio) of the nation in which 1053 centers are existing at present. To study the effectiveness of RC functions 12 RCs were selected out of 1053. The sample is only 1.10 percent of the total centers so that it cannot fully represent the activities of all the centers. As a result, the findings of this small sample may not be representative and generalizable. Here, an attempt has been made to study the status of major RC functions on the basic of the responses provided by the respective resource person during the filed visit:
### Table 7: Effectiveness of RC Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Major RC functions</th>
<th>No of RCs implemented the functions in real life practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of RCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Formulation of Plan and Its Implementation</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make all the schools to form and implement plans</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To form and implement RC level annual plans</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>School Supervision</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision in using teacher guide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervise the availability of curriculum, textbook and teacher guide at schools and make necessary provision of timely delivery of them in schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervise all the schools (esp. schools having special class) and report to DEOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection and Record Management</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To collection educational data</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To update the record of cluster schools and teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Classroom Observation and Model Teaching</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Model class demonstration by RP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Model class demonstration by expert (subject teacher)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Class observation of the teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparing teaching materials &amp; conduct peer-teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities to prepare and use teaching materials</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>NFE Program</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To collect data of the illiterates</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To supervise and guide the NFE classes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Operation of Extra-curricular Activities</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduction of RC level extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exhibition of teaching materials</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other creative and constructive activities like-red cross, scout and so on</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Functions Related to (the enhancement of) Quality education</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobilizations of natural, physical and human resources for quality enhancement of the pupils at schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conduct different programs for educational development (in assistance with different CBOs/CSOs)  

Be in close collaboration with the teachers and help facilitate the teaching-learning activities  

To conduct RC level short term training, seminar and workshop for teachers, head teachers, SMC members, PTA members, and parents for educational development  

To manage and conduct teacher training related to teaching learning and the contents of the subjects  

To ask for the particulars of necessary classes in the concerned authorities  

To assist in necessary activities for the conduction of NFE classes  

To certify for the appointment of the facilitators and local supervises for NFE classes  

To form village literacy campaign committee (VLCC)  

To supervise NFE program and sending the related record to respective DEOs  

8. Other Functions  

School evaluation and reward  

Functions related to the conduction of special classes  

Conduction of RC level exams  

To manage & conduct educational tour in different times  

To conduct and operate all the other activities, functions and directions received from DEOs  

For the quantitative analysis of the data total of 12 sampled RCs were regarded as 100% and their effectiveness of functions were analyzed in terms of their role that they played in those respective works.

4.6 Mobilization of Community People and Organization  
One of the other roles of resource centre is to mobilize community people; community based organizations and parent teacher associations to increase the access of girls and disadvantaged children to education. Resource center is one of the acting local level agencies that assist implementing the EFA goals and national goals of education. For this, one of the main role that resource centre has to play is the mobilization of local level stakeholders community level people and local organization mainly to develop the access of
girls and disadvantaged students. As our study is concerned, resource centers are not found effectively functioning in doing so. Although PTA is formed almost in all the schools, they themselves are not well active. Some of the community based organizations and civil society organization are also in the local areas. But their role to school education do not find so active. Resource centre also has not found coordinating among them and mobilizing them for developing access of disadvantaged and marginalized groups of population, especially the girls.

To mobilize the community people, community based organization and teacher-parents association to increase the access of girls and disadvantaged children to education is the other role of the RCs to play for promoting quality education in the schools. As the study on it is concerned, the status of their mobilization can be seen in the following table:

Table No. 8: Status of Mobilization of Community People and CBOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Particular</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization of community people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobilization of CBOs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mobilization of PTA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobilization of local body</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mobilization of others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The information presented in the table above shows that only 25 percent of the RPs have become able to mobilize the community people for enhancing the quality of education in schools. According to 41.66 percent of them, they have mobilized the PTA to do so. What the RPs has not become able to do is the mobilization of CBOs, CSOs, local bodies and other related stakeholders of the school education.

4.7 Role of RCMC
RC was established with the philosophy of providing professional services like training to the teachers, supervision and guidance and follow up and other necessary supports to the primary teachers. To what extent the RCs have provided services is an important issue. At present RC is providing services to the teachers conducting the officially scheduled programmers of RC. The officially designated programmed were not conducted in some RCs. There is a question of the same programmed meeting the demand of the teachers of all regions and conditions.

The most effective services of the RC were information dissemination to the schools, data collection, and uniformity of lesson progress and examination among the schools in the cluster, regularity of the teachers due to close monitoring, operation calendar, and yearly
planning. RC, despite many other weaknesses, has created an atmosphere in the schools for a systematic planning of education activates. HTs of some schools said that in the programs of RC there are on school and off school programs, RPs are qualified, generous, devoted, honest everything but not getting the environment to utilize their full potential for the improvement of primary education quality. It is a humiliation to the qualified persons to keep them without resources. They said that all the time, whether it is EFA or BPEP, quality of education has become the matter of concern. Quality is the synonym of good classroom practice. Quality primary education is possible only when there are quality teachers. Preparation of quality teacher is not possible only when there are quality teachers. Preparation of quality teacher is not possible without investment. At present RC does not get resource as needed according to the potentiality of the RPs. According to some head teachers RC concept for providing services to the teachers was appreciable but the activities conducted by the RPs were not pertinent to the quality enhancement of the teachers. They just came to collect data. They never demanded the resources for the RC. The RPs from the teachers was effective in providing service but not all of them. If the qualified and the devoted teachers were selected without any bias, their services to the teachers would be effective and relevant. Teachers have demanded a seminar among the primary school teachers before starting a new session. This seminar has to inform about the changes in education in the world, best practices in the world for quality education and the position of Nepal in this regard. Such programs were not conducted in any RCs.

Why this long background information is presented here is that there is the provision of resource centre management committee in each and every RCs. This is the RCMC which has to manage the entire activities of the resource centre. As our study is concerned, all the RCs have found their own RCMCs but most of them were not functional. They are formed just for formality and nothing else their role at present shows. Regarding the de-functioning of RCMC, many RPs under study said that there is a need to further classification of the roles and responsibilities of RCMC with appropriate legal connection. Many of them opined that it is necessary to rethink about the members of RCMC. They suggested to appoint the RCMC members including both the teachers and head teachers of the schools as well as other community members so as to make it functional and efficient working. This statement is also supported by many of the head teachers under study.

The Resource Centre Directives circulated by the Department of Education has made the provision of RCMC for the management of all the RC activities. Mainly the RCMC has to perform its responsibility in preparing plans, programs and budget and mobilizing local resources.
Table No. 9: Role of RCMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparing plans, programs and budget</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobilizing local resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The table shows that the RCMC has involved only in preparing plans, programs and the budget but not in mobilizing the local resources available there. Their role in plan formulation was also not so active and effective. By this, it is clear that they play only the formal role in the RCs. Regarding their role in RCs, the following table has been presented the status of their involvement:

Table No. 10: Status of RCMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of RC</th>
<th>No. of RCMC</th>
<th>Actively functional</th>
<th>Difficultly functional</th>
<th>Completely passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The table shows that all the RCs have RCMCs but only 16.66 percent of them are actively involved in the RC activities. Total of 50 percent of them are completely passive and only 33.33 percent are difficulty functioning as RCMC. By this, it can be generate that most of the RCMCs are passive and have not been playing the role as expected. They are becoming only a formal body in the RCs.

4.8 Qualification, Experience and Selection of RPs

The qualification and experience of the RPs as well as the selection procedure of the RPs is one of the hot and debatable issues in the present day. Many stakeholders of education blame RPs for the inefficient functioning of the RCs which the RPs are not found ready to accept. In this context, the research team had conducted a comprehensive focus group discussion with the RPs and other stakeholders in each study-district. It is observed that all the RPs are at least B. Ed passed and some of them are M. Ed as well. It is also observed that all the RPs have attended job induction training however, they are not trained regarding the contents of the primary level. Further, this study explored that there are three types (categories) of RPs working at present:

a) The permanent school supervisors.

b) School teachers/Head teachers (most of them from secondary level teachers and some from lower secondary and/or primary level as well).

60
c) Fresh graduates temporarily appointed on contract basis.

Two separate and different kinds of dissatisfaction are found regarding the second and the third categories of the RPs. Those who are from school teachers express their dissatisfaction as we are the permanent teachers of the schools but we are appointed as RP in contract basis instead of transfer on deputation. How can permanently appointed personnel of the government again in the contract basis? They are also dissatisfied regarding the leave as they cannot entertain all the leave as they cannot entertain all the leaves as teachers do and also cannot entertain all the facilities as other government gazzeted and non-gazzeted personnel do. The third categories of RPs are still in the contract basis since their appointment. They are found worried about their permanency in the job.

As the qualification experience and the selection of RPs at RCs is concerned, almost all the informants (RPs, teachers, head teachers and some district/national level stakeholders) preferred master's degree in Education (M.Ed.) as the eligible qualification of the RPs. Only some of them opined that B.Ed. with adequate training and long teaching experience can also be eligible. But regarding, the selection of RPs, there are varieties of views. Here, an attempt has been made to present the RPs and (head) teacher's views regarding the selection of RPs in brief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Selection Procedure</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free competition of M. Ed graduates by any recognized government agency (PSC/TSC/DoE and such)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the concerned DEOs at districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Free competition among the permanent teachers having M.Ed. degree or B.Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience by the DEOs at districts.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presently practiced selection procedure is right but tri needs some revision, corrections, and local provisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The information in the table above show that 58.33 percent of the total teachers (head teachers) respondents were in favor of appointing RPs from free competition of M. Ed. graduates by the recognized government body. According to them, most of the school teachers are master
graduates and the schools are also going to the 1-12 structure. Thus, to address the needs of this, the RPs must be M.Ed. graduate with adequate trainings and knowledge/experiences. The following table presents the views of RPs themselves regarding the same:

### Table No.12: Views of RPs on Their Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Selection Procedure</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free competition of M. Ed graduates by any of recognized government agency (PSC/TSC/DoE and such)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the concerned DEOs at districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Free competition among the permanent teachers having M.Ed. degree or B. Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience by the DEOs at districts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presently practiced selection procedure is right but tri needs some revision, corrections, and local provisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

The data in the table above also show that the focus of the RPs on their selection should be made by free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the recognized government body. Here, to draw the findings of the study, an attempt has been made to make the average of the responses in the table below:

### Table No.13: Selection Procedure of the RPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Selection procedure</th>
<th>(Head) teacher’s views</th>
<th>RP’s views</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resp.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Resp.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free competition of M. Ed graduates by any of recognized government agency (PSC/TSC/DoE and such)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the concerned DEOs at districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Free competition among the permanent teachers having M.Ed. degree or B. Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience by the DEOs at districts.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presently practiced selection procedure is right but tri needs some revision, corrections, and local provisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011
According to the data presented in the table above, 50 percent of the total respondents opined that the RPs should be selected by the free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the recognized government bodies. Second is the view of 41.66 percent of the respondents who opined that they can be appointed/recruited by the competition among the permanent teachers having M. Ed degree or B. Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience? They have to recruit by fulfilling the definite procedure by the respective DEOs in the district. According to 16.66 percent of the informants they can also be appointed by the respective DEOs at districts with free competition of M.Ed. graduates. Finally, rests of 12.5 percent of informants viewed that presently exercised procedure is right but there is the need of some review and policy provision. The facts presented above nearly match with the focus group discussions conducted in all the sampled districts. The key finding of the discussion was also to adopt an alternative procedure to select the RPs and focus of the discussion was also in the free competition of M.Ed. graduates. However, these entire stakeholders’ have focused on the technical and skilled trainings for the RPs so that they can conduct all the RC activities efficiently.

4.9 The Use of RC Hall

Before talking about the use of RC hall, it is better to talk about the status of the hall in the RPs. The table below shows the present situation of the RC hall in the sampled districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCs having own building</th>
<th>RCs having only rooms</th>
<th>RCs having no building/rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011

This shows that only half of the RCs have their own RC building and 33.33 percent of them have only the rooms. Among the studied RCs, 8.33 percent of them have no separate room for the RC work. Here, an attempt has been made to explore the status of the use of RC hall in brief:
The data presented in the table above show that in most of the cases, the RC hall is used for academic purpose. However, the use of hall is for different purpose than for using it for enhancing quality of education in schools. Despite, the hall is found of using for some other political and administrative tasks. Mainly the head teachers of the schools use to misuse the RC hall as they certify to provide the hall of the certified purpose which the RPs cannot deny.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HM/Teacher meeting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Model teaching class</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interaction with stakeholders of education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SLC/HSEB/RC exam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evaluation of SLC answer sheet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Training for VDC/DDC/Police</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other skill development and vocational training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>As per headmaster’s want</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>For any of other education unrelated program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field study, 2011
UNIT FIVE: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the collected data, findings and recommendations of the study has been presented in this sub-chapter. For the convenience of the study, the findings and recommendations have been presented in two different sub-headings.

5.1 Major Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study are as below:

1. After the review of all the policy provisions regarding the role and responsibilities of RCs, the following main roles of the RCs to play are found out:
   - Formulation of strategic plans and their implementation
   - School supervision
   - Data collection and record management
   - Class observation and model teaching
   - Operation of extra curricular activities
   - Enhancement of educational quality
   - Functions related to non-formal educational
   - Conduct a meeting of cluster school (CS) teachers on project issues once in a month (a Friday),
   - Organize co-curricular activities for all CSs,
   - Act as a demonstration school carrying out innovative ideas and practices for all CSs for improving education within the cluster.
   - To mobilize the physical and human resources available within the school clusters for the educational development of the satellite schools;
   - To organize training workshops, and seminars in order to enhance the working efficiency of the teachers and headmasters;
   - To promote educational awareness in the school and the community;
   - To supervise and monitor the activities implemented in the cluster schools; and
   - To reduce disparities between the schools

To conduct and operate these RC functions, the RPs are responsible. Thus, an attempt has been made here to state in brief the major functions/roles of RPs as well below:

- Management of RC including preparations of annual and monthly plans of the RC,
- Conduction and follow up training/workshop/seminars,
- Friday meeting with teachers,
- Head teacher meetings,
- RCMC meetings,
- General inspection of schools,
- Classroom observation and discussion with teachers,
- Model lesson presentation,
- RC profile preparation,
- Educational data collection and demonstration,
- Organization of extra curricular activities,
- Community mobilization,
- Management of RC Level examinations
- Instructional material preparation/Management,
- Curriculum implementation,
- Selection of model school,
- Participation on district level meetings,
- Co-ordination with different activities and agencies,
- Report preparation,
- Information dissemination,
- Innovative works,
- Others

2. The structure of RC at present is found of vertical position which is top-down bureaucratic as presented below in the Fig.:1. Though it is conceptually associated with the local community, it is found detached from the community as many of the local level stakeholders are found adopting least ownership of RC as their part of daily life. Most of the stakeholders are found perceiving the RC as a hierarchical unit between schools and DEOs.

![Fig- 5.1: Structure of RC in Practice](image)
3. Only 25 percent of RCs understudy are found using local human and physical resources for the educational development of the satellite (cluster) schools. Rests of 75 percent of RCs are not using these in enhancing the educational qualities. According to most of them, they have to engage in the collection of different types of data, their recording and visit to DEO so that they cannot pay enough time to work at those sectors which have direct influences in quality enhancement of the school education. Further, there is problem to use local human resource as expert due to the intervention in the class that s/he is taking in one hand and in the other hand; it is difficult for them to utilize local human and physical resources due to political problems as well.

4. As RC’s role is to promote educational awareness of the schools and the community to provide educational access mostly to the disadvantaged and marginalized groups, the study found that only 75 percent of them have conducted some sorts of discussion and interaction programs related to it. Total of 33.33 percent have visited the community and only 25 percent of them have visited to the particular targeted community to develop educational awareness of the community people. The RPs said that they have maximum numbers of cluster schools so that they cannot take care of them all in a good way. It is supported by our evidence as the sampled study has 55.75 (i.e., 56) cluster schools under an RC in average.

5. In some of the cases, it is found that the centers are not functioning as Resource Centers but are working only as Data Collection Centers due to the overload of the number of cluster schools. As the effectiveness of RC activities performed by RPs in RCs are concerned, the study showed that RCs have no or very little role played in the distribution of textbook to the primary level students. Only 2 RCs (among 12) were found involved in textbook distribution. However, record keeping of primary school teacher is satisfactory as all the RCs have maintained it in advanced. However, only 16.66 percent of the RCs understudy has kept the record of use of TIP by the teachers in a proper way. Other 33.33 percent of RCs have maintained it simply. Rests of 50 percent have no record of use of TIP by the school teachers. The summary of the major effectiveness activities of the RCs has been presented below:

- Formulation of Plan and Its Implementation-100%
- School Supervision- 33.33%
- Data Collection and Record Management-100%
- Classroom Observation and Model Teaching-16.66%
6. The study found that all the RCs have prepared their supervision plans with the aim to visit schools and supervise their activities in advanced, however, each 8.33 percent of them have simple and poor planning respectively. In total of 12 RCs understudy, 2 of them have found conducting the school supervision visit once in a year. Rest of each 2 have visited the half and the quarter of all the schools respectively once in a year. But rests of 8 RCs have not visited any of the cluster schools even once a time. The study found that only 16.66 percent RCs have observed the classes of the teachers. All the RPs who had supervised the schools according to their pre-set supervision plans had kept the intact record of their school supervision. What is strange is that 25 percent of the RCs have found maintaining the fake record of school supervision.

7. The study showed that resource centers are not found effectively functioning in mobilizing the community people and CBOs/CSOs to increase the access of children from marginalized, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. PTA was found formed almost in all the schools; however, they themselves are not well active. Some of the community based organizations and civil society organizations were also functioning in the local areas but their role to school education do not find so active. Resource centre has not found coordinating among them and mobilizing them for developing access of the target groups, especially the girls. Only 25 percent of the RCs had become able to mobilize community people for enhancing the quality of education in schools. As 41.66 percent of them mobilized the PTA to do so rest of others did not become able to mobilize of CBOs, CSOs, local bodies and other related stakeholders of the school education.

8. All the RCs had their own RCMCs but most of them were not functional. only 16.66 percent of them were actively involved in the RC activities. Total of 50 percent of them were completely passive and only 33.33 percent were difficulty functioning as RCMC. That is, they were becoming only a formal body in the RCs and nothing else. The de-functioning of RCMC is found mainly due to the unclear clarification and statement of the roles and responsibilities of RCMC with appropriate legal connection. The study found that the RCMC had involved only in preparing plans,
programs and the budget but not in mobilizing the local resources available there. Their role in plan formulation was also not so active and effective.

9. Regarding the Qualification, Experience and Selection of RPs, the study found the following three main views of the stakeholders:

- The RPs should be selected by the free competition of M.Ed. graduates by the recognized government bodies-PSC, TSC, or any other newly formed bodies (according to 50 percent of the total respondents).
- They can be appointed/recruited by the competition among the permanent teachers having M. Ed degree or B.Ed. with more than 10 years teaching experience (according to 41.66 percent of the respondents).
- They have to recruit by fulfilling the definite procedure by the respective DEOs in the district with free competition of M.Ed. graduates (according to 16.66 percent of the informants)
- Presently exercised procedure is right but there is the need of some review and definition of policy provision (according to 12.5 percent of the informants).

The key finding of these points is to adopt an alternative procedure to select the RPs in which focus is found in the free competition of M.Ed. graduates having technical and skilled trainings to conduct all the RC activities efficiently.

10. The study found that 7 RCs (58.33%) understudy had their own building and other 4 (33.33%) had only a room(s). Rests of 1 (8.33%) had neither building nor any room. Those who have RC building or room/hall, the RC hall were found using for academic purpose in most of the cases. However, the use of hall was also found for different purpose than for using it in enhancing quality of education in schools. In some cases, the hall was found of using for some other political and administrative tasks. Mainly the head teachers of the schools were found to misuse the RC hall as they certified to provide the hall for the certified purpose which the RPs cannot deny.
5.2 Recommendations of the Study

On the basis of the aforementioned major findings of the study, the following recommendations have been suggested for the betterment of the program:

I. Government should clearly specify the roles, responsibilities and duties (as well as the service & facilities) of the resource persons in the RC defining in the Education Act, Education Regulations and in other legal and administrative documents as needed. This will motivate RPs in one hand and solve the problems of ineffectiveness of RC functioning in the other hand.

II. The RCMC should be restructured and provision of including local level stakeholders (local educationists, parents teachers, PTA members SMC members, CBO/CSO members, VDC representatives) in RCMC should be made. This help to make the RCMC actively functional in management and implementation of the RC programs/activities. The role, responsibility, right and duty of the RCMC should be defined legally (by the education Act, education Regulation, directories etc) and execution of the assignment should be obligatory. RCMC should have the right to readjust the programs according to the local need of the RC. The suggested new structure of RC has been given in the following figure:

**Fig-5.2: Suggested new structure of RC**
III. Necessary legal provision should be made (clearly stating the provisions in the Education Regulation and such other documents) to make RPs accountable to RCMC and DEO not to the head teachers of the schools.

IV. The recruitment of RP (selection procedure) should be changed and new provision of it should be made in order to make the RC activities effective, functional, active and meaningful. For this, it is suggested to recruit RPs from the M. Ed graduates or from the B. Ed. graduates having more than ten years of teaching experience. It is necessary to develop different pre-service, in service and refresher training packages for the RPs and should train them accordingly. RPs should be Resource Persons in reality.

V. One of the different cell should be formed in the DoE (and its constituted cell in each DEOs) in order to manage, guide, operate, supervise, monitor and evaluate all the RC activities throughout the nation as the ineffectiveness of presently observed activities are mainly due to the weak supervision and monitoring of the RC activities. The cell can have the authority of recruiting RP and defining the roles, responsibilities, rights, duties, qualification and experiences of the RPs as well as can conduct the pre- services, in-service and refresher training for the RPs as well.

VI. If the presently practiced RC model is kept in continuation (i.e., if any alternative modalities will not be adopted), it is compulsory to make provision of separate RC building at least having three rooms- one for general administration, another for RC library and the third- a well equipped RC hall for the training, seminar, workshop and Head teacher/RCMC and/or other meetings. The implementation/execution of “one RC-one building” is highly recommended to implement so as to make the RCs as the real Resource Centers. It is also recommended to provide one computer with internet facility to each RCs as far as possible to enhance the quality of school education.

VII. As RPs are the field officer, they must be in the schools in more days. Thus, the provision of an office assistant to assist the RPs in the RCs as well as to open the RCs in absence of them is seen necessary to recruit. If it is defined clearly, assistant can be recruited locally by mobilizing local financial resources as well.

VIII. Present structure of RC (DEO-RC-School) is vertical in nature as a result it has many problems. Thus, it should be re-structured by making almost all the local level stakeholders responsible and accountable to RC and RC activities. For this it is suggested to re-structure the vertical bureaucratic model into the integrative model horizontally (including VDC/VEC, RCMC, PTA, SMC, CSOs, CBOs etc. in its operation).
IX. As it is necessary to rethink about the members of RCMC, it is suggested to appoint the RCMC members including both the teachers and head teachers of the schools as well as other community members, VDC representative, CSOs/CBOs members as well as other local level stakeholders so as to make it functional and efficient working.

X. Teacher training should be school based. For this, RPs should mobilize the locally available physical and human resources in the training instead of involving themselves to make all sorts of subject-specific training effective (as a single person (the RP) cannot be the master of all). Qualified and experienced subject teacher within the cluster schools should be used as the subject export in the training and RPs should coordinate and operate the training. It certainly helps to enhance the quality of education in schools.

XI. RPs are the technical human resources. Thus, they should focus on the technical works in the RCs. But, most of them are found spending their time only in collecting educational data and doing some administrative works as well. Supervision is weak and becoming so called supervision. This can not be strengthened until the integrated structure of RC is not followed. The implementation of yearly operation calendar with strict supervision and follow up program should be made an obligation to RPs.

XII. Above all, an alternative modality of the RC operation has been suggested for the betterment of the RC activities and to make the RC functions effective and efficient. But it does not mean that presently exercised RC system is not good. It is hoped that the suggested modality can help improve RC activities in alternation to it, if this (presently exercised) modality is changed. The suggested modality is the school based modality in which a lead school functions as the RC in those places where the RCs cannot work properly mainly due to the overload of cluster schools. The empirical study and review of related literature both in Nepal and abroad showed three main alternative modalities of RC (in addition to presently practiced modality) as-

(i) Mobile RP for remote area,
(b) Advisory model, and
(c) School based model.

Among them, it is suggested to adapt and employ the school based model as an alternative to the presently implemented model for the betterment of the entire RC activities.
A school based model is an integrated institutional model successfully practiced in different European and American countries in which RC is fully take care, organized, operated and controlled by the school teachers. As geographical complexity, financial crisis and the degrading quality of public schools performance (result) in Nepal is concerned, this can be an alternative mean to address most of the problems related to present RC system. Presently 57 cluster schools are found in average under a resource centre (as our sample is concerned) which is rather impossible to take care, monitor, supervise, train, and collect data by a single RC/RP. If the geographical distance is maintained, it is observed also recommended that one RC can successfully conduct its activities in 8-10 schools in mountain, 10-15 schools in hill and 15-25 schools in terai and valley. If this is so, we need about 5 thousand resource centers throughout the country which is rather impossible to have at present mainly due to the financial crisis of the national economy. Thus, in a school based model, a cluster of 5-7 schools can be made and among the schools one secondary or lower secondary school can be selected as a lead school. And, this lead school should be developed as resource school. The responsibility of training to the teacher and supervision is of the lead school. There should make provision of some additional tenure to the teacher of lead school so that there could not be any hindrance in regular functioning of the school. The existing RC can coordinate some 2-3 clusters and take the responsibility of providing training to develop the trainer for the clusters, and can collect educational data as well as perform all the set activities as the operator and guidance body of those clusters.

If this is so, present RC would be a unit of DEO working for some administrative, coordinating, and qualitative functions but the supervision and training responsibility should be given to the lead school and its teacher. For financial resources, there should be a sharing modality. The government, the local body, community organizations, and even teachers and schools have to contribute for this in a logical and scientific way. The sharing modality should be stated explicitly in the rules and regulation and should be defined by concerned law. This model can provide adequate supervision and training support to the teacher and schools. From the financial point of view, this could be more sustainable because of higher sharing from different sectors and stakeholders. This investment form the local level brings concern to the local people to observe its effectiveness which certainly increases the accountability of local stakeholders as well. But, in doing so too, there should be the provision of separate RC hall along with sufficient resource materials.
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ANNEX
Annex-1: TOR
The Terms of Reference on
Role of Resource Center for improving quality education in schools

1. The context
Nepal has taken different initiatives and practices to increase access, participation and quality in primary education. Introduction of the concept of Resource Center (RC) has been one of such initiatives in this field. The history of RC system in Nepal is very short. RC system was introduced with the implementation of Education for Rural Development (ERD project) in Seti zone in 1982. The Seti project has initiated the RC system by clustering nine or ten schools and designing one of the centrally located schools as RC school. The RCs provided a broad range of services to neighboring schools such as in-service training program to primary school teachers, supplying materials to local schools, providing a venue for monthly meetings and supervising and assisting (The BPE Master Plan, 1997).

Quality primary education was the motto of different initiatives introduced by Nepal. The RC system was followed by Primary Education Project (PEP) which was introduced in six selected districts of the country for the improvement of quality primary education. It was introduced as a response to the need to bring educational services closure to the schools so as to respond to the needs of local teachers and students. In addition, there was a field coordinator (FC) who, in addition to planning, implementing and supervising the PEP programs, assisted coordinated and monitored the activities of six RPs. The concept of RC was further continued by BPEP in order to make the project successful by providing professional support to the primary school teachers.

Nepal endorsed Jomtien Declaration (1990) on ‘Education for All’ providing quality primary education has been one of the set goals of this Declaration. Government of Nepal has implemented Basic and Primary Education Project (BPEP 1992-1997) and Primary Education Development Project (PEDP 1992-1997) in order to achieve the above mentioned goal. With the introduction of EFA, the role of RC has been changed and more responsibilities have been given to it. In most of the cases, secondary schools have been selected to serve as RCs. Major Functions of the RC as listed in the Resource Centre Operation Handbook (BPEP, 1992) are as follows:

- To mobilize the physical and human resources available within the school clusters for the educational development of the satellite schools;
- To organize training workshops, and seminars in order to enhance the working efficiency of the teachers and headmasters;
- To promote educational awareness in the school and the community;
- To supervise and monitor the activities implemented in the satellite schools;
- To reduce disparities between the schools

The Education for All Plan of Action (2001-2015) has set several programs to address the people who are deprived from the primary education and to enhance quality in the primary education. The EFA Plan of Action has accorded roles and responsibilities to RC to work as the main actor in some programs as a co-operating actor in others.
A study conducted on Resource Centre Structure identified some weaknesses in the effective functioning of the RCs. Some of the findings of this study are stakeholders had positive attitude to the institution but negative attitude to the day to day management, inadequacy of human resource and unavailability of the RPs in the centers, lack of supervision and monitoring, lower representation of the local people in RCMC (CERES, 1995 cited in CERID, 2004).

Administratively, RCs are linked to DEO in the districts to perform additional support and also providing training to the teachers, supervising schools and collecting educational data for the planning of better management. These days RC is managed by a Resource Person (RP). RP is selected from among the senior teachers of the schools within the cluster. After the completion of their tenure, RPs can be returned back to their concerned schools. It was also used as a training spot for distance mode teacher training as a training center. Thus these centers are used as a venue for professional meetings for teachers and head teachers, worked as a resource center for providing teaching learning materials.

A study conducted by CERID (2004) mentioned the basic features of RC practiced in the world as i) organized and managed by the teachers themselves with the grant provided by the government, ii) a coordinator from outside the teachers and all the tutors/mentors from the teachers and the budget is provided by other agencies, and iii) organized and managed by the teachers but funding in sharing modality with teachers’ levy, contribution of NGOs/CBOs, local government/state (CERID, 2004).

The above study conducted by CERID also envisioned that all teachers, Head teachers and other community members accepted the RC strategy as the most important strategy for providing support to the primary teachers to improve quality education. It has further explored the positive impact of the RC system as regularity of the teachers in schools, training to the teacher, uniform examination and information dissemination to the teachers and Head teachers. Competitions among the schools in inter school extra-curricular activities and selections of best school among the clustered schools have brought positive changes in the teaching learning activities (CERID, 2004).

In the context of newly introduced teacher professional development (TPD) system in the country, resources available in the centre can be used for continuous and demand driven system of teacher training. Thus this study will attempt to identify the alternative roles of the RC in providing quality education in the school.

2. Objectives of the study

Overall objective of this study is to assess the role of Resource Center for improving quality education in the school and suggest effective measures for the utilization of resources in a way to improve quality education in the schools.

The objectives of the study are as following:

i. To review the policy provisions regarding the role and responsibility of Resource Center for providing quality education in the school.
ii. To review the structure of Resource Center with its functional linkage with VEC, CLC and DEO in order to uplift the quality of education.

iii. To explore the use of human and physical resources available within the school cluster for the educational development of the satellite schools.

iv. To identify the role the RC to promote educational awareness of school and community to provide access to education of the disadvantaged, and marginalized children and girls to education.

v. To identify the expected and performed roles of RC, RP and RCMC to mobilize community people, community based organizations and parent-teacher associations to increase quality education in the schools.

vi. To analyze the effectiveness of RC activities performed by Resource Persons in the distribution of textbooks, Keeping records of primary school teachers and use of teaching improvement plan by the teachers;

vii. To assess the effectiveness of supervision system of the RC (Preparation of supervision plan, school supervision, class observation, record keeping etc.) for quality improvement in the schools;

viii. To explore the problems and challenges of RP and RCMC in the process of institutionalizing RC activities to promote quality education;

ix. To assess the role of resource centre management committee (RCMC) to perform its responsibility of preparing plans, programs and the budget and mobilizing local resources;

x. To suggest alternative modalities of RC for better utilization of resources and better management of RC activities for improving quality education in the schools.

3. Scope of work
To conduct this study, the following things are needed to be incorporated while designing tools, conducting assessment and preparing the report:

11. The types of activities performed by RC in relation to improving quality teaching and learning in the centers.

12. Analysis of the existing structure, working modality and institutionalization of RC system.

13. Utilization of RC hall in different purposes directed towards improving teacher performance in the school;

14. Using a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research methods while preparing the report;

15. Utilization of RC for improving quality education in formal and non-formal education;

16. Role of RCMC in regular functioning of the centre including community and CBO mobilization;

17. Developing appropriate methodology and study tools for information collection in consultation with thematic group of Department of Education.

18. Cover the three ecological belts, five development regions and the rural-urban locations while selecting RCs as the representative sample for the study.

19. Include at least one LRC from each sample district for the study.

20. Be in consultation with the Thematic Committee of the DOE for necessary guidance and reporting of the progress.
4. **Methodology of the study**
The following methodology should be employed while conducting the study:

- A detailed review of the related works should be carried out before developing the tools and a framework for the study.
- A mixed methodology of both qualitative and quantitative techniques can be applied by using appropriate tools to carry out the study.
- To make the study representative, the administrative divisions, geographical belts and rural-urban locations should be considered while selecting the study sites.
- Involve questionnaire and/or interview schedule to all the concerned stakeholders (RP, RCMC members, teachers and head teachers) involved in RC activities.
- The tools, mostly the quantitative ones, should be pre-tested and their feedback incorporated before finalizing them.

5. **Data, services and facilities to be provided by the client**
The client provide the flash and EMIS report, venue for interaction and dissemination of the reports, request letter to school, DEO and related institutions and invitation letters to experts.

6. **Reporting**
The consultant/Firm will follow the reporting schedule as follows:

- An inception report to be submitted one week after the commencement of the assignment
- An interim report submitted in the middle period of the consultancy or after completion of the field survey
- Draft report to be submitted and disseminated before submission of final report
- Final report to be submitted by the end of the consultancy

7. **Monitoring of consultant’s work**
A thematic committee constituted at the Department of Education for this purpose will review and monitor the process and the report of each submission. The firm must consider the suggestions given by the committee. In addition, the DoE can make special arrangement to monitor the field works.

8. **Firm’s qualification**
The research firm must have a minimum of three years of experiences in the related fields as well as theoretical and practical experiences in the above areas. The research firm having personnel with a deep knowledge of program development and evaluation will be preferred. Work experience from remote areas and deprived communities will be prioritized.
9. **Time**

The research study is expected to take place from March 2011 to June 2011.

10. **Proposed budget**

The proposed total budget for the study is Rs. 4,14,950.00

11. **Output**

The study will have the following output:

- The firm will have to submit the inception, interim, draft and final report, action plan as indicated in the RFP.
- The inception, interim and draft and final report must be five hard copies with an electronic copy and the number of final report must be 10 (ten) hard copies with an electronic copy.
- The executive summary of the final report should also be translated into Nepali. The Nepali version of findings and action steps should be just translated literally word for word (what is in the English version).
नेपाल सरकार, शिक्षा मन्त्रालय, शिक्षा विभाग सानोठिमि, भक्तपुरको आ. व. २०६७/६८ को निर्धारित कार्यक्रम अनुसार श्री सान्त्वना मेमोरियल एकेडेमी प्र. लि., शालिनगर, काठमाडौँले विद्यालयमा शैक्षिक गुणस्तर अभिवृद्धिका लागि खोट केन्द्रको भूमिका’ शिर्षकमा एक अध्ययन/अनुसन्धान सज्जालन गर्न गईर्जेको जानकारी अनुरोध गर्दै उक्त अध्ययन/अनुसन्धान कार्यलाई सफलतापूर्वक सम्पन्न गर्न आवश्यक सम्पूर्ण सहयोगसहित तथ्याङ्क उपलब्ध गराइदिनुहुन तथा यस प्रश्नावलीमा उल्लिखित प्रश्नहरूको जवाब दिनुभए सहयोग गर्नुहुन सविनय अनुरोध गद्दछ। यहाँहरूको सहयोग, सल्लाह, सुकावा र राय ने यस अध्ययनको लागि तथ्याङ्कहरू यूनिफल्टले अनुसन्धान कार्यको सफलताको लागि यहाँहरूबाट उल्लेखी सहयोग हुने कुरामा विश्वसन पनि छ।

........................................
श्रीमती जमुना खत्री
अध्यक्ष
२०६८/०९/२५

खोट केन्द्रका लागि प्रश्नावली

खोट केन्द्रको नाम:
ठेगाना:
खोट व्यक्तिको नाम:
सम्पर्क:
प्रश्नावली भरेको मिति:
कार्यालयको छाप:
1. स्त्रील केन्द्रको आवश्यकता किन्छ?
   
2. स्त्रील व्यक्तिको रूपमा स्त्रील केन्द्रमा रेहर तपाईले सम्पादन गर्न मुख्य मुख्य कामहरू को के हुन्?
   
3. यस्ता कामहरूको कार्य-सम्पादन कलिको प्रभावकारी हुने गरेको पाउनुभएको छ?
   
4. प्रभावकारी कार्य-सम्पादन नहुनुहो छांड को कारण छ?
   
5. स्त्रील व्यक्तिको रूपमा तपाईले गर्नुहुने प्राधिकक्षक कामहरू को-को हुन्?
   
6. स्त्रील केन्द्रमा प्राधिकक्षक कार्य सम्पादनमा को के समय छन्?
   
7. उक्ष समस्याहरूको समाधान कसरी गर्न सकिन्छ?
   
8. स्त्रील व्यक्तिको रूपमा तपाईले गर्नुहुने प्रशासनिक कामहरू को-को हुन्?
9. खोले व्यक्तिको रूपमा तपाईले गन्नुहुने शैविक गुणस्तर अभिवृद्धिमार्ग सम्बंधित कामहरू के-के हुन ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

10. खोले केन्द्रले विश्वासहरूमा गुणस्तरीय शिक्षण-सिकाईका लागि के-के कियाकलापहरू गर्दै आएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

11. शिक्षकहरूको श्रमला अभिवृद्धि तथा सीप विकासका लागि के-के कामहरू गर्नेर गन्नुभएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

12. अन्तर्दिक्ष कियाकलाप तथा सर्जनात्मक कार्यहरू के-के गराउनु भएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)

13. एउटा खोले केन्द्र स्वरूपान्तर किलोटा विश्वासहरू हुन उपयुक्त हुन्छ?
   क)

14. यस खोले केन्द्र अन्तर्गत किलोटा विश्वासहरू छन्?
   तालिकामा विवरण दिन्छोला।

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>क्र.स.</th>
<th>तहहरू</th>
<th>सामाजिक</th>
<th>संस्थागत</th>
<th>जम्मा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>प्राथमिक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>निःश्रृंखलिक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>माध्यमिक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>उच्च माध्यमिक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>जम्मा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. खोले केन्द्रबाट सवैभव्य टाइपको विश्वास कृन हो र कति दरीमा छ?
   क)

16. विश्वासहरूको निरीक्षण भ्रमण वर्षमा किलोटक गन्नुहुन्छ?
   क)

17. निरीक्षणबाट मुख्य गरी के-के कुरहर पाइएका छन्?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
18. निरिक्षणात विद्यालय शिक्षकों अवस्था के-के सुधार आएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

19. निरिक्षण सम्बन्धमा केही समस्याहरु रहेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

20. बीच केन्द्रमा भौतिक मौलिक बीच दाखलहरुको अवस्था कस्तो?
   क) सन्तोषजनक
   ख) पार्थक्य
   ग) अपर्याप्त
   ध) अभाव
   न)अन्य (उलेख गर्नुहोला)...........

21. बीच केन्द्रमा शीर्षक सामाजिकहरुको अवस्था कस्तो?
   क) सन्तोषजनक
   ख) पार्थक्य
   ग) अपर्याप्त
   ध) अभाव
   न)अन्य (उलेख गर्नुहोला)...........

22. शीर्षक गणनातर्कित तृण कून कृषि कार्यक्षेत्र बीच केन्द्रको हल (कथा) प्रयोग गरेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

23. शीर्षक गणनातर्कित वाहक बीच केन्द्रको हल (कथा) अन्य के-के कार्यक्षेत्र प्रयोग गरेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

24. अनेकार्थक शिक्षको व्यवस्था तथा विकासका लागि चाहि के-के कार्यक्षेत्र प्रयोग गरेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

25. विद्यालयहरुको शीर्षक विकासका लागि बीच केन्द्रमा भौतिक तथा शीर्षक बीच साधनहरुको उपयोग कस्ती गरेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)

26. बीच केन्द्र अन्तर्गतका विद्यालयहरुको निरिक्षणमा के-के समस्याहरु छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   ध)
   न)
27. निरीक्षण पहुँचिए तपाईंले निरीक्षण/अनुगमन गर्नुहुने मूल्य-मूल्य कार्यक्रम के-के हुन?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
28. तपाईंले स वर्षमा आफ्नो ग्यात केन्द्र अन्तरगतका कृतिबद्ध विद्यालयहरुको क्षेत्र अबलोकन गर्ने गर्नेपनेको छ?
   क) सबै
   ख) कुनै लिहाइ
   ग) आफ्नो
   घ) एक चौथाइ
   ड) अन्य (उल्लेख गर्नौलाई).........
29. क्षेत्र अबलोकनले खास के देखाएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
30. शिक्षण लिस्टार्गुण सम्बन्धित यस्ता समस्याहरुको समाधान कसै गर्न सकिन्छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
31. यस्ता समस्याहरुको समाधान गर्न तपाईंले के के पहलहरु गर्ने भयो?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
32. समुदायमा समान्तरकृत तथा पञ्चायत परिसरका मुद्राविद्याका वाणिज्यकालहरुमा शैक्षिक चेतनाको अभिवृद्धि गर्ने शिक्षाको पहुँच विस्तार गर्नेका लागि के-कस्ता कार्यक्रम गर्ने गर्नेपनेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
33. समान्तरकृत सुविधा बन्द्यत तथा बाणिज्यकालहरुमा विद्याहरूलाई विद्यालयीय शिक्षाको पहुँच विस्तार गर्न्यालाई के गर्ने गर्नेपनेको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   ड)
24. What is the name of the course that is being taught in the combined field of education and social work and its duration is ________ years?

| का | का |
| का | का |
| का | का |
| का | का |
| का | का |

25. The course contents are ________.

26. Describe the course content ________.

27. What is the name of the teacher ________.

28. The name of the teacher ________.

29. The name of the teacher ________.

30. The name of the teacher ________.
41. निम्नलिखित दिने का सारणिक ₹ ५० हजार के के मा खरी गन्तव्य है?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

42. शीतल व्यतिको छिनाट कसरी हुने गई?
   क)

43. के यो छिनाट विधि/प्रक्रिया ठीक छ?
   क)

44. शीतल व्यतिको छिनाटको वैकल्पिक प्रक्रिया के हुन सक्छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

45. शीतल व्यतिको योग्यता/शम्भव के के र क्षति हनु पछि?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

46. शीतल केन्द्रले भोगिरहेका मुख्य समस्याहरु के के हुन?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

47. शीतल केन्द्रले भोगिरहेका समस्याहरु समाधानका लागि के गरुङ्गरेग्न हुन्छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)

48. शीतलकेन्द्रको पुनर्संरचना अवस्था छ कि छैल?
   क) छ
   ख) छैल

49. भने, शीतल केन्द्रहरुको पुनर्संरचना कसरी गन्तव्य हुने?
   क)

50. शीतल केन्द्रको विकल्पमा के हुन सक्छ?
   क)

सहयोगको नाम वार्ता हार्दिक धन्यबाद!
विद्यालयका लागि प्रश्नावली

विद्यालयको नाम:

ढेगाना:

प.अ.को नाम:

समस्या:

प्रश्नावली भरेको मिति:

विद्यालयको छाप:

कृपया तलका प्रश्नहरूको उत्तर निर्दिष्ट अनुरोध छ ।

१. योल केन्द्रको आवश्यकता किन छ?
   (क) 
   (ख) 
   (ग) 
   (घ) 
   (ड)

२. योल केन्द्रमा रहेको योल व्यतिक्रमी सम्पादन गर्न मुख्य मुख्य कार्यहरूको केही हुन सक्छ जस्तो लागू?
   (क) 
   (ख) 
   (ग) 
   (घ) 
   (ड)

३. यस्ता कार्यहरूको कार्य-सम्पादन कतिको प्रभावकारी हुने गरेको पाउनुभएको छ?
   (क)

४. प्रभावकारी कार्य-सम्पादन नह्नुभएको पूरा छ?
   (क) 
   (ख) 
   (ग) 
   (घ) 
   (ड)

५. योल व्यतिक्रमी गर्नुपर्ने प्राविभागकै कामहरूको त्त्तक हुन?
   (क) 
   (ख) 
   (ग) 
   (घ) 
   (ड)

६. योल केन्द्रमा प्राविभागकै कार्य सम्पादनको केही समस्या छनौ?
   (क) 
   (ख) 
   (ग) 
   (घ) 
   (ड) 
   (च) 
   (छ)
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7. उक समस्याहरूको समाधान कसरी गर्न सकिन्छ?
   क) ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)
   च)
   छ)

8. सोल केन्द्रले बिखालवर्षमा गुणस्तरीय शिक्षण-सिफाईका लागि केन्द्रो-केन्द्रका लेख माध्यम र विभक्त देखि हुने?
   क) ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)
   च)
   छ)

9. शिक्षकहरूको क्षमता अभिवृद्धि तथा सीप विकासका लागि केन्द्रो-केन्द्रका कामहरू गर्नुपर्ने हुने?
   क) ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)
   च)
   छ)

10. एउटा सोल केन्द्र अन्तररात कल्याण बिखालवर्षमा हुन उपयुक्त देखि हुने? कारण दिनुहोला?
   क)

11. सोल व्यक्तिले बिखालवर्षमो निरीक्षण भ्रमण वर्षमा कल्याण कामहरू गर्न गर्नु?
   क)

12. सोल व्यक्तिले बिखालवर्षमो निरीक्षण भ्रमण वर्षमा खास केन्द्रो-केन्द्रका गर्न गर्नु?
   क)
   ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)

13. निरीक्षणबाट मुख्य गर्नी केन्द्रो-केन्द्रका लागि भ्रमण बाट पाइएका छन्?
   क)
   ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)

14. निरीक्षणबाट विखालवर्षि शिक्षकहरूको अभ्यासको भ्रमण केन्द्रो-केन्द्रका सुधार आएको छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग) ध)
   ढ)
15. निरिखण सम्बन्धमा केही समस्यारहं पनि छन्? छन् मननं के-के हुन्?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)

16. विचालवर्त्तको शैक्षिक विकासका लागि केही केन्द्रमा भएका भौतिक तथा शैक्षिक श्रेणी केन्द्र साधनहरूको उपयोग कर्शिर हुने गरेको पाउनुभएको छ?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)

17. निरिखणमा आउदा श्रेणि व्यक्तले मुख्य-मुख्य के-के निरिखण / अनुगमन गर्दछ?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)

18. समुदायमा समान्तरत्न तथा पछाडि परेका समुदायका वालविकासहरूमा शैक्षिक पेल्नाको अभिवृद्धि गर्दै विश्वासो पहुँच विस्तार
गर्नका लागि के-कस्ता कार्यहरु श्रेणी केन्द्रवार्त भएका छन्?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)

19. समान्तरत्न, सुषिदा विश्विद्यालय तथा वालविकासहरूलाई विचालिका विश्वासो पहुँच विस्तार गर्नौ के-कस्ता कार्यहरु श्रेणी केन्द्रवार्त
भएका छन्?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)

20. श्रेणी केन्द्र व्यवस्थापन सम्बन्धमा गर्दै आएका मुख्य कार्यहरु के-के छन?
(क)
(ख)
(ग)
(घ)
(ञ)
(च)
(छ)

21. उक्त कार्यहरु केन्द्रको प्रभावकारी रुपमा सम्पन्न हुने गरेका छन्?
(क) उल्लेख
(ख) सामान्य
(ग) राष्ट्रीय
(घ) अन्य (उल्लेख गर्नुहोस्)..........
22. शैक्षिक गुणस्तर अभिवृद्धिको लागि जनपरिचालन तथा समुदायमा रहेका समाजनरको परिचालनका लागि स्रोत केन्द्र व्यवस्थापन समितिको मूलभारत कस्तो छ?
   क) उल्लेख
   ख) सामान्य
   ग) राष्ट्रीय
   घ) अर्थात
   झ) अन्य (उल्लेख गर्नुहोस्)...........

23. स्रोत केन्द्रका कियोक्ताबाट उपपकोट व्यवस्थापन गरी विद्याको गुणस्तर अभिवृद्धिको लागि पर्वत र साधनहरुको सही उपयोग गर्ने के के गरेका मान्य/गन्तव्य?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)
   छ)

24. स्रोत केन्द्रको गतिविधिहरु सञ्चालनका लागि आधिक स्रोत कसरी जुटाइन्छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)

25. स्रोत व्यक्तिको छनुटजनको कसरी हुने गद्दी?
   क)

26. के यो छनुटजनको विधि/प्रक्रिया ठूली छ?
   क)

27. स्रोत व्यक्तिको छनुटको मैत्रियक प्रक्रिया के हुन सक्छ?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)

28. स्रोत व्यक्तिको योग्यता/शमनता अभिनव के के र कर्ता हुन परि?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)
   छ)

29. स्रोत केन्द्रले भिन्नरक्षक मालक समस्याहरु के के हुन?
   क)
   ख)
   ग)
   घ)
   झ)
   च)
20. शोत केन्द्रे भौगोलिक समस्याहरु समाधानका लागि के गर्नु पर्ने हुन्छ?
   क) 
   ख) 
   ग) 
   घ) 
   ड) 
   च)
21. शोतकेन्द्रका पुनर्संरचना अवस्था छ कि छैल?
   क) छ। 
   ख) छैल।
मने, शोत केन्द्रहरूको पुनर्संरचना कसरी गर्न सकिन्छ?
   क)
22. शोत केन्द्र र संक्षेप यस्ता कार्यहरूलाई कसरी अथ्यवस्थित र प्रभावकारी बनाउन सकिन्छ?
   क)
23. शोत केन्द्रको विकल्पमा के हुन सकिन्छ?
   क)

सहयोगको सागि हार्दिक धन्यवाद!
ANNEX-3: AN OBSERVATIONAL CHECK-LIST TO BE USED IN THE RCS

Name & address of RC:
Name of RP:
Name of the observer:
Observation date:
Signature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Status of Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RC Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Desk/bench/chair/table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Black/white/green board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teaching/training materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supplementary materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reference materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Book rack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Extra news letter and publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher’s room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RP’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Location of resource center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Training for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student’s records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Internet facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Record keeping system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Role of HMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Role of other CBOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Role of SS/DEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Role of political leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Role of RCMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>