JOINER

JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Vol. 1, No. 1 · DECEMBER 2021

OPEN ACCESS

joinetr.com

JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
KAPSAYICI EĞİTİM ARAŞTIRMALARI DERGİSİ

Volume 1, Issue 1, 2021
Cilt 1, Sayı 1, 2021

Editor-in-Chief / Genel Yayın Editörü: Prof. Dr. Hasan KARAL, Prof. Dr. Fahriye ALTINAY, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Kürşat ERÜMİT
Editor / Editör: Prof. Dr. Hasan KARAL, Prof. Dr. Fahriye ALTINAY, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Kürşat ERÜMİT
Publisher Editor / Basım Editörü: Prof. Dr. Hasan KARAL, Prof. Dr. Fahriye ALTINAY, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Kürşat ERÜMİT
Redaction / Redaksiyon: Academic Gülbahar Merve ÇAKMAK ŞILBIR
Typographic / Dizgi: Academic Gülbahar Merve ÇAKMAK ŞILBIR
Cover and Page Design / Kapak ve Sayfa Tasarımı: Academic Gülbahar Merve ÇAKMAK ŞILBIR
Contact / İletişim: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Kürşat ERÜMİT
JOINER is published regularly twice a year since 2021.
JOINER Dergisi 2021 yılından itibaren yılda iki defa düzenli olarak yayınlanmaktadır.

Editorial Board / Editör Kurulu

Contact Information / İletişim Bilgileri

Web / İnternet Adresi: http://joinetr.com/
E-Mail / E-Posta: journal.joiner@gmail.com
Adress / Adres: Trabzon/Turkey

Decentralization: In Context to Teacher Development in India

Jyoti Bawane[1]

Article History
Received: 05.10.2021
Received in revised form: 25.11.2021
Accepted: 27.11.2021

Abstract

Decentralization as an approach was extensively adopted across the world for effective governance and policy making. This approach although rhetorically advocated its strengths as being flexible and inclusive, functionally many shortcomings have been disclosed after it was adopted in real situation. Decentralization of teacher education and development programs in India, in this regard had a similar experience. The District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) were primarily envisioned to restructure and transform the elementary teacher education in the country. They were visualized as autonomous and academic lead institutions which catered to the diverse educational needs within the given districts. However, the outcome was not as expected since in most cases, due to systemic inadequacies and assignment of multiple tasks, these institutions resulted in operating in several directions and with limited focus. Hence, prior to introducing and setting up any decentralized structure it is important to consider an appropriate balance between centralization and decentralization, and lay definite focus on the roles of the functionaries within the established system.

Keywords: Decentralization, teacher education, district, education

1. Introduction

Education policies in India have often served to align and balance the educational system to the needs of its diverse socio-cultural context and well as the global norms, thereby leading to several paradigm shifts in education. Measures to eliminate social, regional and gender inequalities in education, especially in terms of quality, access and performance have always been a matter of concern among the policy makers and educationists. Existence of wide level of variations in educational achievement levels across states and regions have further drawn attention towards many issues such as; the role and functions of a teacher and the teacher education programs, opportunities for continuing professional development, and establishing agencies for maintaining the standards of teacher education and teacher performance. Above all, focus towards structural and systemic reforms which influence the education system in terms of achieving better outcomes has been at the forefront. One of the neoliberal reforms pursued assertively in order to — tackle the problems of inequality and overcome the limitations of centralized bureaucracies while dealing with changing conditions— has been decentralization (Kameshwara, et al, 2020). According to Fiske (1996), *"The worldwide recessions of the late 1980s and early 1990s have drawn attention to the crucial role of education in building sound economies, and experience has shown that many centralized systems of education are simply not working* (p.V)". Decentralization was predominantly chosen as a relevant approach by many democratic governments and autocratic regimes across the globe since it hailed as the operational reform for effective governance and policy making in contemporary times (Bardhan & Faguet cited in Kamehswara, et al, 2020). Decentralized management which implied distributing control by allotting appropriate levels of relative autonomy to local or sub-national units for self- management was sought as 'appropriate' by policy makers for educational management in many countries (Govinda, 1997). Since decentralized systems were more flexible and strengthened school governance, they were claimed to provide better opportunities for developing innovative forms of inclusive education (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2017). Over the years, with the necessity to address educational equity and policies favoring educational autonomy, devolution of decision-making powers and responsibilities to territorial or sub-units, emerged to be widely recognized and promoted across the world.

1.1 Decentralization in Education

The pressure towards 'state-rescaling' was initiated in the 1970s, which symbolized — *"transfer of power and resources from central to lower levels of government"* — was a trend associated to globalization that reduced state's intervention and loosened market forces (Torrisi, et al, 2011, p.1). Decentralization proposed ways to enhance equality and quality in education and the transfer of responsibility of decision-making authority

[1] Associate Professor, Indian Institute of Education, Pune, India, jyoti.bawane@gmail.com, orcid: 0000-0002-6017-2811

from centre to regional and local systems, which became a prominent initiative in the world around 1980's. However, the way this approach was interpreted and implemented seemed to have varied across countries. Even studies examining the effects of decentralization portrayed lack of a distinct and definite pattern, since the findings were either varied, ambiguous or context specific (Kameshwara, et al, 2020).

Indian society being diverse and highly characterized to be hierarchical and disparate due to varied socio-economic and geographical conditions, orientation towards democratic and decentralized governance are visible in its developmental plans. Development of decentralized planning, the district and block level plans, for rural development were initiated right from the third Five-year plan (1961-66) and the guidelines for preparing district plans were issued by the Planning Commission in 1969. Even educational policies recognized the need to decentralize and one of the earliest policy's which emphasized was the Report of the Education Commission (1964-66) that clearly stated, *"We attach great significance to the association of the local community with the development of education. We have, therefore, recommended elsewhere that a statutory local authority, to be called the District School Board, should be established in each district and that it should be in charge of all education below the university level in the district"* (p.250). Varghese, in this regard also affirmed by saying, *"importance of decentralization as development strategy in education was widely appreciated by the central and state Governments in the 1980s and it was adopted as one of the measures to improve equity in achievement in school education*" (Varghese cited in Prakash, 2008, p.9). The district being recognized as the viable unit for planning and management of development programs, was one of the major strategies recommended in the Seventh Year Plan (1985-90) to achieve the yearly plan targets. Subsequently in 1992, the Indian parliament passed the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments to introduce localized self- governance in rural and urban India. Since then, decentralized planning became a constitutional mandate in India. It authorized local bodies like the 'the Panchayats' and 'The Municipalities' to function as the third layer of Government in order to ensure involvement of grass root organizations in development programs, including for the implementation of universal and compulsory free education (Acharya, 2002).

It is claimed that;

> "Such developments transformed the discourse on educational planning emphasizing not only the institutionalization of strategic planning at the macro level but also promoting decentralization and use of local level planning techniques such as school mapping, micro planning, school improvement planning, etc. for improving quality of investment in education (Prakash, 2008, p.4)".

Another effort made in the early 1990s to decentralize educational planning at the district level was the District Primary Education Program (DPEP). This program created wider space for including civil society organizations, NGOs and local communities to contribute in the planning process of basic education, and development of context- specific strategies and interventions. Establishment of District as the basis for unit of planning and management is said to have generated a great deal of participation of organizations (Jain, 2004). It was asserted that this reduced bureaucratic control of the planning process and rather made district planning more process- oriented, flexible and to some extent, evidence -based.

After DPEP, gradually many other small projects, which generated decentralized models for school education and teacher development, also emerged in different States. Few such micro-level initiatives which culminated the idea of school-based in-service education in the District Primary Education Project (DPEP) were; Shiksha Karmi Pariyojna (SKP) in Rajasthan, Bihar Education Project (BEP) and Andhra Pradesh Primary Education Project (APPEP), Mahila Samakhya (MS), UP Basic Education Project (UPBEP) and Lok Jumbish (LJ). DPEP experiences were subsequently modified in the decentralized planning process of a major country-wide umbrella program, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) that was launched in 2001 (Mukhopadhyay et al, 2009). This program engaged grassroot level organizations including Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs) and urban local bodies in planning and management of elementary education and recognized the role of school mapping and micro-planning critical in developing district elementary education plans (Prakash, 2008). One of the recent Right to Education (RTE) Act of the Government, even emphasized decentralized planning and management in order to provide equal access to quality education to all children. This is evident in the Section 21 of the RTE Act 2009, which mandates the formation of localized School Management Committees (SMCs) at the elementary level in all the schools (Kundu, 2018).

In context of Teacher Development, the Report of Education Commission (1964-66) recommended the idea to constitute a nodal institution in each district in order to make teacher education at elementary school level more comprehensive. This idea was made operational by The Nation Policy of Education (NPE) 1986 and in its Program of Action (POA) of 1992, by initiating the establishment of District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs). DIETs were expected to organize teacher education programs- pre-service and in-service for elementary school teachers and for those functionaries working in non-formal and adult education (NPE, 1986). They came to be formally established in 1987 as one of the major policy interventions of the centrally sponsored scheme for restructuring and reorganization of teacher education in the country.

1.2 District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs)

The DIETs in India, were envisioned to restructure and transform the elementary teacher education in the country and were allocated the responsibility of organizing pre-service and in-service programs, in addition to function as nodal resource centres for elementary education at the district level. It was envisaged that each DIET would provide technical support to district-level activities in the areas of planning and management and grow beyond the traditional teacher-training role, by providing academic and resource support at the grass-roots level and through innovative pre-service and in- service education. In 1987, under the centrally sponsored scheme, 571 DIETs or District Resource Centres (DRCs) were sanctioned, of which 529 DIETs become functional in the country (NCERT, 2009). The guidelines for the DIETs were outlined by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, specifying the mission, functions and organizational set-up of DIETs across the country.

Every DIET was visualized to create a district identity of its own by having the required space and autonomy to plan programs, experiment and innovate under the guidance of the state body, the State Council of Education Research and Training (SCERT), which is an apex body responsible for improving the quality elementary and secondary education in the State. DIETS initially, apart from being engaged in teacher development and school improvement activities, were also assigned to be as resource centers for adult education, non-formal education, educational technology, educational planning and field work (Mehrotra, 2004). The functions of the DIET however, broadened with time and in some States, they held greater responsibility like monitoring the interventions under SSA which included; infrastructure upgradation, capacity building of teachers, research & development, and utilization of selected grants. To strengthen the functioning of the DIETs, new institutional structures and mechanism were further introduced in the state at the subordinate (local) levels, namely the Block and Cluster. The block and cluster level structures — Block Resource Centre (BRC) and Cluster Resource (CRC), functioned as an extensions, solely mentored and supervised by DIETs themselves, so as to meet the district-block-cluster specific needs. This systemic approach, which complemented with the needs and priorities of the Block Resource Centres and Cluster Resource Centres, was perceived to attain quality and universal elementary education. The BRCs and CRCs became functional in 1994 under the DPEP program with their roles initially restricted to teacher support and professional development and conducting periodic visits to schools for monitoring purposes. It was alleged that regular monthly meetings and training programs conducted by these centres, enabled new pedagogical concepts and practices to reach the remotest schools (Ayyar & Bashir, 2004). This structure also prevented primary school teachers to be isolated and enabled in sustaining their motivation and upgrading their academic skills. It was assumed that, if BRCs and CRCs were made the epicenter for in-service training programs, this would reduce the workload and transform the role of DIETs as institutions for coordination, academic support and quality control.

The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) program consequently revised its framework and conceptualized teacher development through an annual in-service education for teachers at block and cluster level, backed by onsite support and collaborative monthly meetings under In-service Education for Teachers (INSET). INSET was considered 'the gateway to professional enculturation' (Jangira, cited by Yadav, 2012, p.1). The decentralized infrastructure for the delivery of INSET with backup onsite support to teachers in schools was envisioned to be led by the District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), Block Resource Centre (BRC) and Cluster Resource Centre (CRC). Decentralized in-service teacher education programs initially for that matter has never been on the limelight in terms developing a plan, model or approach the States needed to adopt in order to upgrade the skills and competencies of teachers on a continuous basis.

1.3 Has Decentralization been Effective?

DIETs were treated as 'Academic Lead Institutions' to provide guidance to all academic functionaries in the district (Azim Premji Foundation, 2010) and establishment of the DIETs promised a new phase of elementary school teacher preparation by being responsive to the local needs. This restructing of the training mechanism and offering guidance and support to teachers on a periodical basis signaled a major step for refining the quality of teachers and teaching-learning processes in the classroom. Despite the above defined vision and plans, when attempts were made to assess the effectiveness of the functioning and performance of DIETs, the findings have been mixed, indeterminate and hence no definite conclusions could be drawn on these institutions.

In general, all the DIETs as a routine were seen to regularly organize pre-service and in-service programs for various school personnel. Apparently, lesser studies were available to examine the effectiveness of the Pre-Service Teacher Education (PSTE) conducted by the DIETs. Initial studies on the pre-service education showed that they failed in assessing the teaching skills and their demonstration lessons did not facilitate teaching abilities. The teacher education curriculum was viewed to be outdated and did not cater to meet the student-teachers' aspirations and community needs (Chandrasekar, 2001). There were concerns that these institutions failed to fully conceptualize and apply the tenets and principles of the national policies at ground level (NCERT, 2012). Akai & Sarangapani, (2016), on the other hand, based on a single DIET study, located in a backward

district revealed that some evidence of innovation sensitive to local needs was visible in this institute. The teacher educators eventhough were qualified, lacked first-hand experience in primary school teaching.

With regard to their in-service training programs, findings were mixed. Few teachers and school heads of elementary schools felt the trainings were based on the latest trends and as desired by the new policies and recommendations of the RTE Act (Kumar, 2017; Lata, 2014). Kumar expressed that the induction training programs for new appointed teachers and all other trainings were planned based on the inputs received from Block, District and State level functionaries. Lata, too shared the similar opinion about the content dealt in the in-service training being appropriate to the teachers needs and improved their knowledge, teaching skills, communication ability and self-confidence. In case of other in-service programs, despite the concern was towards heavy reliance on conventional practices like — lecture and group discussions, the training delivery was rated satisfactory by the teachers, (RMSA-TCA, 2016).

On many other occasions, perceptions on the in-service training programs were not satisfying since their functioning did not take place as envisioned. Experiences of Model Districts Education Project (MDEP) which was a collaborative five-year demonstration project showed that the expectations and ground realities of in-service teacher training were divergent. Existence of several gaps had adverse impact on the quality outcomes and the in-service teacher training failed to reflect the principles proposed in the curriculum. According to the teachers, the trainings received at the sub-unit (Mandal/Cluster) level was diluted and not equivalent to those delivered at the state/national level. This dilution in the dissemination of training was another reason for sub-par teacher training practices at localized centers. Moreover, despite interventions like the RTE 2009 and Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) 2012 which guaranteed qualitative improvement, their effect was minimal (Kidwai et al, 2013). The impact of in-service training conducted by the DIETs were claimed not to be very effective for other reasons too. Teacher educators felt maximum time was devoted to teaching for the pre-service trainees and training, while minimum time was allocated to research. They complained of not receiving full co-operation from the educational administrators while organizing these programs. It was also observed that there was no mechanism to conduct follow-up to monitor and evaluate the impact of training programs in the actual field (Kamat, 2000).

As decentralized units, DIETs were considered to be less functional, poorly monitored and failed to perform their expected roles (Azim Premji Foundation, 2010; Bhushan, 2004) and consequently the responsibility of teacher education was slowly withdrawn from these institutions (Akai & Sarangapani, 2017). Despite having a planning and management wing, these institutes lacked expected district level deliberations and planning, and their annual work plans rarely made efforts to strengthen educational human resources or facilitate involvement of NGOs pertaining to selected districts (Sarangapani & Vasavi, 2003). Apparently, only a few DIETs in the country were claimed to be functioning well, while many others were yet to accomplish the desired goals. The DIETs fell short of fulfilling their missions set out while they were conceived, which also implied existence of a wide difference in their performance both in terms of quantity and quality (Bhushan, 2004). Batra (2009) underlined the fact that the institutional designing of the DIET was at fault since assigning multiple tasks with different foci has led DIETs to operate in several directions and with reduced focus and diluted roles.

Some of other systemic gaps prevailing in the DIETs were inadequate infrastructural facilities and human resources, which were overtly uneven and also not as per the DIET guidelines. Essential facilities like equipment and instruments required for conducting in-service course were either not sufficient or properly used by all DIETs (Akai & Sarangapani, 2016; Chandrasekar, 2001; Kamat, 2000; Kumar, 2017; Gogoi & Khanikor, 2016; Viswanathappa, 1992). Existence of large vacancies led to limited research and extension activities in these institutes. The branches especially associated with the pre-service teacher education programs, had inadequate teaching staff, and more importantly, majority of the teaching staff had no experience and specialized training in elementary education. The faculty recruitment was largely through deputation and fewer efforts were taken to build a stable and professional cadre of teacher educators (Government of India, 2011). The professional capacities of the DIET faculty were also seen to be varied across the DIETs (Betagiri, 1996; JRM on Teacher Education in Maharashtra, 2014; Manoj, 1993).

From the above deliberations, it is argued –even if it proposed that ‘centralization promotes control, decentralization fosters legitimacy’ (Biswal cited in Prakash, 2008, p.14), when efforts are laid to reduce central control on program implementation, they can possibly get in the way of decentralization. Similar experiences were evident in the role and functioning of the DIETs which showed that they ultimately remained insulated from key sites of education decision making and activity planning at the district level. Moreover, their inter-linkages with the subordinate academic structures like the BRCs, CRCs were seen to be fragile (NIAS, 2007). Lack of appropriate coordination of the DIETs with the state structures (SCERTs), regional (RIEs) and national (NCTE, NCERT), including with the local community were some of the common observations (Chandrasekar, 2001; Kamat, 2000). Other issues like being equipped with inadequate resources including technical and specialized personnel, non-alignment of internal structure and functions, diverging from expected roles were often raised as matters of concern (Mukhopadhaya, et al, 2009).

2. Conclusion

Decentralization in education, rhetorically promised the capability to distribute and allocate responsibility in order to cater to the needs and interests of different stakeholders within any tiered educational system. Nevertheless, in reality, such an arrangement has always led to a conflict between the purpose of maintaining effective control over policy implementation and establishing the legitimacy of such governance. In context to teacher development, due to systemic challenges, most of the DIETs, worked in isolation from other institutions, thus leaving less scope for efficient faculty development and diluting the strength of decentralization as one gradually moved from the central to the lower structural units. The sub-units apparently remained poorly strengthened and had lesser autonomy in planning and implementing the defined educational programs. Hence, the assumption that creation of such smaller and flexible independent units assisted in overcoming the inertia and reduce the bureaucracy of the central and larger systems (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2017), can be contested in this context. The establishment of District Institutes of Education and Training although has not been a fully promising experience, it certainly provided an attractive opportunity to become teachers for students in rural and backward areas.

It may be realized that even if, decentralization tend to succeed in environments with sufficient support and institutional arrangement, many a times, educational systems may need an appropriate balance of centralization and decentralization, for strengthening local institutional capacity and providing sufficient opportunities for democratic participation and control. The district education functionaries were encouraged to view education needs of their respective region through an integrated approach (Kidwai et al, 2013). Effectiveness of decentralization is conditioned to the context of its planning and implementation, strengthening inter-linkages, and periodic monitoring to minimize the lacunae in the process of implementation. To conclude, decentralized structures can offer diverse alternatives and solutions only if a holistic approach rather than a compartmentalized approach to teacher development is adopted, and at the same time, re-conceptualizing the purpose and role of DIET and its sub-units may support in making these institutions more effective and inclusive.

Acknowledge

This paper is based on a research project financed by ICSSR New Delhi. The author would like to acknowledge the ICSSR for funding this research.

References

Acharya, P. (2002). Education: Panchayat and decentralization – Myths and reality. Economic and Political Weekly. 37(8), pp.788- 796.

Akai, H., & Sarangapani, P. M. (2016). Preparing to teach: A study of elementary teacher education in a DIET. 2016.Working Paper. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310774462_Preparing_to_Teach_A_study_of_Elementary_teacher_education_in_a_DIET?channel=doi&linkId=5836ccc308ae74bb3aa41e63&showFulltext=true

Ayyar, R.V.V & Bashir, S. (2004). District primary education program. In J.S. Rajput (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Indian Education, New Delhi: NCERT. p.468.

Azim Premji Foundation. (2010). Status of District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET): A brief report on the State of DIETs in India. Retrieved from http://apfstatic.s3.ap-south-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Status%20Report%20on%20DIET.pdf

Batra, P. (2009). Reclaiming space for teachers to address the UEE teaching-learning quality deficit. Retrieved from http://www.educationforallinindia.com/Reclaiming-the-Space-for-Teachers-to-Address-the-UEE-Teaching-1.pdf

Betagiri, S. (1996). Competencies and training needs of DIET faculty members in DPEP districts of Karnataka. Dissertation submitted to Univ. of Mysore. Mysore: Regional Institute of Education.

Bhushan, S. (2004). District Institute of Education & Training. In Rajput, J.S. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Indian Education. New Delhi: NCERT. p.462.

Chandrasekar, K. (2001). Primary school teacher education program: An evaluative study of DIETs. New Delhi: Discover Publishing House.

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, (2017). Decentralization in Education Systems – Seminar Report. (V.J. Donnelly, E. Óskarsdóttir and A. Watkins, eds.). Odense, Denmark.

Fiske, E. B. Decentralization of Education: Politics and Consensus. Washington: The World Bank. p.V.

Gogoi, P.K., & Khanikor, S. (2016). A study of educational facilities available in District Institute of Education and Training in Assam. Research Inventy: International Journal of Engineering and Science. 6(4), pp.78-82.

Government of India (GoI). (2011). Report of the working group on teacher education for the 12th Five-year plan. Retrieved from http://planningcommission.gov.in/aboutus/committee/wrkgrp12/hrd/wg_teacher1708.pdf

Govinda, R. (1997). Decentralization of educational management. Paris: IIEP.

Govinda, R., & Bandyopadhyay, M. (2006). Decentralization of educational governance in India: Trends and issues. In Educational Decentralization (pp. 159-176). Dordrecht: Springer.

Jain, S. (2004). Management of elementary education. In Rajput, J.S. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Indian education. NCERT: New Delhi.

Joint Review Mission (JRM) on Teacher Education in Maharashtra. (2014). Retrieved from http://14.139.60.153/bitstream/123456789/7901/1/Joint%20Review%20Mission%20on%20Teacher%20Education.%20Maharashtra%2C%20April%202014.pdf

Kamat, V. (2000). Assessment of technical and infra-structural capacities of district institutes of education and training: Goa state report. Mumbai: SNDT University.

Kameshwara, K., Sandoval-Hernandez, A., Shieds, R., & Dhanda, K. (2020). A false promise? Decentralization in education systems across the globe. International Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 104, Article 101669

Kidwai, H., Burnette, D., Rao, S., Nath, S., Bajaj, M., & Bajpai, N. (2013). In-Service teacher training for public primary schools in rural India. Working paper series, Mumbai: Columbia Global Centers. Retrieved from http://righttoeducation.in/sites/default/files/In-service%20Teacher%20Training%20for%20Public%20Primary%20Schools%20in%20Rural%20India.pdf

Kumar, S. (2017). In-service training programs organized by District Institutes of Education and Training in Himachal Pradesh. Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science & English Language, 4(2), pp.4545-4561.

Kundu, P. (2018). Budgeting for school education: What has changed and what has not? Analysis of six states in the 14th Finance commission Recommendation Period. New Delhi: CBGA & CRY

Lata, S. (2014). A study of District Institute of Education and Training (DIETs) role in improving the knowledge and skill of in-service elementary school teachers. International Journal of Current Research. 6(12).

Manoj, P.G. (1993). Competencies and training needs of DIET faculty members in DPEP districts of Kerala. Dissertation submitted to Univ. of Mysore. Mysore: Regional Institute of Education.

Mehrotra, R. (2004). Teacher education institutions, Encyclopedia of Indian Education, Volume II, Rajput J.S. (ed.), New Delhi: NCERT.

Mukhopadhyay, R., Ramkumar, N., & Vasavi, A.R. (2009). Management and structures of elementary education: Structures and strategies. NEUPA: New Delhi. Retrieved from http://www.educationforallinindia.com/management-of-elementary-education-in-india.pdf

Mukundan, M. V., & Bray, M. (2006). The decentralisation of education in Kerala State, India: Rhetoric and reality. In Decentralisation and Privatisation in Education (pp. 111-131). Springer, Dordrecht.

NIAS (2007): DIETs: Potential and possibilities, Bengaluru: National Institute of Advanced Studies. National Policy of Education. (1986). Government of India, New Delhi: MHRD, p.26

NCERT. (2009). Comprehensive evaluation of centrally sponsored scheme on restructuring and reorganization of teacher education. Delhi: NCERT.

NCERT. (2012). Editorial. Voices of teachers and teacher educators, 1(2).

Prakash, V. (2008). Directions in educational planning: Changing landscape of educational planning in India. Working document. NEUPA: New Delhi.

Pritchett, L., & Pande, V. (2006). Making primary education work for India's Rural poor: A proposal for effective decentralization. New Delhi: World Bank.

Report of The Education Commission (1964-66): Education & national development. Ministry of Education, Government of India, p.251.

RMSA-TCA. (2016). RMSA teacher in-service training evaluation: Summary report. Delhi: NCERT.

Sarangapani, P.M. & Vasavi, A.R. (2003). Aided programs or guided policies? DPEP in Karnataka. Economic and Political Weekly, 38(32), p.3401-3407.

Torrisi, G., Pike, A., Tomaney, J., & Tselios, V. (2011). Defining and measuring decentralization: a critical review. Retrieved from https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/51441/1/MPRA_paper_51441.pdf. p.2

Venkatesu, E. (ed.) (2016). Democratic decentralization in India: Experiences, issues and challenges. New Delhi: Routledge.

Viswanathappa, G. (1992). An evaluation program of DIET in Andhra Pradesh. Ph.D Thesis, Edu., Mysore University: Mysore.

Widmalm, S. (2008). Decentralisation, corruption and social capital: From India to the West. SAGE Publications India.

Yadav, S.K. (2012). Impact of In-service teacher training on classroom transaction. New Delhi: NCERT.