

# **Report of the National Workshop on ‘Progress and Planning for Quality Improvement under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan’**

**Bangalore, 19-20<sup>th</sup> November, 2009**

The Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD organized a National Workshop on ‘Progress and Planning for Quality Improvement under SSA’ on 19-20<sup>th</sup> November 2009 in Hotel Abhimani Vasathi, Bangalore. The workshop was coordinated by Pedagogy Unit, Technical Support Group, SSA and hosted by SSA Karnataka, with the participation of State Project Directors and State Pedagogy Coordinators from approximately 30 States/ UTs (List of participants attached as **Annex 1**). The purpose of the workshop was to collectively take stock of efforts and achievements in improving the quality of elementary education under the SSA program, and to help States by sharing a Planning Framework, tools and guidelines for designing a comprehensive Quality Improvement Plan for the next three years, which will effectively integrate all core and enabling components towards achieving a clearly outlined vision of quality. This 3-Year Perspective Quality Plan is to form part of the Annual Work Plan and Budgets for 2010-11, and to become the basis for guiding States’ SSA quality interventions over the next few years. The Workshop also provided an opportunity to discuss with States the important implications emerging from the recently enacted Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, and its implications for quality efforts under SSA. It was also an opportunity to review the States’ progress in SSA Quality interventions for 2009-10 up to the end of II<sup>nd</sup> Quarter (30 Sept 2009), and also to review the follow-up process from the four Regional Workshops on ‘Education of Equitable Quality’ organized by MHRD during Jun-Aug 2009 (Detailed Program Schedule attached as **Annex 2**).

## **I. Inaugural session**

After a welcome by Mr. O. P. Nautiyal (Senior Consultant, Pedagogy Unit, TSG), the workshop opened with some brief introductory remarks by Mr. A. K. Tewari (Under-Secretary, MHRD), who once again welcomed all the participants. Mr. Tewari stressed the importance of these two days’ deliberations, especially in light of the Right to Education Act, the four Regional Workshops recently organized by MHRD on ‘Education of Equitable Quality’, and the recommendations made by the 10<sup>th</sup> Joint Review Mission of SSA, which have all brought to the forefront the urgency of strengthening our quality interventions under SSA in an integrated manner. For 2010-11, each State must design a comprehensive 3-Year Quality Plan that will strengthen each of the major quality parameters in an integrated manner, in order to lead to visible enhancement in children’s learning. The focus is to gear all interventions to **bring changes in classroom processes** and to **ensure that every child learns**, and to ensure the State is geared up to meet the specifications of the **Right to Education Act**.

This was followed by a round of introductions where each participant was asked to think back to when they were children and to talk about what they had wanted to be when they grew up. This elicited a variety of excited responses as participants reflected back to their childhood ambitions and dreams. Following this, Ms. Suzana Andrade (Senior Consultant, Pedagogy Unit, TSG) gave

a few introductory remarks on the purpose and plan for the Workshop. She appreciated the childhood dreams that each participant had shared, yet lamented that too often our schools end up suppressing rather than nurturing our children's brilliant dreams. If we were able to create a system where each child's unique dreams and talents were nurtured and supported, this would unleash a huge potential for our country's progress. Ultimately, this is what we aim when we talk about quality improvement – to create a system that is able to think like children and listen to children, to value and nurture children's unique dreams, and to equip them to successfully pursue those dreams. Ms. Andrade concluded that the purpose of this workshop is to plan together for how we can address each and every component under SSA to ensure that it is tuned towards achieving this vision of schools that are able to nurture and support our children's dreams and unleash their potential, especially in light of the recently passed Right to Education Act which now guarantees this right to every child in India.

## **II. Right to Education Act: Implications for Quality Planning in SSA**

Following this was a presentation by Mr. O. P. Nautiyal (Senior Consultant, Pedagogy Unit, TSG) discussing the provisions of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE), and their implications for quality planning under SSA (Presentation attached as **Annex 3**). Most important for our quality efforts is that the Act mandates a shift in the entire curriculum, pedagogy and assessment to ensure conformity to constitutional values, learning through activities, discovery and exploration in a child-centred and child-friendly manner, and to ensure all-round development of the child in an environment free from fear, trauma or anxiety. This will require integrated efforts to bring attitudinal and behavioural shifts in the entire system, to ensure the above as well as to ensure that no child is subjected to physical punishment, mental harassment or discrimination. It will also require several policy changes to ensure no detention, expulsion or board examinations till Class VIII, provision of free pre-school education for all children age 3 to 6, no hiring of untrained teachers, banning of private tuitions, etc. There are also clear criteria laid out for teachers in terms of their selection, qualifications, deployment, working hours, academic responsibilities, etc. Community's role will need to be greatly strengthened in the form of School Management Committees which will help in planning and implementation of a School Development Plan for each school. The entire system will need to be geared up to ensure and monitor admission, attendance and completion of quality elementary education by every child.

Following this was an interactive discussion where participants expressed various questions, clarifications and concerns regarding the RTE Act, some of which are listed below:

- What are the criteria for selecting 25% children from disadvantaged backgrounds?
- To meet the new PTR specifications, will additional teachers be provided under SSA?
- For those schools who have less than 30 children, would it be necessary to provide the minimum of 2 teachers for those schools as well?
- What are the new qualifications to be laid down for appointment of teachers?
- Regarding banning of private tuitions, how is this to be implemented and ensured?
- Some statements such as 'academic responsibilities of teachers' and on providing mother-tongue education 'as far as possible' need to be further clarified
- Other questions were asked regarding whether there is to be any revision in the shared centre/state funding pattern, regarding deployment of teachers for non-academic duties, and whether minority communities who open their own schools are allowed to charge capitation fees.

### III. Approach to Quality Planning & Appraisal in 2010-11 in light of RTE

Next was a presentation by Ms. Suzana Andrade (Senior Consultant, Pedagogy Unit, TSG) on the approach to Quality Planning in 2010-11 (Presentation attached as **Annex 4**). Ms. Andrade highlighted that the Quality Plans this year must be designed keeping in mind the implications of the Right to Education Act, the recommendations of the 10<sup>th</sup> Joint Review Mission of SSA, the discussions held in the 4 Regional Workshops on 'Education of Equitable Quality', and the letter sent out from the Joint Secretary (EE-II) with guidelines for formulation of the AWP&B 2010-11. The Joint-Secretary's letter highlights the following key thrust areas for quality:

- i. All quality interventions must be **in consonance with NCF 05 and the RTE Act**, with clear steps to ensure that curriculum, syllabus, textbooks, TLMs, teacher training and assessment systems are all harmonized in tune with NCF 05
- ii. **Teaching Learning Materials** for LEP and remedial teaching should be integrated with the regular textbooks, without becoming an add-on or extra load on children
- iii. States must review their systems of **testing** and **school grading**, to ensure they do not demotivate or cause stress to children, which contributes to dropout
- iv. Must include a Saturation Plan for upgrading all **untrained teachers** over next 2 yrs, with appropriate 2-yr equivalent course, in convergence with Teacher Education Scheme
- v. Need for major shift in **in-service training programs** to address the social, cultural & economic context of learners, and the training *process* itself should be conducted through experiential, participatory and inclusive methods
- vi. Must include approaches for **rejuvenating BRC/CRCs**, by reviewing the recruitment/ placement systems, selection criteria, roles & functions, and capacity building for RPs
- vii. Need for re-orientation & training of **educational administrators** at all levels, to the 'child rights' perspective as per RTE

In light of the above, States are being asked this year to prepare a **3-Year Quality Perspective Plan** to ensure continuity so that the desired outcomes are achieved. It is not sufficient to simply provide inputs and complete targets; the thrust is on outcome-oriented plans that must be able to show clear changes in classroom processes, and learning enhancement in each subject, as a result of all the interventions. This requires first laying out a clear vision, to be shared and internalised across all players in the state, regarding what are the desired outcomes to be achieved at the level of children, teacher/schools, sub-district/district, and state level. After designing this clear vision, then all core and enabling elements must be integrated and tuned towards achieving this shared vision.

Ms. Andrade shared with the participants a Broad Outline of the Quality Plan for AWPB 2010-11, listing all the non-negotiable components that must form part of this year's quality plan (Attached as **Annex 5**). These can be categorised under 8 major categories, listed below, and each state must take concrete steps to ensure that each of these 8 major quality parameters are strengthened in an integrated manner, since only then will we begin to see changes in children's learning:

1. Learning Processes and Learning Outcomes
2. Comprehensive Quality Vision and Framework
3. Minimum Enabling Conditions

4. Vision-based Curriculum and Teaching Learning Materials
5. Continuous Learning Assessment Systems
6. Framework to ensure Teacher Effectiveness
7. Academic Support & Monitoring Systems
8. Community & Civil Society Partnerships

#### **IV. Taking Stock of Existing Situation: Situational Analysis and Emerging Issues**

Next was an interactive session to help states take stock of where they currently stand against each of these 8 quality parameters, what are the major issues and underlying causes for these issues, and what kind of strategies can be undertaken that will effectively address each issue. For this purpose, Ms. Andrade shared a ‘**Quality Planning Checklist**’ with each State, listing key questions under each quality component, against which each State was asked to reflect individually and fill out what is the current status of where the State stands, what are the key issues/ obstacles faced in that area, and what strategies the state will undertake in 2010-11 to address those issues in an integrated manner (Attached as **Annex 6**).

Following this individual reflection exercise, there was a broad discussion on the process of change, and how we can ensure that the changes we want to see actually happen. For many years now we have been making many efforts, providing many inputs and conducting many programs under SSA, yet we are still not able to see the extent of changes we desire in classroom processes and in children’s learning levels. If we intend to ensure change this year, this requires that we first step back and dig beneath the surface to critically analyse what may be the deeper issues or obstacles that may be restricting change or may be hindering the success of our interventions – whether it was a problem in designing the input, or problems in the field that prevented it from being effectively implemented, or insufficient monitoring, or a larger ‘systemic inertia’, etc.

In order to enable participants to reflect on this by discussing among themselves, the participants were divided into small groups, and each group was assigned one of the 8 major quality parameters, and were asked to discuss the following 2 questions:

1. For your quality parameter, brainstorm the possible root causes for the key issues/obstacle you have faced in this area
2. Brainstorm possible creative strategies for addressing or getting around these root problems. What can we do differently this year to address these issues? (Think outside the box!)

This led to lively discussions within the small groups, following which each group shared their conclusions with the larger group which were consolidated together. The insights noted by each group about some of the deeper underlying issues preventing the success of our quality interventions, as well as some of the potential steps that could be taken to address these, are attached as **Annex 7**.

## V. Review of Quality Progress upto 2nd Quarter: State-wise Progress & Issues

The last presentation of the day, led by Mr. O. P. Nautiyal, involved a review of the States' progress in SSA quality interventions in 2009-10, as per the second Quarterly Progress Reports submitted up to 30 Sept. 2009 (Presentation attached as **Annex 8**). Broadly, the reports highlighted the following status in quality interventions up to 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter:

1. Progress of **In-Service Teacher Training** is 54%, with least progress (less than 30%) seen in Assam (29%), Bihar (2%), Dadra & NH (0%), Haryana (0%), Jharkhand (7%), Lakshadweep (25%), Manipur (0%), Sikkim (0%), Tripura (27%), UP (25%), WB (30%).
2. Progress of **Induction Training** is 6%, with zero progress in Andhra, Bihar, Delhi, Goa, Haryana, J & K, Karnataka, MP, Maharashtra, , Rajasthan, NE States and UTs
3. Progress of **Training of Untrained Teachers** is 15%, with zero progress in Andhra, Himachal, J&K, MP, UP, and NE States
4. Progress in **Training of BRP/CRPs** is 43%, with zero progress in Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Himachal, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab, Uttarakhand, and NE States and UTs
5. Progress of **Free Textbook distribution** is 92%, with zero progress in Dadra & NH, Mizoram and Tripura
6. Progress in **distribution of grants** has been 66% in TLM grants, 68% in school grants and 15% in TLE grants. States showing low progress in grants distribution include Andhra, D&N Haveli, J&K, MP, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Manipur Meghalaya, Puducherry, Punjab, Tripura, UP & WB
7. Progress in **operationalization of BRC/CRCs** is 99%, with only Arunachal, Jharkhand and Orissa still having non-functional BRCs, and Assam, Jharkhand, Orissa and Puducherry having non-functional CRCs yet to be operationalised
8. Progress in **remedial teaching** has been 46%, with 17 States with very poor or **0%** achievement includeing Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Haryana, J&K, Jharkhand, Karnataka, MP, Orissa, Punjab, TN, Uttarakhand & NE States.
9. **Regarding bringing changes in approach to assessment by rolling out NCERT Sourcebooks on Learning Assessment**, most progress was indicated in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, and Madhya Pradesh. Punjab and Gujarat also indicated that they are in the process of translating the Sourcebooks into the state language. Progress in remaining states has not been satisfactory.
10. **Regarding progress in implementation of ADEPTS performance indicators** to track performance levels of teachers and trainers, the following states indicated that they have already begun to track performance levels against these indicators: Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh, Daman & Diu, Assam, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, and Orissa. Bihar and Jammu Kashmir also indicated that they have begun using the indicators and are still in the process of collecting reports. Progress in the remaining states has not been satisfactory.

This was followed by a discussion with low-performing states exploring where are the bottlenecks or issues that are impeding progress in these States, and renewed commitments by various states that the situation will improve by the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter.

After this last session of the day, each State was assigned the task during the evening of completing the exercise of reflecting on the situational analysis in their state using the 'Quality Planning Checklist (Annex 6), and keeping in mind these ground realities, to begin reflecting on what would be their key desired outcomes over the next 3 years at different levels, around which their 3-Year Perspective Plan for Quality is to be designed.

## **Day 2**

### **VI. Follow up from Regional Workshops on 'Education of Equitable Quality'**

The next day opened with a session facilitated by Ms. Suzana Andrade to review the follow-up that has been made by States to the 4 Regional Workshops on 'Education of Equitable Quality' that were held by MHRD in the months of Jun to Aug 2009. These Workshops had been organised in order to facilitate discussion with all the top educational authorities in each state, to reflect about children's learning and classroom processes, and to arrive at a shared vision of the shifts desired in core and enabling components of education quality. During these workshops, each State had designed a broad framework and plan of action for carrying forward this quality vision, to promote shared vision and deeper pedagogical understanding across agencies and levels in the State, and to ensure harmonization of curriculum, learning materials, pedagogy, assessment and training systems in the State.

Subsequent to the Regional Workshops, approximately 12 States have conducted State-level workshops with different stakeholders in the State, in order to share the discussions from the Regional Workshops and to discuss a broad vision and plan for quality improvement in the State. These include Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chandigarh, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Orissa, Punjab, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, and Uttarakhand. Moreover, 7 additional States are planning to hold such State-level workshops in the coming month or two, including Assam, Daman & Diu, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. About 4 States so far have been able to develop a Quality Vision Document for their State, including Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Kerala, and Uttarakhand; while 3 others are in the process of finalizing theirs, including Chhattisgarh, Orissa, and Uttar Pradesh. Some States have taken other steps such as reconstituting their State Resource Group based on new criteria (Gujarat), deciding to adopt the NCF 2005 and NCERT textbooks (Assam), or involving teachers in consultative discussions on 'what is quality' (Tamil Nadu). The remaining 13 States have not indicated clear progress in following-up on their commitments made during the Regional Workshops, including the states of Andaman, Arunachal Pradesh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Delhi, Goa, Haryana, Lakshadweep, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Puducherry, and Sikkim (Details about State-wise commitments and progress are attached as **Annex 9**).

Ms. Andrade also inquired what kind of specific support the State representatives felt was most needed from the National Level, to help them in rolling out their quality efforts. Mr. K. K. Thakur (State Pedagogy Coordinator, Bihar) expressed that having a suggestive Framework for

strengthening of BRC/CRCs would be useful. This was echoed by other States such as Gujarat, Delhi and Tamil Nadu who said it would be useful if some suggestive criteria could be laid out for selection of effective BRC/CRC Resource Persons. Mr. Purkuyasta (State Pedagogy Coordinator, Tripura) requested resource support and materials geared towards strengthening multi-grade multi-level teaching processes. Mr. Keertiwas Kumar (SSA Jharkhand) suggested that it would be helpful to have an online forum where different State SSA Pedagogy teams can post resources, research findings, and so on, and also if a list could be circulated of National Level Resource Persons in different areas of expertise, who could be contacted by States for support. Several states asked for help in training of their Master Trainers and Resource Group Members, and Mr. Hanumantha Rayappa (Joint Director, SSA Karnataka) specifically asked for help in designing training that is able to bring attitudinal changes among teachers. Mr. Kalatharan (SPC, Kerala) asked for help in how to integrate quality education with other areas such as girls education, SC/ST, minority education, and so on.

## VII. Framework for 3-Year Quality Plan Development

The next session was devoted to discussing a broad framework to help States in designing their 3-Year Perspective Plan for overall quality improvement. As part of AWPB 2010-11, each State is being urged to develop a long-term plan keeping at least the next 3 years in mind, in order to ensure the continuity and sustainability of interventions which is needed for real change to occur.

Ms. Suzana Andrade shared a Broad Framework that listed certain key questions that each State must ask themselves in designing their plan, which are as follows:

1. What are the **desired outcomes** to be achieved at the end of three years?
2. What are the **issues/obstacles** that may prevent us from achieving these outcomes? What are the strategies needed to address these issues and ensure the outcomes?
3. **Processes:** How will we do each of these things *differently* this year, to ensure that the outcomes are achieved?
4. What steps will the State take to ensure that **ALL core and enabling components** (curriculum, textbooks, TLMs, pedagogy, teacher training, assessment systems) are **harmonized** to NCF 05 beliefs, and geared towards supporting this change?
5. What steps will the State take to ensure that **ALL key stakeholders internalize** the need for change, and become inspired and motivated towards this vision?
6. **Resource & Capacity Development Plan:** How will the State ensure that all stakeholders are made capable of implementing change, through effective resource support and capacity building?
7. **When** will each activity be done, by **whom**, and how will it be **monitored**, to ensure that the desired changes are actually taking place? What will be the accountability systems, incentives, and consequences?
8. **Sustainability:** What steps will the state take to ensure that this will be sustained over the period needed for change to really occur?

Following this, Mr. Subir Shukla (Resource Person) shared some important points that States should keep in mind in designing their plans in such a way as to ensure change (Handouts

attached as **Annexure 10**). He noted that what is needed is a shift in perspective from input provision, towards ensuring effective performance and ensuring rights. This implies bringing change in terms of relationships and processes, by setting and pursuing concrete outcomes at different levels on a system-wide scale. Mr. Shukla explained that a strategy document would need to clarify the following elements:

1. The 'roll out' of outcomes (including changes in relationships and processes) over 3 years
2. The roll out of components / steps / inputs / processes over 3 years
3. The qualities of these components /steps / inputs / processes that would manifest the change desired or enable it
4. Other measures that may be needed to ensure effectiveness of what is implemented
5. Roles, responsibilities, capacity building and professional support required

**In terms of deciding on the desired outcomes**, it is important to clarify not only what are the outcomes expected at the level of children, but also what would be the subsequent implications for teachers, teachers, trainers, supervisors, and others in the system in order to achieve these child-level outcomes. Thus, states were asked to think about what are the critical outcomes they wish to see by the end of three years, at each of these four levels: i. for children/ learning processes, ii. for teachers/school, iii. district/sub-district levels, and iv. state level. The outcomes decided upon should be stated as clearly as possible, in a manner that is easy to understand. States should make sure that their list is streamlined to only a limited number of outcomes rather than having a long list, by focusing on those which are to be prioritized, and those which are achievable. All the desired outcomes cannot be attained at once – they need to be phased out across the next few years. Moreover, the outcomes at each of the different levels should be closely and logically linked - that is, the outcomes for each higher level should be clearly based on the outcomes set for the previous levels.

After selecting the desired outcomes, states will need to think through what are **the inputs and processes that would be needed at each level**, in order to achieve each outcome. States must reflect on the inputs they have been giving in previous years and on what are the possible reasons for not seeing the desired level of changes in outcomes – thereby incorporating an awareness of the kind of challenges that need to be overcome, and possible ways of overcoming them. States need to think through how each intervention would need to be done *differently* this year in order to ensure effectiveness of the *processes* themselves. For example, in teacher training, what kind of new methodology or training processes would need to be adopted, in order to ensure that training is actually effective in bringing the desired changes among teachers? The plans would also need to ensure that the actions are appropriately and logically sequenced. States also need to ask whether the actions themselves are sufficient for achieving each outcome, and whether they include the required core and enabling components and the required synergy and harmony across them.

Mr. Shukla gave **one example** of the kind of inputs that might be needed to ensure that all components are harmonized towards achieving a certain desired outcome – for example, say the desired outcome is to develop a scientific temper in children. For this, the State would first need to decide, through collaborative discussions, what is the meaning of 'scientific temper', and what are the indicators that would tell us whether a child displays scientific temper or not. Based on

this, a strong pedagogical model would need to be laid out for developing scientific temper, and also tools would need to be developed to assess this in children. Monitoring officials would have to be made aware of what it means for children to develop scientific temper, and tools will need to be developed for monitoring this. Awareness will have to be generated about the resources available at school level, by orienting teachers on how they can use even inexpensive locally available resources for effective science learning. Another question is how we can create in teachers the desire to generate scientific temper – perhaps by recognising and appreciating those teachers who have done this well, giving those teachers a platform to share their successes, or through involving community members in encouraging the teacher /school to do this. Community Resource Groups can be organized to help identify the rich scientific knowledge that the community already possesses. Other activities could also be undertaken for promoting a general culture of science learning, such as children’s forum for science information exchange, science melas, or the SPO could even send out one science-related question to all schools each week, to generate a sense of curiosity and excitement in explore scientific questions. These are just some examples of how for each desired outcome, the State must think backwards to map out what steps will need to be taken at each level in order to integrate each different component towards achieving that goal, in a cohesive manner.

### **VIII. Presentation and Feedback on States’ Quality Plan Outlines**

After this, time was given for each State team to discuss and prepare an outline of their 3-Year Quality Plan, based on the Broad Framework of 8 questions that had been circulated earlier in the day. In the afternoon session, some of the states presented the Plan outlines they had put together, including the teams from Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh (Attached as **Annex 11**). As each team presented their plan, feedback and suggestions were provided by the TSG Resource Persons and Mr. Shukla. Some of the key suggestions that were made include that *the list of desired outcomes should be streamlined to only a few, most critical outcomes to be focused on*. Either the outcomes themselves can be sequenced over three years, or they can be broken down and different parts attained each year, or the State can decide what are the outcomes to be achieved by the end of 3 years and then break down the steps needed to attain them in each year. In selecting the desired outcomes, the State can start with the outcomes it can feasibly achieve for children in one year – and then it can identify what teachers/school needs to do, which then provides the basis to decide what the sub-dist and dist levels have to do. All of this then establishes what needs to be done at state level. It is important to remember that not all the desired outcomes can be attained at once – they need to be phased out across years or even across quarters. Moreover, in the first year, the plan must incorporate sufficient scope for developing vision, common and shared understanding, deepening the situational analysis, developing resource groups as needed, and so on.

In order to finalise their plans, States were asked to organise a State-level consultation immediately upon returning to their State, in order to discuss with all the key stakeholders (including SPO, SCERT, Directorate of Education, Department of Education, and some District representatives) and decide on the following points:

- a. At the end of 3 years, what are the (5-6) most critical outcomes that we want to see for our children?

- b. For this to happen, what are the outcomes we need to see at the level of teacher/school, District/ sub-district, and State?
- c. To attain these outcomes, what are the ACTIONS that are necessary? How do they need to be done differently this year, to address the emerging issues and ensure the outcomes?
- d. What will happen in the first year, second year, third year?

Based on these State-level consultations with key stakeholders, States were asked to complete their 'Quality Planning Checklist' and to finalise the Outline of their 3-year Quality Plan; and to submit both these documents to TSG by 5<sup>th</sup> December 2009. Moreover, it was emphasized that each State should continue the follow-up from the Regional Workshops by conducting State level Visioning Workshops over the next month involving all stakeholders (including from State, District and Sub-District levels, teachers, academics, community, NGOs, Teachers Associations, etc) for finalizing their State Quality Vision Document, which should be included as part of the AWP&B 2010-11.

The meeting closed with a vote of thanks by Mr. O. P. Nautiyal, who thanked all present for their active participation, and also appreciated the warm hospitality and sincere efforts of SSA Karnataka in helping the workshop run smoothly.