From Community Participation to Community Engagement

The Call for School Leadership in the Indian Context

Charu Smita Malik*

Abstract

Community participation in the Indian education system has largely been operationalised and studied through formal structures, which also forms a part of much of the documented literature. The existence of formal structures based on the community, such as the village education committees, parent-teacher associations, mother-teacher associations, school management development committees, etc., are linked with the larger government policy of decentralisation for encouraging local governance and enabling school-based management. Community participation, through these formal structures, has come to be viewed as synonymous with the functioning or non-functioning of these committees rather than studying the practices of the stakeholders involved, including the school head. While discussing school-community relations in the Indian context, the school as an entity has often subsumed the role of the head of the school and does not explicitly put focus on the behaviour exhibited or practices initiated by them. This paper proposes a shift in the way we perceive community participation and relooks at its key purpose which is to involve the parents and the community with the learning development of the child and be a valuable resource to the school. Drawing from studies on school leadership which study the behaviour and practices of the heads of schools in engineering meaningful community engagement, the paper attempts to position the role of the school head in the framework of School Leadership in the national policy discourse. This re-focus on the agency of the school head as a leader can be useful in bringing the school and community together, keeping the child at the centre.

* *Senior Consultant,* National Centre for School Leadership, National University of Educational Planning and Administration

Introduction

The school and community have often been studied as separate entities, even though there exists an organic relationship between the two. Educationists and practitioners argue that 'those closest to the schools are in a better position to make responsive and relevant decisions about how teachers, headmasters and schools should operate to best serve the needs of local children'(Chapman et al., 2002). Community participation is considered as an important vehicle for promoting education, especially girl's education (UNICEF 1992), bringing together different stakeholders for problem solving and decision making (Talbot and Verrinder as quoted in Aref 2010), garnering support for educational planning and development (Cole as quoted in Aref 2010) and promoting quality of life. In the Indian scenario too, community participation has been used as an effective strategy to increase participation of children in schools, reduce drop outs and improve school functioning (Govinda and Bandyopadhyay 2010). Successful community participation has contributed to overall quality of education, improve educational access, help find solutions to many of the local challenges, build ownership of school among people, reach disadvantaged groups and mobilise additional resources through different programmes and raise awareness for educational change (Noronha 2003, Pailwar and Mahajan 2005).

In the context of school leadership, a number of researches exist that have highlighted the role and agency of school head in enabling school-community relations (Epstein 2002, Lopez 2003, Bryk and Schneider 2004, Chrzanowski et al., 2010, Khalifa 2012, Barr and Saltmarsh 2014). The role of school head has been considered as central for initiating practices that can strengthen ties between school teachers and staff and the communities that surround them (Fullan 2000). It is said that leaders of most successful schools which host children from diverse and disadvantaged backgrounds continuously engage with and are trusted by schools, parents and wider community (Hargreaves and Flink 2006). These school heads also try to improve achievement and well-being of children by becoming more involved with multiple partners of the community and help build their ownership and accountability in the school. They also act as agents to create meaningful spaces for parental involvement in school that helps improve retention and transition to higher classes, better attendance in school, improved behaviour and social skills of children (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis 2012).

In India, several government initiatives have attempted to promote community participation in school processes largely through constitution of formal school-based management structures within the framework of decentralisation of educational governance. For instance, as a uniform practice, the Centrally Sponsored Schemes of Sarva Shiksha

Abhiyan (SSA)[1] and Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) 2009[2] enabled the constitution of School Management Committees (SMCs) at the elementary level and School Development Management Committees (SDMCs) at the secondary level of schools that function variably in different locations. However, the mere presence of these formal structures have not been an indicator of the degree of involvement of community members, in terms of either their participation, contribution of their ideas or their say in the decision-making process within the school. In order to revitalise these formal structures and involve the community more organically with school processes, the need is to move beyond the normative structures and think creatively on how community can be brought closer to the school. This shift from community participation to community engagement calls upon the school head to formulate practices that create spaces for the community to interact and become equal partners in decision-making of the school. This paper argues that community participation in education needs to be studied not just through functioning of formal school-based management structures within the framework of decentralisation but also as a more dynamic, practice-oriented engagement with the community spearheaded by the school head and their team.

The paper begins with situating community participation in the framework of decentralisation, with particular reference to educational governance. Here, community was seen as a vehicle for improving many aspects of school functioning and for this a number of school and community-based programmes were initiated by the government and non-government sector in India. Some of these programmes were *Shiksha Karmi* project (1987), *Lok Jumbish* project (1992) and the *Janshala* programme (1998). Many of these initiatives were sporadic but with the launch of Centrally Sponsored Schemes, such as SSA and RMSA, a unified formal school-based management structure in the form of SMC/SDMC was institutionalised that sought to increase the accountability of community in school. However, a review of functioning of SMCs and SDMCs revealed that the lack of focus on the agency of individual members became secondary to the structural mandates of these committees thus limiting their effectiveness on the ground. Building on this, the paper draws on findings of various studies that discuss the role of a school head as an initiator of practices who attempts to involve the community and parents more organically with school processes as well as with the learning needs of children.

The last section describes in brief the rationale behind the National Programme Design and Curriculum Framework (NPDCF) on School Leadership Development which was developed by the National Centre for

[1] *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (SSA) was launched as a centrally sponsored scheme of GoI to universalise elementary education across the country in 2001.

[2] *Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan* (RMSA) was launched as a centrally sponsored scheme of GoI to universalise secondary education in 2009.

School Leadership (NCSL)[3] and its relevance to the theme of this paper. A discussion on NPDCF brings out the current thinking on the practitioner-centric approach on school leadership development to building school-community relations in the Indian policy discourse. The NPDCF adopts a practitioner-centric approach to leadership development with the belief that school heads need to build on knowledge, skills and behaviours to be able to lead school transformation. The programmes based on NPDCF centering on leading partnerships with the community emphasise building a repertoire of skills and practices which can help the school heads and their teams to prepare action strategies for involving multiple partners of the community in many aspects of school transformation. With this as the background, the paper towards the end also puts forth potential entry points for the role of an emerging school leader in the context of engaging the community with the school.

Community Participation in the National Policy Discourse

In the context of democratic governance, the process of decentralisation has been hailed as an important milestone for initiating local participation of people. It is argued that through decentralisation '... the local government has the potential to evolve democratically because the decentralisation process allows for more responsiveness, representation, and local participation' (Fitriah 2010). The notion for 'empowering' the community and seeking their active participation was enshrined in Article 40 of the Indian Constitution which aimed for local self-governance. This got further teeth with the 73rd and 74th Amendment Act (1992–93) which required the states to legislate a three-tier structure at district, block and village level. The 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts provided for decentralisation of powers and responsibilities to the Panchayati Raj[4] institutions (PRIs) (Singh and Mor 2013). Within the broader policy framework for strengthening of local self-governance and involvement of community, these Acts made the democratic election of local bodies at the village, block and district levels mandatory. Through these acts, it became obligatory for state governments to adopt a decentralised structure of administration, across various departments be it agriculture, health, education or social welfare.

In the educational policy framework, the discussion on educational governance started as early as 1960s, when the Education Commission Report (GoI 1966) had recommended the involvement of communities with the school processes. This was followed by the recommendation of National Policy on Education (NPE) (GoI 1986) which strengthened the case for empowering communities for management of educational institutions at the local level within

[3] National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), New Delhi in 2012 as a specialised Centre with the mandate of building school leadership capacities of school heads of the government and government aided sector by the Government of India (GoI).

[4] *Panchayati Raj* is a system of local self-governance with three tiers- the village, block and the district. It is called a *Panchayat* at the village level.

the framework of decentralisation. For this purpose, NPE visualised direct community involvement in elementary schools in the form of Village Education Committees (VECs). The Programme of Action (POA) (GoI 1992) which detailed out the operationalisation of the recommendations of NPE explicitly laid down the guidelines regarding the constitution of VEC and articulated the accountability of school heads to the VEC. The VEC constituted of 15 members with representatives drawn from parents, women, scheduled castes or scheduled tribes, minorities and functionaries of local bodies to oversee the management of all educational programmes in the village. The head of the school was the ex-officio member and convener of the Village Education Committee. Consequently, the POA also envisaged the role of the VEC as a decentralised mechanism for operationalising micro-planning and school-mapping exercises at the village level, involving villagers and parents.

The NPE thus emphasised both parental and community involvement in educational management. Since then a substantial volume of experience in the field exists with respect to involvement of community in the management of elementary education in different states of India. These initiatives in the education sector heralded an era of decentralisation in educational governance, which subsequently took shape of school-based management, through setting up of committees involving both school functionaries and community members. School-based management was one of the highlights of SSA with its mission to achieve the target of universalisation of elementary education. In fact, SSA focussed on inclusion and participation of children from the scheduled castes or scheduled tribes, minority groups, urban deprived children and children with special needs in the educational process.

For this, the representatives of these marginalised groups were given due representation in the constitution of SMCs. The enactment of Right to Education Act[5] (RtE 2009) further mandated the establishment of SMC in each school involving parents and other community members for improving the quality in education. In essence, community participation within the framework of decentralisation of school education meant the gradual shifting of powers from the central authority to the school level for strengthening of local self-governance.

Functioning of Formal School-based Management Structures: Scope and Limitations

A number of these national- and state-level initiatives attempted to build community participation into the educational process, both within the sphere of mandated school-based structures as also outside the scope of formal structures. The impact of the committees was seen the most on improving access and schooling participation of children in many parts of the country. Drawings from various practices across the country (Govinda and Bandyopadhyay 2010) highlighted the roles of different agencies like the VECs, Parent Teacher Associations

[5] The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act passed by the Indian Parliament in 2009 ensures free and compulsory education to children between the age group of 6 and 14 years of age.

(PTAs) and Mother Teacher Associations (MTAs) in improving quality of school education. In many states, it was found that VECs were involved in a variety of activities ranging from counselling of parents, organising fairs and other community events for raising awareness and driving change. In some states, VECs were also responsible for mobilising and utilising funds available from the government as well as from other sources. Other states, such as Andhra Pradesh took initiatives like the *Chaduvula Panduga* (festival of education) and *Janmabhumi Programme* which involved community members, parents and teachers on a large scale. Advocacy campaigns in Madhya Pradesh and Assam were implemented to promote local participation in school education. These initiatives had led to a significant increase in student enrolment and in a reduction in dropout rates (ibid.). Along with these initiatives, in some states, the role of motivator groups, such as *Sahayoginis* in Maharashtra and *Mahila Samata* in Andhra Pradesh were also reported to be significant in promoting women's education.

In Bihar and Karnataka, the VECs involved members of the community and PRIs within the ambit of basic education projects. In some places like in Madhya Pradesh, even teacher employment was delegated to the PRIs. The education guarantee scheme and the alternative school scheme in Madhya Pradesh saw a different approach to setting up of schools, where the local community demanded opening of schools and ensured that the schools followed minimum norms (Govinda 2003). The communitisation of public services in Nagaland was also a step towards increasing community's ownership of school, making teachers more accountable towards people and schools more efficient in their functioning. Hence, forms of community participation in education varied from appointment of community members on bodies, such as the VECs, PTAs, MTAs, SMCs and SDMCs to even complete ownership of the school by community members as part of local bodies (Govinda and Diwan 2003).

An important finding emerging from these programmes was that most of the successful initiatives mentioned above were community-led. They took the route of first engaging with multiple stakeholders around the need for education and then establishing local structures for effective participation; finally, building their capacities to contribute effectively (Chakravarty 2006). Drawing parallels between the decentralisation process in the larger policy framework and in education, Vasavi (2008) argued that states which initiated best practices in implementing the PRIs also exhibited good models for decentralising elementary education. Some of these states were Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Sikkim and Uttaranchal that successfully operationalised structures and processes for people to directly engage with school maintenance and functioning.

However, not everywhere one could find examples of best practices. There exist researches and evaluation studies which point to gaps in effective functioning of school-based

management committees. For instance, it was found that in a few places in Odisha, these committees became dysfunctional as there was an absence of close rapport and interaction between teachers and community and poor attendance of members in committee meetings. Many of the committee members including the president were not aware of the role and functions of the SMCs (Orissa Primary Education Programme Authority 2007, Barik 2005). In the SMCs of *Morigaon*, Assam and *Medak*, Telangana, it was found that they did not perform the functions assigned to them (Sharma et al., 2014). The teachers blamed parents for not attending meetings and parents blamed teachers for incorrect information about meeting timings. The key reasons for poor performance of school-based committees were cited as low member participation, corruption and cultural barriers, such as the caste system and political pressures.

A review of the work of SMCs through secondary data revealed that one of the critical deficits in the effective functioning of these units was the lack of role clarity among members (Ramachandran et al. 2013). Most of the members were unaware about their roles and responsibilities and ways in which they could involve themselves in the school. Lack of role clarity was also highlighted in a separate study on the functioning of SMCs in schools in Delhi which stated that though RtE 2009 was instrumental in defining the broad responsibilities of the committees, there was nothing said on the specific contribution of each member, thus creating a sense of confusion in terms of what the members were supposed to do (Sabharwal 2015).

Related with the effective functioning of school-based management committees, another important issue that deserved attention was the capacity building of community members to better utilise the decentralised powers that they now possessed. It could not be denied that in order to extend meaningful participation, community members must also exhibit certain knowledge and skills to execute these roles and functions. Under SSA, each state had some provision for capacity building programme of community members where training was imparted to a few members but was not found to be robust (Chakravarty 2006). In fact, poor quality of training programmes which were unsuitable for building capacities of members arose as a major concern in many of the researches on SMCs (Narwana 2015, Sabharwal 2015, Ramachandran et al., 2013).

It was also found that the most important activity of these committees was supervision of civil works. The committees whether at the school, village or Panchayat (village level body for local self-governance) level helped in managing midday meals, school grants and mobilisation of additional resources. Their role in improving enrolment was encouraging in a few states through initiatives, such as *Badi Baata* (an enrolment drive for attracting school going children to public schools) in Andhra Pradesh or the *Prabhat Pheri* (taking out mini processions as an enrolment drive) in Madhya Pradesh. However,

multiple case studies of selected states observed that the VECs/MTAs, PTAs and PRIs did not have the capability to conduct academic monitoring or providing academic support to the school (Ramachandran et al., 2013, Sabharwal 2015). The non-functioning of school-based management could also be attributed to the larger socio-cultural factors that had an impact not only within the school processes but also outside the school. The prevalent social exclusion of females in a village in Haryana was attributed to separate seating arrangements of boys and girls in different class sections of the school (Narwana 2015) which also reflected in less or negligible participation of women in VEC registers. There was also existence of social exclusionary practices by teachers towards students as well as social class differences between teachers and community inhibiting community participation.

Such instances signified that even though policies on decentralisation had come to view participation of community as an end-all, it did not lead to 'empowerment' of the community (Govinda and Diwan 2003, Chakravarty 2006). There is also a dearth of research on how far these administrative changes have brought reordering of hierarchical relations within the community. It still remains to be seen if these changes truly enabled sharing of power with the disadvantaged sections and those who had been traditionally outcast (Govinda and Diwan 2003). Perhaps envisaging real 'empowerment' of community to the extent of having an impact on the social structure and reversing some of the class-caste differences as an outcome of school-community relations may require a phenomenal shift in the minds and attitudes of school functionaries as well as community members.

A review of studies on functioning of SMCs or SDMCs also point to the fact that there are not many researches which show a way out in terms of what can be done to make these committees more functional except for course correction or suggest alternative mechanisms beyond the role charter prepared for these formal structures which can effectively involve the community and bring tangible results to the fore. It is here that the role of the school head is critical, as they are the focal point who can mould and build relations between the school and the community and bring the desired attitudinal change required for a closer involvement of community with each of the school functions and processes.

Role of School Leadership in Fostering Meaningful Community Engagement

The importance of school leadership behaviour and practices have been extolled in influencing student learning (Leithwood and Sun 2012) and for a host of practices that are drivers for creating meaningful relations with the community (Epstein 2002, Barr and Saltmarsh 2014, Bryk and Schneider 2004, Khalifa 2012, Lopez 2003). It is well researched that continuous and purposeful communication with the parents has an impact on self-belief and learning outcomes of the

children (Khalifa 2012, Masumoto and Brown-Welty 2009). Within this growing literature, the emphasis is on the school creating opportunities for families and communities to contribute towards their child's learning at home, volunteer for activities at school, and also champion the cause of the community to sustain long term school-community relations.

Some of these leadership behaviours and practices fall under formal structures (such as in the Indian context, we have the VECs, SMCs, SDMCs or other forums), whereas a large part of these practices can be envisioned by school heads through informal spaces that are creative as well as cost-effective in bringing family and community closer to the school and contributing to children learning. A useful and popular model proposed by Epstein (2002) situates the child at the centre, with the family, the school and the community operating as three 'overlapping spheres of influence' which serve the core purpose of supporting and facilitating child's development. This envisages a shift in perspective, wherein the school no longer moves away from its accountability of student outcomes citing family and background limitations; rather it invites the support of child's family and parents to contribute to learning and development.

All of this requires genuine and sustained practices to be initiated by the school head and their team, in order to create conditions where children feel supported and develop. Community engagement, therefore, is beyond just participation in meetings and committee proceedings, and more towards seeking involvement of parents and community in school's transformation and most importantly, in child's learning. The idea of community engagement can be operationalised including dimensions, such as the six components — parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making and collaborating with the community (Epstein 2002) or high commitment to learning, principal support for enrolment, a welcoming school climate and two-way communication (Sanders 2002). Both these and many other models, based on practice-based research have a few elements in common, such as the ones which place significance on communication and promoting learning of children. It is observed that in researches on school leadership that value practices of school heads towards building relations with the family or community, the key goal of putting the child first is spelt out clearly.

There are many school leadership practices that have been lauded and found effective in engaging parents and the community with child's learning and school transformation. Some of the examples are where the schools had started reading sessions involving community members and retired school teachers. During this, the volunteers and children read and discussed plots and characters of stories and promoted writing (Epstein and Salinas 2004). An elementary school worked with parents to generate books and videos to capture their lives and experiences involving

children. Another example was where teachers and parents mutually designed home work, as an important strategy for creating opportunities for parental engagement. A school had involved families with eleventh grade students to create a career profile for themselves. As part of this project, the children interviewed a professional in the chosen field of their interest and were encouraged to think on what they would do once they graduated (ibid.). One of the important researches within the framework of Joyce Epstein's model, found two dimensions, parenting and learning at home as more effective in three sample public schools in Chicago that served children belonging to minority and low-income population (Ingram et al. 2007). This research investigated different typologies of parental involvement that could enhance student achievement in high school, especially those schools which housed at-risk student population. The first typology, parenting was found to be more prevalent and had a positive outcome on student achievement. This was gathered through a questionnaire designed with practices that parents involved themselves in, such as dropping the child to school in the morning, praising a child for schoolwork, sharing stories with the child, keeping up with rules at home and creating a reading corner at home, etc. The other dimension which scored high amongst parents related to learning at home. The practices included taking the children to zoos and museums, to the library, bringing learning materials at home, talking to teachers about expectations of completing school work, working with children on various reading, writing and number skills.

In fact, many of these practices can be employed in situations where the parents belong to low socio-economic background and have difficulty in reading and writing. The idea is to engage them in their child's learning so that children feel supported at home and participate in the school more often. If school heads are encouraged to think on these lines, the parents and community members would feel more deeply connected with the child's learning activities, despite their own perceived deficits.

The Call for School Leadership in the Indian Context: Way Forward

Decentralisation of educational governance has opened the doors for community participation in school; however, the many structures it has created seem to face limitations in functioning as well as in their purported outcomes. This is because decentralisation of school governance has not been viewed as a strategy to improve quality of education, rather, as a tool for improving enrolment, maintenance of school infrastructure, supervision of midday meal projects, etc., (Ramachandran et al. 2013). Even though each of these functions are valuable, the participation of community and parents, except for in few instances, is found to falter on many grounds, for example, poor attendance in committee meetings, lack of awareness, non-clarity of roles and apathy from school and teachers.

There can be various ways in which functioning of SMCs or SDMCs can be streamlined and made useful. But, it is important that for each of the functions, there is a clear indication of how being part of decision-making will benefit the school and the child. The lack of this could be why the functioning of formal structures of school community partnership lags behind. Perhaps, the issues that are central to the functioning of SMCs or SMDCs do not resonate well with parents and community (who are part of these committees), such as overseeing utilisation of funds or providing support in the preparation of school development plan. These functions require knowledge of rules and processes, role clarity and expertise from the parents' side as well as the community. It also presumes that all members are literate and would understand the nuances of these complicated functions, which is mostly not the case.

While all these functions are connected with the development of school and children, they might not be perceived as being directly connected with the interests of the child. It is equally important for the school management committees and the school teams to involve the parents and the community with the learning graph of their children, discuss the learning needs of children and devise interesting and simple strategies by which parents and the larger community can contribute in enhancing learning levels of children. Once the communication around the goals is made clear, it becomes easier for the community and parents to associate themselves with functions of formal school-based management structures as well as be available for additional support to the school.

Some of the above concerns point towards a new paradigm for engagement of school with the community, one that is built around a practitioner's approach to School Leadership. Taking this into account with several rounds of needs-based analysis and interactions with field functionaries in states of India, NCSL had developed the NPDCF, a curriculum framework that clearly articulates a 'shift in the role of leadership that goes beyond administrative and managerial responsibilities to proactive practices for school transformation' (Diwan et al. 2015, p. 1). One of the key curricular areas of the NPDCF relevant to the theme of this paper focusses on leading partnerships that focusses, '… on the need for developing meaningful relationships between school and parents, community members, officials in education departments and other schools in the neighbourhood. The purpose is to enable school leaders to skillfully create opportunities for establishing partnerships with multiple stakeholders' (Diwan et al. 2015, p. 22). This framework has been at the base of designing capacity-building programmes for current and prospective school leaders that urge the participants to reflect individually and brainstorm in groups, problem solve and devise strategies on how to make formal structures more proactive as well as ideate on informal practices that can be potential solutions to local

challenges. This is the methodology that is followed in transaction of all the curricular areas besides school-community partnerships, such as transforming teaching-learning processes or building and leading teams.

These programmes motivate school heads to encourage positive behaviour and attitudes from self, teachers, staff and students towards the community to seek their support (see Diwan et al. 2014 and Subitha GV and Malik 2016). The themes covered in the curricular key area of Leading Partnerships cover a wide range of school-community interface. It begins with a session which is developed around identifying stakeholders and partnering with them on specific challenges that are peculiar in the Indian context. These challenges are, for example, girls staying back at home to look after siblings while parents go to work, dispute between an SMC and school staff, inadequate number of teachers in school or dealing with slow learners. The participants are asked to brainstorm in small groups on the potential stakeholders and the community from where they would involve them for each of the challenges and how they they engage them. The responses are collated into clearly articulated action steps for a building relationship with the concerned partners from the community (Diwan et al. 2014).

The next session is based on home school partnership which employs the method of discussion around reading of real life case studies in small groups. Through this method, the participants are encouraged to reflect on their own contexts and spell out challenges of their schools in order to collaboratively design strategies for bringing home and school together (ibid.). In addition, there are sessions aimed at revitalising formal school-community structures, such as the SMC, by once again focussing on building communication and problem solving skills and simulation exercises. Hence, the significant contribution of this curriculum framework lies in the fact that it opens an array of entry points for the school heads to approach the community and parents for building meaningful relations with them. This happens when the school heads develop the ability to match school challenges with the identification of right stakeholders, build on communication skills, learn to state clear purposes around a challenge or design an innovation where they seek the support of community or parents, solve problems and find strategies that are simple and actionable to arrive at a solution. This helps them to build a clear roadmap for engaging with the community around what they can really and actually contribute and not entirely based on roles that are structurally defined in mandates of SMCs or SMDCs.

Conclusion

Community participation in education in India has traversed a long distance beginning from decentralisation of educational governance. This process brought with itself the constitution of VECs/SMCs/SDMCs that were helpful

in improving educational access and functioning of schools but with limited success. These committees have involved the participation of community members and parents of children but their role is confined to supervision of school-related functions and in preparation of school development plans, much less in academic monitoring or contributing in actual learning and development of children. This paper has argued that there is a need to view community participation as a process that is rested on practices of school heads rather than as an isolated exercise where community members are expected to participate in formal committee meetings without much understanding of roles and their contribution to school processes. In order to engage the community more meaningfully, the school heads and teachers or staff need to be proactive and think of creative and context-specific strategies for bringing the school and community together (Diwan et al., 2014 and Subitha GV and Malik 2016). For this, school leadership as a practice-oriented field can offer various entry points as an aid to school heads and their teams to state clear purposes for community and parental engagement and collaboratively achieve tangible outcomes, be it for school improvement at large or instilling academic co-ownership of children in both schools and community.

References

Aref, Abrisham. 2010. "Community Participation for Educational Planning and Development." *Nature and Science.* Vol. 8. No.9. pp. 1–4.

Barik, A. 2005. *Role and Functioning of School Committees in Improving Elementary Education: A Study of Mayurbhanj District in Odisha.* Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

Barr, J. and S. Saltmarsh. 2014. "It All Comes Down to the Leadership: The Role of the School Principal in Fostering Parent-School Engagement." *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* Vol. 42. No. 4. pp. 491–505.

Bryk, A.S. and B.L. Schneider. 2004. *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement.* Russell Sage Foundation Publications, New York.

Chakravarty, S.D. 2006. Community Participation in Basic Education. *Background Paper for PROBE.* Revisited 2006. Unpublished Document.

Chapman, D., E. Barcikowski, M. Sowah, E. Gyamera and G. Woode. 2002. Do Communities Know Best? Testing a Premise of Educational Decentralisation: Community Members' Perceptions of their Local Schools in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development.* Vol. 22. No. 2. pp. 181–189.

Chrzanowski, D., R. Susan, and R. Thompson. 2010. *"Building Mutually Beneficial Relationships between Schools and Communities: The Role of a Connector."* Accessed on 14 October 2016 https://resources.depaul.edu/abcd-institute/publications/publications-by-topic/Documents/Building%20Mutually%20Beneficial%20SchoolCommunity%20Relationships.pdf.

Epstein, J.L. and K.C. Salinas. 2004. "Partnering with Families and Communities." *Educational Leadership.* Vol. 61. No. 8. pp. 12–18.

Epstein, J.L. 2002. "School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Caring for the Children We Share." In 2nd edition, Epstein, J.L., Sanders, M.G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K.C., Jansorn, N.R., Francis L., and Van Voorhis (Eds), *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action.* Corwin Press, California.

Fitriah, A. 2010. Community Participation in Education: Does Decentralisation Matter? An Indonesian Case Study of Parental Participation in School Management. Accessed on 9 October 2017. https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1370/02_whole.pdf?sequence=1.

Fullan, M. 2000. "The Return of Large-Scale Reform." *Journal of Educational Change.* Vol. 1. No.1. pp. 5–28.

Government of India. 1986. *National Policy on Education.* Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education, Government of India, New Delhi.

——. 1992. *Programme of Action: National Policy on Education.* Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education, Government of India, New Delhi.

Govinda, R. 2003. "Dynamics of Decentralised Management in Primary Education: Policy and Practice in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh." In Govinda, R., and R. Diwan (Eds) *Community Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education.* Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Govinda, R. and R. Diwan (eds.). 2003. *Community Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education.* Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Govinda, R. and M. Bandhyopadhyay. 2010. Changing Framework of Local Governance and Community Participation in Elementary Education in India. *CREATE Pathways to Access, Research Monograph.* No. 35.

G.S. Negi, C.S. Malik, Monika Bajaj, D. Parween. R. Diwan, S. Chugh, K. Awasthi, G.V. Subitha, N. Mythili, S. Tiwari, S. Singh 2014. *School Leadership Development: A Handbook.* National Centre for School Leadership, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

G.S. Negi, C.S. Malik, Moni ka Bajaj, D. Parween. R. Diwan, S. Chugh, K. Awasthi, G.V. Subitha, N. Mythili, S. Singh, S. Tiwari. 2015. *School Leadership Development: National Programme Design and Curriculum Framework.* National Centre for School Leadership, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

Hargreaves, A., and D. Flink. 2006. *Sustainable Leadership.* Jossey-Bass, USA.

Ingram, M., R.B. Wolfe, and J.M. Lieberman. 2007. "The Role of Parents in High-Achieving Schools Serving Low-Income, At-Risk Populations". *Education and Urban Society.* Vol. 39. No. 4. pp. 479–497.

Khalifa, M. 2012. "A New Paradigm in Urban School Leadership: Principal as Community Leader." *Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. 48. No.* 3.

Leithwood, K., and S. Jingping. 2012. "The Nature and Effects of Transformational School Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of Unpublished Research." *Educational Administration Quarterly.* Vol. 48. No. 3. pp. 87–423.

Leithwood, K. and K. Seashore-Louis. 2012. *Linking Leadership to Student Learning.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Lopez, M.E. 2003. *"Transforming Schools through Community Organising: A Research Review."* Accessed on 12 November 2016 http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/transforming-schools-through-community-organizing-a-research-review.

Masumoto, M. and S. Brown-Welty. 2009. "Case Study of Leadership Practices and School-Community Interrelationships in High-Performing, High-Poverty, Rural California High Schools." *Journal of Research in Rural Education.* Vol. 24. No. 1. pp. 1–18.

Narwana, K. 2015. "A Global Approach to School Education and Local Reality: A Case Study of Community Participation in Haryana." *Policy Futures in Education.* Vol. 13. No. 2. pp. 219–233.

Noronha, A. 2003. "The Community in Charge: Shades of Experience from Madhya Pradesh." In Govinda, R., and R. Diwan (Eds) *Community Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education.* Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Odisha Primary Education Programme Authority. 2007. *Community Mobilisation: Documentation of Success Stories: The Prime Mover.* Research and Evaluation Unit, Odisha.

Pailwar, V.K. and V. Mahajan. 2005. "Janshala in Jharkhand: An Experiment with Community Involvement in Education." *International Education Journal.* Vol. 6. No. 3. pp. 373–385.

Ramachandran, V., R. Patni, S. Kompalli, K. Jandhyala, B. Patni, and N. Mehrotra. 2013. *"School Management for Quality Inclusive Education and Decentralised School Governance."* A Report by EU, NUEPA and Save the Children. Accessed on 28 November 2016 http://eruindia.org/files/school-management-09-04-13.pdf

Sabharwal, V. 2015. *"Refining Monitoring Mechanisms through School Management Committees in Government Schools."* Researching Reality Internship, Working Paper 340. Centre for Civil Society. Accessed on 10 January 2017 https://ccs.in/internship_papers/2015/340_refining-monitoring-mechanisms-through-school-management-committees-in-government-schools_vidushi-sabharwal.pdf.

Sanders, M.G. 2002. "Community Involvement in School Improvement: The Little Extra That Makes a Big Difference." In Second Edition, Epstein, J.L., M.G. Sanders, B.S. Simon, K.C. Salinas, N.R. Jansorn, Francis L., and Van Voorhis *(Eds) School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action.* Corwin Press, California.

Sharma, S., D. Burnette, A. Bhattacharya, and S. Nath. 2014. *"Community Participation in Primary Education."* The Earth Institute, Columbia University. Accessed on 15 January 2017 http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/mumbai/mumbai/files/globalcenters_mumbai/13.%20MDEP_Community%20Participation.pdf

Singh, D.P. and R. Mor. 2013. *Community Participation in School Education.* Shipra Publications, New Delhi.

Subitha, G.V. and C.S. Malik (Eds.). 2016. *One Month Certificate Course in School Leadership and Management: A Resourcebook.* National Centre for School Leadership, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

UNICEF. 1992. *Strategies to Promote Girls' Education: Policies and Programmes that Work.* UNICEF, New York.

Vasavi, A.R. 2008. "Concepts and Realities of Community in Elementary Education." Paper presented at National Seminar on Community and School Linkages: Principles and Practices, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, March 17–19.