Chapter-2

ORGANISATIONAL SET UP

The Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘Organisation’\(^1\) as “the action of organising the structure of an organised body, the fact or process of becoming organised.” The word ‘organise’ is defined as “to form into a whole with inter-dependent parts; to give a definite and orderly structure to.” Organisation is thus a structure, an ordering one at that, which means that is formed to achieve some purpose.

Organisations possess formal structures and work in particular environments while the sub structures usually decide the working culture. Organisation is, therefore, the framework and is not an end in itself. If the framework is not proper, the organisation is bound to suffer. It may lead to not only inefficiency, bad management, wastage of scarce resources but also a blockage in achieving end objectives. As such, the importance of an organisation can not be ignored.

Organisation is the most important part of administration. In fact an organisation is prior to all administration. There can be no administration unless there is an organisation to run it. The term Organisation\(^2\) has further been defined, elaborated and conceptualised differently by different scholars. Luther Gullick has defined organisation as the formal structure of authority through which work sub-divisions are arranged, defined and co-ordinated for the defined objectives. J.D. Money has defined organisation as the form of every human association

---

for the attainment of a common purpose. By taking a comprehensive view, an organisation generally consists of structure, working arrangement between the people who work in it and their relationship.

There are many schools of thoughts about the theory of Organisation. Scientific Management Theory propounded by F.W. Taylor advocates scientific management through rationality, predictability, specialisation and technical competence. Henry Fayol, Gullick and Urwick formulated a set of universal principles of organisation called the Classical Theory of Organisation or simply the Administrative Theory. The classical theorists emphasised formal organisations, order, objectivity, rationality, certainty, hierarchy and professionalism. Similar view point was taken by theorists of Bureaucratic Theory of Organisation. Max Weber in his Bureaucratic Theory lays emphasis on principles of value-neutral, impersonal, passive and instrumental approach. Weber wished to make bureaucracy an efficient instrument of policy implementation. He sought to make it a neutral instrument with qualities of expertise, impartiality, stability and anonymity. Human Relations Approach to Organisation advocated by Elton Mayo and Chester Bernard lays emphasis on elements of individualism, informal organisation and participatory management. According to this theory, working of an organisation depends more upon the human relations of the work group and less upon formal structures. It further lays emphasis on designing a social environment within an organisation that stimulates individuals to strive to achieve the organisational objectives. Herbert Simon in his analysis about Behavioural Approach as a Theory of Organisation observed that human behaviour is important in the growth and evolution of an organisation. It provides a new paradigm to an organisation by bringing the concepts of
values, facts and rationality in the administrative thought. In the present context, the organisation shall be examined both from the formal structure and human angles.

On analysing the Organisational structure of DPEP, it would be found that this organisation unlike other Govt. bureaucratic organisations - agencies, departments and official organisations has a Mission approach and, therefore, it is working in a different wave length. Keeping in view the objectives of the DPEP approach and the tight time-frame in which the targets have to be achieved, a different type of organisation has been constituted under this programme. Before indicating the organisational chart of DPEP set up and describing functions of each sub-structure, it would be relevant to point out that the project being for a specified time duration, the formal structure would naturally be proactive during the project period and would have to be wound up once the objectives were achieved and the project period was over. Therefore, like a permanent organisation, this organisation can not have staff of permanent nature. Instead most of the programme experts, co-ordinators, trainers, teaching staff etc. have either joined on deputation for fixed terms or have been engaged on contractual basis. Consultants and experts have been engaged on mutually agreed terms for specific jobs which are for limited periods and once the purpose is achieved, they would revert back to their parent organisations or new assignments somewhere else.

The Organisational set up of DPEP is, therefore, slightly different from the typical bureaucratic setup propounded by Max Weber. However, while commenting about the lack of adaptability of bureaucracy
and its basis of pyramidal organisation, Max Weber3 wrote: “Its value, however, is seriously questionable in the fast changing technological environment of today. Organisations of future will not be hierarchies of pyramids. They would be adaptive and temporary to suit the even changing environment. These organisation will be built around problems and would be organic ones. They will not be based on the machine model.”

Shiriram Maheshwari comments that the ‘matrix organisation’ is a compromise between the pyramid organisation and the task force. It derives its home from a number of team or project managers, who exercise planning, scheduling and financial control over persons assigned to their projects. These are other managers who exercise traditional line control (e.g. technical direction, training, salary payment etc.) over the same people. Control over subordinates is thus shared, each employee reports to two supervisors. A matrix organisation is fluid.

Keeping in view the characteristics of DPEP setup, it has to be analysed as to with which particular type of organisation the DPEP can be equated. There are five dominant types of Organisational patterns4 in vogue, e.g. Line*, Staff, Line and Staff, Committees and Matrix Organisation. Out of these categories, DPEP organisational setup has similarity with Matrix Organisation. Matrix Organisation like DPEP


* Line Agency - Line stands for those who carry out programmatic functions, who administer operations, enforce laws and attain programme objectives.
Staff Agency - Staff refers to those engaged in planning in logistics, in financial and personnel matters in substantive terms. Their role is advisory and recommendatory.
has a novel form and is typically designed to accommodate vertical, horizontal as well as diagonal authority and responsibility relationship amongst various functionaries. The Functional Managers having been matrixed out from their parent functional departments are placed under the Project Manager (Chief Executive) in the transient phase of the project. The Functional Managers report to Project Manager for all project tasks. The members of the Organisation are chosen for their capabilities and return to the parent organisation units as soon as the project work is over. On this basis, DPEP has Matrix type of organisational structure, which is not of permanent or traditional nature but has flexible and innovative features for operational success of the programme. Similarly, like a Matrix organisation, DPEP has staff which has been drawn from different organisations and after the Project period is over, they are likely to return to their parent organisations.

Ever since DPEP took its roots in India in the year 1994, it is managed at National Level by the DPEP Mission comprising the General Council, Project Board, DPEP Bureau, Technical Support Group, National Resource Institutions as shown in the chart 2.1 below:

*Chart 2.1*

**Programme Management Structure at National Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPEP Mission</th>
<th>National General Council</th>
<th>Project Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Chairperson (HRM)</td>
<td>- Chairperson (Education Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Member Secretary (JS, DPEP)</td>
<td>- Member Secretary (JS, DPEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Resource Centres</td>
<td>DPEP Bureau</td>
<td>Technical Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCERT, NIEPA, LBSNAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. CIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


General Council

National Level structure of DPEP has been based on the guiding principles that implementation of the programme should be in a Mission mode i.e. it should have adequate financial and administrative autonomy commensurate with its tasks. The apex body i.e. General Council has been established along the lines of National Literacy Mission which had earlier experimented successfully in implementing district level literacy projects. The setup at National level is, therefore, free from bureaucratic hassles and delays in implementation of the programme. The role of National Level Structure essentially includes effective facilitation, capacity building, appraisal, co-ordination and overall direction of the programme in assisting the States in planning and implementation. National level structure is, therefore, dependent upon lean organization with minimal permanent staff, with most of its work being done through contractual arrangement with Institutions and individual consultants.

The General Council of DPEP, as the chart reveals, is headed by the Union Minister for Human Resource Development. The Council has varied membership both from non officials and officials viz. Ministers Incharge of Primary Education of some of the States, Member (Education), Planning Commission, Secretaries of Union Govt. (Departments of Education, Women and Child Development, Social Justice and Empowerment, 3 Members of Parliament etc.); eminent educationists, NGOs and some distinguished public men. The present membership of the General Council consists of 36 members. The Joint Secretary of DPEP

---

Bureau acts as Secretary of the Council. The Council meets annually to deliberate on issues with policy implications for Primary Education Development as well as to review the progress of the programme. The study shows that the Council has been meeting periodically to take important policy decisions and also to review the progress of the Programme.

**Project Board**

The General Council being the policy making organ, for day to day administration, it is assisted by the DPEP Project Board which has been setup on the lines of National Aids Control Programme due to its proven effectiveness. It is headed by Union Education Secretary and has representatives not below the rank of Joint Secretary of concerned departments (Education, Women & Child Development & Health) and Financial Adviser. Advisor (Education), Planning Commission is also member of Project Board. The present membership of the Project Board is 13. The Joint Secretary of DPEP Bureau is the Member Secretary of Project Board. The broad functions of Project Board include recommending to Governments polices in regard to DPEP; considering Annual Work Plans received from the States; approval of norms for technical programme components; activities for promoting convergence of services and quarterly review of the programmes etc.

Project Board is empowered to exercise all the financial powers and no separate reference is required to be made to Department of Expenditure (Ministry of Finance) as their representative is already on the Project Board. As per the mandate, the Project Board has been meeting

---

6. Source: Membership of Project Board of DPEP Mission - See Annexure 2.2
almost quarterly and arranging approvals expeditiously within the
Ministry itself. The Project Board in addition to functions enumerated
above acts as a facilitator to the DPEP Bureau in implementation of the
Programme in the right earnest.

**DPEP Bureau**

The DPEP Bureau headed by an officer of the rank of a
Joint Secretary, is the main agency for implementation of the
programme at the grass roots within the framework of agreement with
the donor agencies. It has the authority and responsibility to
appraise, supervise and evaluate sub projects both at national and State
levels. In order to perform its innumerable activities, the Bureau has
been divided into two Divisions, each headed by a Deputy Secretary,
one dealing with Policy programmes and the other with sectoral
functions. The Policy Division is responsible for implementing the
decisions of the Project Board. Timely reimbursement of funds and
proper maintenance of accounts for various programmes are also some
of the important activities of this Division. As regards Programme
Division, it supervises the work of technical support services (both
institutional & individual consultancies). This Division is also
responsible for overall co-ordination with the States for follow-up of
DPEP programme and represents the Government of India in the State
Implementation Societies like Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana
Parishad in case of State of Haryana. The Bureau of late has prepared
an Implementation Manual dovetailing the detailed procedure for
speedy execution of the programme at the National, State and District
levels.
Technical Support Group

DPEP Bureau is serviced both by full time senior level technical and professional experts (on contract basis) and the Educational Consultants India Ltd. (Ed.Cil), a Govt. of India autonomous agency engaged in consultancy in the field of Educational Administration. Ed.Cil has provided consultancy and support services by recruitment of professionals and engagement of institutional and individual consultants as per needs.

National Resource Centres

The Bureau is also assisted by National Resource Centres like National Council of Educational Research & Training, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration and Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration. These Institutes have been guiding and assisting the Bureau in technical capacity building, module development and training of functionaries.

To be more specific, National Council of Educational Research & Training specialises in qualitative improvement and excellence in school education and teacher education. It has developed curricula, instructional material and training packages. Its Regional Institutes of Education help the DPEP set up on regional basis. As regards National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, it is providing technical resource support to Educational planners & Administrators in the implementation of DPEP. Its involvement has been primarily in the areas of module development.

❖ For the North Zone, the RIE is situated at Ajmer (Rajasthan).
development for training; project planning and implementation; micro-
planning, school mapping and community mobilisation; institutional
development-particularly of State Institute of Educational Management
and Trainings/State Council of Educational Research & Trainings.
Coming to Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, it
has been contributing in areas like Annual Plan formulation with focus on
data analysis & interpretation and Appraisal & Supervision.

Therefore, all the organs in the DPEP at the National level
have worked as a cohesive group and given necessary boost to the
Programme which is the main objective of this Organisation. As per India
Education Report⁷, the Govt. and external agencies did not face serious
problems due to existence of highly trained, skilled and talented
manpower within the country for implementation of the programme.
Therefore, the need for consultants from abroad has not been felt either
by the Govt. or by external agencies. Further capacity building of
manpower at local levels has been important component of the
programme. Therefore, under DPEP, local level manpower for planning,
project preparation and for execution of projects have been created.
Similarly on Research front, the massive programme under DPEP
could be run relatively smoothly since large amount of research on
various aspects of primary education was already available and the gaps
under research could be filled in no time due to existence of large network
of “Universities” and “Research Institutions” in the country.

⁷ R. Govinda, India Education Report – A Profile of Basic Education, (New Delhi :
Oxford University Press), 2002, p.289
Organisational Setup in Haryana

In the State of Haryana, an autonomous organisation in the name and style of Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojna Parishad (HPSPP) for implementation of DPEP programme was setup in the year 1994 as shown in the chart No.2.2:

Chart 2.2
Programme Management Structure at State level.
(Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana Parishad)
The organisational setup of DPEP at the field level is indicated below in chart No.2.3:

Chart 2.3
District Project Advisory/Implementation Committee
   Chairperson - Deputy Commissioner

   District Project Implementation Unit
      Chairperson - Additional Deputy Commissioner

   District Project Office
      Chief Executive Officer - District Project Co-ordinator

      Asstt. Project Co-ordinator (Planning)
      Asstt. Project Co-ordinator (Training)
      Asstt. Project Co-ordinator (General)
      Sub-Divisional Engineer
      Section Officer (Accounts)

         Block Resource Centre
            Block Resource Centre Co-ordinator

         Cluster Resource Centre
            Cluster Resource Centre Co-ordinator

         Village - VEC/VCC/MTA/PTA
The policy making body is the General Council like its counterpart in the Union Government. It is headed by the Chief Minister. The General Council has presently 32 members. The Council is to meet at least twice in a year to deliberate on issues with policy implications for primary education development as well as to review the progress of the Programme. However, General Council, which was to regularly review the progress of the programme and accord approval of work plans for implementation along with Executive Committee, had not been constituted in Haryana till audit test checking took place by a team of CAG between October, 1999 and April, 2000. The study however reveals that after belated delays, the council was constituted in 2001 and its first meeting was held on 8th January, 2002.

Next to the General Council, Memorandum of Association provides for an Executive Committee. This is the most powerful body to monitor and control the affairs of the Parishad. It is headed by the Chief Secretary to Govt. of Haryana. The composition of the Committee as per Memorandum of Association is that it consists of senior Govt. functionaries of Social Services departments, representatives from teaching fraternity, eminent educationists, NGOs etc. At present, the Executive Committee has 22 members. The Committee is required to meet at least once in a each quarter but it has not been meeting very regularly and in this context the CAG in its audit report had also commented that Executive Committee met only 13 times to review

8. Source : Membership of General Council, Haryana. Annexure-1.1
9. Source : Memorandum of Association (Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana Parishad), Chandigarh
10. Source : Membership of Executive Committee, Haryana. Annexure-1.2
the progress of the programme during six years period (1994-95 to 1999-2000). The monitoring of the programme by the two apex bodies of the organisational setup was, therefore, termed to be ineffective.

**State Project Director**

Chief Executive of the Parishad is called as State Project Director. As per Memorandum of Association, he is to be appointed by the State Govt. from amongst senior functionaries of All India Services. There is no fixed tenure for SPD as he/she can be transferred at any time at the pleasure of the Govt. He acts as the friend, philosopher and guide for the efficient functioning of the Parishad. Since the Chief Executive himself cannot undertake all the functions alone, he is assisted both by Staff and Line officers. As on 31st March, 2001, he had a team of following 12 officers alongwith a supporting staff of 50 personnel:

1. Deputy Director (Planning)
2. Deputy Director (Media)
3. Distance Education Co-ordinator.
4. Deputy Director (Teacher Training)
5. Deputy Director (SIEMT)
6. Project Officer
7. Chief Accounts Officer.
8. Accounts Officer.
9. Administrative Officer.
10. Store Purchase Officer
11. Executive Engineer.

Out of above, officers at Sr.No.1 to 3 act as Staff Officers at Sr.No.4, 5 & 6 act both as Staff and Line Officers and the remaining act as Line officers. The actual staff strength against the sanctioned staff was quite skeleton in and supporting staff were temporarily drawn from the Directorate of Primary Education and from District Offices. However, as the programme picked up, the sanctioned posts were filled up through deputation and direct appointments.

The State Project Director while acting as a bridge between General Council/Executive Committee of Parishad and the State Govt. on the one hand and his field administration and other sister agencies including Central Govt. on the other hand, provides leadership in carrying out the activities like teacher training; curriculum and text-books development; supervision and monitoring; non-formal education; research, innovations and experimentation; evaluation studies and management information & planning. Ever since the inception of DPEP, the following officers12 have been holding the charge of State Project Director:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of the SPD</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sh. Sanjiv Kumar, IAS</td>
<td>21.04.1998 15.06.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sh. Sanjiv Kumar, IAS,</td>
<td>01.08.1999 31.12.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sh. R.R. Banswal, IAS,</td>
<td>01.01.2001 08.04.2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from Table 2.1 that in all 9 State Project Directors have worked in Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana Parishad. The successive postings of all these incumbents were confined to non-educational departments. Even earlier postings of the various incumbents were also in non-educational departments (except in the case of Sh. Mahapatra, Sh. Sanjiv Kumar, Sh. R.R. Banswal and Smt. Surina Rajan who were holding charge of Director, Schoo. Education prior to their postings as SPD). As regards their tenure, Sh. P.K. Khullar and Sh. Sanjeev Kumar only enjoyed a term of more than 2 years and it is during their period alone that there was consistency to some extent in implementation of the Programme. It would have been better had the State Project Directors been posted for longer durations to facilitate the Mission approach in timely implementation of different aspects of this programme and achievement of the set targets in the given time frame.

The data reveals that over the years with the functional increase in activities, there has also been increase in staff strength which appears to be in tune with the volume of workload. The maximum increase has been in the area of academic staff. The fifth Joint Review Mission during its visit in February, 1997 had observed that administrative processing at SPD level was functioning adequately. In addition to these observations, there is general acceptability to the popular thinking that with the introduction of DPEP organisational structure both at the top and bottom levels, there is a greater realization of effectiveness in implementing the programme inputs. The policy decisions have sufficient clarity and the activities are specified to be undertaken by different functionaries. The delegation of powers is real and, therefore, there is complete involvement at every level. As against this, the existing setup has lot of deficiencies. The functionaries in the traditional setup do
not have sufficient powers and freedom to perform specified activities. They have to depend upon the system too much which suffers from red tapism, delays and resource crunch. There is no element of decentralization and everything flows from top. The system has no flexibility and lacks innovative approach.

It was against this background that Memorandum of Association for DPEP setup was tailor-made to suit the innovative approach and nature of this Mission mode Programme with lot of flexibility and freedom to achieve the set objectives within the given time-frame. So far the organisational setup of DPEP has worked well at the middle and bottom level but there is need for further improvement at the top level. The apex bodies of General Council and Executive Committee need to meet regularly and review the programme in real sense of the Project needs. There could have been much more contributions from these bodies had there been regular meetings with exhaustive agenda items covering different aspects of this new technique in the field of primary education. As a result, the finer and some of the core issues were generally left to the middle rung leadership to manage at their levels. Therefore by slightly modifying the constitution of both these apex bodies and allowing them the flexibility of taking on these bodies, members who are really interested and can contribute in this area, the organisational setup of DPEP can be further activated. Another area for improvement is constant review of all programme activities. The review so far by both these bodies has not been real, exhaustive and effective. A real mission approach is needed at the higher level in this respect.
Field Administration

Having explained Headquarters administration, let us also describe the field administration. The administrative structure at the district level consists of District Project Advisory/Implementation Committee headed by the Deputy Commissioner with representatives from Departments of Education, Women and Child Development, Welfare, Panchayati Raj Institutions, NGOs and Educational Institutions. The operational wing is headed by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of the District who works in close co-ordination with District Project Co-ordinator (usually in the rank of District Education Officer) and acts as Executive Officer for day-to-day functions in the district. The District Project Co-ordinator is generally assisted by a Project Co-ordinator, 3-4 Assistant Project Co-ordinators and 3 members of MIS (Management Information System) unit alongwith supporting staff of 30 to 40 personnel (excluding Block and Cluster Resource Coordinators) depending upon size of the district.

The district office plans and organises district level strategies and interventions, provides academic leadership, co-ordinates the various activities including in-service training and capacity development of teachers, block level functionaries and other organisations in the district, monitors progress of the schools, helps supervise the schools and prepares reports on academic activities.

Block Level Administration

In the State of Haryana, an educational block is a unit of management and supervision of primary schools. On an average 70 primary schools and about 300 teachers are included in one block. The key functionary is Block Resource Co-ordinator in the rank of Block Education Officer assisted by two officials. They are selected from senior secondary
school teachers with experience in primary education. In addition to the role of Co-ordinators, they act as resource persons at BRC level. At the Block levels, training programmes and workshops are planned and organised. The BRCs accordingly conduct meetings, visit schools, take follow up action and also act as Resource centres. At present there are 55 positions of BRCs (28 in 1st phase and 27 under 2nd phase).

Grass-roots level Administration

The administration for primary education has been fully decentralised up to the village level. It emanates from the fact that Cluster Resources Centres, spread over 5-7 villages, have been set up to provide on site support to teachers in terms of school visits, demonstrations and feedback, teacher training material, preparation and discussions at monthly meetings. The CRCs are headed either by a Trained Graduate Teacher or a JBT Teacher. On an average, a block includes 11 such clusters of primary schools. At present there are 266 clusters under DPEP-I and 277 clusters under DPEP-II. The detailed breakup district-wise and Block-wise is given in Table 2.2:

Table-2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>No. of Blocks</th>
<th>No. of Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hisar (including Fatehabad)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sirsa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jind</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kaithal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gurgaon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mohindergarh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bhiwani</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>543</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. For detailed role of BRC, See Annexure- 2.3.
The data shows that maximum number of Clusters fall in district Gurgaon and maximum number of Blocks in district Hisar. The Cluster approach has many inherent advantages, such as contiguous and compact area; easy accessibility of the area; easy to perceive the felt needs/problems of a small group of schools; potential of involvement of teachers and better prospects of work and environment.

The tenth Joint Review Mission and 2nd In-depth Review Mission which visited Haryana in November, 1999 observed that BRCs and CRCs had adequate freedom to take financial and academic decisions. It was a positive observation about the working of BRCs and CRCs in Haryana which are the corner stones of decentralised and disaggregated management.

Coming down to the village, Village Education Committee (VEC) facilitates community mobilisation, participation and implementation of the project activities. The VEC members are drawn both from schools and community covering all the sections16. The setting up of VEC is a bottom up approach in participatory planning and school mapping at the gross root level. These are gradually emerging as viable village institutions as these not only act as a watch-dog in optimum utilisation of public money, but are also the motivating force for

16. Constitution of VEC:

   Source : Directorate or Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana Parishad, Chandigarh.
   Gram Sachiv/Sevika
   One social worker
   2 members of PTA
   Aganwari worker
   Health worker
   One representative of Mahila Mandal
   One lady teacher
   Head teacher
   3 members of Gram Sabha (including one SC member)
mobilising resources from the community for construction of school buildings and development of other educational activities. The constitution and functioning of VECs has been tailor made as per guidelines of Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Decentralised Management of Education. As per India Education Report\textsuperscript{17}, the role assigned to VECs is as per spirit of 73rd Constitutional Amendment. Village Educational Committees plan and decide as to how the school grants for welfare activities be utilised or additional rooms to be planned. It also supervises provision of basic school facilities like drinking water, toilets, boundary walls and cleanliness in the school campuses.

In addition to setting up of BRCs, CRCs & VECs, the Parishad in its 15th meeting of Executive Committee held on 13.09.2000, had accorded sanction for creation of 4000 posts of Project Teachers\textsuperscript{18} due to enhanced enrolment in seven DPEP districts as Table-2.3:

**Table 2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of District</th>
<th>No. of posts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hisar</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bhiwani</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gurgaon</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mohindergarh</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jind</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sirsa</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kaithal</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} R. Govinda, India Education Report – A Profile of Basic Education, (New Delhi : Oxford University Press), 2002, p.289

\textsuperscript{18} Source : Directorate or Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojana Parishad, Chandigarh.
Prior to this, 18 posts of Project Teachers (15 in Kaithal district and 3 in Sirsa district) were created under the powers delegated to Vice Chairman of the Executive Committee for the schools covered under DPEP. Thus in all 4018 posts of Project Teachers were created. However, against these posts 3291 teachers were working on contractual basis on a consolidated salary of Rs.3000/- per month for a period of one year. But due to rationalization exercise taken up by the Education Department for deployment of surplus JBT teachers in various districts, these posts were later on abolished by the Executive Committee in its meeting held on 27.07.2001.

**Research and Technical Resource agencies**

In addition to the formal structure at Headquarters/field offices, Research and Technical Resource agencies like SCERT, SIEMT and DIETs (both at State and District level), assist DPEP for training, material development, planning and management for District sub projects.

State Council for Education Research and Training, Gurgaon plays a pivotal role in the qualitative improvement of school education. It serves as a resource centre for DIETs and other institutions so far as quality improvement of pre-service course for primary schools teachers, training of Master Trainers, conducting research studies and customising the prototype training material, is concerned. For performing these duties, this Council has been strengthened to provide training and technical support to the Project Authorities on the pattern of NCERT at National level.
SIEMT at Bhiwani has been developing training courses and modules for educational administrators, heads of schools, supervisory officials and project functionaries. It has further been establishing network with Government and Non-Government Organisations, Institutions and agencies within and outside the State for training, research, monitoring and evaluation in the area of educational planning and management.

The District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) have been constituted all over the State to improve and enrich the academic background of elementary school teachers, non-formal and adult education functionaries and other persons at the lowest level of educational system. At present, out of the 7 project districts, 6 have DIETs and Kaithal district is being looked after by DIET, village Palwal (Kurukshetra). The DIETs provide resource support to the BRCs and school clusters for planning and organising in-service training programmes for primary school teachers and head teachers, non-formal education volunteers, Village Education Committees and other village and block level functionaries. These have recently been strengthened by providing additional academic staff as its existing in-service wing could not cope with the additional workload.

DIETs, as resource groups, have been contributing in the areas of developing training packages and materials for training, curriculum and textbook development, supervision and provision of academic inputs to BRCs and CRCs.

† SIEMT was initially setup in April, 1997 and was located in the campus of SCERT at Gurgaon but was shifted to Bhiwani in September, 1998.
Having explained organisational structure at all levels, we would now analyse whether this framework has been able to meet its objectives. We have used different tools of organisational analysis as discussed below:

**Organisational Charting - Levels of Decisions making**

A perusal of the existing organisational chart reveals the hierarchy of management in the DPEP. Hierarchy or scaler principle is the most important means whereby resources are apportioned, personnel selected and operations assigned and reviewed. It is the principal channel of communication both downward, and upward through which information, instructions, directions and advice etc. flow. Delegation of powers is also done through this channel. One of the primary strategies of DPEP is decentralization of policy making, planning, administration and implementation of educational policies and plans. But when a uniform format was prepared under DPEP by Govt. of India, some of the fundamental aspects relating to decentralization were obscured. While the plans are formulated at decentralized levels, the formats for the formulation are provided by Union Govt. These formats include detailed procedures and guidelines to be followed at every step. These also include specific limits on broad pattern of allocations for different major items of expenditure which are same for all districts. It can thus be said that the responsibility for implementation of the programme is decentralized but with a limited degree of freedom. The planners, administrators, educationists and community leaders are involved in the preparation of educational policies and plans.

---


plans and their execution, which gives by and large a rich flavour of decentralization.

In the DPEP setup of Haryana, the General Council and Executive Committee are the policy making bodies empowered to take all important financial and administrative decisions to implement the programme. The implementing agency is the State Project Director who is also the Chief Executive for administering day to day affairs and acts both as a staff and a line agency to General Council/Executive Committee.

Though as per design of DPEP concept, it involves local area planning with disaggregated management, which means planning should be from the village upwards, the Parishad works under the principle of hierarchy from the top to the bottom. Immediately under State Project Director the Parishad has Administration, Finance, Planning, Engineering, Training and Publicity wings. Out of these, Administration, Planning and Training wings are staff agencies while Engineering, Finance and Publicity are line agencies. However, Training wing is acting both as staff as well as line agency.

Departmentalisation

The purpose of creating different departments in an organisation is basically to group together different services whose operations fall in the same field and they maintain intimate relations to achieve common objectives. In the Parishad, there are 6 major departments looking after various activities. The Administration department directly supervised by State Project Director and assisted by Administrative Officer looks after all administrative and personnel matters. Meetings of General Council and Executive Committee, Legal matters, administration of properties and general functions also fall within the purview of Administration Department. The Finance Department
headed by Chief Accounts Officer deals with budget and all types of financial management. The Central and State allocations and the distribution of funds amongst various departments, is handled by this department. Planning Department under Deputy Director (Planning), co-ordinates planning functions i.e. exercise for academic inputs, training and creating of infrastructure etc. The Engineering Department under the charge of an Executive Engineer, undertakes building activities for construction of additional school rooms, toilets, drinking water arrangements, construction of boundary walls and other infrastructure. The Training Department prepares Action Plans for training of Educational Planners, Administrators and academicians. Deputy Director (Teachers Training), Co-ordinates training programmes both within the organisation and networking with State level and national level institutes. Lastly, department of Media and Mass Communication headed by a Deputy Director looks after publicity as also deploying new technologies and equipments for successful implementation of programmes.

**Span of Management**

As per the organisational structure, six departmental Heads and District Project Co-ordinators are directly reporting to the Chief Executive which shows that span of control is on the higher side. However, keeping in view the time bound nature of the programme and achieving of set targets within the project period, the existing arrangement is working well in view of overall approach of dis-aggregated and decentralised management.

◆ Span of Control - Span of control refers to the issue and problem of the number of subordinates that each officer should or can effectively supervise.
Unity of Command

The principle of Unity of command, which ensures efficient reporting and control and helps in avoiding confusion and conflicts, is very much prevalent in the Project. The District field offices receive orders from the Headquarters and the Block and Cluster Resource Centres in turn are receiving orders from the district offices and hence there is no incidence of duality of command.

Authority and Responsibility

Authority without responsibility is very risky proposition and similarly responsibility without authority is meaningless. The powers and functions of the Chief Executive are extensive and accordingly he is responsible for putting up best performance as per the set targets. Along with all administrative & financial powers, he is responsible for effectively implementing the policies and programmes of DPEP and ensure both qualitative and quantitative achievements.

Delegation of Powers

There is sufficient delegation of powers at all levels as the very basis of framing this programme is based on the principle of disaggregated and decentralised management. Chief Executive enjoys lot of sanctioning powers within the overall guidelines of the Project and the same holds good in respect of District Project Co-ordinators. The delegation of powers arrangement has worked well so far and it is one of the mainstay of the successful implementation of this programme.

*Unity of Command - The concept of Unity of Command requires that every member of an Organisation should report to one and only one leader.*
On the basis of findings discussed above, it is revealed that since DPEP is a time bound venture and the existing organisational structure would have to be dissolved into the regular educational structure of the State setup, sustaining DPEP’s efforts is a real challenge. This in turn will also have financial, institutional and social implications. As per the collaboration agreement, although the State Govt. has agreed to continue to maintain the essential activities beyond the project period at its own cost, concerted efforts would be required to strengthen the institutional capacities. It is, however, too early to predict what shape it will adopt for achieving the intended objectives. For operational success of the programme, organisational structure need not be of permanent or traditional nature with fewer alternatives. But it may be of Matrix type, which has the features of flexible and innovative in nature.

To recall the first objective of this study, it was to understand and examine organisational structure in Haryana and its inter-relationship with existing departmental structure. The purpose was to analyse whether the existing organisational structure has been successful or not in implementing the District Primary Education Programme. The hypothesis formulated to achieve this objective was ‘The existing organisation structure without adequate delegation to field functionaries is not conducive to the growth of DPEP.’ The picture emerging out of organisational scenario reveals that there exists a responsive and flexible system having substantial autonomy, a lot of scope for experimental actions at all levels i.e. right from village to CRCs, BRCs, District Project Implementation Committees and up to the Headquarters. Accordingly the hypothesis is supported on the basis of decentralised management coupled with adequate delegation of powers at each level as revealed from the above findings.
The earlier studies are also a testimony that although linkages\textsuperscript{21} do exist from DIET to Block/Cluster/Teacher level, these need to be further strengthened. Similarly, study of BRCs/CRCs\textsuperscript{22} has revealed that these are the grass-roots institutions paving the way for greater interface with the teaching fraternity. Thus, the above findings too supplement and corroborate the findings of the present study so far as organisational setup of DPEP is concerned.


\textsuperscript{22} R. Govinda, India Education Report - A Profile of Basic Education, (New Delhi : Oxford University Press), 2002, p.289