

SCHOOL INSPECTION IN SCOTLAND (UK) AND ORISSA(INDIA)

Sunil Behari Mohanty, Lecturer & Head, Department of Education, Bhadrak College, Balasore (Orissa)

School inspection and supervision is one of the important aspects of our educational system. The 33rd International Conference on Education held at Geneva pointed out that inspectorate or its equivalent play an effective role 'in providing help and guidance to teachers (UNESCO 1972. p. 110). The term 'inspection' is very often used interchangeably with the term 'supervision'. Supervision is conceived as a service to teachers, both as individuals and members of groups, and helps them in improving their instructional skills (Oliva 1976). It aims at recognising "the inherent value" of each student, teacher, administrator and supervisor so that the full potentialities can be realised (Neagley and Evans 1980). Rozaric (1975) points out that supervision is undertaken for four purposes-corrective, preventive, constructive and creative. The various aspects covered in inspection and supervision are results of students, teaching skills of teachers, training of teachers, research undertaken in the school, environmental cleanliness of the school, individual cleanliness of staff and students of the school, rapport between the various groups operating in school, nature and quality of community involvement in school programmes, nature and quality of involvement of the school in the community welfare, co-curricular activities organised in the school, physical and health education programmes, library, school plant, staff requirement, etc. Eye (1975) points out that supervision is conducted for purposes such as (i) obtaining information about working conditions of the schools, (ii)improving teaching learning situation, (iii) achieving co-ordination effort, etc. Thus inspection and supervision have been essential elements of educational systems in various countries. They help in ensuring quality and removing weaknesses in operation of the educational system. The quality of these programmes depends on the quality of the roles played by their personnel.

ROLE OF AN INSPECTOR

Role can be defined by the images held for the relative behaviour of an individual operating in a particular position (Sergiovanni and Carver 1980). When a person operates in a particular position, persons connected with that position expect certain types of behaviour from the person holding that position. A school inspector, is expected to play different roles by school students, teachers, heads, government, and community members. This type of expectation is called role expectation. It is "an evaluative standard" applied to incumbent of a position. (Gross, Mason and Mc Eachern 1951). The inspector also expects certain types of roles to be played by the students, their parents, heads of schools, his or her senior and junior officers and also members of the community. When in actual situation one does not find various persons behaving as per one's role expectation of those persons or one finds difficulty in adjusting various expectations from different roles expected to be played by the same person due to various positions being held by him or her, a conflict arises. It is called role conflict. An inspector may be subjected to role conflicts in various situations. For instance, an inspector as a member of a particular community may want a teacher to continue in a school, but as an officer of the Government may want to carry out orders of superior authority for transferring the Said teacher. Conflicts are again of two types. The example given above is that of inter-role conflict. Other category is intra-role conflict, when an inspector is left between expectations of two or more than two positions, for instance a school head and a school education Director. An inspector has to play various types of roles. "Generally, the supervisor or administrator assumes polyfunctional roles adviser in education, planner, agent of change, and implementor. As a change agent he is a communicator who translates the ideal into the practical ways capable of implementation in the field" (APEID 1981 p. 55). He is also a problem identifier and solver and exemplifier of effective ways of functioning. The supervisor is "at once a channel of communication, mediator,interpreter, broker, professional adviser and coordinator, the link between policy makers and other practitioners, the providers of education and the consumers (Commonwealth Secretariat 1973). Various such types

of roles have been also pointed out by educationists such as Sybouts (1967), Wiles and Lovell (1975), Stoller (1978) and Sergiovanni and Carver (1980). The characteristics of a good inspector are that he or she is a good teacher scholar, good administrative chief, good negotiator-statesman, and good community resource developer. A good inspector is expected to encourage flexibility and innovation in education systems. He has a good understanding of human relationships. Wiles (1968) points out that some of the attributes of good human relationships are empathy, involvement, collaboration, threat-reduction and permissiveness. A good supervisor provides constructive criticism (Mukherji 1960). He suggests ways of overcoming various barriers through exemplary actions. He is a good teacher, and on visit to schools he takes demonstration classes. Segiovanni (1975) points out that a good supervisor does human resources supervision basing on identity, commitment and motivation. A good supervisor possesses excellent interpersonal skills (Goens and Lange 1976). He believes that help not perceived as help by the supervisee is not a help. In such types of expectations from the good inspectors, a look at findings of a few studies made on the field may throw light on the prevailing situation.

FINDINGS OF A FEW STUDIES

Mukherji (1960) found that inspectors often lack in ability to provide constructive criticism. Rawat (1967) found that inspecting system defective and suggested that there should be two types of inspectors-administrative and academic. The former may be in charge of 25 schools and later in charge of 50 schools. He also pointed out the need for full period observation of classroom teaching of a teacher and panel inspection for each school for once in a span of .three years. Manuel and Nair (1972) found that primary school teachers had favourable attitude towards inspection. They favoured observation of lessons by inspectors and opined that inspectors having primary school teaching experiences were more effective than the ones not having such experiences. Alkfofure (1974) points out that supervisors often become conscious fault finders. Blumberg (1974) points out that due to faulty inspection practices the teachers do not take the visits in proper spirit. Eye (1975) found that supervisors were subservient to administrative convenience, which was taking them away from teachers. In working of the supervisors, the skills of directing, influencing, analysing, planning, and expediting are looked as inferior to that of administrative compatibility. In such a situation, there arises the need for training courses for inspectors to appraise them of their roles.

TRAINING OF INSPECTORS

The preparation and training of inspectors for their entry into the job is not very old. In fact, in many situations such a type of pre-service training is not a pre-requisite to apply for such jobs. According to Elock (1982), Columbia University, in 1905, for the first time in U.S.A., introduced such a type of programme. In 1966, such a course was created in an Australian university and only in 1978, such type of course was introduced in Germany. A course for training of educational administrators exists in British universities. No such type of course exists in universities of India. However, in some universities optional papers are available at B. Ed. and M. Ed. stage on this area. But there is no stress in selecting candidates who had such types of optional courses as their field of study, for the jobs of inspectors. Need for pre-service training programmes for inspectors arises out of the consideration that key personnel may be either catalysts to a planned change or a conservative force that may hamper any change (APEID 1981 p. 59). The components of such a training programme are knowledge of various educational policies and issues and skills in management, programme and project development, interpersonal communication, research and evaluation, etc.

Let us now have a look at the inspection system of a developed country like U.K.

SCHOOL INSPECTION IN SCOTLAND (UK)

School inspection in Scotland (U.K.) is carried out by two sets of personnel-inspectors appointed by the Government and supervisors appointed by various local education authorities. In the year 1978-79, there were 114 inspectors of schools in Scotland area. For the sake of administration, U.K. has three distinct areas-Scotland, Northern Ireland, and England and Wales. There is a Secretary of State for Scotland and another for Northern Ireland who looks after the affairs of these two regions including education. The educational affairs of England and Wales are looked after by the Central Government at London. For our analysis the Scottish system of school inspection is being considered.

Three-fourth of the total number of Scottish inspectors were involved in school education and the remaining one fourth for further education and community education. Corbett (1971) points out four major functions of Her Majesty's Inspectors (i) assessing and reporting on all schools and other educational institutions, except universities, financially aided by the Government, (ii) advising and imparting in-service training, (iii) encouraging educational development and (iv) forming a link between Department, local education authorities and Councils. These inspectors are also represented in the various examination boards and teaching councils. Various categories of inspectors are Chief Inspector, Deputy Chief Inspector, Senior Chief Inspector and Inspectors. They work as a team.

Inspection Procedures

The inspectors favour team-inspection and sample inspection. A group of inspectors visit a school and take up different aspects of school for scrutiny. At the end of their scrutiny, they sit together and prepare a report. This report is then scrutinised by the Chief Inspector and then passed on to the Scottish Education Office. A copy of the report is also sent to the Director of Education of the concerned local Regional Authority for necessary action to be taken by him. The report contains (i) a brief history of the institution, (ii) accommodation, (iii) staffing characteristics, (iv) in-service training, (v) resources, (vi) curriculum design and organisation of courses, (vii) remedial programmes, (viii) examination results, (ix) work of the school on different subjects taught, (x) guidance activities, (xi) management and organisation of external links and (xii) over-all conclusion. The inspectors organise themselves on regional and subject bases. They also bring out surveys based on local inspection that take good practices to wider audience. The inspectors generally do not go into the techniques of teaching different school subjects. These are taken care of by the supervisors appointed by the local authorities. The reports of the Inspectors have serious consequences for staffing pattern and the amount of grant received by an institution. Thus, inspectors are not required to be masters of various skills used in schools but masters of specific skills.

Training of Inspectors

The inspectors, when newly appointed go through a period of induction for two to three days' duration. Besides, they also go through periodical in-service programmes that help them in reinforcing earlier acquired skill and receiving training in a new skill. The skills required in inspecting team are taken into consideration at the time of selection of personnel.

Recruitment Policy

The inspectors are recruited through specific open advertisements/Because of this provision, teachers take different courses catering to the needs of the job of an inspector offered in different institutions. Each inspector generally has some years of school teaching experiences.

Thus, school inspection in U.K. is somewhat organised. There are many areas on which improvements are needed such as training of inspectors and inspecting pattern. Now let us have a look at our own system.

SCHOOL INSPECTION IN ORISSA (INDIA)

In India, school inspection system varies from state to state. For the purpose of this study let us analyse the system prevailing in one state e.g., Orissa. The inspectors are government servants. The categories of inspectors are Director of Public Instruction, Deputy Director, Assistant Director, Inspector of Schools, District Inspector of Schools, Deputy Inspector of Schools and Sub-Inspector of School. The Director is the administrative head and is helped by Deputy Directors and Assistant Directors. Although they mainly do file work, at times they also undertake inspection of schools. The Inspector of Schools is the highest field level officer, who looks after the working of high schools and also the work of District Inspector of Schools functioning in his area.

The District Inspectors of Schools are in charge of educational districts not revenue districts and they look after the middle schools directly and also the working of the Deputy Inspectors of Schools and Sub-Inspectors of Schools. Deputy Inspectors of Schools are often placed in the office of the District Inspector of Schools to help him in his day-to-day administrative work. At times they are also given work for inspecting schools. The sub-Inspector of Schools looks after the elementary schools situated in his area. The Inspector of schools is the appointing and transferring authority of Deputy Inspectors of schools and Sub-Inspectors of Schools. Besides, he or she is also the appointing authority for teachers of middle Schools, high schools, etc.

Presently, the selection or appointment of teachers is being done by a State Selection Board and the Inspectors have been relieved of this work to a great extent. Earlier they used to give grants to private schools for payment of salary to their teachers. This task has now been lessened with the introduction of the scheme of direct payment. Thus, inspectors have various functions to perform-appointment, grant, transfer, leave, increment sanction, character roll, etc. There is no provision for subject-wise experts except one expert in each of the school subjects, available at the Board of Secondary Education. The Inspectors of schools are also members of the Board of Secondary Education and take part in its various meetings and take active role in its examinations. They also award scholarships to meritorious students. The District Inspectors of Schools appoint and transfer primary school teachers. There is no school-wise appointment. Hence persons appointed in tribal or rural areas always go on trying for their transfer till they come to their own home place or to a nearby place. This practice also gives rise to corruption at various levels. Transfer of school teachers working at primary level from one education district to another is done by the Inspector of Schools and in case of out of jurisdiction of one inspector, it is done by the Directorate of Public Instruction. The teacher has to get his application forwarded by various levels of the hierarchy and the process is a sad story of bribe and nepotism. This makes the inspecting officers inefficient in carrying out the inspection work.

Inspection Procedures

The inspection of schools is done by one Inspector and not by a panel of inspectors. Generally such inspection is completed within a few hours. When the author was a school Headmaster, his school was visited by the Inspector for a few hours; outside the normal working hours of the school. The Inspector was mostly concerned about a few records but not about the teaching and learning activities and helping teachers improve their work. Often the school heads fill-up the date on the day of the visit, and the Inspector just fills in the remarks. The inspector responsible for each level of school sends a copy of his or her inspection report to next higher Inspector; and the Inspector of Schools sends his or her report to the Directorate. Inspectors in this situation are required to be masters of different school subjects, but in practice it is not so. Hence the school teachers do not expect much guidance from the Inspectors and they treat them as an unwanted ritual in the educational system.

Training of Inspectors

There is no provision of pre-service training of school Inspectors. There is also no Specific pin-pointed training programme at in-service level. However, the State Council of Educational Research and Training provides training to Inspectors in certain areas of education. This is arranged generally at the time of introduction of a new curriculum, etc.

Recruitment Policy

The recruitment policy of Inspector is not separate from those of school teachers. No separate advertisement is made for appointment and selection of Inspectors. They are part of the cadre meant for teachers. The Sub-Inspectors of Schools are transferable to the post of Heads of Middle Schools or posts of teachers in Secondary Schools or post of teachers in training school and so also is the case with the Deputy Inspectors of schools. The District Inspectors of schools are gazetted servants, and they are transferable as heads of training schools or some selected high schools having gazetted head posts. A person who has worked throughout his or her life in secondary school may be transferred as District Inspector of Schools, who has nothing to do with secondary schools.

A high school teacher can get transferred as Sub-Inspector or Deputy Inspector of Schools who deals with primary school teaching. Experience of the persons in various fields is nor taken into consideration. Earlier, anybody from a college or a school could come to work in school education wing. A reader in a college holds equivalent post to that of Inspector of Schools. Now-a-days this practice has stopped. Only persons from school wing or from training colleges are being appointed to the posts of Inspectors. There is no open advertisement for such posts. Hence, it is mostly done in a secret manner and the criterion used for selection is not made public.

How to Improve our School Inspection ?

The following suggestions are given in the light of discussions made above on the situation prevailing in U.K. and in our country to improve our own system :

1. The Inspectors should be appointed only for inspecting job through open advertisements giving due recognition to concerned areas of school education and previous study of the applicant in the said field.

2. There should be at least a pre-service training programme for a period of 2 months for each new entrant.
3. The Inspectors should be relieved of the task of appointment and transfer of persons for various posts in school education. It will purify the present lot and not spoil the future ones.
4. There should be provision of subject experts in each of the school subjects at the Inspectorate level.
5. At the time of Inspection, the Inspector should take with him or her expert school teachers in the concerned subjects taught in the school to be inspected.

REFERENCES

1. Alkoofure, A.E.O. (1979) Supervising the system. In Commonwealth Secretariat, *Sixth Commonwealth Education Conference Report*. London : The Secretariat, 109-119.
2. APEID (1981), *Preparing Administrators, Supervisors and other Key Personnel*. Bangkok : UNESCO Regional Office.
3. Blumberg, A. (1974) *Supervision and Teachers: A Private Cold War*. Berkely, Ca : McCutchan Pub. Co.
4. Commonwealth Secretariat (1973), *Report of the Commonwealth Regional Seminar on Administration and Supervision of Education*, London : The Secretariat.
5. Corbett, A. (1971), *Innovation in Education in England*. Paris : O.E.C.D.
6. Elock, M. (1982), The preparation and Training of Educational Administrator : An international view. *Canadian and International Education*, 11, 1, 43-54, Ju
7. Eye, G.G. (1975). Supervisory Skills : The Evolution of the Art, *Journal of Educational Research* 69, 1, 13-19 September.
8. Goens, G.A. and Lange, R.W. (1976), Supervision as Instructional Analysis, *NASSP Bulletin*, 60, 401, 15-20, September.
9. Gross, N. Mason, W and McEachern, A. (1958), *Explorations in Role Analysis*. New York ; John Wiley.
10. Harris B.M. (1975), *Supervisory Behaviour in Education* (2nd edition) Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
11. Manuel. N.V. and Nair, T.K.D. (1972), A Study of Attitude of Primary School Teachers towards Inspection, In University Department of Education, *Studies in Education*. No. 5, Trivandrum : University of Kerala, 116-122.
12. Mukherjee, L. (1960), Inspection : Its needs and misuse and how to improve it, *Education*, 39, 6, 5-11, June.
13. Nair, T. K. D., 'Inspection by Post', *The Hindu (Madras)* 13-1-1981, ; P. 19.
14. Neagley, R. L. and Evans, N.D. (1980) *Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction*. Englewood Cliffs : Prentice Hall.
15. Oliva, P. (1976), *Supervision in To-day's Schools*. New York : Harper Row.
16. Rawat, D.S. (1967), The Indian School Inspectorate, *NIE Journal*, 2,2,60-63, November
17. Rozario, E.D. (1975), Educational Supervision, *Rajasthan Board Journal of Education*, 11,3,11-18, July-September.
18. Sergiiovinni T.J. (1975), *Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers*. Washington D.C. : A.S.C.D.
19. Seriogavinni T.C. and Carver, F. D. (1980) *The New School Executive*. New York : Harper and Row.
20. Sybouts, W. (1967), Supervision and Team Teaching, *Educational Leadership*, 25,2,158-166, November.
21. UNESCO, (1972), Report of the Debate on Major Trends in Education at the 33rd Session of the International Conference on Education. In I.B.E., *Initiatives in Education: A World Profile for 1971-72*. Geneva/Paris : IBE/UNESCO 110-112.
22. Wiles, K. (1968) *Supervision for Better Schools*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall
23. Wiles, K. and Lovel, T.T. (1975) *Supervision for Better Schools* (4th edition) Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.