

## 17. A Study of Kendriya Vidyalayas in Karnataka and Kerala

*M N Usha*

### **Introduction**

Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, an autonomous (Registered) body, was set up in 1965 to start and manage Kendriya Vidyalayas. Kendriya Vidyalayas (KVs) cater to the educational needs of the children of Central Government employees, including defence and paramilitary personnel, by providing a common programme of education throughout the country. It has a mandate to pursue excellence and set the pace in school education. KVs all over the country follow a common syllabus and bilingual medium of instruction (Hindi and English). They are affiliated to CBSE. A well-knit organizational set-up forms the backbone of the Sangathan.

The Sangathan has registered considerable growth, expansion and progress over the years. In 1997–98, there were 874 KVs with 7,42,320 students and 31,886 teaching staff, of which Karnataka accounted for 1,350 teachers and 29,110 students in 31 KVs. In Kerala, there were 26 Vidyalayas with 28,403 students and 1,152 teaching staff during the same period.

### **Objectives**

The main objectives of the study sponsored by the Planning Commission, New Delhi, were:

- Why do the KVs in Karnataka and those in Kerala differ in their functioning?
- What are the socio-cultural, administrative, managerial and financial factors/circumstances for the success or failure of the scheme of KVs in the states under review?
- Does the scheme of KVs as introduced/implemented in the States have inherent weaknesses and require any modification to suit the socio-cultural features of the region?
- Are there any administrative lapses that hinder the implementation of the KV scheme in terms of adequate funds / benefits not reaching the targeted groups, lack of convergence of schemes, etc?
- What problems are encountered by various functionaries involved in the conduct of Kendriya Vidyalaya?
- Are alternative strategies needed to enable the KV scheme to achieve its avowed goals?

### **Tools**

Simple descriptive statistical techniques such as percentages, mean, standard deviation and CV were used to analyse the data.

## **Conclusions**

1. Participation rates of students in KVs were higher in Kerala than in Karnataka, the average participation rate in Kerala being 1,092 as against 939 in Karnataka during 1998–99.
2. There existed significant differences in principals' perceptions about the organizational climate in KVs in Karnataka and Kerala. There was more democratic and participatory management in Karnataka than in Kerala.
3. In Karnataka, principals and teachers worked as a team towards the goals of KVs. They also acted collectively to enhance the prestige of Vidyalayas. Students performed well owing to the healthy atmosphere of the Vidyalayas and to the support systems provided by their parents at home.
4. Decentralisation of administration was well received by principals in both states.
5. In both Karnataka and Kerala, the setting up of Vidyalaya Executive Committee elicited mixed reactions.
6. Karnataka KVS had the advantage of well-knit communication facilities; hence the flow of information and communication from the regional administrative unit was smooth and swift. In Kerala the distance of the administrative unit seems to have slowed down the communication process.
7. Most of the teachers expressed the need for restructuring of the curriculum, re-designing of textbooks and modifying evaluation and assessment patterns.
8. In-service courses needed different kinds of inputs.
9. Supervision and inspection by the authorities was more effective in Karnataka than in Kerala.
10. KVs in Karnataka had more contributory factors—institutional factors, teacher factors, student factors, parental involvement and commitment to school education, educational management, investment decisions made by institutions and regional level offices, team approaches by staff and principals and implementation of policies and performance by students that yielded in quality education.

## **Recommendations**

- ❖ Setting up of sub-regional administrative units within the region is essential.
- ❖ There is scope for further expansion of KVs in the regions.
- ❖ Re-framing of grant-in-aid codes and C and R rules is required (essential).
- ❖ The wide disparity in pay and allowances of principals and teachers needs to be examined.
- ❖ Capacity-building programmes for staff need to be planned.
- ❖ Short-term sandwich courses should be conducted for teachers using multi-media to introduce modern techniques of teaching modes of assessing and evaluating students' work.
- ❖ In-basket workshops and seminars need to be organised for teachers.
- ❖ Serious attention needs to be given to the multi-media approach to school education with KVs.
- ❖ Vocationalisation of education programmes could be tried out at the diversified secondary stage. Vocational counselling cells could be set up in schools.
- ❖ A perspective plan needs to be drawn up with strategies for networking with other institutions as well as establishing linkages with industries in the region.

- ❖ Action plans are needed to introduce and implement neighbourhood schools schemes and complexes.
- ❖ Examination at regional and sub-regional levels could be tried out after class V and IX to ensure entry of worthy students into X and XI classes.
- ❖ Self-learning support materials need to be supplied to students by KVs.
- ❖ Parental accountability to schooling needs to be ensured and popularised through a campaign approach and through non-print media.
- ❖ Management of information systems needs strengthening.
- ❖ Orientation training courses need to be organised for non-teaching staff at the school level.