

Outcome Report of
Roundtables and Recommendations
on New Education Policy

October 2015

Disclaimer: This report is a summary of discussions on February 17, June 18 and September 21, 2015 and should not be construed as consensus of all participants at the roundtables.

1. Backdrop

In light of the fact that Government of India is in the process of formulating the New Education Policy, CUTS International embarked upon the endeavour to collate credible inputs for the same in the month of February 2015 under the aegis of CUTS International Public Policy Centre (CIPPoIC), which amongst other areas also works on Education Reforms (<http://www.cippolc.in/>).

Three roundtables were conducted and organised by CIPPoIC to gather inputs for the policy beginning in the month of February 2015 and culminating in the month of September 2015.

The first Roundtable Discussion was organised on 17th February 2015 in Jaipur and was chaired by Professor Vijay Vyas, Professor Emeritus, Institute of Development Studies. The list of participants were drawn mainly from the state of Rajasthan and comprised of 21 experts from both school education and higher education realms. Detailed report of the proceedings at this roundtable can be accessed here http://www.cippolc.in/pdf/Report-Roundtable_on_Education_Reforms_in_India.pdf

The second Roundtable Discussion was held on 18th June 2015 in New Delhi and was chaired by Prof S.K. Thorat, Chairman, Indian Council of Social Science Research, with keynote address by Prof. C. Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, O.P. Jindal Global University, Prof. J. S. Rajput, Former Chairman NCTE and Former Director NCERT and Mr. Sanjay Bhargava, Chairman, Shiksha Mandal, Wardha. Nearly 40 experts participated in the discussion comprising policy makers, researchers, academia, civil society and media. To facilitate the discussion CIPPoIC also prepared a draft discussion paper which can be accessed here http://www.cippolc.in/pdf/Discussion_Paper_on_Education_Policy.pdf. Detailed report of the proceedings at this roundtable can be accessed here http://www.cippolc.in/pdf/Report-Roundtable_on_New_Education_Policy_of_India.pdf

The third Roundtable Discussion was held on 21st September 2015 in collaboration with UNESCO, New Delhi. This roundtable discussion was opened by **Dr Satya Narayan Jatiya, Chairman, Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development**. 48 participants contributed their expert views to this roundtable including Members of Parliament, Government Officials, representatives of NITI Aayog, representatives of prominent universities, think tanks, World Bank and UN officials, amongst others. Detailed report of the proceedings at this roundtable can be accessed here http://www.cippolc.in/pdf/UNESCO-CUTS_Roundtable_on_New_Education_Policy.pdf

2. Key recommendations from the Roundtable Discussions

The recommendations that emerged from the three roundtable discussions pertain to the pre-primary education, school education and higher education. These recommendations related to the 33 themes identified by the Union Government and on areas which have substantial bearing on those 33 themes.

The following are the recommendations from all the three Roundtable discussions. It is urged that policy takes into account these well informed recommendations.

2.1 Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE)

1. ECCE is a basic right of children and especially for communities in margin. Therefore there is a need for linking ECCE with school education. Presently, cognate areas of pre-primary education and school education are handled by two ministries namely Ministry of Women and Child Development and Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD).
2. ECCE needs special attention in urban areas.
3. With respect to policy formulation, there needs to be continuity in planning by focusing ECCE Policy and curriculum with National Education Policy, National Curriculum Framework and Teacher Education.
4. The Supreme Court, in its judgment in the J. P. Unnikrishnan v. the State of Andhra Pradesh case (A.I.R. 1993 SC 2178) has held that children under the age of 14 have the fundamental right to free education. One important aspect of this judgment is that the fundamental right to education must also be extended to pre-primary education.
5. ECCE should also be a part of teacher education curricula and policy to ensure that professional education is imparted to ECCE practitioners and the quality regulation norms are at par with norms at school education level.

2.2 School Education

1. Policy must balance the objectives of socialist economy and market based economy

Increasing integration with the global economy is increasingly diluting the socialist framework to a more market based economy. Notwithstanding these developments, the Constitution of India still envisages India to be a socialist country. Therefore, the policy must balance the purpose of education between these realities.

2. Need to improve human capital indicators in a mission mode

If we see the successful growth stories from other countries in the world, health care and education are two of the most critical areas which can contribute to creating a healthy and smart work force or human capital. A recent World Economic Forum global Human Capital Index has put India at the 100th position in a survey of 124 countries. The list has been compiled on the basis of 46 indicators about how well countries are developing and deploying their human capital, focusing on education, skills and employment. Among BRICS countries, Russia is at 26th, followed by China at 64th, Brazil at 78th and South Africa at 92nd. Like the Government's hectic efforts to improve our Doing Business indicators to reach 50th rank from the current rank of 142 in 189 countries, the Government of India should also set a target to reach a similar ranking in Human Capital Index in the near future.

The New Education Policy must spell out well defined and time bound goals such as improving the human capital indicators. However in doing so following recommendations must be considered.

3. Recommendations based on 2005 Global Monitoring Report

India is at the cusp where much focus is being accorded to skills necessary for economic growth. An inherent danger with disproportionate focus on this goal is likely to create an environment of monitoring and regulation which could undermine the basics needed for learning. As with all aspects of development, a balance should be struck between ensuring the relevance of education to the socio-cultural realities of learners, to their aspirations, and to the wellbeing of the nation. Specific recommendations in this regard would therefore entail:

- Avoid standardisation of cognitive skills as it will create distortion in measurements
- Group or collective learning must be encouraged instead of individual ranking of learners
- Learning indicators prepared and tried out in 2008 for MHRD for primary level may be looked into to improve overall development of learners
- Maintain a balance between focus on skills for economy, socio-cultural realities and aspirations of learners
- Teacher training must be designed to include the above stated recommendations
- If benchmarking of states and the country is taken across different parameters then it must be borne in mind that such benchmarking does not have any adverse effect on the learner and it should not undermine widely accepted learning theories.

4. The policy needs to define quality education

When speaking of quality unfortunately the main focus is only accorded to learning outcomes whereas quality is the combination of inputs, processes and outcomes which may include infrastructure, teacher, classrooms, school functioning, student teacher interaction, assessments, school environment, curriculum, learning outcomes, retention rates, dropout rates and age appropriate completion. While redefining quality the policy must spell out correlation between each one of these elements.

Further with regards to learning, different aspects of learning must be taken into consideration such as learning for development of identity, for development of the capacity to live in the society and development of skills or even for development of learning capacities. In this regard further recourse should be had to domains such as physical well-being; social and emotional aspect; culture and arts; literacy and communication; learning approaches and cognition; numeracy and mathematics and science and technology. Further NCF 2005 is also instructive in this regard and it may be revisited to define quality in addition to the above.

This should be done in the backdrop of a national blueprint which should be spelt out in the policy and must cover a broad range of objectives. In other words, blueprint should not be narrow and parochial to include only specific aims such as skills necessary for economic growth.

5. Recommendations on Assessments

Assessments should be culturally sensitive and should focus on understanding of learner rather than learning outcome alone. This is because credible empirical studies have shown that learning in India is mostly by rote. This will be well in line with agreed upon Sustainable Development Goals which require high order of thinking rather than mere rote learning amongst learners.

National assessments and state assessments have been mandated in the last one year but these are not mapped to pedagogy or curriculum and neither are they developed in a way that can provide feedback into these aspects. Therefore there is a need to lay out a roadmap for assessments taking into account how they can generate credible feedback into curriculum and pedagogy and other such important aspects having bearing on understanding ability of the learner. This will facilitate a shift from an approach of monitoring to meaningful diagnosis.

6. Need to have clear definitions

There is a need for formulating clear definitions. For example, definition for Out of School Children is not very clear at the moment. It is important to have clear definitions in order to get accurate data for better monitoring.

7. Need to improve measurement systems

Policy is no good without implementation. Therefore for better implementation the following aspects must be considered:

- Data should be made more relevant. Currently DISE and NSSO data is not very relevant for the states and enrolment data is mostly biased.
- Multiple data sources should be referred to in order to cross validate the data and to ensure reliability.
- Data users should be able to communicate with data collectors with regards to the data gaps and data should be used not just by planners but by those carrying out monitoring process as well.
- Indicators should be kept to minimum but at same time should not compromise upon essential elements.
- Monitoring must entail monitoring across the entire spectrum of quality education
- Strong monitoring capacity should be developed at the sub national level
- Data collection should be for both qualitative and quantitative indicators
- Not all quantity indicators may be easily quantifiable. Therefore, a system to record and report qualitative indicators also needs to be put in place.

8. Role of Panchayat Raj Institutions

Village Education Committee (VEC) and School Management Committee (SMC) should be embedded in the PRI system making them more responsible to the Gram Sabha rather than being accountable to parents who are out of depth due their own limited education.

Primary school teachers should be recruited from the village as the first preference and if not available then recruitment should be from the block and district level and as a last option it should be done by state governments. Such a system would be less expensive and more accountable.

If the supervisory system is embedded in PRI measuring quality would also be affected. It would be easier for someone belonging to the village and who is voluntarily involved in the village committee to carry out formalities that statisticians require.

In the above context, the government is well advised to refer to 2013 report titled 'Towards holistic Panchayat Raj - Leveraging Panchayats for Efficient Delivery of Public Goods and Services'

9. Need to have early education in mother tongue

Multilingualism in India has played a crucial role in shaping its education dynamics. Research has shown that children first language is the optimal language for literacy and learning throughout primary school (UNESCO, 2008a). In this regards, learning in mother tongue should be accorded greater importance. Experience has also shown that children whose mother tongue is not the language of instruction in school are more likely to drop out of school or not succeed in early grades. On the other hand learning in mother tongue would lead to enhanced understanding and comprehending skills thereby creating a hospitable environment for children to learn and would also lead to overall progress in the education sector.

10. Lessons from International experiences

- The countries that have succeeded in delivering quality education are the ones spending 6% of GDP and/or 20% budgetary allocation on education sector. There is a strong argument that there is no reason why this formula will not work in India. India could do well to learn from a country like Brazil in this regard because Brazil has clear constitutional provision of 20% of budget to be allocated for education and not only it is implemented but it has also shown impressive results.
- Maldives has done a curriculum reform and introduced a new theory of measurement. It focusses not just on cognitive aspect but takes into consideration other aspects such as monitoring by teacher as to how child is behaving, his/her health, compliance with homework and other such aspects that complement the cognitive development. The model can be studied in further detail to learn relevant lessons.
- With regards to assessments, there is a need to learn from assessment frameworks of other similarly placed countries as India in order to continuously improve the science of assessments and not just the technique. India must take a lead in the creation of a regional assessment hub in the South Asian region.
- International experiences have demonstrated that citizen participation and role of civil society is critical in demanding accountability. For this purpose recommendation # 8 under this section must be considered.

- International experiences have established that getting the policy right requires a systematic mechanism to ensure delivery. Policies need to be not just conceived but designed, structured and implemented which requires a greater degree of understanding of how the system works. For this purpose recommendation # 13 in this section must be considered.

11. Need to link public funding to outcomes

At the international level, one would observe that countries which have typically spent 6% of the GDP or 20 % of the budget on the education sector have achieved better results on quality. As discussed above, the case of Brazil is one such example. In the Indian context, even though the past policies envisaged a public spending of 6% of GDP, it has never been achieved. The public spending in India on education has only peaked at approximately 4%. On the other hand, nearly 70 % of the spending in the sector has been undertaken by states. Moreover, this spending has seen a steady rise over the years yet the improvement in crucial areas like access and learning outcomes has been insignificant.

In light of the above, it appears that public funding on education sector is not entirely linked to the outcomes. Therefore there is a need to create a more accountable framework for public funding.

It is also recommended that progressive taxation would be an appropriate way to provide adequate public funds for education. This is particularly relevant because the recent steps taken by the GoI indicate that there will be reduced funding from the Union Government to the states on Centrally Sponsored scheme on education and related sectors but since states are differently placed in varied contexts, this discussion assumes special significance. For instance, from recent statements of Union Minister of Women and Child Development it appears that budget cuts have hurt fight against malnutrition. In turn this may have adverse impact on early childhood development and in the ultimate analysis on the quality aspect of education.

12. Role of NITI Aayog

- NITI Aayog can help in formulation of credible plans at the village level. In this context it may be wise to capitalise the momentum generated through the consultation process for policy formulation.
- NITI Aayog can also support learning goals and independent monitoring outcomes. The newly established Development and Monitoring Office (DMEO) can be instrumental in this regard.
- Further the DMEO must also ensure that adequate capacities are built to enhance data usage and not just collection. A special cell for monitoring education at the state level must be constituted to increase the usage of data for better planning. In this regard a leaf can be taken from national and international experience that India can learn from. This document can be instructive in this regard http://www.cippolc.in/pdf/Is_There_an_Opportunity_to_Develop_a_Whole_of_Government_M&E_Framework_in_India.pdf

- Further NITI Aayog can also be instrumental in developing Learning Data Management systems for better data use by stakeholders
- The Aayog can also assist in providing supportive environment for evaluation of innovative practices, and sharing of best practices across states
- NITI Aayog can also facilitate in partnerships between key stakeholders national and international think tanks, educational and policy research institutions and can offer problem sharing and solving platform.
- Further the Aayog can also be instrumental in coordinating and facilitating the mapping of physical and human resources and convergence among programmes at the state level
- The Aayog can also be instrumental in laying out a framework for engagement of private sector and common schooling : sharing of resources between private and public schools at the state level

13. Education in the realm Cooperative and Competitive Federalism

Govt has taken significant steps to usher in Cooperative and Competitive Federalism. In the education sector this can be done by having states compete in order to provide best possible outcome. So that states adhere to national objectives, a system of measurement of their performance in the sector will be useful at the national level. However if such a system is to be in place, the following points must be borne in mind:

- Care should be taken that benchmarking of states does not lead to manipulation of data by the states as states are likely understate their performance in order to get more central resources while on the other hand they may inflate their achievement for electoral gains.
- State specific conditions and systems must be taken into consideration. For this purpose lessons can be learnt from UNESCO's International Standards of Classification of Education (ISCED). In the Indian context it can be done by mapping state specific education programmes, different criteria such as entry levels, education structure, the envisaged pathways etc. This will allow measurement of the comparable indicators.

In other words, state specific data on a particular indicator (such as entry level for primary education) even though it may be different across states will help in better comparison. Again NITI Aayog can be instrumental in this regard.

Additionally the following approach is also recommended:

Each state across the country can develop its own theory of change. Similarly processes can also be mapped out to achieve the desired objective. Theories of change across these states may not be identical nevertheless from different theories a common theory can be culled out and some of the major indicators that are common across these theories of change can be identified and those can be used to compare the effectiveness of educational programmes of each state. In this

regard however concerns highlighted under GMR 2005 report must be taken into account and a middle path has to be found.

The policy may envisage a framework on the above lines.

2.3 Higher Education

1. Need for an education statistics institute

There is a need in India to have institutes like Higher Education Statistics Agency in UK to regularly gather and monitor data on higher education. There is also a need to have an institute to map and analyse data for other levels too namely pre-primary, primary, upper primary, secondary and higher secondary. Currently, neither there are such institutes nor credible data. Hence, policy formulation exercise is only based on estimates. The situation is worse with regards to diploma and certificate awarding institutions. The data pertaining to such institutions is even scarcer.

2. Rashtriya Ucchar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) must be strengthened

The status of universities in India has gone down substantially. This situation is even more alarming at the state level since most of universities are state universities. Therefore, there is a need to identify universities which need assistance both financial and technical. Centrally Sponsored Scheme RUSA can be an appropriate tool in this context. The State Higher Education Councils as mandated under RUSA must engage in identifying such universities and then make a plan for the improvement of their infrastructure, faculty and academic programmes. However, it must also be borne in mind that RUSA which would move the bulk of allocation of funds to colleges from UGC should not result in badly run institutions controlled by politicians cornering most of the funds.

3. UGC should be reformed to reflect the spirit of Cooperative Federalism

As a central regulator UGC should be restructured to have representation from states and adequate mechanisms must be placed so that states' voice carry weight in the decisions of the central regulator. This can be done by setting up a UGC Governing Council with state representation in it.

4. Remove monopoly by affiliating universities at state level

According to a 2014 report of the British Council titled "The future of higher education and opportunities for international cooperation", the vast bulk of students study at public and private colleges which are affiliated to state universities. Therefore, if there is one overall structure which defines Indian higher education, it is the affiliated college system. These colleges do not have their own degree awarding powers but they deliver the courses, curricula and examinations specified and regulated by their parent state university. The affiliated college sector is huge, enrolling over 90% of undergraduates, 70% of postgraduates and 17% of doctoral students.

To make matters worse there is monopoly of state universities in their respective jurisdiction. As a result, a college which may wish to get affiliation from a better and higher ranking university cannot do so, adversely affecting the quality of education and ultimately the students.

In light of the above, government must consider this issue and should allow freedom to colleges to get affiliated to the University of their choice. This will facilitate competition and is expected to improve the quality of education.

5. Need for increased freedom in revenue raising powers of public universities

Public universities (especially state universities) depend on affiliation fees paid by the colleges for their survival, which in turn is supplemented by state government funding to pay salaries and little else. As a consequence, most universities have poor infrastructure and conduct little research, although pockets of excellence exist. This is exacerbated by the fact that many state universities spend much of their time administering the exams and admissions to their affiliated colleges.

In other countries like the US, public universities have full autonomy. Consequently, public universities are not hamstrung in their ability to compete against their rivals, whether private or public.

In this context it is recommended that there is certain flexibility for public universities to raise funds, for instance by hiking fee. This would enable the universities to upgrade the infrastructure and invest required funds for quality enhancement. It was also recommended that one of the other effective ways to facilitate the autonomy of institutions is by providing for a 'negative list' in their regulation. Further, to increase the financial availability for the university, cross subsidisation should be allowed across components like tax and fee. The policy document can spell out the necessary framework to facilitate this.

6. Need to have choice based credit system (CBCS) across all disciplines

Study of varied subjects widens students' horizon and exposure. Keeping in mind that individual universities might not have the necessary faculty for elective subjects, the government has created a framework for credit transfer between institutes, where students can transfer credits from one university to another as credits will be recognised by every university.

To strengthen this system, credit transfers can either be lateral or vertical, that is, at the same or higher level, respectively. It is recommended that CBCS should be available for all disciplines. It was expressed in the roundtable that CBCS is currently available only for a few disciplines like engineering disciplines. Additionally, it would require shift from annual system to semester system which must be undertaken swiftly.

7. Need to monitor the accreditation system and institutions' compliance

With respect to checking quality through regulation, it may be noted that one of the failures of centralised system to move ahead in timely fashion relates to quality assurance system.

The National Education Policy 1986 recommended putting such a system in place. But it was only in 1994 that the accreditation body, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) came into existence. It took another four years to accredit the first institution. Later, UGC adopted the policy that accreditation will have no implication for funding and salaries. This took away substantive value from accreditation.

It was suggested that accreditation strict review of quality and should inspire institutions to align their missions according to the requirements of accreditations. This need to be followed in all sincerity across all institutions and a timely review is needed.

8. Need for greater collaboration between federal partners in determining useful knowledge

The concern with “useful knowledge” was first expressed in the colonial period, then in the context of a developmentalist state, and now in the context of globalization. By implication it means that curriculum at school as well as higher education level is subject to change as per changing times.

Therefore, it is recommended that government of India and the state governments must engage in a shared narrative to identify what is useful knowledge at different levels. This would need to be reviewed from time to time. This will require a sustained and collaborative effort and hence there needs to be platform or mechanism or a process to discuss this between Centre and state and at interstate level also.

9. Need to improve research and innovation

One of the ways to measure the rigorousness of research and innovation in a country is by looking at its patent filings. The Indian government has also been indicating that it is keen to see an increase in domestic patent filings across all industry sectors and technology areas.

The World Intellectual Property Organisation’s (WIPO) IP Indicators report for 2013 revealed that of the 43,663 patents applications made in India in 2012-2013, only 22% were filed by domestic entities. “Domestic filings need to be increased by encouraging research and development in India...

One way to improve this is by creating a tenure system for the university lecturers and linking their tenure with a certain research output. The guidelines for quality research output must be framed in partnership with public and private institutions.

It is also recommended that Government must strive to create partnerships with industry and academia. Partnerships with academia must be construed both at the level of Universities and independent research and policy think tanks.

10. Need to regulate coaching institutions

Private coaching institutes are Rs 35,000 crore businesses in India today. It is a fact that learning levels substantially improve in private tuitions. Private tuitions at the moment are an unregulated business. Teachers with spare time tutor students after school, and tuition centres coach students on how to clear specific exams (SAT, GRE, GMAT, etc).

In this background, the debate persists whether or not such tuitions should be regularised. It was recommended that instead of regularising coaching, attempts should be made to improve teaching in schools.

11. Greater debate over Common University Act is needed

The issue of Common University Act is one of the most hotly contested issue in the education sphere in India. Currently, there are several universities working within a state under different Universities

Acts. This means they follow different rules leading to administrative difficulty and increased litigation. Therefore, need to have a common varsity act have been often expressed.

Such decisions should be best left to states. However, it is recommended that in case a common university act is envisaged by the state, it must take into consideration experience of states like UP and Gujarat where attempts have been made to introduce Common University Act.

It is recommended that Common University Act must be brought in other states as well. In this regard, it may be pertinent to mention that lessons should be learnt from states which already have such acts and at the same time state specific issues and apprehension must be taken on board before introducing a Common University Act. For instance, a fear that has been expressed by the lobby opposing Common University Act is that such Act would erode into the autonomy of universities.

3. Combined list of participants in all three roundtables

S No	Name	Particulars
1.	Dr Satyanarayan Jatiya	Chairman Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development
2.	Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar	Member of Parliament (RS), INC
3.	Shri R Ramakrishna	Member of Parliament (RS), BJP
4.	Shailendra Sigdel	Statistical Adviser (South Asia) UNESCO
5.	Mitrasen Bhikajee	Programme Specialist, Natural Sciences UNESCO
6.	Pradeep Mehta	Secretary General CUTS International
7.	C. Raj Kumar	Vice Chancellor O.P. Jindal Global University
8.	V. S. Vyas	Professor Emeritus Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
9.	S.K. Thorat	Chairman Indian Council of Social Science Research
10.	J. S. Rajput	Former Director NCERT
11.	Sanjay Bhargava	Chairman Shiksha Mandal Wardha
12.	Anjela Taneja	Head of Policy Global Campaign for Education
13.	Kiran Bhatta	Senior Fellow

S No	Name	Particulars
		Centre for Policy Research
14.	Gunjan Sharma	Professor, Ambedkar University
15.	Vyjayanthi Sankar	Senior Consultant Brookings Institution
16.	Anuradha De	Director Collaborative Research and Dissemination
17.	Pramod Kumar Anand	Consultant NITI Aayog
18.	Toby Linden	Lead Education Specialist The World Bank
19.	Sunita Sanghi	Adviser, NITI Aayog <i>(sent her inputs through a presentation)</i>
20.	Ádithya Narayanan	Fellow Teach for India
21.	Ajay Mohan Goel	Executive Vice President Wadhvani Foundation
22.	Anurag Goel	Former Member Competition Commission of India (CCI)
23.	Apoorva Shankar	Education Analyst PRS Legislative Research
24.	Ashish Mehta	Program Manager LIQVID eLearning Services
25.	Furqan Qamar	Secretary General Association of Indian Universities
26.	Garima Babbar	Standards and QA National Skill Development Corporation
27.	Honey Gupta	CUTS Institute for Regulation & Competition (CIRC)
28.	Huma Masood	National Programme Officer, Gender and Education UNESCO
29.	K. S. Chalam	Political Economist and Educationist & Ex-Member Union Public Service Commission
30.	Manish Upadhyay	Co-founder and Chief Evangelist

S No	Name	Particulars
		LIQVID eLearning Services
31.	Meenakshi Gautam	Phd Student Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies School of Social Sciences Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU)
32.	Milindo Chakrabarti	Visiting Fellow Research and Information system for Developing Countries (RIS)
33.	Monika Banerjee	Phd Student Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies School of Social Sciences Jawaharlal Nehru University
34.	Mukul Priyadarshini	Miranda House, Delhi University
35.	N. Mathur	Supertech
36.	N. V. Varghese	Director Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE), NUEPA
37.	Nidhi Sabharwal	Associate Professor Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE), NUEPA
38.	Parth J. Shah	Founder President Centre for Civil Society
39.	Pawan Chopra	Director Dua Consulting
40.	Pradyumna Bhattacharjee	Fellow Teach for India
41.	Pratibha Jain	Partner & Head (Delhi Office) Nishith Desai Associates
42.	R. R. Koirang	NCERT
43.	Rajesh Pankaj	Joint Director FICCI
44.	Richard Everitt	Director (Education) British Council
45.	S. S. Chawla	Senior Director ASSOCHAM

S No	Name	Particulars
46.	Sabina Dewan	Senior Fellow Just Jobs Network
47.	Sajad Santosh	Research Associate Centre for Civil Society
48.	Saumen Chattopadhyay	Associate Professor Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies School of Social Sciences Jawaharlal Nehru University
49.	Shamika Ravi	Fellow, Development Economics Brookings India
50.	Tarun Cherukuri	City Director (Delhi Operations) Teach for India
51.	Vandana Singh	Associate Fellow Digantar Shiksha Evam Khelkud Samiti
52.	Vimlendu Jha	Founder Swechha
53.	Vivek Vellanki	Regional Resource Centre for Elementary Education University of Delhi
54.	Aashika Aggarwal	Intern <i>under</i> Mr. R Ramakrishna (MP)
55.	Abhishek Kumar	Associate Director CUTS International
56.	Aditi Agrawal	Programme Manager Centre for Civil Society
57.	Aditi Banerjee	ASER Centre
58.	Amanbir Singh	Research Coordinator Just Jobs Network
59.	Amit Chandra	Associate Director (Policy Advisory) Centre for Civil Society
60.	Amol R. Deshmukh	Managing Director HERD Foundation
61.	Amulya Yerramaneni	ASER Centre
62.	Anita Rampal	Faculty, Department of Elementary Education University of Delhi
63.	Anjali Mody	Journalist & Writer
64.	Anjana Hazarika	Asst. Commissioner

S No	Name	Particulars
		Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan
65.	Anurag Kundu	Lead – Community Engagement & Advocacy Indus Action and Delhi Dialogue Commission
66.	Arko Chakraborti	Student Shaheed Bhagat Singh College
67.	Arunima Gupta	CUTS International
68.	Bipul Chatterjee	CUTS International
69.	Esther Suhasini	Education New Agency
70.	Geetha Nambissan	Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University
71.	Keerti Jayaram	Secretary Organisation for Early Literacy Promotion
72.	Mukul Kumar	Chief Executive Officer MuvIn Infotech
73.	Nishma Madhav	Student Lady Shri Ram College for Women
74.	Poonam Batra	Professor of Education, Central Institute of Education University of Delhi
75.	Praveen Khanghta	Programme Manager Central Square Foundation
76.	Pritha Ghosh	Program Lead (Strategy & Implementation) Accountability Initiative
77.	Priyanka Anand Chadha	Accountability Initiative
78.	Rohan Joshi	Associate Director Centre for Civil Society
79.	Ranjit Bhattacharyya	ASER Centre
80.	Richa Gupta	Student Deshbandhu College
81.	S A Khader	SAK Consultants & Associates
82.	Shipra Roy	Deputy Secretary Ministry of Women & Child Development
83.	Somaya Gupta	Student Lady Shri Ram College for Women
84.	A. K. Sacheti	Project Adviser Rajasthan Skill and Livelihoods Development Corporation (RSLDC)
85.	Abhishek Poddar	Director

S No	Name	Particulars
		Kamla Poddar Group of Institutes
86.	Archana Surana	Founder & Director Arch Academy of Design
87.	Ashok Bapna	President NHRDN
88.	Ayush Poddar	Director Kamla Poddar Group of Institutes
89.	Benoy Thoompunkal	Designer Arch Academy of Design
90.	Devi Singh	Vice Chancellor JK Lakshmipat University
91.	Kulbhushan Kothari	Managing Trustee PRATHAM
92.	Kumkum Garg	Dean, Faculty of Engineering Manipal University
93.	Madhusudan Sharma	Senior Project Coordinator CUTS International
94.	Naresh Dadhich	Officiating Director Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
95.	Pramod Yadav	Director, Administration & Projects Arch Academy of Design
96.	S. L. Kothari	Professor & Director Institute of Biotechnology Amity University
97.	S. M. Seth	Chairman Poornima University
98.	Sunny Sebastian	Vice Chancellor Haridev Joshi University of Journalism & Mass Communication
99.	Sushil Kumar	Assistant Director Micro Small Medium Enterprises Development Institute (MSME)
100.	TCA Sharad Raghavan	Data Journalist HT Mint
101.	Vijay Vir Singh	Professor & Head Department of Economics University of Rajasthan

