

“Analysing the Right to Education Act 2009 with special focus on No Detention Policy”

*Arsh Arora
Masters in International Economics and Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences,
Charles University, Prague, Czechia*

ABSTRACT

India is expected to reach the stage of true demographic explosion by 2050 and we must build strong foundations of New India. It is possible only through a quality rich and a vibrant education system. This paper focuses on the quality of primary and secondary education in India after the incorporation of the No Detention Policy (NDP) in 2009 by the Government of India. The question arises why the system (Pass-Fail) is being brought back when it was scrapped to pave the way for NDP and when NDP seemed to be ineffective in enhancing the standards of quality education, the pass-fail system is being brought back. There also arises the sense of education crisis with this flip-flop of policies as government and stakeholders should strive for deriving an alternative solution which caters to all types of students be it slow or fast learner, economically/socially backward or strong student. The authors in this paper try to critically examine the impact of NDP by doing a qualitative analysis through structured questionnaires and in-depth interviews with all stakeholders involved or impacted by it and also attempt to give an innovative solution to this intensifying issue.

Keywords: primary education, right to education, quality

1. Introduction

Primary Education is the foundation for any child to begin her journey in school. To make sure that a building stands strong for years, its foundations have to be resilient. Similarly, a child must receive quality primary education in schools. Research indicates that if a child adopts good learning and reading skills during primary education, his/her self-learning ability is enhanced. At the time of independence only 9% of women and 27% of men were literate (Kingdon, 2007). The state of primary education was not good in terms of the number of formal schools, teacher availability, and logistics.

There was an urgent need to formulate policies on Education and making them available to every child in the country. However, not much action was taken in this regard, except for constructing schools (Bajaj, 2014). The first official report by the government was published in 1964, by the Kothari Commission. It highlighted various issues outside the education system, such as varied socio-cultural backgrounds, inequality in the country, discrimination based on gender and race. Therefore, the purpose of policy formulation was to make sure that Education acts as an instrument of equalizer in society. The Kothari commission

suggested the development of a common schooling system and improving the infrastructure of government schools (Sharma & Bapana, 2015). Based on recommendations by the Commission, the National Policy of Education (NPE) was framed in 1976. It focused on improving quality at all levels of education, science and technology, and moral values. It covered the aspect of Primary Education by providing free education to children up to 14 years of age. The implementation of NPE 1976 realized that there exist variations in learning levels among students across the states (Bajaj, 2014) which led to the adoption of revised NPE in 1986.

It was the first time that the government committed itself to work in a target-bound manner. It primarily focused on primary education by promoting, child-centered approach. We will see in coming literature that the child-centered approach was formalized in form of the Right to Education Act'2009. The third and last revised version of NPE came in 1992 with three main focal points, viz; Universal access to Primary Education, Universal Retention for up to 14 years, and improvement in the quality of education. The goals specified in the policies turned out to be elusive and the deadline for its achievement has never been met successfully. In 1994, District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) was launched in a view to decentralize the primary education system. Followed by DPEP, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan (SSA) came into effect in 2001. The difference between DPEP and SSA comes from the source of funding, DPEP was a completely centrally funded program, whereas SSA was majorly funded by state governments (Bajpai & Goyal, 2004). The core goals and targets of policies till 2001 were almost similar and sometimes overlapping too. The mere failure of the government to achieve the targets led to the formulation of the same policy under a different banner and with little improvements in it.

The impact of educational policies since independence is evident with the following statistics. The crude literacy rates have increased by almost three times from 16.4% in 1951 to 55.3% in 2001 (CCI, 2001). Concerning primary school enrolment among boys, it increased from 13.8% in 1951 to 63% in 2001. Among girls, it increased ten times to almost 50% in 2001 since 1951 (Ministry of Education, 2014). The pupil-teacher ratio as of 1991 remained as high as 43, however, state-wide variations were high in this regard (Azim Premji Foundation, 2010). The dropout rate was recorded at 39.62% in 1999. However, in Bihar, the dropout rate was highest at 59% and the lowest was 7% in Kerala (Ministry of Education, 1998).

The indicators depicted the upward trend in almost all factors. However, some factors were neglected. For example; lack of access to toilets, no drinking water facility, no availability of classrooms, no electricity, teacher absenteeism, and lack of access to schools. All these factors play an important role in improving the quality of education, however, they were not quantified until the first of the 21st century in India. The low quality of the school system adds to parent's apathy for sending their children to school even when they realize the social and economic significance of going to school is low (Bajpai & Goyal, 2004). Till 1991, the research undertaken in the field of education was merely academic.

The impact of policies was estimated through the general census and through National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) rounds (Aggarwal, 1999). This did not present a crystal picture of primary education in India as it majorly focused on quantitative variables. Therefore, the effectiveness of policies was a mystery till a state-wise survey for education was undertaken in 1999, named by Public Report in PROBE. The failure of policies on the ground level can be caused by factors outside the system, such as the caste system and poverty. The unnoticed low quality of the school system adds to parent's apathy for sending their children to school even when they realize the social and economic significance of going to school (Bajpai & Goyal, 2004). Poverty has remained a major obstacle in access to education. Even though education is a free and compulsory right, the overhead expenditure for textbooks, uniforms, and transportation adds to the burden to the poor family (Tilak, 2004). The schools were supposed to be catalyzing instruments to abridge the socio-cultural gap in society. In contrast, the Brahmanical attitude continued, especially in rural areas where marginalized sections like Dalits were not allowed to enter the schools. Such practices widened the inequality in India. As (Mehrotra, 2006) said, the survey found a trinity of burden viz; you are a girl, you are Dalit and you are from a rural area, the chances of you being never enrolled are higher.

The steady improvement in education indicators has given more importance to the quantitative aspect, thus assessing the learning level among students has been compromised (Mehra, Bali, & Arora). Excessive focus on universalization of elementary education has led to many students getting enrolled in schools. However, mere enrolment of students is not the end objective of government. The number of schools constructed has increased tremendously, such that as of 2001 there are over 80% of primary schools which are within the one-kilometer range (Planning Commission, 2001). No doubt, India has made a quantum jump in primary education but the quality of primary education in India has been out of sight for long. Quality of Education has been much debated since the twentieth century as a matter of concern. Assessing primary education in qualitative terms is complex as there are a plethora of factors affecting it and thus, we cannot have a definition for Quality of Education.

Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Teachers Quality, number of working days, accountability, governance system, pedagogical innovation, infrastructure, and students learning levels are the key determinants to Quality of Education. In India, there are various institutions, government agencies that have carried primary surveys to assess the quality of education through different factors as mentioned above. A parent sending his child to school is in a hope that his child will be provided an environment where she can groom herself to be a better human being, explore through learning, gets a free meal, she is provided with basic facilities like toilets, drinking water, and shelter, the teacher is self-motivated to deliver education, schools are regular in working days, and remedial instructions are provided. The dearth in the provision of basic amenities sways parents into thinking that sending their child to school is inconsequential. This leads to high dropout rates, which became a major issue and a

foundation of major policy that was the Right to Education Act 2009. Stakeholders of education, viz; teachers, parents, and policymakers have argued for increased stress on the quality of primary education in India and should be the primary goal while policy formulation. Therefore, the broad theme of this paper is the Quality of Education at the primary school level. The narrowed scope under Quality of Education will be discussed in the Literature Review section.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Towards Quality of Education

Quality of Education does not have a confined definition with definite variables as different researchers have used different parameters. (Bajaj, 2014) discusses the quality of education concerning the theme of infrastructure, the role of teachers, and the implementation of decentralization. Using Annual State of Education Report (ASER) Data of 2011, (Mehra, Bali, & Arora, 2012) constructed the Quality of Education Index using similar parameters as (Bajaj, 2014) did. Quality of Education can also be defined as an outcome of school accountability, the number of working days (Ramachandran, 2014). It can also be measured or rather assessed by effective learning, widening their experience, accepting diversity of culture, taking responsibilities, and inculcating moral values (Aggarwal).

In 1996, the first evidence-based study was conducted in India across Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, and Bihar. The study found that 26% of the schools didn't have a blackboard, 52% of schools didn't have a playground, 59% of schools didn't have any drinking water facility, 89% of schools lacked toilet facility, and 77% of the schools possessed no library (PROBE, 1999). These results were confirmed by another survey conducted by an organization Pratham in 2005. The report highlighted the fact that 34% of the schools didn't have an outlet for drinking water and 42% of the schools didn't have a toilet (ASER, 2006).

The target of universalization of primary education blindsided the implementers to make sure that supply factors are enough to meet high enrolment rates. Even though enrolment rates were increasing little attention was paid to hiring more teachers. This eventually resulted in a high Pupil-Teacher Ratio and an increase in single-teacher primary schools in rural areas. The fiscal constraints faced by the state government forced them to hire teachers on contract rather than permanently, these teachers were called Para-teachers (Mehrotra, 2006). Para teachers were not provided any kind of training and were rarely motivated to put an extra effort to improve a child's learning. Teachers Accountability became another issue faced in the education system. According to Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) bye-laws, there is no such provision of evaluation and feedback mechanism for teachers (CBSE, n.d). The teachers are the kingpin of the education system and any policy has to be implemented by the teachers. If teachers are not fit to do so, the implementation gets haywire.

Concerning learning levels, ASER 2006 found that 47% of students in the fifth standard can read properly. In arithmetic, 55% of students of the fifth standard can do basic addition and subtraction and the percentage drops to 25% among students of the eighth standard. The study also proved that there exist interstate variations across the states. National Achievement Survey of 2011, also founded that learning levels across the states are far from being similar (NCERT, 2011). In 2006, the National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT) using the data of 2002, also tried to evaluate learning levels. The results supplemented the results of ASER, 2006. The average percentage marks of fifth standard students were 50.3% in Science, 46.5% in Maths, and 58.6% in language. Post-2006, various other surveys were undertaken by academicians and the government agencies (NCERT, 2006). (PROBE, 2011) highlighted the issue that 40% of students in formal classroom learning are not able to do simple subtraction.

The above literature depicts that even though the government has been successful in making a quantum jump in the school education sector but the quality of education has been compromised with low learning levels, lack of basic infrastructure, issues related to education delivery. This led to high dropout rates among students. In 2005 the dropout rate was 10% and the retention rate at the primary level was only 73%. The issues discussed above led to the formation of the Right to Education Act'2009 (RTE Act'09). Right to Education Act'2009 was one of the most advanced and innovative policies in the education system. It was framed to focus more on the qualitative aspect of the schooling system rather than quantitative factors.

2.2. Right to Education Act'2009 and No Detention Policy

Right to Education Act was enacted in the year 2009 and was implemented in the year 2010. The law covered a wide range of sections to fill the gap and deficiencies pre-existing in the school education sector. The legislative piece entitled elementary education a legal right to children in the age bracket of six to fourteen years. It lays down the duties of government at the center, state, and local levels. Concerning schools and teachers' responsibilities, it sets minimum qualifications for appointments of teachers and schools recognized under the act. One of the unique features of the act is its decentralized approach by advising the formulation of School Monitoring Committees (SMC) for each school where three-fourth of the member will be parents. One of the unique features of this act is the No Detention Policy (NDP) and Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE). In the following literature, the authors will be discussing the intention behind the implementation of NDP and CCE, and why it was repealed later.

No Detention Policy as mentioned in Section 16 of the act states that "No child admitted in a school shall be held back in any class or expelled from school till the completion of elementary education." Research shows that repeating a grade harms children's social and academic life. Additionally, it does not contribute in enhancing the learning level of the students. Another rationale for implementing NDP was increasing dropout rates. Students

tend to leave school if they fail in a grade because detaining a child for a year means the family has to spend resources for repeating a year. Households belonging to economically and socially backward areas thus prefer to cancel their child's admission. In addition to NDP, the clause of CCE was also designed for elementary education which is recognized throughout the world. The intention behind CCE was to assess a students' learning periodically during an academic year and not just at the end. Collectively, NDP and CCE lead to a better system for increasing learning levels, teachers' accountability as a teacher is now tasked to enhance learning levels and not just passing or failing a child.

Right to Education Act 2009 was seen as one of the most progressive policies for school education in India. However, NDP and CCE remained in controversy. Since its implementation, the psychological approachability of teachers and parents towards the NDP and CCE system was not positive. They did not understand the philosophy behind the system (Centre for Policy Research, 2015). Another reason for the low motivation is the lack of training and mechanisms provided to teachers to implement the CCE system. In the absence of implementation manuals, teachers felt this system was time-consuming and tedious. Parents were never oriented with the new system their child will be studying as a result they did not understand and resisted it from the beginning. According to (KPMG, 2016) even though the RTE Act 2009 has brought significant changes in terms of curriculum and social infrastructure, it has failed to impart quality education. After the implementation of the RTE Act in 2010, learning levels continued to deteriorate as the ASER 2014, reported that only 19% of students studying in the third standard can do simple subtraction and among fifth standard students only 41% can read second standard books.

The cause of the deteriorating quality of education was attributed to NDP and CCE system. According to Central Advisory Board on Education (Government of India, 2013) report most of the state governments in India advised the central government to roll back on NDP and CCE. However, the findings of the report lead to different conclusions. The 2013 results of the tenth-grade examination which was the first batch to face examination after implementation of NDP showed increasing trends in terms of percentage and number of students passed. Another assessment was carried to check the impact of NDP which reflected that states with the NDP system experienced an increasing trend in mathematics and language scores whereas only one-two states with detention policy witnessed increasing trends. The study conducted by (Ahmad, Behara, & Un, 2016) highlights the fact that the impact of NDP on different boards is different in the state of West Bengal. This creates ambiguity over the actual impact of NDP on schools in India because across the nation there is no unique board system being followed in schools. A similar study was conducted in Bihar which concluded that the perspective of both government and private teachers was the same towards the policy.

The rationale behind not revoking the NDP is the lack of evidence-based research. A study by Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy finds that analysis of Unified District Information System of Education (U-DISE) data indicates that it is inadequate to conclude the success or failure of

NDP. Additionally, the data by U-DISE indicates no clear correlation between the implementation of NDP and poor/stagnant learning outcomes. There is literature on assessing the impact of NDP on a smaller scale as mentioned earlier but research highlights that the decision of revoking NDP and CCE should be made only after conducting assessment studies on large scale (Khan & Hussain, 2016). Another reason is that viewing provisions of the RTE Act in isolation will not be the correct way of assessing the policy (Ghosh, 2015) because the fall in learning levels is the product of many factors. Factors such as pedagogical interventions, lack of teacher training, poor implementation of School Monitoring Committees (SMCs) (Thapa, 2012), high Pupil-Teacher Ratio, lack of parents' orientation are not discussed as a cause for the low quality of education.

In 2017, RTE Act was amended to allow teachers a grace period of additional years for attaining the minimum qualification as required for appointment. In 2019 the act was again amended to roll back the provision of NDP and CCE with annual exams to be held at fifth and eighth grade. The decision to repeal NDP and implement the old pass-fail system is a matter of concern. Now there is a threat that the inherent lacunas in the Pass-Fail system which paved the way to the implementation of NDP might emerge again. A reversal in policy without large-scale research is a matter of concern and thus needs introspection. The authors believe that the fall in continuous learning levels was not due to NDP and CCE solely but it was because of failure to implement the provisions of the RTE Act. This leads authors to the decision to conduct a study on whether the implementation of provisions such as basic infrastructure, quality teachers, electrification as prescribed in the Right to Education Act'2009 was significant as compared to Pre-RTE Act'09 levels. Additionally, the paper will also focus on conducting a primary survey among teachers and students to understand and analyze their views on NDP and its impact on learning.

3. Research Methodology

This paper aims to investigate firstly, whether provisions prescribed under RTE Act'09 were implemented or not. This could be done by cross-comparison of pre and post-RTE Act'09. Secondly, the authors aim to investigate students and teachers to understand their views. This will lead to the understanding of whether the decision taken by the government to repeal NDP was justified or not. The research questions that drive this research are suitable to operate on extensive secondary research. Therefore, the paper will be following a secondary research design. To gather and understand the views of students and teachers on the concerned research questions, an exploratory research design shall be adopted where a semi-structured primary survey will be conducted. The primary survey will appropriately capture the attitudes and perceptions of the participants involved in the study, all the while also providing a deeper understanding.

4. Research Questions

The research questions that the paper attempts to answer are:

1. Whether the implementation of provisions such as basic infrastructure, quality teachers, electrification as prescribed in the Right to Education Act'2009 was significant as compared to Pre-RTE Act'09 levels?
2. What are the views of students and teachers towards the recent policy change?

5. Results

5.1. Primary Analysis – Teacher's perspective

To understand teachers' point of view discussion method was adopted for the survey. The survey included open-ended questions as well-fixed questions. The number of teachers interviewed was thirty. The proportion of government and private school teachers is represented unbiasedly. The range of experience of interviewed teachers was 2 to 15 years. The findings from the survey are as follows.

Only a quarter of the teacher respondents think that re-introducing the Pass-Fail system is a solution to issues caused by NDP and the rest of the teachers are either not sure or do not agree. Then, 31% of the teachers are in the view that the Pass-Fail system will help in restoring quality of education, whereas 27% of teachers disagree and a large proportion of teachers are unsure. Almost all of the teachers think that the Pass-Fail system hurts student's social and academic life. When asked if parents should be given the choice to choose between NDP and Pass-Fail system, most of the respondents (73%) disagree with the notion. However, most of the teachers are of the view that NDP was the cause of deteriorating quality of education, citing various reasons such as high Pupil-Teacher Ratio (PTR), overload of management work, unchanged curriculum, to list a few. Apart from the questions asked teachers iterated changes required in the school education such as roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined, PTR should be reduced in private schools, the orientation of parents and students to any policy change should be the priority.

5.2. Primary Analysis – Parents' perspective

To understand parents' point of view discussion method was adopted for the survey. The survey included open-ended questions as well-fixed questions. The number of parents interviewed was thirty. The findings from the survey are as follows.

Most of the parents were in the view that re-introducing the Pass-Fail system is the right step taken by the government. However, most of the parents were not sure whether this step will enhance the learning levels of students and restore the quality of education. Interviewee asked parents if they are aware of the No Detention Policy. Almost all the parents were unaware of the policy verbatim but when explained what it, interviewees saw that parents are familiar with this policy is. Over three-fourth of the parents highlighted that schools should also work in improving some factors such as PTR, basic infrastructure facilities, frequent orientation.

Parents would also like to have a choice if they want their children to study under NDP or Pass-Fail system. There was a mixed response to this question as there were parents who observed that with the implementation of NDP and CCE, their children who were good in extra-curricular activities are supported by school authorities and were no longer burdened with exams. So, they focused on sports and excelled in it throughout their school life. On the other few parents cited that their child was good at studies and scoring in exams, however, he was an introvert and hesitated in participating in activities. As a result, it took students like him/her to adjust to change in school culture.

5.3. Primary Analysis – Student's perspective

The authors surveyed a large number of students (200) to understand and analyze their perspective. The questionnaire contained multiple-choice questions and the discussion method was not adopted. Students belonged to mostly 10th and 11th standard and age bracket of 15-17 years as they have gone through both NDP and Pass-Fail System. The proportion of government and private school students is represented unbiasedly. The findings from the survey are as follows.

42.05% of students think that bringing back Pass-Fail System is a solution to the No Detention Policy. Whereas 31.79% refute the question statement and a quarter of students think that there should be a different solution. Following, almost 59% of the students are in a view that the Pass-Fail system will help in restoring the quality of education in the country. In contrast, 22% are against the notion, the rest are not sure that whether it will help in restoring the quality of education or not. However, 61% of students are concerned that the Pass-Fail system impacts students socially, psychologically, and mentally. Concerning whether NDP and CCE are the cause of low quality of education, more than half of the students in the taken sample are unsure whether NDP is the real cause of falling quality of education. 27% of students think that cause of low quality of education is the CCE system, whereas 20% of students disagree. At last, the surveyor asked if parents should be given the choice to choose between NDP and Pass-Fail system, 70% of the students are in favor of the motion.

5.4. Secondary Analysis

To assess the implementation of some of the provisions of Right to Education'2009 as compared to pre-2010 levels, the authors have used the secondary data from various sources, such as, (NEUPA, 2015), (Ministry of Human Resource and Development), Annual Status of Education Report (ASER,2016), and District Information System of Education (U- DISE). Provisions like, playground, drinking water, quality teacher, low PTR have a certain degree of impact on learning among students as discussed in the Literature Review section. The authors have divided the data variables into three sections; Infrastructure, Teacher related, and Student related.

Concerning the state of infrastructure, there is a significant improvement in the availability of separate toilets for boys and girls since the implementation of the RTE Act 2009. The percentage of schools equipped with drinking water facilities is close to cent percent. However, as of 2016, there is only sixty percent of schools with electricity and twenty-six percent of schools with computers. There is no drastic improvement in implementation progress post-2010. In India, there are still single teacher schools (6.2% in 2016) as compared to 11.2% percent in 2004. Single Teachers Schools are the schools where one teacher teaches to students in different standards. There has been a considerable improvement in terms of reduction in single teacher schools, however, the number is huge and impacts the learning levels of students negatively. An individual who clears a particular exam qualifies to be a teacher. However, she or he has to go through training while in school at different time frames, this can be a time of induction, change in curriculum, use of computers, etc. The data says that the percentage of teachers who receive training at the time of induction, which is supposedly the most crucial one, is falling since 2011. As of 2015, only 15% of the teachers have received In-service training. After the implementation of the RTE Act'09, the number of trained teachers is on a downward trend. The percentage of contract teachers has remained constant throughout both phases in the range of 10-13%. Contract teachers form the part of the staff which are temporary and needs less qualification as compared to permanent teachers. One of the provisions of the RTE Act'09 was that schools should conduct classes for at least 200 days. Since 2010, the percentage of schools failing to achieve the benchmark has reduced to 4.46% as of 2014. Concerning students' related indicators, the Retention Rate which reflects the number of students retained in school irrespective of whether they were promoted to higher standard till primary level or not has increased to close to 85% in 2016 as compared to 74% in 2009. Another evidence of the implementation of the No Detention Policy can be seen in way of falling dropout rates. In 2005 the dropout rates were 10% which reduced to 4.1% in 2015. The RTE Act'09 had set the target to achieve a PTR of 30. However, the target was already achieved in the year of its implementation, as of 2015 ratio is 24:1.

6. Conclusion

In 2009 Right to Education Act was enacted with two deadlines, 2013 and 2015 to provide basic infrastructure and quality teachers respectively. Collected efforts were made by the stakeholders and within five years there was a significant improvement in most of the areas. However, much more still was left to be done. As the deadlines were missed, the government amended the Right to Education Act 2017. The 2017 version, firstly, extended the 2015 deadline to March'2019, and secondly, scrapped the backbone of the 2009 version, which was No Detention Policy. The impact of bringing back the pass-fail system has been discussed in detail in the earlier sections. The amendment was termed unrealistic, mere aspirational by many experts. At this juncture, one needs to observe that after seven years of policy coming into effect, it was repealed without any assessment on its implementation. Instead of proposing an alternative to it, the policymakers bring back the Pass-Fail system, failures of which paved the way for No Detention Policy.

The Rise and Fall of No Detention Policy is an epitome of failure on the side of policymakers in the education system. The authors found that out of 10 indicators analyzed, six parameters were improved significantly since 2010 as compared before 2010 levels. The parameters which deteriorated were mostly related to teachers' quality. The two most important stakeholders, teachers, and students revealed that the re-implementation of the Pass-Fail system is justified, however, its negative effects will arise if changes are not made in curriculum and other parameters. After the primary survey, the authors found that the narrative of Pass-Fail Vs NDP was not the real issue. NDP was somehow made the scapegoat of falling Quality of Education. However, the crux lies somewhere else. It is not a disputed fact that the focal intent of the education system is to enhance the learning level of students. But is it the intent of teachers and students? The only reason students are worried about is passing an exam and teachers are worried about completing the syllabus on time. The intent to learn and enhance learning is missing in schools. If it is an examination pattern, students should be taught the purpose of giving exams, if it is CCE, students should be explained why this system and what is its intent. We are in the ninth year of the RTE Act and still, the number of children eligible for elementary education is not being maintained, UDISE data has inconsistencies, and several schools are running without the recognition. One can infer from the research that the decision taken to implement the amendment was not justified as it is regressive. The 2017 amendment specified no deadline for meeting infrastructure requirements. It didn't bring any new approach to solve the current issues.

The research raises subsequent questions, first, whether the responsibilities of stakeholders viz; parents, teachers, students, and the policymakers are clearly defined, if not, what it should be, and lastly, who is accountable for the deteriorating quality of education? Introspecting these questions will give researchers and policymakers almost all solutions to issues persistent in the education system.

References

1. Aggarwal, Y. (1999). Quality Concerns in Primary Education in India Where is the Problem?
2. Ahmad, D. R., Behara, D., & Un, M. (2016). A Comparative Study of Impact of "No Detention Policy" on Different School Boards in West Bengal.
3. Aiyar, Y. (2015, March 16). Sarokaar - Goal of RTE achieved? (A. Rai, Interviewer)
4. Ambast, S., & Akriti. (2015, August 17). The Wire. Retrieved from The Wire: <https://thewire.in/education/dont-make-the-no-detention-policy-a-scapegoat-for-poor-learning-outcomes>
5. Annual Status of Education Report. (2016). Trends over Time 2006-2014. Delhi: ASER. ASER. (2006). Annual Status of Education Report. Delhi: PRATHAM.
6. Azim Premji Foundation. (2010). Azim Premji Foundation. Retrieved from Azim Premji Foundation: www.azimpremjifoundation.com
7. Bajaj, D. (2014). Quality Before Quantity: The Shortcoming of Primary Education in India. Retrieved from

- https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/18540/Bajaj_oregon_0171N_11123.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1
8. Bajpai, N., & Goyal, S. (2004). Education in India: Quality and Coverage.
 9. CABE. (2016). CABE on assessment of Implementation of CCE and RTE ACT 2009. Delhi: Government of India. CBSE. (n.d.). CBSE Bye-Laws. Delhi: National Information Centre.
 10. CCI. (2001). Competition Commission of India. Retrieved from Competition Commission of India: www.cci.gov.in
 - Chandra, B. (2015). History of Modern India. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.
 11. Comptroller and Auditor General of India. (2016). Report on Comptroller and Auditor General of India on the Implementation of Right to Education Act'2009. Delhi: CAG.
 12. Dhankae, R. (2015, September 03). The Hindu. Retrieved from The Hindu: <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/right-to-education-act-beyond-the-passfail-binary/article7608382.ece>
 13. Indiatat. (2016). Education Data. Retrieved from indiatat.com: <https://www.indiatat.com/education-data/6370/educational-boards/6375/central-board-of-secondary-education-cbse-1991-2018/366463/stats.aspx>
 14. Kingdon, G. G. (2007). The Progress of School Education in India.
 15. Mehra, A., Bali, U., & Arora, N. (n.d.). Quality of Primary Education in India: An Interstate Perspective. Mehrotra, S. (2006). Reforming elementary education in India: A menu of options.
 16. Ministry of Education. (1998). Annual Report 1997-98. Delhi: Ministry of Education.
 17. Ministry of Education. (2014). Ministry of Education. Retrieved from Ministry of Education: www.education.nic.in
 18. Ministry of Human Resource and Development. (n.d.). Elementary Education in India. Delhi: NUEPA. Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2011).
 19. THE RIGHT OF CHILDREN TO FREE AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION ACT, 2009. Retrieved from THE RIGHT OF CHILDREN TO FREE AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION ACT, 2009: http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/RTE_Section_wise_rationale_rev_0.pdf
 20. Namala, A. (2015, March 16). Sarokaar - Goal of RTE achieved? (A. Rai, Interviewer)
 21. NCERT. (2006). All India Education Survey. Delhi: National Council for Education Research and Training. NCERT. (2011). National Achievement Survey. Delhi: NCERT.
 22. NEUPA. (2015). U-DISE 2001. Retrieved from U-DISE: <http://udise.in/flash.htm>
 23. Planning Commission. (2001, December). REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY AND ADULT EDUCATION. Retrieved from REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY AND ADULT EDUCATION: http://planningcommission.gov.in/aboutus/committee/strgrp/stgp_elmedu.pdf

24. PROBE. (1999). Public Report on Basic Education in India. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. PROBE. (2011). Public Report on Basic Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
26. Ramchandaran, V. (2014). Equity and Quality are Two Sides of the Same Coin in India's School Education.
27. RSTV. (2015, May 15). Special Report - Right To Education. Delhi, Delhi, India.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom.
28. Sharma, A., & Bapana, N. (2015). School Education in India: A Handbook.
29. Status of Implementation of Right to Education Act 2009. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.careindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Status%20report18.pdf>
30. Thapa, S. (2012). How functional are School Management Committees in the present context? Tilak, J. B. (2004). Public Subsidies in Education in India. Economics and Political Weekly.
31. Times of India. (2017, August 18). Times of India. Retrieved from Times of India: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/education/news/11-lakh-teachers-to-be-trained-by-march-2019/articleshow/60251054.cms>