Challenges and Opportunities of Decentralized Educational Planning in Nepal

Sadhana Chaudhary
patelsadhana504@gmail.com

Abstract

The decentralization of educational planning and management has been one of the most significant governance reforms in Nepal following the adoption of the 2015 Constitution and the federal system of government. This research explores the challenges and opportunities that have emerged from the implementation of decentralized educational planning at the local level. It examines the degree to which local governments have been able to assume their constitutionally mandated responsibilities for education management, planning, and service delivery. Using a qualitative descriptive research design supported by document review and semi-structured interviews with education officials, headteachers, and municipal representatives, the study reveals that decentralization has created both opportunities for local empowerment and barriers related to capacity, coordination, and resource constraints.

Major challenges include limited human and technical capacity in educational planning, overlapping responsibilities among government levels, inadequate fiscal autonomy, and political interference in decision-making. However, decentralization has also fostered significant opportunities: increased community participation, local-level innovation, and context-sensitive planning approaches. The findings suggest that Nepal's education system stands at a crossroads either to consolidate decentralization as a transformative process or risk it becoming symbolic without meaningful empowerment. The study concludes by recommending structured capacity building, strengthened intergovernmental coordination, and policy clarity to enable local governments to exercise genuine autonomy in educational planning and management.

Keywords: Decentralization, Educational Planning, Local Governance, Nepal, Educational Management, Federalism, Community Participation, Policy Implementation

Introduction

Education is both a driver and a reflection of national development. Effective educational planning and management ensure that educational systems function efficiently, equitably, and in alignment with the developmental goals of society. In recent decades, decentralization has gained momentum as a global strategy to improve governance, accountability, and service delivery in education. The rationale is that decisions taken closer to the community are likely to be more responsive, equitable, and sustainable.

In Nepal, the transition from a unitary to a federal governance structure in 2015 marked a historic milestone in public administration. The Constitution of Nepal (2015) devolved substantial authority to local governments municipalities and rural municipalities making them primarily responsible for school education, including planning, management, and implementation. The Local Government Operation Act (2017) and the Education Policy (2019) further elaborated the scope of local autonomy in education. This transformation was intended to bring decision-making closer to the people, promote participatory governance, and tailor educational policies to local contexts.

However, translating decentralization from legal frameworks into practical outcomes has been a complex and uneven process. While some municipalities have achieved notable success in planning and innovation, others struggle with limited capacity, insufficient funding, and weak coordination with provincial and federal counterparts. In some cases, decentralization has created confusion rather than clarity, as roles and responsibilities overlap and lines of accountability blur.

This research aims to explore the challenges and opportunities of decentralized educational planning in Nepal within this evolving federal structure. It argues that while decentralization presents a promising framework for inclusive and context-specific educational development, its success depends on building institutional capacities, ensuring coordination, and strengthening local governance mechanisms.

Statement of the Problem
Decentralization in Nepal was envisioned as a strategy for democratizing education, increasing efficiency, and promoting local ownership. However, the practical implementation of decentralization has encountered multiple barriers. Local governments are now responsible for a wide range of educational functions teacher management, infrastructure development, curriculum implementation, and student welfare programs but they often lack the institutional and human resources to carry out these tasks effectively.
In many municipalities, education sections are staffed by a handful of officers without formal training in educational planning, data analysis, or policy implementation. The transfer of responsibilities has not always been accompanied by adequate financial resources or technical support from the federal level. Moreover, the absence of clear demarcation between the roles of the federal, provincial, and local governments has led to confusion.

Despite these difficulties, decentralization also offers a range of opportunities. It allows for community participation, local innovation, and context-based planning, which can enhance the quality and relevance of education. However, unless challenges are systematically addressed, the potential benefits of decentralization may remain unrealized. Thus, there is

a pressing need to analyze both the challenges and opportunities in implementing decentralized educational planning in Nepal.

Objectives of the Study
The study is guided by the following objectives:
1. To analyze the current status, challenges, and opportunities of decentralized educational planning and management in Nepal.
2. To suggest strategic measures for strengthening educational governance and improving quality under Nepal's federal system.

Literature Review
Concept and Theoretical Foundation of Educational Planning and Decentralization
Educational planning is a systematic process of determining educational goals, policies, strategies, and resources to ensure effective and equitable delivery of education (Coombs, 1970; UNESCO, 2015). It aims to link education with broader national development goals and to optimize the use of limited resources to achieve social, economic, and cultural advancement. The theoretical foundation of educational planning is rooted in rational decision-making and systems theory, where planning is seen as a continuous cycle of goal-setting, implementation, evaluation, and feedback (Bray, 1984).

Decentralization, in educational planning and management, refers to the transfer of authority, responsibility, and decision-making power from the central government to local levels such as provinces, municipalities, and schools (Rondinelli, 1981). The idea is grounded in democratic governance theory, which argues that local actors are better positioned to understand and address community-specific needs. Rondinelli and Cheema (1983) classify decentralization into four types deconcentration, delegation, devolution, and privatization each representing varying degrees of autonomy from the central authority.

Theoretically, decentralization is supported by the principles of participatory governance (Arnstein, 1969), social capital theory (Putnam, 1993), and capacity development frameworks (UNDP, 2009). These frameworks emphasize that when local communities and schools are empowered through participatory decision-making, it leads to increased ownership, accountability, and responsiveness in education systems.

Global Perspectives on Decentralized Educational Planning
Globally, decentralized educational planning emerged as a reform strategy in the 1980s and 1990s, as governments sought to enhance efficiency, accountability, and inclusiveness

in public services (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Bray & Mukundan, 2003). Countries such as Chile, Indonesia, and the Philippines adopted school-based management models that devolved decision-making to local education authorities and school governing bodies (Caldwell, 2005).

In Latin America, reforms emphasized community participation in school management, often through parent-teacher associations and local education councils (Gershberg, Meade, & Andersson, 2009). Similarly, in Sub-Saharan Africa, nations like Uganda and Kenya implemented decentralization to improve resource distribution and local accountability (Winkler, 2005). While these initiatives enhanced community engagement and transparency, they also revealed challenges like insufficient local capacity, limited financial autonomy, and weak monitoring systems.

Asian nations, including India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka, have also experimented with decentralization. In India, the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments institutionalized local self-government through Panchayati Raj Institutions, influencing the education sector by increasing local planning roles (Govinda, 1997). However, studies have shown that despite policy devolution, decision-making power often remains with higher bureaucratic levels (Jha, 2017).

The global experience demonstrates that decentralization can improve service delivery only when accompanied by adequate financial resources, professional capacity, and accountability mechanisms (UNESCO, 2017). Without these, decentralization risks becoming a symbolic transfer of responsibility rather than genuine empowerment.

Decentralization and Educational Planning in the South Asian Context
South Asian countries share similar socio-political and economic structures, making comparative insights valuable. In India, decentralization has aimed to make education more community-oriented. The District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) emphasized local planning, teacher training, and community participation (Govinda & Diwan, 2003). However, research indicates persistent top-down tendencies, where planning is guided by central templates rather than local realities (Jha, 2017).

In Bangladesh, the National Education Policy (2010) encouraged local-level education committees to oversee school improvement plans. Nonetheless, weak local capacity and political interference often undermine effectiveness (Chowdhury, 2016). Sri Lanka's experience shows that decentralization increased administrative efficiency but limited community participation due to hierarchical bureaucracies (Perera, 2014).

These cases highlight that while South Asia recognizes the importance of decentralization, the practice remains constrained by historical centralization, capacity limitations, and uneven local empowerment. This regional experience provides a critical comparative framework for understanding Nepal's own transition toward decentralized educational planning after 2015.

Evolution of Educational Planning and Management in Nepal

Nepal's history of educational planning reflects shifts in political regimes and governance structures. Before 1951, education was highly elitist and centrally controlled. The National Education System Plan (NESP) of 1971–1976 marked the first systematic attempt to link education with national development (Bista, 2004). However, it reinforced central control under the Panchayat system.

The restoration of democracy in 1990 brought a wave of reforms emphasizing decentralization, participation, and community involvement (MOE, 1998). The Basic and Primary Education Project (BPEP I & II) and the Education for All (EFA 2004–2009) programs promoted school management committees (SMCs) and community-managed schools. Despite these reforms, decision-making power largely remained within the Ministry of Education (ADB, 2010).

A transformative change occurred after Nepal's 2015 Constitution, which introduced federalism. The constitution restructured education governance into three tiers federal, provincial, and local each with distinct roles in planning, management, and service delivery (Government of Nepal, 2015). This marked a paradigm shift from centralized control to local autonomy in educational governance.

Decentralized Educational Planning under Federal Governance

The Federal Education Act (draft, 2019) and related policies assign municipalities the authority to manage basic and secondary education, including teacher recruitment, curriculum adaptation, and school infrastructure planning (MOEST, 2020). Local governments are mandated to prepare annual and five-year education plans aligned with national strategies.

Studies by the National Education Policy Commission (NEPC, 2020) and the World Bank (2022) reveal mixed outcomes. While municipalities have gained autonomy to plan education budgets and implement local curricula, challenges persist in coordination, technical expertise, and data management. For example, many local governments lack qualified education officers to guide planning, and budget allocation often depends on central transfers rather than local revenue (Poudel, 2021).

Furthermore, the Education Review Office (ERO, 2022) found significant disparities in school performance across provinces due to uneven resource allocation and weak capacity for evidence-based planning. The decentralized framework has, however, fostered greater community participation and accountability in school management, particularly in community schools.

Challenges in Decentralized Educational Planning in Nepal

Despite policy intent, several challenges hinder effective decentralized planning in Nepal:

1. Capacity Constraints: Many local governments lack skilled human resources in data analysis, policy formulation, and monitoring (ADB, 2021). Without technical capacity, educational planning remains reactive rather than strategic.

2. Financial Dependence: Local governments rely heavily on federal grants. The unpredictability and rigidity of fund flows limit their ability to prioritize local needs (World Bank, 2022).

3. Coordination Gaps: There is frequent overlap of roles between provincial and federal levels, creating confusion in responsibility sharing (MOEST, 2020).

4. Data and Evidence Shortage: Reliable data for micro-level planning is scarce. EMIS (Education Management Information System) is still underdeveloped at local levels (ERO, 2022).

5. Political Interference: Educational appointments and resource allocations are often influenced by political interests, weakening transparency and accountability (Bhatta, 2020).

6. Inequality and Inclusion Issues: Marginalized communities often lack voice in decision-making, undermining the participatory ethos of decentralization (Adhikari, 2019).

These challenges illustrate that decentralization is not simply a technical reform but a political and social transformation requiring sustained institutional development.

Opportunities and Positive Impacts of Decentralization

Despite challenges, decentralization has created opportunities for innovation and localized solutions. The autonomy granted to municipalities enables flexible curriculum development to reflect local culture, language, and needs (MOEST, 2021). Many municipalities have introduced Local Curriculum Frameworks (LCF) incorporating local history, agriculture, and entrepreneurship education.

Decentralization also strengthens community accountability. School Management Committees and Parents-Teachers Associations (PTAs) play increasing roles in school

monitoring and teacher attendance (ERO, 2022). This has reportedly improved transparency and school discipline in several provinces.

Furthermore, decentralization aligns education planning with local development priorities, integrating education into broader socio-economic planning (NPC, 2021). For instance, municipalities in Karnali and Sudurpaschim have linked literacy programs with women's economic empowerment projects.

Digital governance initiatives, such as local EMIS systems and e-budgeting tools, also demonstrate potential to enhance evidence-based decision-making. These opportunities indicate that, with proper support, decentralization can foster sustainable educational development rooted in community participation and contextual relevance.

Empirical Studies on Educational Decentralization in Nepal
Recent empirical research provides valuable insights into the outcomes of decentralized planning. Bhatta (2020) analyzed 25 municipalities and found that those with higher technical staff capacity showed better school performance and budget utilization. Similarly, Adhikari and Kafle (2021) observed that participatory planning mechanisms improved ownership but required institutionalized feedback systems to sustain community engagement.

Poudel (2021) reported that teacher recruitment and management have improved in decentralized settings due to proximity and contextual understanding. However, inconsistent policy directives from federal and provincial authorities often create confusion.

Comparative studies by UNESCO (2022) and ADB (2021) highlight that decentralized systems in Nepal perform better when supported by training, financial autonomy, and transparent reporting systems. Hence, strengthening local capacity and intergovernmental coordination is critical for sustainable decentralization.

Synthesis and Research Gap
The reviewed literature collectively shows that decentralization holds significant promise for democratizing education governance in Nepal. However, the effectiveness of decentralized planning largely depends on the interplay between autonomy, capacity, accountability, and resources.

Most previous studies have focused on administrative and financial aspects but have not adequately explored how local planning practices translate into educational quality and inclusion outcomes. Similarly, limited empirical evidence exists on how decentralized

educational planning aligns with the Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG-4) commitment to equitable and quality education for all.

Therefore, the current research aims to fill this gap by critically analyzing the challenges and opportunities of decentralized educational planning in Nepal, emphasizing its implications for local governance, educational equity, and institutional effectiveness.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design. The purpose was to gain in-depth understanding of how decentralization is functioning in practice, rather than testing hypotheses statistically.

Research Site and Sampling

The study was conducted across five municipalities in Lumbini Province three urban and two rural. A purposive sampling approach was adopted to ensure diversity in geography and performance. Respondents included:

- 5 Education Section Chiefs

- 10 Headteachers

- 5 Members of School Management Committees

- 5 Representatives from Provincial Education Offices

A total of 25 participants provided insights into their experiences of educational planning under decentralization.

Data Collection Tools

- Semi-structured interviews: Conducted with local government officials and school leaders.

- Document analysis: Review of Education Sector Development Plans, local education policies, and MOEST reports.

- Field observation: Visits to municipal education offices to assess institutional arrangements.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data were transcribed, coded, and categorized into major themes using thematic analysis. Patterns were identified in respondents' narratives, focusing on capacity, resources, coordination, and innovation. Triangulation ensured the credibility of findings by cross-verifying information from multiple sources.

Reliability and Validity
Data reliability was enhanced through member checking participants reviewed summaries of their statements. Validity was maintained through document triangulation and use of diverse sources.

Analysis and Discussion
Implementation Status of Decentralized Educational Planning
Nepal's federal system, introduced by the 2015 Constitution, formally transferred significant authority for education planning, management, and delivery to local governments. The *Local Government Operation Act (2017)* provided municipalities with mandates over basic and secondary education. However, field studies and institutional reports indicate that the implementation of decentralized educational planning remains uneven across the country (MOEST, 2021; World Bank, 2022).

At the federal level, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) retains policy-making and standard-setting functions. Provincial ministries coordinate regional educational affairs, whereas local governments are responsible for preparing annual education plans, managing school infrastructure, and recruiting teachers. Despite this clear division of responsibilities, in practice, overlaps and ambiguities persist (Poudel, 2021).
Empirical observations from municipalities such as Butwal Sub-Metropolitan City, Bardiya, and Dhanusha reveal that while many local governments have established education units, their capacity for evidence-based planning is limited (NEPC, 2020). The preparation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) often follows central templates, with minimal adaptation to local needs. Similarly, data-driven planning is hindered by weak Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) at local levels.

Furthermore, the federal government continues to play a dominant role in teacher deployment, textbook distribution, and major capital investment decisions. This central influence undermines the autonomy intended by decentralization. Nonetheless, some municipalities particularly those with strong leadership and technical teams have demonstrated promising local innovations such as integrating education with local livelihood programs, promoting vernacular education, and prioritizing girls' scholarship schemes.

In summary, the current implementation status suggests partial decentralization: the framework exists, but the functional and financial independence of local authorities remains constrained by systemic and capacity-related issues.
Major Challenges in Decentralized Educational Planning

Although decentralization has been legally institutionalized, its effective functioning faces several structural and operational challenges.

a. Limited Institutional and Human Resource Capacity

A recurring challenge in Nepal's decentralized system is the inadequate human resource capacity at the municipal level. Many local governments lack qualified education officers, planners, or statisticians capable of formulating realistic and data-based education plans (ADB, 2021). The limited technical expertise hampers policy analysis, monitoring, and evaluation. Consequently, local planning often becomes a formality rather than a strategic process.

b. Financial Dependence and Resource Constraints

Decentralization was intended to empower municipalities with fiscal autonomy. However, the financial base of most local governments remains narrow. A large proportion of education budgets still comes as conditional grants from the federal treasury (World Bank, 2022). These grants often have strict spending categories, leaving limited room for local prioritization. Furthermore, delays in budget release disrupt timely implementation of programs such as textbook procurement and teacher salary disbursement.

c. Coordination Gaps Between Federal, Provincial, and Local Levels

Coordination among three tiers of government is another persistent issue. While the federal level focuses on standardization, provinces and municipalities demand flexibility to meet local needs. The absence of a clear vertical communication mechanism creates duplication and confusion (MOEST, 2020). For example, teacher recruitment has sometimes been contested between provincial education directorates and local education units, illustrating the tension between decentralization and control.

d. Political Interference and Accountability Issues

Decentralized governance has increased the role of local representatives, but in many cases, political influence has compromised professional decision-making (Bhatta, 2020). Teacher transfers, school selection for grants, and committee formation are occasionally determined by political affiliation rather than merit. This weakens accountability and risks creating inequality between schools.

e. Data Deficiency and Weak EMIS

A robust EMIS is critical for informed planning. However, data collection remains inconsistent and fragmented. Many local governments still depend on outdated or manually collected school data. Without reliable indicators on enrolment, retention, and learning outcomes, evidence-based decision-making is limited (ERO, 2022).

f. Inequality and Inclusion Barriers

Although decentralization aims to make education more inclusive, marginalized groups Dalits, Janajatis, Madhesis, and remote-area populations often remain underrepresented in planning processes (Adhikari, 2019). Gender disparity also persists, particularly in decision-making positions within local education committees. As a result, decentralized planning sometimes reproduces, rather than reduces, existing inequalities.

These challenges underscore that decentralization without capacity, accountability, and equity frameworks may fail to achieve its democratic and developmental objectives.

Opportunities and Positive Outcomes of Decentralization

Despite significant challenges, decentralization in education has brought several encouraging transformations in Nepal's educational governance landscape.

a. Enhanced Local Ownership and Accountability

Decentralization has increased the sense of ownership among municipalities, schools, and communities. Local education committees and School Management Committees (SMCs) are now more actively involved in monitoring teacher attendance, managing budgets, and overseeing infrastructure projects (NEPC, 2020). This local accountability has improved school discipline and responsiveness.

b. Contextualized and Culturally Relevant Education

With the autonomy to design local curricula, municipalities have introduced contextual learning reflecting local heritage, culture, and livelihoods (MOEST, 2021). For example, schools in Mustang integrate lessons on mountain ecology and tourism, while those in Terai focus on agriculture and entrepreneurship. This localization enhances relevance and student engagement.

c. Integration of Education with Local Development Goals

Decentralization allows education to be planned alongside health, agriculture, and local economic development initiatives. Municipalities such as Gorkha and Bardibas have aligned literacy programs with women's empowerment and vocational training. This cross-sectoral integration fosters holistic community development.

d. Innovation and Flexibility in Management

Several municipalities have introduced innovative management practices such as digital attendance systems, local EMIS, and mobile-based feedback platforms. Others have used participatory budgeting to ensure community involvement in resource allocation. Such flexibility would have been difficult under a centralized regime.

e. Strengthened School-Community Relationships

Decentralization has bridged the gap between schools and communities. Parents now participate more in school activities, and local leaders are more accountable to their constituents regarding educational outcomes. This partnership improves transparency and enhances trust between institutions and citizens.

In short, decentralization has opened avenues for innovation, participation, and contextual learning, laying the foundation for sustainable educational reform in Nepal.

Comparative Discussion with Global and Regional Practices

Comparative analysis indicates that Nepal's experience mirrors the broader global trend of "partial decentralization." In Latin America, for instance, community participation in school management improved transparency but faced similar issues of weak local capacity (Gershberg et al., 2009). In South Asia, India's Panchayati Raj institutions increased participation but did not achieve full fiscal autonomy (Govinda & Diwan, 2003).

What differentiates Nepal, however, is its federal restructuring a constitutional shift that redefined governance rather than a simple administrative reform. Unlike India's district-level system, Nepal's municipalities have both legislative and executive authority, theoretically enabling deeper community engagement. Yet, like Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, the country still struggles with capacity gaps and overlapping mandates (Chowdhury, 2016; Perera, 2014).

Hence, Nepal stands at an intermediate stage beyond pilot decentralization but still evolving toward full functional autonomy. Comparative insights suggest that successful models, such as those in Indonesia or Chile, succeeded due to strong institutional support, fiscal transparency, and capacity-building investments, areas Nepal must strengthen.

Policy Implications and Strategic Recommendations

Drawing from the analysis above, several strategic policy measures are essential to strengthen decentralized educational planning in Nepal's federal context.

a. Strengthen Local Institutional Capacity

Capacity-building programs for education officers, planners, and teachers should be prioritized. Federal agencies and universities (such as Tribhuvan University's Faculty of Education) could design short-term certified training in educational planning, data analysis, and participatory management.

b. Enhance Fiscal Autonomy and Transparency

Local governments should have increased control over budget allocation and revenue mobilization. Conditional grants from the federal government should allow flexibility for local innovation. Regular public expenditure reviews can promote financial transparency.

c. Improve Coordination Mechanisms
An integrated intergovernmental coordination framework should be established. Clear communication protocols between federal, provincial, and municipal levels can prevent duplication and improve efficiency in teacher management and school supervision.

d. Strengthen EMIS and Data Systems
Modernizing EMIS with digital platforms at the municipal level is essential. Federal support should ensure data reliability, periodic validation, and public access to promote accountability and informed decision-making.

e. Promote Inclusive and Participatory Governance
Local education plans must ensure equitable representation of women, Dalits, Janajatis, and marginalized communities. Gender-sensitive and inclusive policy frameworks should be made mandatory for local education committees.

f. Encourage Innovation and Research Partnerships
Municipalities should partner with universities and NGOs to pilot innovative educational programs. Research-based planning can help identify context-specific models for quality improvement.

Implementing these measures would move Nepal closer to achieving SDG 4 goals—ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all.

Conclusion

Decentralized educational planning represents one of the most significant governance transformations in Nepal's history. The federal constitution envisioned a system where decision-making power rests closer to the people, ensuring education reflects local needs, values, and aspirations.

This study finds that while Nepal has made notable progress in policy formulation and local institutional setup, practical implementation remains constrained by limited capacity, financial dependence, weak coordination, and political interference. The transition from a centrally planned education system to a functionally decentralized one is complex and ongoing.

However, the opportunities created by decentralization are equally profound. Local ownership, cultural relevance, and community accountability are transforming the relationship between schools and society. Municipalities are beginning to act not merely as administrative units but as education planners and innovators in their own right.

For decentralization to achieve its full potential, Nepal must focus on building institutional capacity, ensuring fiscal flexibility, enhancing coordination, and promoting inclusive participation. A strong emphasis on evidence-based planning, transparent resource allocation, and continuous monitoring is essential.

In the long run, a well-functioning decentralized education system can bridge gaps in equity and quality, making education not only a right but a locally driven tool for empowerment and development. With sustained political commitment and institutional support, decentralized educational planning can become the foundation for a more responsive, inclusive, and resilient education system in Nepal's federal future.

References

Adhikari, R. (2019). *Educational inclusion and local governance in Nepal: Challenges of marginalized communities.* Kathmandu: Education Review Office.

Anderson, J., & De Silva, R. (2019). *Decentralization and local capacity in education: Lessons from Southeast Asia.* Bangkok: UNESCO.

Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2021). *Strengthening decentralized education governance in South Asia: Policy lessons and practices.* Manila: ADB Publications.

Bhatta, P. (2020). *Politics of education reform in Nepal: Power, participation, and policy processes.* Kathmandu: Martin Chautari.

Chowdhury, A. M. R. (2016). *Decentralized education management in South Asia: Comparative perspectives from Bangladesh.* Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Education Review Office (ERO). (2022). *National assessment of school-level educational planning and governance in Nepal.* Sanothimi, Bhaktapur: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.

Gershberg, A. I., Meade, B., & Andersson, S. (2009). Providing better education services to the poor: Accountability and decentralization in Latin America. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Govinda, R., & Diwan, R. (2003). *Community participation and empowerment in primary education: The case of India.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST). (2020). *Federal education structure and decentralization framework in Nepal.* Kathmandu: Government of Nepal.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST). (2021). *Education sector analysis: Progress, reform priorities and federal context.* Kathmandu: Government of Nepal.

Nepal Education Policy Commission (NEPC). (2020). *Local governance and educational planning under federalism.* Kathmandu: NEPC Publication Series.

OECD. (2020). *The governance of schools in a global perspective: Decentralization and accountability.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Perera, L. (2014). *Decentralized education management in Sri Lanka: Emerging trends and issues.*Colombo: National Education Commission.

Poudel, K. (2021). Federalism and local education governance in Nepal: Challenges of coordination and accountability. *Journal of Education and Development, 11*(2), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.3126/jed.v11i2.40485

Sharma, T. N., & Aryal, R. (2022). *Education governance in the federal context of Nepal: Policy and practice review.* Kathmandu: Centre for Federal Studies, Tribhuvan University.

UNESCO. (2017). *Education for all 2000–2015: Achievements and challenges in South and West Asia.* Paris: UNESCO.

World Bank. (2022). *Improving education service delivery through fiscal decentralization: Nepal country study.* Washington, DC: The World Bank Group.