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## ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AICTE</td>
<td>All India Council of Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDMI</td>
<td>All India Disaster Mitigation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAI</td>
<td>Builders Association of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCI</td>
<td>Bar Council of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCH</td>
<td>Central Council of Homeopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIM</td>
<td>Central Council of Indian Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENDEP</td>
<td>Centre for Disaster and Emergency Practice (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTI</td>
<td>Central Emergency Relief Training Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Construction Federation of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI</td>
<td>Council of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>Calamity Relief Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>Dental Council of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Distance Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoPT</td>
<td>Department of Personnel and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Environmental Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIDM</td>
<td>Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Gram Panchayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Educational Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>High Power Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEM</td>
<td>International Association of Emergency Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Incident Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAR</td>
<td>Indian Council for Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Incident Command Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Information, education and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIT</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Indian National Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Organisation for Standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTCDM</td>
<td>Jamsedji Tata Centre for Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBNAA</td>
<td>Lal Bahadur National Academy of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>Medical Council of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAC</td>
<td>National Assessment and Accreditation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABCB</td>
<td>National Accreditation Board for Certification Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBA</td>
<td>National Board of Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABET</td>
<td>National Accreditation Board for Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Cadet Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRI</td>
<td>National Council for Rural Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>National Council for Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDMA</td>
<td>National Disaster Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRF</td>
<td>National Disaster Response Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICMAR</td>
<td>National Institute of Construction, Management and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDM</td>
<td>National Institute of Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMS</td>
<td>National Incident Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIT</td>
<td>National Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NITTTR</td>
<td>National Institutes for Technical Teachers’ Training and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>National Service Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP</td>
<td>National Training Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYKS</td>
<td>Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Pharmacy Council of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>Panchayati Raj Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMS</td>
<td>Quality Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Council of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Search and rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHE</td>
<td>State Councils of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRF</td>
<td>State Disaster Response Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERP</td>
<td>Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self-help Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Trainer Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISS</td>
<td>Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Training and Learning Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC</td>
<td>University Grant Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Study

This study on accreditation process, quality management and certification process of short term disaster management trainings has been carried out as part of the larger initiative on preparing a long-term training and capacity building strategy for disaster risk mitigation under the National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project. It forms part of a three-stage process that will look at accreditation and certification of disaster management trainings; accreditation and quality aspects of disaster management research and education; and accreditation of graduate and undergraduate courses in disaster management.

The study is based on a range of research activities including national and international literature review and interviews with key informants at the national level, as well as the six states covered by the study namely Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Odisha, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. It also covers over ten case studies drawn from national and international best practices.

The approach taken is cognisant of the fact that virtually no accreditation system for disaster management trainings currently exists in the country as of now and that any proposed system would need to be built from scratch. In this light, the study looks at various options. Conclusions and recommendations are made in light of the fact that an iterative approach is needed in a system of such complexity in order to develop a comprehensive accreditation system. Options presented need to be viewed in this perspective. Additionally, any training strategy in the field of disaster management is made more complex due to the multidisciplinary nature of the field and the resultant cross-sectoral engagement that is required. The study takes this into account, presenting options that carry different levels of trade-offs. These can be considered in making informed decisions towards establishing a contextualised accreditation and certification regime for disaster management training in India.

Findings

The study identifies the following critical issues that are faced in terms of the quality, accreditation and certification of short-term disaster management training courses in India.

1. The number of institutions and programmes imparting DM training are very few as compared to the need in India. These operate in an almost total absence of a quality assurance system.
2. Institutions mostly impart certificates of participation or course completion. No evidence of certificates pertaining to quality of training or trainees is found across the country.
3. Certification of DM trainings is ad-hoc in general. Certificates are mostly issued by the institutions conducting the courses as per their own system and criteria.
4. There is no system of accreditation; neither of institutions nor courses nor trainers for DM training.
   a. In order to establish an elaborate system of accreditation, it is important to plan for following challenges: The field of disaster management is intrinsically multi sectoral, and the number of sectors that have a direct involvement is very large.
b. There are pre-existing training, education and capacity building programmes institutionalized in each sector, and they have their own certification bodies.

c. Some of the sectoral capacity building and certification/licensing programmes are backed with appropriate legislation related to the sector and its capacity building institutions.

d. It is particularly challenging to capture quality and to build in quality assurance elements in very short-term training programmes due to lack of opportunity to impart and test capacity gain, these being more like orientation or sensitisation programmes.

e. Control and adherence to quality assurance systems in short-term training programmes is relatively easier in the government system and in training programmes of government agencies than academic and non-government systems.

f. Accreditation and certification of volunteers undergoing short-term training can pose the risk of the trainers and training/accreditation bodies being held accountable for adverse outcomes and damages caused by subsequent actions of trained persons. Therefore, conditions of certification must be specified while assuring the quality of short-term training.

g. State and local context specific issues make national standardization of curriculum difficult for short-term training of persons related to operations. A multi-level standardization approach can be evolved for this through the state institutions identified for the implementation.

h. Training institutions are themselves very short of capacity in terms of trainers, facilities and curriculum, and will find it difficult to meet high standards suddenly. In such cases, external support can be facilitated to introduce quality and accreditation as well as to promote participation of training institutions.

i. There are no existing national accreditation agencies that can take on the role of accrediting DM courses since these courses address a mix of technical and social dimensions of disasters. At the same time it is not advisable to split DM training courses across various sectoral accreditation agencies as it will dilute the element of consistency.

Recommendations

Considering the Indian context of disaster management training courses and their quality, accreditation and certification aspects and drawing lessons from national and international best practices, the following five options emerge for establishing a context specific and suitable accreditation system for India:

1. An Independent Council for Disaster Management Education and Certification
2. A Council established Under NDMA/ Ministry of Home Affairs
3. A Council established under the Ministry of Human Resource Development
4. NIDM as an Accreditation Body for Disaster Management Courses
5. Accreditation through linkages established with National/International Systems

The first option is seen as the most effective one given its autonomous status and alignment with the line ministries and departments. Representation of concerned line ministries in the council or alternate mechanism is seen as an essential element to address the cross-cutting, multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature of disaster management training programmes in the country.

Appropriate accreditation processes will also need to be established, based on the recognised steps of application, self assessment, criteria based assessment, time based accreditation, reassessment and reaccreditation. For disaster management trainings though, the set of criteria for assessment will need to be much more broad based than any other such programmes due to the multi-sectoral nature of the subject.

In accordance, the certification regime has to be developed and tuned to the accreditation system for the purpose of quality assurance. It musts also be tuned to the national training framework for the purpose of ensuring flexibility and outreach across different levels, hazards, geo-climatic regions, administrative regions and sectoral areas of intervention.

The overall system of quality assurance through accreditation and certification in short-term disaster management training programmes will also need to be mapped and aligned with the strategic framework for implementation of training.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Study and the Strategy to Develop Accreditation Methods

Introduction to the Study

In order to improve the quality of DM training in the country a need to develop accreditation methods for DM training courses was felt. It is also necessary to ensure quality of DM training since it is envisaged that the proposed training policy would be linked to promotions and incentives of various stakeholders at various institutes. Through the process of accreditation a qualitative improvement of institutions, courses and trainers in envisaged and it is felt that the process would result in development of efficient disaster management professionals in the country.

Definition of Short-term Trainings

A study of DM courses in the country has revealed that the courses vary in duration from one day courses to courses running for a year or more. For the purpose of this study all courses of upto six weeks duration are classified as short-term trainings. Certificates are usually awarded at the end of such short-term trainings but they may or may not be awarded at the end of all courses, as is discussed in this report.

Strategy to Develop Accreditation Methods, Quality Management and Awarding Certificates

As per Activity A.3 of the project, preparation of a strategy to develop accreditation methods, quality management methods / tools for maintaining a standard of all trainings being imparted by any institution or organisation and criteria for awarding certificates was taken up towards the preparation of this report. The strategy flows from a national accreditation system down to state and sub-state levels, taking a multi-tiered approach.

In the context of an overarching Capacity Development Framework, the objective of the study is to strategize and suggest DM training models; with a focus on quality, the accreditation process, research and education initiatives, strengthening of organizations and institutions and further strategizing of public awareness initiatives. In order to evolve a proper accreditation system various national and international training courses have been analysed and learning from these courses has been documented.

The strategy is provided in this report and along with it various options have been developed for the national institutionalisation of accreditation in the field of disaster management trainings. It is proposed that the approach be one of an independent system of accreditation following good practices from other sectors, yet having its unique constitution keeping in view the multi-sectoral nature of the subject.

The same system will apply to the accreditation and quality management of research and education in disaster management, and will be illustrated further in the upcoming deliverables on these subjects.

Sub Activity A3.1 of the study dealt with quality and accreditation of DM training and the certification process and covered the following six steps:

1. Establishing standards for accreditation and certification: derived from the study and covered in Section 5.2.1

2. Establishing national and state level bodies for accreditation and certification: arrived at as part of the recommendations and covered in Section 6.2.1 under the proposed national council and its supporting institutional structure.
3. Study of international accreditation and certification practices: carried out under good practice case study exercise including national and international cases, covered in the report under Section 3 and discussed in Section 3.14.
4. Setting up criteria for certification: developed as part of the implementation strategy and covered in Section 5.2.4.
5. Setting up benchmarks for maintaining standards of training courses: developed as part of the implementation strategy and covered in Section 5.2.5.
6. Setting up schedules for upgrading courses and review of accreditation systems and certification modalities: developed as part of the implementation strategy and covered in Section 5.2.6.

1.2 Evolution of DM Training in India

The training of officers and people responsible for dealing with an emergency situation is one of the most crucial requirements for effective disaster management. This need was identified as early as 1957, when the first Disaster Management Training Institution was established in Nagpur. It was named the Central Emergency Relief Training Institute [CERTI] with an aim to support emergency relief by the Government of India. As a central institute, it provided advanced and specialised training for relief and response managers to natural and man-made disasters (http://ncdcnagpur.nic.in/). Over the years, the changes in the nature of the institute also reflected the changes experienced in the disaster management trainings in India. The institute was renamed the National Civil Defence College in 1968 following the Civil Defence Act enacted in the same year. The Civil Defence Act was a consequence of conflicts observed during 1962 due to Chinese incursion and 1965 due to Indo-Pak conflict, which required the protection of life and property from any war emergency. In 1978, the losses caused by the Andhra Cyclone again brought back the focus and responsibility on training for disaster response and relief officers (ibid). These broad changes in the overall context of disaster management are also observed in other parts of the world such as the United Kingdom, the United States of America and New Zealand. After the era of civil defence and ad-hoc response to disasters, the 1990s United Nations Decade for Disaster Risk Reduction emphasised the need for integrated emergency management for different types and levels of response. This has been taken up by different countries with some variations.

A major shift in disaster management trainings came with the Disaster Management Act, 2005. This act pointed towards a holistic response to disasters and hence a shift from relief-oriented response to comprehensive disaster management. This included disaster mitigation, preparedness, emergency response, relief and recovery. The National Disaster Management Authority [NDMA] henceforth was established as a nodal agency responsible for policy and capacity building for disaster management. The NDMA has also set up a structure for national disaster management, which gives an overview of linkages between different organisations working for disaster response.

The structure identifies a range of training, education and research institutions as key stakeholders for disaster management, with feedback exchanged between multiple organisations. A few of these which are critical include academic and technical institutions, scientific organisations, professional bodies, corporate companies and NGOs; which often vary significantly in terms of their focus, standard and areas of interests. The structure doesn’t specifically address the standardisation and accreditation of disaster management training and programmes. However, it can be suggested that a standardisation and
accreditation at the national level may lead to a clear decision-making and enhance the quality of training and education at the local level.

Among various organisations mentioned in this structure, the nodal agency for the DM training is that of National Institute of Disaster Management [NIDM]. The institute is responsible for human resource development, capacity building, training, research, documentation and policy advocacy for disaster management to help build a disaster resilient India. The institute’s mandate lays down the approach of designing its programmes in consultation with central ministries, state governments and other stakeholders (http://nidm.gov.in/). In practice, however, the capacity constraints and inadequate mechanisms of this coordination lead to most of the programme design processes being managed by NIDM itself, with overall support but little technical inputs from line ministries. An example of such a gap was identified during the field study wherein it is brought forth that building safety in schools was taken as a separate issue needing attention of the public works department due to the lack of the awareness that maintenance of school buildings is the responsibility of the Department of Education through their own engineering team. Maintenance of the buildings is a key element of ensuring their safety over time, and many of these buildings are very old and in vulnerable condition. Unless the engineering staff of the education department is trained on safety features in maintenance, repairs and retrofitting, the element of safety in building maintenance will be entirely missed. This aspect is currently not part of the school safety training modules being used by various agencies across the country.

NIDM functions within the broad policies and guidelines laid down by NDMA. It assists in developing training modules, imparting training to trainers and DM officials and strengthening Administrative Training Institutes (ATIs) in the state. The institute hosts a variety of training programmes, workshops, conferences and self learning programmes relating to disaster management. The institute also facilitates e-Learning programmes on Disaster Risk Management in partnership with the World Bank (GFDRR), Washington. These courses facilitate professional guidance for distant learning whereby materials are sent through CDs or accessed through the online platform. Similar to regular classroom teaching, these courses generate discussion, queries, clarifications, assignments and end-of-course projects which are evaluated by the professional facilitators. For local people, the institute has also started e-learning self study programmes in collaboration with C-DAC. These programmes are free of cost. The institute also holds regular conferences and national platforms on disaster management, hence playing an active role in disseminating information. The duration of the course varies from a few days up to six weeks. With an average of 78 workshops per year, the institute trained 7,811 people between 2009-2013. NIDM and the World Bank (GFDRR) jointly provide certificates to the successful candidates. Anyone interested in professional learning can register for these programmes for a nominal fee of 1000 to 1500 rupees for a basic or specialised course.

Apart from NIDM, Administrative Training Institutes [ATIs] at the state level are also responsible for the training of professionals and administrative personnel from central ministries, department and state governments in DM. ATIs are also involved with making action plan with NIDM and other technical institutions. Besides ATIs, there are also agencies responsible for creating required number of trained professionals, such as the National Institutes of Technical Teachers’ Training and Research (NITTTR); the National Institute of Construction Management and Research (NICMAR); the Construction Federation of India (CFI); the Builders Association of India (BAI), and other national bodies. The state governments are responsible for Training of the Trainers to impart knowledge related to different hazards in collaboration with Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), National Institutes of Technology (NITs) and other research organisations.
The DM Act 2005 mandated the constitution of the National Disaster Response Force (NDRF) for specialised response. NDRF also holds the responsibility of basic training of personnel of the State Disaster Response Force (SDRF), Police, Civil Defence, Home Guards and other stakeholders in disaster response.

1.3 The Breadth of Institutions and Training Programmes

Apart from NIDM, there are numerous other organisations that provide training at the international, national and local scale. Some of the prominent ones are listed below.

Table: Organisations Providing Training for Disaster Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>World Bank Institute (through NIDM)</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Research Institution</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asia Disaster Preparedness Centre</td>
<td>Research &amp; training institute</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SAARC Disaster Management Centre</td>
<td>Research &amp; training institute</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) / Indian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Asia Regional, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM)</td>
<td>Educational Institute</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Centre for Civil Defence College, Nagpur</td>
<td>Training Institution</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>National Institute of Rural Development, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad</td>
<td>Education &amp; training Institute</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Public Administration</td>
<td>Administrative &amp; research Institute</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indian Institute for Human Settlement (IIHS)</td>
<td>Educational Institute</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RedR India</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PRAXIS, Institute for Participatory Practices</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SEEDS - GOLFRE</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Centre of Disaster Management, HCMRIPA, JLN Marg, Jaipur</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institution</td>
<td>Rajasthan, Haryana, Punjab, Jammu &amp; Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Delhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institute Name</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>State/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Disaster Management Institute, Bhopal</td>
<td>Training Institution</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dr. MCR HRD Institute of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institution</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and Andaman &amp; Nicobar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yashwantrao Chavan Academy of Development Administration (YASHADA), Pune</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institution</td>
<td>Maharashtra, Goa, Dadar &amp; Nagar Haveli, Daman &amp; Diu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sri Krishna Institute of Public Administration, Ranchi</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institution</td>
<td>Jharkhand, Bihar, West Bengal and Odisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Assam Administrative Staff College, Guwahati</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institution</td>
<td>Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland, Sikkim and Arunachal Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Centre for Disaster Management and Studies, Pune</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institute Name</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>State/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Civil Defence Emergency Relief Training Institute, Hyderabad</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute, Mysore</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Assam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Directorate of Training, UTCS</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Central Civil Defence Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sardar Patel Institute of Public Administration</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Haryana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Haryana Institute of Public Administration, Gurgaon</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Haryana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh Institute of Public Administration</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Central Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>J &amp; K Institute of Management and Rural Development</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Home Guards and Civil Defence Academy</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Karnataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Institute Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Institute of Management in Government, Trivandrum</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Kerala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>RCVP Noronha Academy of Administration, Bhopal</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Civil Defence Staff College</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Centre for Disaster Management and Studies, Pune</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute, Aizwal</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Mizoram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute, Kohima</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Nagaland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Gopa Bandhu Academy of Administration, Bhubaneshwar</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Public Administration, Chandigarh</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Sikkim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Anna Institute of Management</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Combined Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Tripura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Institute of Public Administration and Rural Development</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Tripura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Central Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>UP Academy of Administration and Management, Lucknow</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Uttarakhand Academy of Administration, Nainital</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Central Civil Defence and Home Guards Training Institute</td>
<td>Training Institute</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute, Kolkata</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institute</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The task of accreditation of DM programmes is huge. NIDM should ideally not be the body for accreditation. It has a specific and huge agenda of research and training in itself and should stay focused on that. We need an independent body that is responsible for accreditation. It should also ensure the contextualization that will be needed for trainings at state level.”

: Disaster Management Trainer at State Administrative Training Institute

### Overview of Institutions and their respective approaches and views:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NIDM         | ▪ Master trainers are an important component of the training system to ensure cascading effect of training.  
▪ Impact of the training should be felt at the community level.  
▪ Training systems at state level need to be strengthened to ensure adequate support at district and sub-district levels.  
▪ NIDM provides certification for training programmes conducted by it, often jointly with the supporting ministry, department or agency. In collaboration with the World Bank it also jointly provides certificates to the successful candidates of online courses. The certification has some elements of quality assessment by the course coordinators. There is however no standard benchmarks or credit based rating systems for quality check of performance. |
| LBSNAA       | ▪ The role of a professional, humane and people-centric civil service remains central to the development strategy of the country.  
▪ Quality management in accreditation needs to be developed. |
| AICTE        | ▪ Courses need to provide trainees with adequate practical orientation to enable them to respond effectively to situations and to help develop relevant skills.  
▪ Constant review and updating of courses in keeping with technological developments is required. |
| MCI          | ▪ Trainings should help in upgrading of skills in keeping with developments in the sector.  
▪ Quality assurance also requires regulatory measures and ensuring that proliferation of institutions in the absence of appropriately qualified faculty in adequate numbers does not have detrimental effects. |
| DoPT         | ▪ The approach of the national training policy should be adhered and impact generated through replication and scaling.  
▪ Organised frameworks, approach of master trainers and resource persons, and implementation through national network of training institutions working through systematic approach will create the desired impact.  
▪ There is a need to create a good fit between organization and expectation of stakeholders. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **NDMA** | ▪ Proper capacity development is the key to effective response.  
▪ Community based approaches are required for improving national capacity on disaster management.  
▪ NDMA guidelines provide direction in various sectors for such capacity building measures. |
| **SIDM** | ▪ Adequacy of resources is a major issue with most training organizations. Though financial resources have grown, the institutional and human resource capacity is limiting.  
▪ Cooperative and collaborative approach linking various institutions and also international agencies is a viable approach. |
| **ATIs** | ▪ Resources for training are limited in terms of faculty and material.  
▪ Documentation is weak and therefore adequate content that is context specific is not readily available.  
▪ Certification approach is adopted wherein the quality criteria is not very prominent, and completion of courses is the primary factor. |
| **State Institutions: SIRDs** | ▪ Organised content and adequate resource persons for delivery of lectures are not available, and the institutions have to depend on external resources that makes course structures often ad-hoc.  
▪ Internal capacities need to be strengthened.  
▪ Accreditation and quality mechanisms need to be strengthened. |
| **TISS, Amity, KGMC, SPA,** | ▪ Centers for disaster management have been set up in academic institutions but they do not play a significant role in training and development of professionals.  
▪ DM training is part of continuing medical education process, but is in the form of short exposures with no accreditation mechanisms. The institutions and their courses both need to be accredited. The institution needs to be accredited for its facilities, faculty and systems and courses for content. |
| **Civil Society: RedR, Sphere India** | ▪ There is no consistency in DM training.  
▪ Agencies have their own content and approaches.  
▪ Certification of participation is awarded, with very basic grading approaches in some cases. No quality certification is done.  
▪ RedR has internationally established a credit sharing system with Oxford Brookes University, and the approach can be useful for India too. |
| **Corporate sector institutions – CII, FICCI, PHDCC** | ▪ There is a need for larger number of disaster management professionals in the country, and the corporate sector has taken initiatives for offering voluntary resources through initiatives such as a resource network.  
▪ There is no significant component of capacity building of training, and there is no approach of accreditation.  
▪ Various bodies have set up committees on disaster management and they can be instrumental in taking the agenda forward. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hudco – HSMI | - HSMI organizes short term training programmes on issues of settlement planning and development, including urban settlements.  
- There were disaster management courses in the past but the number is now reduced.  
- Initiatives such as housing portal etc. are being taken up and can incorporate disaster management aspects.  
- Trainings lead to certification issued by HSMI with co-branding of sponsoring ministries or institutions. There is no accreditation system followed. |
| IIPA | - IIPA organizes both short term trainings and programs for a longer duration like the Advanced Professional Programme in Public Administration (APPPA). There is no continuity between the short term courses and the longer term professional programs.  
- Certificates of participation and course completion are awarded based on self assessments and assessments by course coordinators. There is however no system of accreditation being followed. |
| CENDEP, OBU | - There is a need for more tie ups between civil society and academia, and OBU has taken the first step in a partnership programme with RedR.  
- The development and emergency practice approach is one that links risk reduction with development.  
- Accreditation is followed as per university system for degree courses but not for short term trainings. |

Key Areas of Learning

The study has looked at the good practice case studies as well as the institutes covered through interviews and field visits to draw lessons on four key areas of enquiry, discussed below.

**Institutional setup and programme details:** It is observed that institutional arrangements that are unique to types of institutions studied drive the nature of programmes and there is no standardisation across the range of training programmes studied. Most of the quality observations are based on the faculty concerned – their quality, numbers and their ongoing research and projects that keep them updated. Curricular content is usually ad-hoc and driven by faculty and resource persons. In training programmes there are usually no student bodies involved, and the administrative systems of the parent organization determine the operational structure. Institutional facilities, networks, financial status and future planning are dependent on larger institutional approaches, and there is little process input provided from the course structure and operation for this.

**Certification:** Certification is ad-hoc, with some organisations giving certification based on quality of performance in the trainings, some having no element of examination of quality of performance, and some providing no certification. Except for a few international case studies, there is no evidence of upward linkages, credit systems, or cross linkages in credit accrual. The one international case that illustrates such a system is of Oxford Brookes University, UK, where there is a credit system for short term trainings, including trainings carried out outside the university in partnership with the international training NGO Red-R, and wherein the credits earned in the trainings can be used for offsetting courses in post graduate degree programmes at the university.
Accreditation: Accreditation systems vary across the institutions studied, with short term training in non-educational institutions largely being without accreditation. Universities have umbrella accreditations from their respective core sectors, and these by default apply to the disaster management courses and trainings.

Quality Management: While there is evidence of quality assurance through the accreditation of host universities and educational systems as discussed above, there is no such system in institutions providing short term trainings outside the university system. Even in the university system, the quality assurance is for the institution and does not translate into the course as the DM courses themselves have not been assessed as part of the accreditation process and have no quality assurance mechanisms in the entire process.

Merits and Demerits, and Lessons for Way Forward
Various merits and demerits of the training provided by these institutions suggest adopting an integrated approach to incorporate lessons learnt from different institutions. While the involvement of the World Bank for NIDM trainings facilitates a global platform at the national level, such initiatives with other international institutions including universities and research centres can be adopted at the state or district level trainings. Most of the trainings provided by various institutions including NIDM is one time training programme and do not necessarily demand from participants for their subsequent trainings or drills. In this context, one of the best practices from LBSNAA can be promoted which requires the participation of the trainees in drills and disaster response to keep the certificate valid for every two years. Regular training and drills of participation may also enhance communication and networking of volunteers, professionals and local people who take on these trainings. An increased interaction of different stakeholders for disaster response can further enhance resilience at different levels.

1.4 Current Limitations and Concerns in Quality Accreditation and Certification
Training has been seen as an essential and central activity of the overall capacity development programme, and therefore, a range of stakeholders are engaged in providing training for DM. These institutes vary from local to international significance. They include educational and administrative training institutes to national and international NGOs. While the number is still small considering the size and need of the country, their distribution in different states at least ensures availability of training institutes in various parts of India. However, their reach still varies widely. Many programmes are open to all, but access becomes limited due a variety of reasons including inadequate qualification or infrastructural support. Interviews conducted with different state administrations brought forth unrealistic prerequisites of an educational background for the training of masons. This severely limited participation in the programme as most adopt this profession through tradition and are illiterate.

Such issues that were clearly highlighted in interviews with state administrations require particular attention while planning for the quality and accreditation of disaster management trainings in India. These are classified in the following subheadings:

Spatio-temporal gaps in trainings: Despite the availability of a three-tier structure, DM trainings are found to be missing in many districts. Officers from the same state mentioned contrasting situations wherein one had regular disaster management training and the other
had not come across one. An Additional District Magistrate from Gujarat mentioned that he has not been exposed to any disaster management training anytime during his 23-year service career. DM training is required by all officials of different departments in both rural and urban areas and hence it is important to bring DM training in forefront of every programme. In Gujarat, it was noted that there is a need to have Block Level Project Officers since it is not feasible for the District Project Officer to attend all work at the grass root level.

**Inadequate human resources:** Human resources-related issues that were frequently recorded include inadequate manpower at the district and sub-district administration level; the lack of adequate training of administration for major crises; and inefficient utilisation of trained manpower. A District Revenue Officer [DRO] from Andhra Pradesh mentioned that “it is ironic that nodal district officials have not received any specific training on disaster preparedness and emergency management. They are overloaded due to handling of multiple profiles at a time”. In such cases, even the availability of training may not help. In Bihar, which has a very extensive programme on DM by UNDP, an officer mentioned that only a certain group of people are trained and know how to tackle disaster-like situations. There are limitations on resources for training and DM faculty needs to be strengthened. Similar observations about institutions having limited manpower and no interest in expanding were also made by officers in Odisha.

**Inadequate infrastructure:** Lack of training infrastructure is noted as a major challenge, especially managing resources before DM trainings. In Andhra Pradesh, the officers mentioned that the administration struggles for the required boats, of which there are only one or two in the risk prone locations at the moment. Also, the number of institutions which provide trainings are very few. This means that in some cases, where there is infrastructure, inadequate training makes it useless. In Odisha, cyclone shelters are not properly used for this reason.

**Funding:** Funding situations varied from state to state. In Andhra Pradesh, it was noted that there was no dedicated funding for disaster preparedness training and the conduct of mock drills. NGOs have small funds which they use at times for training. In Bihar, however, it was mentioned that 5% of Calamity Relief Fund (CRF) funds and 5% of SDRF funds are committed to be used for disaster preparedness training and capacity building. Similarly, training funds are not a problem in Odisha.

**Training Gaps:** Officers also noted that trainings should be based on need. In Odisha, it is felt that government staff involved in DRR activities are not adequately trained. The officers mentioned that the problem with the NIDM training is that it is too theoretical. Another officer from Bihar who attended administrative training in Hyderabad also found that training was too theoretical and that inclusion of practical aspects would have been useful. In Gujarat, officers mentioned the lack of coordination among different stakeholders involved in training and capacity building. In response, the Inter Agency Group in Gujarat has initiated a process of coordination among different institutions involved in community development. According to the NGO Unnati in Ahmedabad, “Agar aaj ke date mai dehka jaye to Gujarat mai Preparedness/ DRR par kum karya ho raha hai , jo ki bada GAP hai” (There is little training on preparedness/DRR in Gujarat today which is a huge gap). Training on compliance issues is another essential gap, especially since non-compliance with norms is a big issue during disasters.

Training programmes should also bridge the gender gap. Across states, a number of other trainings where DM is taught on an intermittent basis hold scope to become regular DM training courses. These include training for women’s empowerment, Self Help Groups (SHGs), Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty (SERP) and others.
Training modules: Training modules not only differ according to the topic, but also depend on the organisation facilitating the program. The Panchayati Raj Institution in Bihar mentioned that the department has developed its own modules on DM training and ToT guidebooks which is unique in itself. Red Cross is involved in first aid training and Fire Services in search and rescue (SAR) training. UNDP trainings are found to be more useful at the ground level. According to the Kutch Mahila Nav-Nirman Abhiyan (KMNA) from Bhuj, “there is a need to train the community with specially designed training modules which are user-friendly and should be developed in consultation with community so that their needs and comprehension levels are duly taken into account”. Further, any information, education and communication (IEC) material should be distributed in local languages to the community.

Training frequency and duration: There is no regular training frequency and schedule for DM across spaces. In Bihar, the PRI department conducts periodic trainings on DM as per their calendar. In Gujarat, the Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management (GIDM) organises 30 training programmes every year. Since 2004, it has conducted 250 trainings that have reached out to over 7,000 personnel. According to the Deputy Director (Training), Institute of Health and Family Welfare, Odisha, trainings were frequently conducted after the Super Cyclone; but over the years, the process has lost its vigour and the number of training programmes has declined.

In Gujarat, the training programme for Civil Defence and Home guards, as well as other volunteers, was noted as being conducted over a 12-day period. Most of these trainings at the local level in other places, however, vary from 2-3 days. This is found to be very basic and not substantial. On the other hand, there is a demand to reduce the duration of training programmes for engineers/architects due to their non-availability for such long periods.

Training of stakeholders: Most of the current DM training programmes have trained senior government officials, current staff, volunteers, engineers, architects and masons. There is a need to identify and enlist varied stakeholders and impart DM trainings. Some of the key stakeholders that emerged during interviews included women, media, school children, teachers, specialists such as IT professionals who can run control rooms and prepare plans, as well as those who are called upon when the need arises like policemen or para-military forces.

Accreditation: The interviews with state administration clearly brought out the fact that, at present, there is no system of providing accreditation to trainees for DM. As most of the programmes are held for very short periods, only a certification of participation can be given. In the view of faculty, accreditation can be given only if there is some system of long-term training programmes and certification is in place. In Bihar, it was observed that even certificates were avoided due to legal issues.

1.5 Strengths of the Training System

Current DM training systems in India have certain strengths which can be retained and capitalised upon in the process of upgrading DM training systems. These are as under:

Legal Framework and Policy

- A comprehensive legal framework which mandates training and capacity building from national to local level.
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- A national policy regime that promotes training and capacity building: this is embodied in national level policies including National Training Policy 2012 and National Policy on Disaster Management 2009

- State level policies with emphasis on investment in training and capacity building as in the states of Gujarat, Odisha and Bihar.

Institutional Infrastructure

- An extensive institutional Infrastructure for training from national to district level: NIDM at national level; SIDMs/ DM cells of State ATIs at state level; training centres of various sectors and departments like Rural Development (SIRDs, RIRDs and DIRDs), Education (DIET), Health (NIHFW, SIHFW and its allied institutes at lower levels), ULBs and PRIs (AIILSG) etc: most of these training institutions across sectors and levels have linkages with the disaster management domain in the sense that they address disaster management concerns in their training.

Good Practices and the Related Learning

- GOI-UNDP DRM 1 and DRM 2 Programmes (West Bengal, Gujarat, Odisha, Uttarakhand, Bihar etc.) and GOI-UNDP Disaster Risk Reduction Programme across the country (2009-2012) have laid a good base for effective DM and DRR in the country. Despite the fact that the results are not so visible on ground (as indicated by this study), general awareness amongst the government functionaries and NGOs about the need for community based disaster management in the country is indicative of the constructive role that these and other similar initiatives have played in creating this kind of awareness.

- NDRF has adopted a good model of training programmes; it not only trains different stakeholders, but simultaneously develops Master Trainers among them so that future training programmes including refresher training programmes may be organised in-house by such organisations obviating the need to depute trainees again and again to NDRF. The functioning of this model has yielded significant learning about institutionalisation of training capacity within government systems.

Availability of Funds under Different Programmes

Availability of Funding for Disaster Management has increased manifold over the past decade with multiple initiatives already underway e.g.

a. To build the capacities of the state governments’ functionaries and its dispersal to grass root level, GOI has provided support for training and capacity building in DM through dedicated faculty and support to the DM Cells in State Administrative Training Institutes/Colleges and other Institutes. Dedicated funding of Rs. 525 crore has been provided to State Governments which will inter alia include it also.

b. A dedicated fund to the tune of US$ 6717 million has been earmarked for the States under State Disaster Response fund. 10% of this SDRF can be utilised for training and capacity building activities.

c. To build the capacity of the community, a national scheme on revamping of Civil Defence System is being implemented across the country at a cost of US$ 20
Million. Civil Defence Volunteers are representatives from the community and are being involved at the local level in disaster management initiatives.

d. There is an added emphasis to provide training to officials of Local Authorities. NDMA/IGNOU project on training and capacity building of ULBs and PRIs with a cost of 2.18 cr. An initiative in 54 districts of 11 states that has just concluded in 2012 is the most recent targeted initiative for the ULBs and PRIs.

e. Another program on Capacity Development for Local governance (2008-12) has been launched by UNDP and Ministry of Panchayati Raj with an initial budget allocation of US$ 5.9 lakh.

f. A National School Safety Programme has been launched by GOI as pilot project in 22 states across the country covering 8800 schools.

The lessons drawn from these programmes have been carried forward to draw recommendations for accreditation and the strategy for implementation, discussed in Sections 5 and 6.
2. NATIONAL TRAINING POLICY AND ACCREDITATION SYSTEM

One important question that emerges for the standardisation of training is whether these institutes follow any rules of training? If yes, who provides these guidelines? For example, the department of Personnel and Training is the nodal agency for the training of civil servants. The policy was first formulated in 1996 and then revised in 2012 with the consultation of all departments and ministries. It gives general directions for training of three tier government employees. However, it doesn’t mention trainings beyond general capacity building or disaster management in particular.

2.1 DoPT: National Training Policy, 2012

The National Training Policy [NTP] was formulated in 1996 by the Department of Personnel and Training [DoPT]. Following the liberalisation of the economy and the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments which took effect in 1993, the policy was adapted to the new environment. It was adopted by various ministries and departments in 2012. It recognises the three tiers of government including Panchayati Raj and Urban Local Bodies as critical for the development of rural and urban areas and for delivery of many essential services to the citizens. While the policy discusses overall training issues, it also suggests some areas of capacity building. This includes, among others, conflict management in rural and urban environment and governance which touch disaster management only on its periphery. The policy does identify the need and significance of training human resources, but it doesn’t make any comment on accreditation of training in general or disaster management in particular. However, it comments that the training plan of each Ministry/Department/Organisation needs to address the gap between existing and required competencies and provide such opportunities to employees.

The policy also draws the conceptual framework of competencies. It finds that the fundamental principal of a competency framework is that each job should be performed by a person who has required competencies for that work. The policy identifies key components of competencies which include knowledge, skills and behaviours. (This can be noted as a suggestion to extend the accreditation process to also review behaviours, apart from skills and knowledge.) It mentions that objective of the training is to develop a professional, impartial and efficient civil services that is responsive to the need of citizens. For this, care must be taken to include and empower vulnerable groups including the elderly, marginalized communities by development design and people with disabilities. As vulnerability is a key prompter of disasters, considering this aspect in DM training is essential.

The policy also adopts the proposal made by the Sixth Central Pay Commission for major incentives such as 30% training allowance, rent free accommodation and so on for Central Training Institutions for Group A officers in recognition of the importance of this function and to attract a wide range of officers. It recommends State Governments to provide similar incentives to the faculty of state training institutions. The policy talks about regular certifications for the trainer, in order to maintain high quality and excellence in competencies, but the same is not mentioned for the trainees. It also asks for a benchmarking or evaluation study of training institutes providing training to officers under the control of Ministry or department to create them as centre for excellence. While quality and review of training is emphasised, accreditation could provide a structure for effective quality management.
2.2 Accreditation and Accreditation Bodies

Accreditation is a process of quality assurance and improvement, whereby a programme in an approved Institution is critically appraised to verify that the Institution or the programme continues to meet and exceed the Norms and Standards prescribed by appointed bodies from time to time. Accreditation does not seek to replace the system of award of certificates or degrees/diplomas by the Universities/autonomous Institutions. Accreditation provides quality assurance that the academic aims and objectives of the Institution are honestly pursued and effectively achieved by the resources currently available and that the Institution has demonstrated capabilities of ensuring effectiveness of the educational programme(s), over the validity period of accreditation.

It is essentially a process of quality assurance and improvement, whereby a programme in an institution is critically appraised and given credit for its academic strength and objectives of the institution.

Through accreditation, the following main purposes may be served:
- Support and advice to institutions in the maintenance and enhancement of their quality of provision
- Confidence and assurance on quality to various stakeholders including students
- Assurance of the good standing of an Institution to government departments and other interested bodies
- Enabling an institution to state publicly that it has voluntarily accepted independent inspection and has satisfied all the requirements for satisfactory operation and maintenance of quality in education.

The purpose and impact of accreditation goes far beyond quality assurance of an Institution/programme. Major impacts of accreditation system are summarised below:
- Encourages quality improvement initiatives by Institutions
- Improves student enrolment both in terms of quality and quantity
- Helps the Institution in securing necessary funds
- Enhances employability of graduates
- Facilitates transnational recognition of degrees and mobility of graduates and professionals
- Motivates faculty to participate actively in academic and related Institutional / departmental activities
- Helps create a sound and challenging academic environment in the Institution
- Contributes to social and economic development of the country by producing high quality technical manpower.

The process of accreditation helps in realising a number of benefits, such as:
- Helps the Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities
- Initiates Institutions into innovative and modern methods of pedagogy
- Gives Institutions a new sense of direction and identity
- Provides society with reliable information on quality of education offered
- Promotes intra and inter-Institutional interactions

Accreditation signifies different things to different stakeholders.

Benefits to Institutions

Accreditation is market-driven and has an international focus. It assesses the characteristics of an Institution and its programmes against a set of criteria established by National Board of Accreditation (NBA).
NBA’s key objective is to contribute to the significant improvement of the Institutions involved in the accreditation process. The accreditation process quantifies the strengths and weaknesses in the processes adopted by the Institution, providing directions and opportunities for future growth.

NBA accredited Institutions may be preferred by funding agencies for releasing grants for research as well as expansion. It signifies that the Institutional performance is based on assessment carried out through an independent competent body of quality assessors, with strengths and weaknesses emanating as a feedback for policy-making.

NBA provides a quality seal or label that differentiates the Institutions from its peers at the national level. This leads to a widespread recognition and greater appreciation of the brand name of Institutions and motivates the Institutions to strive for more.

**Benefits to Students**

Students studying in NBA accredited Institutions can be assured that they will receive education which is a balance between high academic quality and professional relevance and that the needs of the corporate world are well integrated into programmes, activities and processes. It signifies that he has entered the portals of an Institution, which has the essential and desirable features of quality professional education.

**Benefits to Employers**

Accreditation assures prospective employers that students come from a programme where the content and quality have been evaluated, satisfying established standards. It also signifies that the students passing out have acquired competence based on well established technical inputs.

**Benefits to the Public**

Accredited status represents the commitment of the programme and the Institution to quality and continuous improvement. It creates credibility in the minds of the public and generates interest and motivation for pursuing the training programmes.

“Trainings are carried out sometimes, but there is no system or regular interval. It will be useful also if we can get certificates and identity cards for participating in the trainings. That will encourage the local people in a big way.”

: Block Level Official responsible for disaster management among many other responsibilities

**Catalyst for International Accreditations**

Due to accreditation from NBA, the Institution’s systems and procedures get aligned with the Institution’s Mission and Vision. All essential prerequisites for international accreditation are included in the accreditation process of NBA. Therefore, NBA acts as a catalyst for the Institutions planning to acquire International Accreditation.
**Benefits to Industry and Infrastructure Providers**

It signifies identification of quality of Institutional capabilities, skills and knowledge.

**Benefits to Parents**

It signifies that their ward goes through a teaching-learning environment as per accepted good practices.

**Benefits to Alumni**

It reassures alumni that they are products of an institute with a higher standing in terms of learning.

**Benefits to Country**

Accreditation helps in gaining confidence of stakeholders and in giving a strong message that as a country, our technical manpower is of international standards. It can be very useful in enhancing the global mobility for our technical manpower.

Accreditation of educational Institutions/programmes is a global practice and its need has been felt by various developing and developed countries for one or more of the following purposes.

- Funding decisions
- State recognition of qualification/certification of professionals
- Accountability of Institutions to stakeholders
- Encouraging self improvement initiatives by Institutions
- Quality assurance of educational programme

Accreditation may be summarised as a process, based on professional judgment, for evaluating whether or not an educational Institution or programme meets specified standards of educational quality. Its primary purpose is to assure prospective students and public that graduates of an Institution, conducting various programmes, have achieved a minimum level of competence in their chosen fields of study, thus serving as a form of consumer protection. In many countries, accreditation is the legal responsibility of the ministry of education or other governmental agencies.

Apart from DoPT policy, there are a number of accreditation bodies for training organisations. The table below highlights some of the accreditation bodies for training institutions. However, as per the list, none of the organisations is solely responsible for the accreditation of training for Disaster Management, though a few mention hazards or environmental conditions that touch the issue on its periphery.
Table: Organisations Providing Accreditation for Training in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Accreditation Organization</th>
<th>Institutions accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Accreditation Board for Education and Training (NABET)</td>
<td>The institutions covered include: institutions providing vocational training; conducting train the trainer programmes; assessing bodies with provisional accreditation; institutions providing consultation for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Environmental Management Systems (EMS), Food Safety Management System (FSMS), Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP), Hospital &amp; Healthcare, Quality Management Systems (QMS) and Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Council of Rural Institutes (NCRI)</td>
<td>Institutions offering training in micro-planning, agriculture, health, natural resource management, Geographic Information Systems, environmental sustainability, sustainable rural industries, co-operatives and rural enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pharmacy Council Of India (PCI)</td>
<td>Pharmacy training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI)</td>
<td>80 long-term and short-term disability training courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Accreditation Organization</th>
<th>Institutions accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD)</td>
<td>All institutes and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Ministry of Human Resource and Development is responsible for all educational institutes and programmes, it can also be seen as a possible channel to accredit and bring standardisation in DM. The National Accreditation Board for Certification Bodies on the other hand is more actively engaged in quality issues in management systems including environment, food and occupational health and safety. While many of these have indirect relationships to hazards and disasters, there is also a scope for introducing a body specifically for disaster management.

Among various institutions that provide training for DM, the Centre for Disaster Management can be seen as one which has a highly structured approach to training. Against the DoPT suggestion of three-tier training, the institution has developed a four-tier training in order to manage the number of trainees and control the quality. The reason for this is its specific focus on Incident Command Systems (ICS) rather than general disaster management. Other national institutions have more generic approaches as they invite participants from different backgrounds.
2.3 Certification System

Certification is an important part of any education and training. However, since most of the DM training institutions are not accredited, the certificates from these institutions are simply recognition of participation, rather than their quality. These certificates are either issued by the institution itself or in collaboration with national or international bodies. While the certificates can be used to increase participant credentials, this is not a guarantee that the training institutions themselves undertake. In interviews, faculty from institutions agreed that the short-term training of participants does not make participants fully equipped to take on disaster management roles. This is also true internationally, as illustrated in the following section on best practices.

“We issue certificates of our institute, with our name on it. There is no backward accreditation. We are recognized by the NIDM and the State Government as well as Government of India. Everyone knows our institute.”
: Course Coordinator at Disaster Management Centre, State Administrative Training Institute

“Certification is very important in training programmes at community level. Community persons really value certificates as it improves their identity. Yes, you need to ensure quality and standardization, but here the only thing that matters is a certificate with a big logo and your name on it.”
: NGO staff carrying out community capacity building activities at village level

2.4 Emergence of Outcome Oriented Approach

The NBA has evolved a framework of quality assurance. This is a robust process ensuring the highest degree of transparency and credibility - with little scope of discretion and subjectivity. The key elements of the accreditation criteria, parameters, policy and process are discussed below. These directly feed into the recommendations and the implementation strategy discussed in Section 5. The tools to be developed (discussed in Section 5.2.3) will directly be linked to these factors.

Accreditation Criteria

The criteria that are considered by accreditation agencies during the process of accreditation of a programme are determined by the definition of quality of programmes and its relevance to the profession concerned. These criteria may include:

- Institutional Mission, Vision and Programme Educational Objectives
- Programme Outcome
- Programme Curriculum
- Students’ Performance
- Faculty Contributions
- Facilities and Technical Support
- Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process
- Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources
- Continuous Improvement in Attainment of Outcomes

The accreditation of program curriculum and program outcome will address the needs of specific capacities to be built of specific groups of functionaries as mentioned in the Strategic Framework for Implementation of Training.

Accreditation Parameters

The parameters adopted for accreditation of programmes are based on initial capabilities, competence and skills, keeping in mind the outcomes desired by the profession concerned. These parameters are called ‘graduates attributes’ and they vary from discipline to discipline and level to level. Attributes listed below can be taken up for disaster management training.

1. Knowledge: Apply the knowledge of relevant specialisation to the solution of complex disaster management problems.
2. Problem analysis: Identify, formulate, research literature and analyse complex disaster management problems reaching substantiated conclusions using first principles of disaster risk reduction and management.
3. Conduct investigations of problems: Use research-based knowledge and research methods including design of studies, analysis and interpretation of data and synthesis of the information to provide valid conclusions.
4. Modern Tool Usage: Create, select and apply appropriate techniques, resources and disaster management and IT tools including prediction and modelling to complex disaster management activities with an understanding of the limitations.
5. Disaster management and society: Apply reasoning informed by contextual knowledge to assess societal, health, safety, legal and cultural issues and the consequent responsibilities relevant to the professional disaster management practice.
6. Environment and Sustainability: Understand the impact of disaster management solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate knowledge of the need for sustainable development.
7. Ethics: Apply ethical principles and commit to professional ethics and responsibilities and norms of the disaster management practice.
8. Individual and Team Work: Function effectively as an individual, and as a member or leader in diverse teams, as well as in multidisciplinary settings.
9. Communication: Communicate effectively on complex disaster management activities with the disaster management community and with society at large.
10. Project Management and Finance: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the disaster management principles and apply these to one’s own work, as a member and leader in a team, to manage projects and in multidisciplinary environments.
11. Life-long learning: Recognise the need for and have the preparation and ability to engage in independent and life-long learning in the broadest context of technological change.

Accreditation Policy and Process

Accreditation approach will be developed in detail based on the overall strategy, and the basic principles to be followed can be along the following lines:

- Institutions, programmes and faculty can be accredited.
- Assessment and accreditation will be considered only at the written request of the educational institution and after agreeing to abide by the accreditation council’s manual, rules, regulations and notification issued from time to time.

- The institution will have to pay accreditation fees as prescribed from time to time.
- The institution will send Self-Assessment Report in the prescribed format in respect of each programme to be accredited.
- The title of a programme to be accredited shall be the same as shown on the trainee’s certificate and transcript. All routes leading to the completion of the programme will have to satisfy the accreditation criteria.
- The total credits to be earned for the award of the certificate shall be uniformly distributed in the various sessions of the programme to the extent possible.
- Programmes from which at least two batches of students have graduated will be considered for accreditation. However, new programmes could be considered as a special case on merits for provisional accreditation.
- Programmes will be evaluated in accordance with the accreditation criteria given for various categories of the programmes. Accreditation will be based on satisfying the minimum standards. Courses with theoretical and practical considerations will be accredited separately based on criteria for each.
- An onsite visit shall be a part of the accreditation process.

The accreditation process is a multi-layered one with the first tier involving application, examination and self assessment by the applicant institutions; the second tier looking at evaluation and accreditation of institutions; and the third level addressing the follow-up and re-accreditation requirements. The overall process is illustrated in a schematic figure as below.

**Fig.: NBA Accreditation Process Steps**

**The Outcome Based Approach**

The outcome-based model focuses on those who pass the training, and their qualities. Graduate attributes surpass the infrastructure or facilities of any institute and are of utmost importance. At present, the system as used at NBA is geared to assess and accredit programmes only. The accreditation of an institution has not been taken up yet. The need to accredit technical education programmes has grown, especially at a time when we are witnessing unprecedented growth in the number of educational institutions and programmes on offer. The approach can further be developed in due course to aim at accreditation of courses and also trainers.
"We carry out organized training programmes, including a module on disaster management. We, however, do not issue certificates. That will create huge problems of people’s demands and political pressures locally. Our aim is to train and build capacity, not to certify”

: Official supervising PRI trainings at state level
3. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICES

3.1 Trainer Development Programme, Department of Personnel and Training, Government of India

Trainer Development Project (TDP) was launched in 1983 by Department of Personnel & Training, Government of India, with a goal to strengthen the capabilities of Central and State training institutions to train administrators in providing effective public service. It was launched in collaboration with the Overseas Development Administration (a financial wing of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, UK which has been replaced by the Department for International Development since 1999) and managed by the British Council Division, UK. Till the Trainer Development Project was launched in 1983, there was no systematic mechanism to impart trainer skills to the faculty of the various training institutions both at national and state levels. Its goal was to strengthen the capabilities of central and State training institutions to train administrators in providing an effective public service. It was implemented in three phases:

Phase I (1983-1986) of the project concentrated on developing subject specific expertise of the trainer. Training was construed as useful for the individual trainer’s professional development. About 100 trainers from Central and sate training institutes were sponsored to training courses in different training institutions in U K. It was experienced that in this effort institutional benefit was difficult to establish.

In Phase II (1986-1989) emphasis was shifted to development of skills in the training process irrespective of subject areas. A joint review of the GOI and Britain concluded that the Training of Trainers (TOT) effort through the TVU course on DTS has been most successful and trainer training should be taken forward in a third phase, so that the project could develop the capacity of Indian training institutions to deliver quality TOT courses.

Phase III (1992-1995) -Building upon the experiences of the above two phases, the TDP Phase III was launched in 1992, aiming at institutionalizing the training process through a group of trainers selected from National and State level institutions called Regional Training Centres and Link Training Institutions. The aim was to strengthen the 5 Regional Training Centres.

The Trainer Development Programme seeks to supply a pool of specialists in the form of Master Trainers and Recognized Users through Training of Trainer Courses. The National Training Policy also emphasizes that utmost care shall be exercised in selecting trainers and identifying trainer potential

The Trainers are recognized as the heart and soul of the training function. It is essential that they have certain special qualities and there is a system in place to monitor the standards of trainers both in qualitative and quantitative terms. The necessary indigenous capabilities were developed through a provision of Master Trainer and Recognised User to meet the requirement of the country. The Master Trainer among others had the responsibility to further develop Recognised Users who are competent to run the TDP courses.

The choice of the resource persons must be by method and not by accident. Since once a trainer is always a trainer and substantial investments are made in developing the Master Trainer or a Recognized User, it is important that the right person is selected for development as such. It is also important that due recognition, incentive and respect is given to the trainer, so that successful field managers opt for becoming trainers.

http://persmin.gov.in
LESSONS:

- Creation of a cadre of intermediaries in the form of levels of trainers and master trainers is critical for a national training approach.
- Selection of the right persons is a key to the creation of master trainers and resource persons.
- Accreditation systems for such programmes are yet to be fully evolved and established, and international linkages are a potential area for exploration for this purpose.

3.2 Centre for Disaster Management, LBSNAA

The Centre for Disaster Management at Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA) provides training for DM with a particular focus on ICS since August, 2003. The main objectives of the centre include adaptation of the ICS to suit Indian conditions; preparation of operation manuals with integrated ICS principles; training of IAS and Group A central service and in-service officers for DM and ICS; conducting national level training of trainers for ICS; coordinating with regional and state training institutes; and finally, to document films, case studies and teaching materials. It collaborates with the United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Services under the GoI-USAID Disaster Management Support Programme.

ICS is a standardised method of disaster management and yet flexible and adaptable to suit any scale of natural or man-made emergencies. It is mainly based on five-management principles:

1. Command: The command of an incident is headed by an Incident Commander (IC), who can appoint a Deputy Commander and other command staff such as safety officer, information officer or Liaison officer. The IC also appoints various other positions and responsible for positions not implemented.
2. Planning: The Planning Section is responsible for the collection, evaluation, and display of incident information, maintaining status of resources, and preparing the incident action plan and incident-related documentation.
3. Operations: The Operations Section is a key section of ICS responsible for directing the tactical actions to meet incident objectives.
4. Logistics: The Logistics Section is responsible for providing adequate services and support to meet all incidents or event needs.
5. Finance and administration: This section is responsible for keeping track of incident-related costs, personnel and equipment records, and administering procurement contracts associated with the incident or event.

Other important features of the Incident Command Systems include management by objectives, common terminology, unity and chain of command, span of control and organisational flexibility.

The centre has six regional centres for training within the country. These include:

1. Dr. MCR HRD Institute of A.P., Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh [Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and Andaman & Nicobar]
2. YASHADA, Pune, Maharashtra [Maharashtra, Goa, Dadar & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu]
3. Sri Krishna Institute of Public Administration, Ranchi [Jharkhand, Bihar, West Bengal and Odisha]

4. Assam Administrative Staff College, Guwahati, Assam [Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland, Sikkim and Arunachal Pradesh]
5. Disaster Management Institute, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh [Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Uttar Pradesh]
6. HCM RIPA, Jaipur [Rajasthan, Haryana, Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal and Delhi]

It follows the four tier training initiatives from DoPT, for maximum outreach of the training:

**First-tier Training:** Training of 20 core group of trainers at LBSNAA.
**Second-tier Training:** Training of four faculty members from regional centres for training.
**Third-tier Training:** Training of 12 state level master trainers adding up to 350.
**Fourth-tier Training:** Training of the district functionaries and responders by the state level master trainers. Approximately 100 persons may be trained from each state.

State level ICS teams are managed by the state government. Each state hosts two state level Incident Command Teams at all times for immediate response. However, the deployed officer could be from any other state. The State Relief Commissioner maintains the database for the trainees of ICS positions.

The course therefore has 11 need-specific training modules to meet the requirement of 8 positions of the ICS teams:
1. Basic/Intermediate ICS
2. Advanced ICS
3. Area Command
4. Incident Commander
5. Planning Section Chief
6. Operations Section Chief
7. Logistics Section Chief
8. Finance and Administration Section Chief
9. Situation Unit Leader
10. Resource, Demobilization, Documentation Unit Leader
11. Disaster Simulation Exercise

After successfully completing the training course, the officers receive certification for ICS. The only prerequisite is holding a designated rank for the course. This certificate is issued annually. The officers are also required to participate in at least one disaster simulation after their training. If there is no participation in a real life disaster response or simulation exercise in the given three years, the ICS certification can be cancelled.

http://www.lbsnaa.ernet.in/lbsnaa/research/cdm/index.htm

**LESSONS:**
- National networks of institutions and a master network of such networks can be a viable system for cascading training programmes.
- A multi-tiered system of trainers and master trainers will be needed at a national level to bring consistency and scale to the DM training domain.
- Accreditation systems will need to look at institutions as well as courses and trainers / master trainers.
3.3 Training and Learning Circle, AIDMI

The Training and Learning Circle (TLC) is a community of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) practitioners that seeks to strengthen the interface between training and education in DRR. TLC promotes continuous knowledge exchange among training institutions, universities, and DRR organisations across India, Asia and beyond. The overall purpose of TLC is to enhance learning through South-South knowledge and solution exchanges with a focus on addressing systemic gaps and topics in training and education. TLC focuses on supporting and developing Asia’s professional training assets for disaster risk management. The TLC Community of Practice works on system-wide issues relating to DRR training and education in India and beyond.

Joining the TLC India Community of Practice is free and open to all practitioners interested in DRR training and learning.

http://traininglearningcircle.aidmi.org/index.html

LESSONS:
- The Learning Circle approach shifts the focus from teaching to learning; and the application of tools and processes in such an approach can result in a more learning-friendly and outcome-oriented approach.
- The inclusion of civil society and academia in the approach and overall accreditation system can broad-base the overall training agenda for a greater outreach.
3.4 Sevottam

The Sevottam model has been developed with the overarching objective of improving the quality of public service delivery in India. In addition to this overarching objective, there are intermediate outcomes expected from compliance of conditions designed for each of its three components.

The first component of the model requires effective charter implementation; thereby opening up a channel for receiving citizens’ inputs on the way organisations determine service delivery requirements. Citizens’ Charters publicly declare the information on citizens’ entitlements; making citizens better informed and hence empowering them to demand better services.

The second component of the model, ‘Public Grievance Redress’ requires a good grievance redress system operating in a manner that leaves the citizen more satisfied with how the organisation responds to complaints/grievances, irrespective of the final decision.

The third component ‘Excellence in Service Delivery’, postulates that an organisation can have an excellent performance in service delivery only if it is managing the key ingredients for good service delivery well, as well as building its own capacity to continuously improve delivery.

The main part of the model consists of criteria that ascertain how well the organisation is tuned into the requirements of the three components that form the Sevottam model. However, even before the organisation undertakes a systematic assessment it needs to have some basics in place.

**LESSONS:**

- Indigenous systems like Sevottam that have been deployed in a wide range of organisations across diverse sectors to provide insights into developing consistent systems across the national governance structure.
- Compliance based approaches such as Sevottam are anchored in an input-process-output system. This can give clues as to how training programmes can be responsive to context, specific needs and be open to inputs from participants. Accreditation across sectors can take cues from this system.

3.5 Civil Defence Training

The change in context since 1968 led the government to redefine the role of civil defence for disaster management. In 2001, a High Power Committee (HPC) constituted by the Govt. of India recommended the active involvement of Civil Defence in Disaster Management in order to maintain preparedness over time. Accordingly, a committee constituted by MHA and headed by a member of the NDMA Shri K.M. Singh prepared a comprehensive report on the revamping of the Civil Defence in the country transforming it to be a community-based effort run by socially motivated trained volunteers. It led to a major change in the focus of Civil Defence from ‘Town Specific’ to ‘District Specific’ in order to cover all districts of the country in two phases. In the first phase, 241 districts are included. Civil Defence setup is now seen as an important vehicle to train the community for disaster response in the concerned district.

The DG of Civil Defense in the respective state is responsible for planning training modules that include awareness generation, first aid and rescue drills. Efforts of civil Defence are mainly voluntary and are mainly combined with the trainings for home guards. Various youth organisations including National Cadet Corps [NCC], National Service Scheme [NSS] and Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan [NYKS] are also integrated with Civil Defence set-up at the state and district level. At present, 17 states have civil defence training centres. The reason behind having dedicated Civil Defense training is to fulfill the gigantic task of creating civil defense teams in each district. These institutions train employees of CD, volunteers, youth organisations, office bearers of PRIs, urban local bodies and NGOs.

**LESSONS:**
- Training is rooted in the skills being transferred and the deployment objective can be wide or can even transform over time.
- There exists a large base of practitioners with basic skills who can be deployed for disaster management purposes. They will accordingly need to be trained in select skills and accreditation systems will need to account for providing bridges between such linked trainings.

3.6 Federal Emergency Management Agency, USA

**Emergency Management Training:** For these courses, the participants need to meet the basic minimum criteria. Participants are not allowed to take a course more than once. The courses are mainly for US nationals and only limited seats are available for international participants.

**Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Program:** Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, National Park Service, National Centre for Preservation Training and Technology and National Preservation Institute provide a range of programs that FEMA enlists along with resources required.

**Flood Hazard Mapping:** FEMA gives online tutorials for in-depth training on varied aspects of the National Flood Insurance Program and public education through Risk MAP. Softwares as well as the link for their tutorial are also provided and registrations can be made through e-mail.

**Hazus Training:** This course involves training for loss estimation processes including inventory verification and improvement and running a loss analysis. It helps in risk mitigation, planning, response and recovery. Personnel from GIS specialists, geologists, state and local planners, consultants and all those involved in risk assessment benefit from the program.

**National Incident Management System (NIMS):** This training program relates to preparedness, communication and information management, resource management and command and management. It gives details of national incident commands and stakeholder responsibilities and activities for developing, maintaining and sustaining NIMS training.

**Training for Tribal Representatives:** The aim of Emergency Management Institute’s tribal curriculum is to collaborate with tribal governments for capacity building and partnership to ensure continued survival of tribal nations and communities. Different courses address issues from building awareness for basic emergency management principles to governance.

http://www.fema.gov/training
LESSONS:
- While the entry point may be emergency management, a holistic approach including related themes such as environment, historic preservation and indigenous people make the programme more relevant.
- A Federal accreditation system helps bring diverse fields to the same benchmarking level and bring varied programmes to a level of comparative recognition and quality assurance.

3.7 International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM) Certification

“IAEM’s Certified Emergency Manager (CEM) and Associate Emergency Manager (AEM) certifications are not in any manner intended to serve as a warranty, representation, guarantee or promise with respect to the quality of performance of or procedures utilised by certified emergency managers in their work. The certification programme is intended only to establish education, training and experience criteria relevant to emergency management and to certify that the IAEM certified individual has met the established criteria. IAEM specifically disclaims any and all liability for any third party claims, actions, causes of action, judgments, liabilities, monetary losses, or injuries or damages to persons or property arising out of or resulting from the services performed by or any errors or omissions on the part of any IAEM Certified Emergency Manager (CEM) or Associate Emergency Manager (AEM).”
http://www.iaem.com/page.cfm?p=certification/intro

LESSONS:
- Certification in itself serves a purpose and is a necessary tool in order to make training programmes respectable and accountable.
- Certification provides the primary purpose of licensing a participant to practice certain skill-sets. It has its inherent value in this and in the identity value it creates.
- This is a valuable asset for the DM training programmes in India, particularly at the field level.

3.8 ISO and the Case of Australia and New Zealand Risk Management Standard

Another important agency for certification is International Organisation for Standardisation [ISO] based in Geneva, Switzerland. It provides world’s foremost quality standard accepted worldwide. While many of the educational institutions in India have received the certification of ISO 9001-2008, which ensures quality management standard, such certification is not noted for any of the training institutions for disaster management. Apart from the institutional certification for the services, ISO also provides certificates for Risk Management which is called ISO 31000: 2009. It gives principles, frameworks and a process of managing risks that helps organisations perform in an environment full of uncertainty. However, ISO 31000 cannot be used for certification process, though helps in internal and external audit programmes. It also facilitates national and international comparisons for the best practices (http://www.iso.org/iso/home/standards/iso31000.htm).

The Australian and New Zealand Risk Management Standard (AS/NZS 4360: 2004) is a generic guide for managing risks, which can be applied to a range of situations. This standard is different from the ISO 31000: 2009 as it looks into the process of risk management, while
the latter looks into management systems. The standard gives an overview as well as specifies details of main elements of the risk management process. These include (i) Communicate and consult, (ii) Establish the context, (iii) Identify risks, (iv) Analyse risks, (v) Evaluate risks, (vi) Treat risk, (vii) Monitor and review. The process can be applied at different levels including strategic, tactical and operational levels, for different projects or for different areas. For each stage it requires recording of the process in order to understand the process and further improvement.

The standard also suggests methods to establish the effective risk management process in an organisation. It suggests that the organisation should develop risk management policy, plan and support arrangements. It also highlights a few critical steps that suggest after evaluating the existing practices and needs, the risk management planning should aim to develop risk management plans, ensure the support of senior management, develop and communicate the risk management policy, establish accountability and authority, customise the risk management process, and finally, ensure adequate resources.

The joint standard was prepared by the Joint Technical Committee OB-007, Risk Management and approved on the behalf of the Council of Standards Australia and New Zealand in 2004. The technical committee OB-007 included 24 organisations from Australia and New Zealand including Australian Computer Society, Australian Customs Service, Australia New Zealand Institute of Insurance and Finance, CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation), Department of Defence (Australia), Department of Finance and Administration, Emergency Management Australia, Environmental Risk Management Authority (New Zealand), Institute of Chartered Accountants (Australia), Institution of Engineers Australia, Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand, Local Government New Zealand, Massey University (New Zealand), Minerals Council of Australia, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (New Zealand), Ministry of Economic Development (New Zealand), NSW Treasury Managed Fund, New Zealand Society for Risk Management, Risk Management Institution of Australasia, Safety Institute of Australia, Securities Institute of Australia, University of New South Wales, Victorian Work Cover Authority and Water Services Association of Australia.
The standard is recognised as a living document which improves with advances in science, technologies and systems. Hence, it is open for improvement and has been edited a few times. The first AS/NZS was published in 1995, the second in 1999 and the third in 2004. The latest standard puts greater emphasis on embedded risk management practices in an organisation’s culture and processes, management of potential gains and loss, as well as more indicative examples into a new handbook. It also provides specific guidance for its implementation. A range of handbooks have been published to suggest application of risk management processes in a variety of sectors and subject areas.

The objective of the standard is to provide guidance to enable public, private or community enterprises, groups and individuals to achieve:

- A more confident and rigorous basis for decision-making and planning;
- Better identification of opportunities and threats;
- Gaining value from uncertainty and variability;
- Proactive rather than reactive management;
- More effective allocation and use of resources;
- Improved incident management and reduction in loss and the cost of risk, including commercial insurance premiums;
- Improved stakeholder confidence and trust;
- Improved compliance with relevant legislation; and
- Better corporate governance

One best practice of using this standard to ensure the quality of emergency management is found in New Zealand. The most important aspect of this standard is that it is integrated into the national civil defence and emergency management system.

The Civil Defence and Emergency Management [CDEM] Act was adopted in New Zealand in 2002. The act required the local territorial authorities to join and prepare a Regional Civil Defence Group Plan. In order to guide the process, it facilitated the Guide to National Civil Defence and Emergency Management Plan, which provides guidelines for managing different aspects of response including Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery (4Rs). The Guide requires the adoption of the Australian and New Zealand Risk Management Standard (AS/NZS 4360: 2004) in order to determine risks and manage them. The framework is adopted for CDEM planning in order to integrate legislation, policies and services across central government and other sectors to achieve 4Rs (MCDEM, 2009, 4).


**LESSONS:**

- International standards exist and linkages should be found with these instead of developing systems from the start.
- Joint standards have benefits of drawing on the experience and resources that are tested and tried, and also of expanding the outreach and advantages of collaborative action. Joint accreditation will need to be looked at in case of a diverse skill based training regime such as disaster management.
- A project cycle approach allows for inclusion of a range of skill-sets required for overall management, creating trained cadres with wider ranging skills. Accreditation systems should account for this.
3.9 Accreditation policy and procedure of ABET, USA

ABET was founded in 1932 as the Engineers' Council for Professional Development (ECPD), an engineering professional body dedicated to the education, accreditation, regulation and professional development of the engineering professionals and students in the United States. Seven engineering societies founded the organisation and contributed to its original direction and focus. In 1936, ECPD evaluated its first engineering degree programs. Ten years later, the council began evaluating engineering technology degree programs. By 1947, ECPD had accredited 580 undergraduate engineering programs at 133 institutions. Producing guidance and training publications was a large part of ECPD operations.

In 1980, ECPD was renamed the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) to more accurately describe its emphasis on accreditation. In response to the anticipated boom in computer science education, ABET helped establish the Computing Sciences Accreditation Board (now called CSAB) in 1985. CSAB is now one of ABET's largest member societies with more than 300 accredited programs. In 2005, ABET formally changed its name to ABET. It has been recognised by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) since 1997.

Today, ABET is recognised as the worldwide leader in assuring quality and stimulating innovation in applied science, computing, engineering, and engineering technology education. It accredits educational programmes; promotes quality and innovation in education; consults and assists in the development and advancement of education worldwide; and anticipates and prepares for the changing educational environment and the future needs of its constituents.

ABET also accredits internationally, beginning in 1979 when ECPD signed its first Mutual Recognition Agreement with the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board. Currently, ABET accredits over 3,100 applied science, computing, engineering, and engineering technology programs at more than 670 colleges and universities in 24 countries worldwide. Approximately 85,000 students graduate from ABET-accredited programs each year.

ABET's accreditation process works with societies - not individuals - as its members. Currently, ABET has 32 member societies. These are professional and technical organisations that represent applied science, computing, engineering, and engineering technology fields. These member societies join ABET so they can collaborate to review and accredit degree programs in the fields they represent. In addition, these societies recruit and help to train the 2,000 volunteers who carry out ABET's accreditation activities.

ABET's four commissions lead and conduct its accreditation activities. Each one reviews programs related to different sectors of the technical disciplines. The four include: Applied Science Accreditation Commission; Computing Accreditation Commission; Engineering Accreditation Commission and Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission. Each accreditation commission is responsible for the continuous review and enhancement of its particular criteria, policies, and procedures; but all changes to the accreditation criteria and policies require approval by the Board.

Accreditation is based on eight general criteria that have a focus on 'what is learnt' rather than 'what is taught'. These include students; programme educational objectives; student outcomes; continuous improvement; the curriculum; the faculty; facilities; and institutional support. Apart from this, there are programme specific requirements within each area of specialisation.
ABET also establishes a six-year cycle of scheduled general reviews for each institution. This general review applies to all programs accredited by a particular commission. A year in which such a review occurs is called a general review year.

LESSONS:
- Education, accreditation, regulation and professional development need to be seen as linked activities and accreditation should not be dealt with in isolation.
- The credibility of an accreditation system comes from the scale and respect it garners from across societies and networks, not as an isolated system. Such credibility is easy to nurture to international levels if founded on sound principles.
- Accreditation requires continuous review and enhancement of its criteria, policies and procedures. It is not a one time activity.
- ‘What is learnt’ is more important than ‘what is taught’.

3.10 Training course accreditation policy by The Open Group, UK

The Open Group is a global consortium that enables the achievement of business objectives through IT standards. With more than 400 member organisations, it has a diverse membership that spans all sectors of the IT community — customers, systems and solutions suppliers, tool vendors, integrators and consultants, as well as academics and researchers. As part of its aims, The Open Group attempts to operate the industry’s premier certification service. This includes accreditation of The Open Group Architecture Framework (TOGAF) training courses. The accreditation provides an authoritative and independent assurance of the quality and relevance of TOGAF training courses.

For a TOGAF course to be accredited, it is required to meet specific criteria. This includes adequate coverage of the curriculum, with an appropriate mix of lectures, practical work and revision appropriate to the level of the course. Materials (including presentations, candidate handouts, course tutor notes, exercises and case studies) must show relevance to the curriculum and be kept up-to-date of any changes. Tutors must be appropriately qualified, with teaching skills, knowledge and experience of the subject area, familiarity with the curriculum and be up-to-date in line with changes to the curriculum. The training provider must have the capability to offer the proposed training courses in terms of organisation, physical resources, administration, tutors, finance, and marketing. Finally, sufficient guidance must be available to candidates and their employers, before enrolment, on what level of prior knowledge and experience is expected for each course.

The Accreditation Requirements are a precisely defined and documented set of requirements against which courses may be assessed and accredited, including requirements for conformance to the applicable technical and process requirements as interpreted by The Open Group from time to time, and including coverage of the applicable Key Learning Points (KLPs) defined in the Conformance Requirements.

Accreditation is valid for 36 months from the date at which the Certification Authority provides written notice to the Accredited TOGAF Training Course (ATTC) Provider that accreditation has been achieved, unless accreditation is subsequently terminated in accordance with Section 4 or Section 6 of this document. Thereafter, accreditation is valid for successive periods of 36 months. The last day of each period is referred to as the renewal date and represents the date on which the accreditation will cease to be valid, unless the ATTC Provider renews the accreditation in accordance with the procedures defined below.
Prior to the renewal date, the ATTC Provider is required to demonstrate that the ATTC continues to meet all applicable Training Course Accreditation Requirements.

- All training materials associated with the ATTC continue to meet The Open Group Training Course Accreditation Requirements.
- All trainers that deliver or may deliver the ATTC are registered with the Certification Authority.
- All Interpretations that have been granted since the previous accreditation and any new revisions or updates to the Training Course Accreditation Requirements issued more than 90 days prior to the renewal date are reflected in the course.

The Accreditation Package includes the full course documentation, including presentation materials and any case studies, work-books, etc., the names and training credentials of all primary and back-up trainers who will initially deliver the course, plus the Conformance Statement, which contains the information that the Program requires to be made public about the course on the Certification Authority’s web site after accreditation.

The Certification Authority’s Assessor will carry out a detailed Assessment of the accreditation package to determine whether the Accreditation Requirements are met. The Assessor will produce a detailed written report of the results of the Assessment, including a description of any non-conformances that were discovered and a recommendation to the Certification Authority as to whether provisional accreditation should be granted.

If the Assessor discovered any non-conformances, the Certification Authority will communicate the findings to the Applicant and agree an action plan. The action plan will define a set of corrective actions for the Applicant to undertake to come into conformance with the Accreditation Requirements and a timeframe for implementing such actions.

Audits are carried out within one to six months of initial accreditation; between 11 and 13 months after the initial accreditation; and within two months of the subsequent anniversaries of accreditation thereafter, for so long as the course remains accredited. Any non-conformities that are discovered are documented and recommendations made to the Certification Authority as to whether continued accreditation requires corrective action. The Certification Authority communicates the findings to the training provider and, if corrective actions are required, an action plan and timeframe are agreed upon. Follow-ups are done to ensure that corrective action have been appropriately implemented and the updated audit report submitted; based on which accreditation can continue.

The Programme currently also recognises two levels of personal certification:

- Level 2: Knowledge, comprehension and ability to analyze and apply TOGAF 9.
- Level 1: Knowledge of the fundamentals of TOGAF 9 sufficient to be able to contribute to an architecture effort or to work with the results.

**LESSONS:**

- Open learning is one of the core elements of future learning systems and creates diverse opportunities, improving access and affordability of learning opportunities.
- An evolving curriculum and a blend of learning tools enrich a training programme. The Key Learning Points (KLP) approach is an effective tool for concise assessment.
- Accreditation valid for a period of 36 months, shorter than most accreditation programmes, may be rigorous to maintain but is a key element that helps keep the programme updated and responsive.
3.11 Teacher Accreditation (Initial and Renewal) in Saskatchewan, Canada

This policy has been developed by The Ministry of Education in consultation with the League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents (LEADS); the Saskatchewan School Boards’ Association (SSBA); and the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation (STF). An Accreditation Review Committee is chaired by the Registrar and includes one member from each of LEADS, the SSBA, and the STF. The terms of reference of this committee are to review applications of teachers where there is a question regarding qualifications and to review the accreditation policy periodically and make recommendations to The Ministry of Education regarding any necessary changes.

Regulation 30 (a) of The Education Regulations, 1986, defines "accredited teacher" as a teacher who meets the requirements for accreditation established by the department and set out in the department’s policy statement on accreditation. Insofar as this policy is concerned, "accreditation" means granting to a teacher the responsibility of determining the final mark or standing of the students in a specified Grade 12 (level 30) subject or subjects. The courses taught by a teacher granted accreditation privileges must be within the framework of the provincial curriculum.

Teachers may be accredited in the following Grade 12 (level 30) subjects:

- Biology
- Chemistry
- Physics
- English Language Arts (A and B)
- Mathematics (Workplace and Apprenticeship, Foundations, and Pre-Calculus)

Teachers are required to renew their accreditation in a subject area every five years after the date of initial accreditation through participation in an appropriate professional development activity related to evaluation in the subject area. A separate renewal is required for each subject area.

LESSONS:

- Systems are run by people and people thus form the crux of the effectiveness. Trainers are the key for quality assurance.
- Accreditation of trainers (and master trainers) is a crucial dimension of quality in trainings, and must be viewed seriously in the current environment that primarily focuses on accreditation of institutions.

3.12 CENDEP’s Modular Credit System

The Centre for Emergency Development and Practice (CENDEP) at Oxford Brookes University, UK, runs an award-winning Masters degree in Development and Emergency Practice. It is known and respected for its practice base and strong culture of student and practitioner collaboration. This programme is organised on a modular credit system. Modules combine taught activities and self-led study. A module of 20 credits, for example, approximates to 200 hours of student input, up to 40 hours of which will be devoted to lectures, seminars, or individual tutorials. The remainder of the time is devoted to self-led study.

For the postgraduate certificate it is compulsory to pass at least one of the modules Theory of Practice or Practice of Theory, and pass other modules to achieve a total of 60 credits. For the postgraduate diploma you must pass 120 credits from the taught modules, including
both compulsory modules. For the Master of Arts degree one must gain at least 180 credits, including the dissertation.

As courses are reviewed regularly the module list may vary from year to year.

**Theory of Practice: Approaches and Understandings** (compulsory, 20 credits) provides the setting for you to understand and critically examine development and emergency practice. Using a livelihoods based approach, the module begins by exploring the nature of poverty and vulnerability. It looks at how people attempt to meet basic needs and access resources, and the relative discrimination that hinders access. It reviews the ability of poorer communities to build and hold onto both tangible and intangible assets, and how assets are used both to increase capacity and to reduce vulnerability to shocks and stresses. From the starting point of people themselves, the module seeks to make sense of the wide range of development and emergency interventions, from poverty reduction interventions (for example community empowerment, social risk management, rights based approaches, advocacy and governance) to disaster mitigation and preparedness, gender, conflict resolution and peace building.

**Practice of Theory: Tools and Methods** (compulsory, 20 credits) introduces one to the tools and approaches used by development and emergency practitioners, including needs assessment, programme design, and monitoring and evaluation. The module is organised as a series of head office programme department meetings in an international development organisation, where students take on the roles of programme staff assigned to regional desks or the policy unit. The task of each desk in the first three weeks is to identify and formulate an initial assessment of a thematic or geographic issue, which may include a cross-border crisis, a specific developmental issue, or an emergency. Working from the initial assessment, each desk produces a development and/or emergency programme for final presentation at the end of the semester.

**Armed Conflict and International Humanitarianism** (optional, 20 credits) examines contemporary armed conflicts with an emphasis on the understanding of violence, the culture of war, and political and legal contexts. It aims to introduce conflict analysis and sensitivity, and show how those approaches may shape international humanitarian action. It also examines conflicts and responses to them through the perspectives of the actors involved: mostly local populations and the international community.

**Disasters, Risk, Vulnerability and Climate Change** (optional, 20 credits) looks at factors contributing to vulnerability due to structural forces created by economic globalisation and their impact on local-level vulnerability. The emphasis will be mainly on the urban sector where such factors are more manifest. The module will put people at the centre of the examination, focusing on the socio-economic and political dimensions of vulnerability rather than hazards.

**Human Rights and Governance** (optional, 20 credits) In any historical account of the second half of the 20th century, the establishment of the international human rights protection system must be seen as a moral, legal and political milestone. Through a series of lectures and discussions, this course will examine the development of international human rights protection over the past sixty years. In exploring the scope and content of the major international human rights standards, we will also investigate some of the contemporary political and cultural challenges to their implementation and enforcement.

**The Refugee Experience: forced migration, protection and humanitarianism** (optional, 20 credits) This module provides a critical examination of contemporary forms of forced migration and explores the adequacy of the international protection system to respond to these. The post-World War II system was premised on the notion of the refugee as an individual fleeing persecution across international borders. Displacement as a result of

conflict, disasters, environmental pressure, “ethnic cleansing,” and redrawing of state boundaries poses new challenges to humanitarian practitioners.

**Shelter after Disaster** (optional, 20 credits) As recent large scale disasters in Haiti, Burma and Kashmir demonstrate, shelter after disaster is complex, spanning immediate relief needs of security, safety and comfort to longer term developmental issues of technical proficiency, funding, community engagement and political control. To these ends, this module analyses the scale of the issues and examines shelter as an emerging discipline. The module uses case studies to illustrate different models of shelter programming and identifies the tools necessary to implement a good shelter project. Emphasis will be placed on both product and process: on product the importance of engineering and good building to reduce vulnerability; and on process the necessity for ownership, i.e. engaging people affected by disasters. The module will be highly participatory, using lectures, seminars, group work, simulations and case studies of practice.

**Partnerships for Development: a Critical Assessment** (optional, 10 credits) explores what is meant by the term ‘partnership’ in a development context through an examination of its different definitions, approaches and forms. Arguments for and against the theory of partnering are analysed and practical experiences drawn upon to assess the pros and cons of working in this way. As well as looking at some of the skills needed to effectively combine different sector drivers, incentives and resources, the module also addresses the challenge of evaluating partnerships and considers issues relating to status and power, governance, accountability and engagement.

**Learning Practice Masterclass** (optional, 10 credits) The old development agenda was dominated by provision - that is the attitude of ‘we do it for you’ - to helpless victims. In recent years aid practice has shifted towards enablement where good interventions facilitate change and victims become co-collaborators in determining their own outcomes. In this way of working, practitioners are called on to adopt new tools and approaches for engaging in strategic planning, advocacy and working with decision makers.

**Working with Conflict: Practical Skills and Strategies** (optional, 10 credits) Conflict, as distinct from violence, is an inevitable dimension of any work for change, including development, rights and emergency relief. It constitutes a potentially positive, as well as destructive dynamic, and practitioners need to have the awareness and skills to make the most of the opportunities it offers as well as the ability to manage the risks it poses. To be effective we need to be able to analyse the situations we are working in, and have the wisdom and expertise to implement the full range of options available in such situations. This module focuses in turn on analysing conflict, developing strategy and methods of intervention.

**Independent Study** (optional, 10 credits) Students with research experience or with substantial practice and field experience may select a predominantly research or practice oriented route through the independent study. Students will be required to produce a proposal and agree this with their supervisor prior to commencing work. The independent study route could include literature reviews in preparation for dissertation work, reflecting on the outcomes and successes of already implemented projects, work in progress, an unconventional piece of work or research on untaught topics.

Other compulsory modules for the Master of Arts are:

**Research Methods** (10 credits) aims to advance one’s knowledge and understanding of research, including both qualitative and quantitative methods.

**MA Dissertation** (50 credits) gives one the opportunity to explore an aspect of development and emergency practice in an extended piece of self led study. The dissertation can be written, or can be ‘unconventional’, for example a film, a play or a piece of creative art.
CENDEP has effectively used its modular credit system to create flexibility in its courses and bridge the gap between diverse streams within the university and with civil society organisations outside the university system. CENDEP organises annual field courses in different parts of the world and these carry credits that are transferrable across streams within the university. CENDEP also has a partnership with the NGO Register of Engineers for Disaster Relief (RedR), wherein Oxford Brookes University allows credit sharing with three RedR courses - Managing People in Emergencies, Managing Projects in Emergencies and the Certificate in Security Management. Participants who achieve a pass on the courses are able to transfer the credits they earn towards CENDEP’s Master degree in Development and Emergency Practice.

LESSONS:
- Credit based systems are versatile and can form bridges between higher education programmes and short term trainings in disaster management.
- Field based learning is an essential part of disaster management lessons and can be very effective if allowed to be diverse through a flexible credit based system.
- Collaborative systems involving diverse players such as universities, government agencies and civil society organisations can create rich learning systems. Credit sharing systems can allow for accreditation of such joint initiatives thus preserving the sanctity of formal university accreditation.

3.13 National Assessment and Accreditation Council

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) is an autonomous body established by the University Grants Commission (UGC) of India to assess and accredit institutions of higher education in the country. It is an outcome of the recommendations of the National Policy on Education (1986), which laid special emphasis on upholding the quality of higher education in India. Their criteria for accreditation are as under

a) Universities (Central/State, including Private) and Institutions of National Importance

- Provided that in case of professional universities / Institutions of National Importance, their record of at least two batches of students having graduated.
- Provided further that the duly established campuses within the country or off-shore campuses, if any, shall be treated as part of the universities / Institutions of National Importance for the Assessment and Accreditation process.

b) Colleges (i.e., colleges/institutions affiliated to, or constituent of, or recognized by universities, including autonomous colleges)

- Provided Teacher Education / Physical Education colleges shall have a standing of at least three years.
- However, colleges/institutions offering programmes recognized by Statutory Professional Regulatory Councils concerned as equivalent to a degree programme of a university shall also be eligible for A&A even if such colleges/institutions are not affiliated to a university.
- Deemed to be Universities declared under Section 3 of the UGC Act are eligible for the A&A process of NAAC, regardless of the number of years of establishment. A deemed university needs to opt for A&A of all its duly approved constituent units, campuses at various locations within the country and off-shore campuses, if any. However, if the deemed university has any unit/campus which is not approved by MHRD/UGC, the deemed university itself shall not be eligible for A&A.
c) Departments of Teacher Education / Physical Education

Provided that the Departments of Teacher Education / Physical Education, if any, may opt for A&A:

- If such departments shall have a standing of at least three years and have a record of at least two batches of students having graduated from them; and
- Either along with the University / College or after the University / College has already been accredited.

d) Any other HEIs at the discretion of NAAC

The NAAC accreditation does not cover distance education units. NAAC’s process of assessment is towards holistic, systematic, objective, data-based, transparent and shared experience for institutional improvement. The process for assessment and accreditation broadly consists of:

- On-line submission of the Letter of Intent (LOI).
- On-line submission of Institutional Eligibility for Quality Assessment (IEQA) for applicable institutions.
- Preparation of Self-study Report (SSR), it’s uploading on the institution website and submission to NAAC.
- Peer team visit to the institution.
- Final decision by NAAC.

NAAC has identified the following seven criteria to serve as the basis of its assessment procedures:

- Curricular Aspects
- Teaching-Learning and Evaluation
- Research, Consultancy and Extension
- Infrastructure and Learning Resources
- Student Support and Progression
- Governance, Leadership and Management
- Innovations and Best Practices

Re- Assessment:

Institutions, which would like to make an improvement in the accredited status, may volunteer for Re-assessment, after completing at least one year but not after the completion of three years. The manual to be followed for re-assessment is the same as that for the Assessment and Accreditation. However, the institution shall make specific responses based on the recommendations made by the peer team in the first assessment and accreditation report, as well as the specific quality improvements made by the institution.

LESSONS:

- Assessment based criteria evolved over the width of outreach and activities is essential for a robust quality management system.
- While accreditation of programmes and faculty may be taken up, the role of the institution is key and should form part of the assessment
- Reassessment and re-accreditation are a key to sustained quality assurance.
3.14 Application of Lessons Learnt and Model Approach

Lessons drawn from various national and international practices have been synthesized and incorporated in the approach as follows, organized under the heads of institutional level, faculty, programme, process and individual level. The lessons classified under these sections are as below:

**Institutional level:**

1. National networks of institutions and a master network of such networks can be a viable system for cascading training programmes.
2. A Federal accreditation system helps bring diverse fields to the same benchmarking level and bring varied programmes to a level of comparative recognition and quality assurance.
3. Joint standards have benefits of drawing on the experience and resources that are tested and tried, and also of expanding the outreach and advantages of collaborative action. Joint accreditation will need to be looked at in case of a diverse skill based training regime such as disaster management.
4. The credibility of an accreditation system comes from the scale and respect it garners from across societies and networks, not as an isolated system. Such credibility is easy to nurture to international levels if founded on sound principles.
5. Accreditation valid for a period of 36 months, shorter than most accreditation programmes, may be rigorous to maintain but is a key element that helps keep the programme updated and responsive.

**Faculty:**

1. Creation of a cadre of intermediaries in the form of levels of trainers and master trainers is critical for a national training approach.
2. Selection of the right persons is a key to the creation of master trainers and resource persons.
3. A multi-tiered system of trainers and master trainers will be needed at a national level to bring consistency and scale to the DM training domain.
4. Accreditation systems will need to look at institutions as well as courses and trainers/master trainers.
5. Systems are run by people and people thus form the crux of the effectiveness. Trainers are the key for quality assurance.
6. Accreditation of trainers (and master trainers) is a crucial dimension of quality in trainings, and must be viewed seriously in the current environment that primarily focuses on accreditation of institutions.

**Programme:**

1. Accreditation systems for such programmes are yet to be fully evolved and established, and international linkages are a potential area for exploration for this purpose.
2. The inclusion of civil society and academia in the approach and overall accreditation system can broad-base the overall training agenda for a greater outreach.
3. Indigenous systems like Sevottam that have been deployed in a wide range of organisations across diverse sectors to provide insights into developing consistent systems across the national governance structure.

4. Compliance based approaches such as Sevottam are anchored in an input-process-output system. This can give clues as to how training programmes can be responsive to context, specific needs and be open to inputs from participants. Accreditation across sectors can take cues from this system.

5. International standards exist and linkages should be found with these instead of developing systems from the start.

6. Joint standards have benefits of drawing on the experience and resources that are tested and tried, and also of expanding the outreach and advantages of collaborative action. Joint accreditation will need to be looked at in case of a diverse skill based training regime such as disaster management.

7. An evolving curriculum and a blend of learning tools enrich a training programme. The Key Learning Points (KLP) approach is an effective tool for concise assessment.

8. Assessment of faculty will form part of the programme process too, as it is a larger set up being assessed.

9. Collaborative systems involving diverse players such as universities, government agencies and civil society organisations can create rich learning systems. Credit sharing systems can allow for accreditation of such joint initiatives thus preserving the sanctity of formal university accreditation.

Process:

1. The Learning Circle approach shifts the focus from teaching to learning; and the application of tools and processes in such an approach can result in a more learning-friendly and outcome-oriented approach.

2. Training is rooted in the skills being transferred and the deployment objective can be wide or can even transform over time.

3. While the entry point may be emergency management, a holistic approach including related themes such as environment, historic preservation and indigenous people make the programme more relevant.

4. Accreditation requires continuous review and enhancement of its criteria, policies and procedures. It is not a one time activity.

5. ‘What is learnt’ is more important than ‘what is taught’.

6. Open learning is one of the core elements of future learning systems and creates diverse opportunities, improving access and affordability of learning opportunities.

7. Field based learning is an essential part of disaster management lessons and can be very effective if allowed to be diverse through a flexible credit based system.

8. A standard set of procedure and methods of accreditation is also required to be developed. This may include the format of application, procedure, parameters with minimum acceptance value, time frame within which the accreditation would be granted, period of accreditation, legal status and acceptability of agency responsible for accreditation. National Board of Accreditation provides some of these, which can be used as a guideline to set up these for the accreditation of DM trainings.
Individual level:

1. There exists a large base of practitioners with basic skills who can be deployed for disaster management purposes. They will accordingly need to be trained in select skills and accreditation systems will need to account for providing bridges between such linked trainings.

2. Certification should address quality of assessing successful completion rather than mere participation. Such assessment should be based on assignment or examination.

3. Certification in itself serves a purpose and is a necessary tool in order to make training programmes respectable and accountable through quality of trained individuals it delivers.

4. Certification provides the primary purpose of licensing a participant to practice certain skill-sets. It has its inherent value in this and in the identity value it creates.

5. This is a valuable asset for the DM training programmes in India, particularly at the field level, through quality trained individuals.

The model taken up for the development of the accreditation strategy flows from these five classifications and applies this to the various levels of outreach required, ranging from awareness to short-term trainings, sector based courses, education and research. The model is further illustrated in the 5x5 matrix in the section on strategy.

Some of the good practices have value for many of the future deliverables including the training modules. Some of the national good practices are worth considering for utilizing at various levels as they are Indian and contextualized for application nationally.
4. APPROACH AND CHALLENGES IN EMERGING NATIONAL CONTEXT

The enactment of a National Disaster Management Act, establishment of a National Disaster Management Authority, and formulation of a National Policy on Disaster Management have been recent developments that have set the stage for a more organized approach for capacity building and training in the area of disaster management at the national level. Various initiatives of the National Disaster Management Authorities have furthered this agenda, though it is yet to be formulated to the level of detail that guides accreditation and certification processes. There still exist a number of challenges in this regard.

4.1. Approach in the Context of NDMA Guidelines

The National Disaster Management Authority being a nodal agency for DM has issued detailed guidelines for different hazards and their management aspects. These include:

1. Guidelines on Earthquakes
2. Guidelines on Management of Tsunamis
3. Guidelines on Cyclones
4. Guidelines on Floods
5. Guidelines On Management of Urban Flooding
7. Guidelines on Landslides
8. Guidelines on Nuclear and Radiological Emergencies
9. Guidelines on Chemical Disaster (Industrial)
10. Guidelines on Chemical (Terrorism) Disaster
12. Guidelines on Biological Disaster
13. Guidelines on Psycho-Social Support
15. Guidelines on Incident Response System
17. Guidelines on Scaling, Type of Equipment and Training of Fire Services.
18. Guidelines on Hand Book for Training and Capacity Building of Civil Defence and Sister Organisations

Apart from the nature of hazards and their management needs, these guidelines specifically address the issue of training and certification. Apart from the training areas and gaps, the guidelines not only mention the responsible bodies for the training and enhancement of skills for professionals engaged in construction, administration and civil defence, but also suggest the guidelines for the certification of disaster management.

A few key features that relate directly with the quality and certification of the trainings for DM include a model techno-legal regime, licensing on the basis of certification and compliance rules.

Techno-Legal Framework: The NDMA specifically directs all state governments to adopt a Techno-Legal framework to assure compliance for specific disaster safe developments such as building codes or construction practices. The relevant ministry along with central and other relevant departments is responsible for creating a techno-legal regime. State governments are responsible for their review, revisions and updates that are to be incorporated in town and country planning acts, land use and zoning regulation, building
bye-laws and development control regulations. It also asks to repeat the process at least once in five years.

**Licensing and Certification of Professionals:** All professionals will be certified through licensing process. The certification requirements evolve through the model of techno-legal regime and are incorporated in DCSs. Engineers, architects, masons and other professionals working for the GoI and other state governments are subject to this licensing. The relevant ministry for different hazards is responsible for making this licensing mandatory. The state governments are responsible for field training of masons and artisans in specialised skills. The renewal of certification is contingent on skill upgradation of professionals and their proficiency.

**Compliance Review:** Designs of all structures are required to go through the mandatory compliance review by the professionals responsible for design approval. Self certification of all the structures is an integral part of the approval. The major projects may also require approval from external agencies.

The framework, certification and compliance review provide layers of quality control for development through training and certification. This also improves the accountability of professionals, which creates a demand for efficient disaster management training and skill upgradation.

"The focus is normally on facilities and equipment available at an institution and used for running a course. Good trainers are also a key feature of ensuring quality. In disaster management, it is difficult to gauge disaster management courses by these factors alone, because we should be looking more at what field orientation is there in the course. Exposure is as important as facilities and faculty. The link of academia with implementation is very important."

: Disaster Management Trainer at State Administrative Training Institute

### 4.2. Challenges

A large number of significant challenges exist in the establishment of an accreditation and certification regime in the area of disaster management in general, and for short-term training programmes in particular. Some of the prominent challenges are discussed as follows.

- The field of disaster management is intrinsically multi sectoral, and the number of sectors that have a direct involvement is very large. The emergency support function approach itself identifies fourteen line departments across different sectors that have a direct role to play in disaster management. An accreditation system for disaster management training will have to cut across this large number of sectors and their concerned line ministries, making it a mammoth task.

- There are pre-existing training, education and capacity building programmes institutionalized in each sector, and they have their own certification bodies. An accreditation system in the disaster management subject will not only have to align with the provisions of the National Disaster Management Policy and capacity building approach, but also with the relevant provisions of all the other concerned sectors.

- Some of the sectoral capacity building and certification/licensing programmes are backed with appropriate legislation related to the sector and its capacity building institutions. There is a challenge in aligning these respective acts, and it will prove
to be a legal challenge to have an overriding feature across sectors and their bodies as is otherwise required for the cross cutting nature of the disaster management field.

- It is particularly challenging to capture quality and to build in quality assurance elements in very short term training programmes. The time period of training programmes ranging from a few days to two weeks is often too short and the content of such courses too basic to include a process of examination that can form a credible basis for quality certification. It is therefore also difficult to establish accreditation criteria and mechanisms for such short courses.

- Control and adherence to quality assurance systems in short term training programmes is easier in the government system and in training programmes of government agencies, but the same will prove difficult to integrate in short term training programmes of academic institutions dealing with participants from the general public, and more so for non government programmes working on capacity development at community level through short term training programmes for field workers and volunteers.

- Accreditation and certification of volunteers undergoing short term training programmes in specialized areas such as first response or first aid is limited to certification of performance under training conditions. For example, certificates from the St John Ambulance (leading first aid organization) not just provides the details of the name of training organization, title of qualification, reference to the Health and Safety Regulation (1981), date of issue, and confirmation of its validity for three years but also mentions the learning outcomes of the syllabus on which certificates have been issued if they are other than First aid work or Emergency first aid at work. Participants are certified based on their performance in training conditions.

- State and local context specific issues make national standardization of curriculum difficult for short term training of persons related to operations. Many hazards are specific only to particular states, and state programmes thus aim to focus on their local hazards. Accreditation processes will need to keep contextual issue in perspective, which will be challenging given the changing scope of the curriculum of such short term DM training programmes.

- Training institutions are themselves very short of capacity in terms of trainers as well as facilities and equipment. Most institutions do not have standard curriculum or training manuals, relying mainly on guest faculty and their PowerPoint presentations as handouts. It will be challenging for them to meet high standards as an immediate step unless an incremental approach is taken up that goes hand in hand with a capacity development programme.

- There are no existing national accreditation agencies that can take on the role of accrediting DM courses since these courses are a mix of technical and social dimensions. At the same time it is not advisable to split DM training courses across various sectoral accreditation agencies as it will dilute the element of consistency.

"It is difficult to have a central accreditation system for disaster management immediately. It requires much deliberations and detailing. There are so many sectors involved and each one has its own level of specialization. This will require a truly cross-sectoral mechanism to do justice to all dimensions of disaster management”

: Trainer at national technical institution carrying out elective course on disaster management.
5. APPROACH AND METHOD FOR ACCREDITATION, QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND CERTIFICATION

The approach taken for the accreditation system development is based on the following schematic representation, building from a study of existing national and international practices, drawing of lessons, developing a methodology, consultation with stakeholders and finalisation of the report.

In order to improve the quality of DM training and education a strategy for accreditation needs to be developed. In order to develop the strategy various national and international courses and their merits and demerits have been studied. The strengths and weaknesses of the existing DM courses have also been studied. The mechanisms that need to be established include the following, which have been addressed under the strategy for accreditation:

1. Standards for accreditation and certification
2. National and state level bodies for accreditation and certification
3. Criteria for certification
4. Benchmarks for maintaining standards of training courses
5. Schedules for upgrading courses and review of accreditation systems and certification modalities.
5.1 Needs and Viability

The existing DM training opportunities are ad hoc, lack standards and therefore have very low quality output across all levels and sectors. The standardization of modules, training delivery and the simultaneous application of certain quality management tools is therefore important. However, even standardization alone is insufficient. It is equally important that trainees have the right attitude towards learning disaster management nuances.

The proposed training policy will be robust and linked to the promotions and incentives of the stakeholders working at various levels and in various institutes. Hence, it would be advisable to develop some accreditation tools, which would be graded to know the level of understanding developed by the trainee. The trainings would be so designed that at the end of the course, the participant is evaluated based on the overall performance. While the trainees are scrutinized, trainers will also be evaluated through quality management tools to help sustain training levels and standards. Training of Trainers will also be evaluated.

5.2 Strategy for Accreditation Process

5.2.1 Accreditation Methods and Standards

The accreditation process can be implemented in the following ways and levels, in line with the findings of the study and indications of needs:

i) Accreditation of Institutions

In this case, standards for infrastructural facilities of institutions and qualifications of trainers form the basis for accreditation. The institutes will need to maintain standards in the form of proper teaching spaces and facilities and proper equipment for training of students. A standard can be established by identifying minimum requirements of facilities and expertise to address technical as well social issues relating to disasters. Facilities related to training sessions and equipment relating to drills and practical activities could also be considered to be the part of accreditation for DM trainings. They will also need to have policy for recruitment of faculty / trainers for DM trainings. The trainers would need to have qualifications in the form of diploma or degree in their field of specialization.

ii) Accreditation of courses

The courses can be accredited on the basis of content and systems of communicating the content and assessing the trainees/students. The advantage of the system is that this method can be used to accredit distance learning as well as classroom courses. Due to a shift in emphasis from infrastructural facilities a number of institutions and organizations lacking adequate resources for infrastructure can be covered. However, the disadvantage of the method is that in the absence of consideration of infrastructure it would not be possible to determine if practical skills have been properly imparted since training on practical skills would require availability of good infrastructure facilities. Trainers needed to impart training in the courses will also be accredited in this system. The accreditation of courses can also be broadly classified into theory based and practical skill courses. Skill based courses will need exposure to hands-on and practical aspects under the training.

iii) Accreditation on the basis of outcomes of the course

This approach will be similar to the outcome based approach currently being followed by NBA. The Graduate attributes would supersede all other factors. Accreditation of trainers and institutions would not be carried out primarily based on outcome criteria.
iv) Comprehensive system
According to this system of accreditation Institutions, trainers and courses will all be accredited. Since DM training is at a nascent stage in the country this system would be most suitable to ensure quality of DM training. The system would cover the needs of theoretical as well as practical training.

Multi-tiered Approach Proposed
A multi-tiered approach to training and accreditation of trainers should be taken since DM training is still at its infancy. The various tiers would be as under

1. **Accreditation of institutions**
   Institutes will be accredited on the basis of its infrastructure facilities and tie-ups with national or international accredited training courses.

2. **Accreditation of faculty**
   Faculty would be accredited on the basis of qualifications in disaster management and the length of field experience.

3. **Accreditation of programs**
   The programs will be accredited on the basis of a balance of theoretical and practical content of the program and the coverage and relevance of issues in the content.

5.2.2 Quality Management Tools
Quality management tools need to cover the range of parameters as emerging from the range and scope of the accreditation approach developed in this study. Quality management is required for institutions, faculty, programmes, processes and individuals. This has to be done through an internal process that has to be institutionalized, and covers the following processes in a cyclic manner:

1. Assessment
2. Improvement
3. Monitoring
4. Corrective actions
5. Reassessment

Besides the internal systems, the process of accreditation and reaccreditation, outlined in this strategy, will provide the structure for external evaluation, accreditation, review and reaccreditation.

Elements for compliance will need to be built in through standards based on the lines of ISO and Sevottam systems, which will be developed for quality management of DM courses by the competent authorities once they are established. All institutions applying for the courses will need to comply with these standards. Suitable provisions of the standard will need to be deliberated and finalized.

5.2.3 Tools for maintaining standards by institute or organization
It will have to be ensured that institutes or organizations maintain the standards on the basis of which they have been accredited. In order to ensure this, accreditation will be granted for a limited period. It will be renewable every 3 years and will be done on the basis of

maintenance of standards on the basis of which accreditation was granted. The tools will include both internal and external processes:

1. Internal process based tools: Based on guidelines for internal assessment, monitoring and improvements.
2. External process based tools: To be anchored with the accreditation bodies as part of their application, assessment, award of accreditation and reaccreditation processes.

Tools and methods for accreditation will be developed under the proposed accreditation council, and will govern the process of assessment, accreditation and reaccreditation. These will include:

1. Format for application
2. Procedures and parameters with minimum acceptance value
3. Time frame within which the accreditation would be granted
4. Period of validity of accreditation
5. Legal status and acceptability of the agency responsible for accreditation

Benchmark tools and processes can be referred from the National Board of Accreditation, discussed as a good practice case study in this report, and used as a base for specific tools to be developed for DM training courses.

Accreditation criteria, parameters, policy and process outlined in Section 2.4 are aligned to the National Board of Accreditation good practice, and will form part of the set of tools, with due detailing and adaptation carried out for the purpose of Disaster Management trainings.

5.2.4 Criteria for awarding certificates

Currently certificates for DM courses are issued in an ad-hoc manner and are certificates of participation and not of performance. This practice should be done away with and certificates should be awarded on the basis of performance of the trainees. Performance of trainees can be graded on the basis of following:

i) Domain Knowledge
ii) Practical application
iii) Cross sectoral skills

5.2.5 Benchmarks for maintaining standards of training courses

The benchmarks for training courses would be based on the following:

- National Training Packages
- Qualification descriptions
- Assessment plan
- Licensing requirements
- Standard operating procedures or work instructions
- Assessment instruments or tools
- Evidence requirements
- Organizational policies and workplace procedures
- Work health and safety legislation, codes of practice, standards and guidelines
- Course outlines

The benchmarking process will be detailed through an accreditation manual to be developed and mandated by the accreditation council. Benchmarking maintaining of standards is a

A process that has been developed very well by the National Board of Accreditation, discussed as a good practice case study in this report, and can be treated as the base for developing guidelines and manuals, including standard operating procedures, for the purpose.

5.2.6 Standards and schedule for upgrading courses and review of accreditation systems and certification modalities

Courses will be reviewed for upgradation every three years, entailing a review and revision of the course curriculum to integrate new advances and developments in the sector. The revisions in course curriculum need to be decided by a committee of multidisciplinary professionals who would ensure that the latest developments in each discipline are incorporated in the course curriculum. The feedback from participants and requirements of stakeholders for specialized training will be taken into consideration while revising the courses.

The accreditation will also be reviewed after every three years to ensure that training institutions maintain the standards for which they were accredited, and will be taken up as a re-accreditation process including a re-assessment. The institutions can be incentivized to improve their standards by extending additional resource support to the institutions if the standards are maintained or improved for two successive accreditation cycles. The time period of the upgrading and re-accreditation has been kept the same so that the re-accreditation process can include the revisions in the curriculum, which should precede the re-accreditation assessment in the institutional calendars.

Certification should be based on an assessment of skills and should reflect the level of skills of the trainee. These should be valid for a suggested period of three years after which a refresher should be carried out. After a period of six years re-training is suggested. Certification should also be linked to posting of officials in vulnerable areas.

5.2.7 Model for Scope and Range of Accreditation and Quality Management

A 5x5 matrix has been developed to map the extent of quality management and accreditation intervention required to address the complete outreach of disaster management capacity building efforts. The matrix looks at the two primary dimensions of addressing accreditation in outreach:

1. **Scope** of the structure and programming, including accreditation of institutes/organisations; faculty/trainers (including accreditation of trainers/resource-persons and master trainers); programmes/courses; process; and the individuals.
2. **Range** of accreditation, from awareness/sensitization; short term trainings; role-based/sector-based courses; education certificates, diplomas, degree courses; and research. It may be noted that accreditation will apply only to training and education programmes, while different measures will apply for quality management in research – such as accredited programme linked research, research by accredited institutions and faculty, and peer reviewed published research. Awareness programmes will also not be accredited but will be expected to follow the norms and principles laid down under the national media and public awareness strategy.
### Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities, Institutes, NGOs, CBOs, Local educational institutions. Framework to be aligned with the media strategy. Details to be developed in Deliverable 14.</td>
<td>Programme staff, design staff, field staff. Guidelines to be set. Framework to be developed under Deliverable 14.</td>
<td>Largely back end design based. Also field workshops, events drills. Guidelines can be set. Matrix of programme being developed under Deliverable 14.</td>
<td>This is most important where the content gets finalized and the credibility needs to be assured. To be aligned with national media strategy.</td>
<td>No certification in this case. In some organized programmes self certification can be allowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short Term Training

| Institutions to be listed: formal, giving certificates aligned to recognized organisations and informal, institutes giving their own certificates. Institutes to be accredited based on process and outcome criteria. | Master trainers in national and state institutions, and trainers at individual institutional level. Accreditation to follow master trainer and resource person approach. | Training of Trainer programmes to be accredited across the board. Training programmes to be accredited where certification of practice being awarded. Scope to expand in phases. | Range of processes to be encouraged. Blended learning approach to be taken up. | The certification of quality performance at the individual level under training condition. |

### Sector Based Courses

| Respective training institutions of different technical and non-technical sectors. Accreditation of institutions to be done in tandem with relevant accreditation bodies through representation on council. | Faculty accreditation to be carried out through master trainer and resource person approach. To be across sectors in relevant departments of respective institutions. | Mainstreaming approach to be adopted. Programme linkages to be considered and accreditation of programmes to be carried out accordingly. | Practical approaches suited to various sectors to be encouraged. Process AND outcome related weights to be promoted. | Certification of quality performance at individual level. |

### Education

| Institutions awarding diplomas, graduate and | Master trainer and trainer approach to | Programmes to be accredited in accordance with guidelines of | Outcome based approach to be adopted, | Diplomas and degrees linked to quality based |
| Research | Research institutions to be accredited by proposed council. To be based on framework being developed under Deliverable 10. | Research abilities linked to qualifications and alignment with recognized institutions. | Framework of research programmes including documentation of events, hazard, vulnerability, risk and capacity as being developed under Deliverable 10. | Research methods to be laid out in framework under Deliverable 10. Quality assurance to be made through technical and social validation. | Individual pieces of research to be encouraged for widening the scope, but no accreditation at individual level. |

**Master Trainer and Resource Person Approach**

Master trainer is single point institution in the long-term and will also be critical in the accreditation process. The National Training Policy from DoPT identifies government training institutions at the heart of training centres and repositories of expertise distilled from the real world, which impacts the training at the subsequent stages and levels. It is thus imperative for them to be leaders in the process of learning and change by honing and upgrading the skills of trainers and faculty member in the new and emerging training techniques and in methodology to assess/review their performance as trainer or faculty. It also finds that development of domain specific trainer provide stability of their tenure and opportunity for faculty development. It also promotes all trainers to be deputed at the earliest possible opportunity to undergo programmes for ‘training of trainers’. It notes that the Trainer Development Programme (TDP) is one of the most successful programme that came after the enunciation of the concept of ‘once a trainer always a trainer’ in 1996. The policy also notes the immediate need to identify international best practices in the training skills and techniques and develop a cadre of trainers in required skills. It also suggests a need to set up a Learning Resource Centre (LRC), preferably on a suitable public private partnership mode to develop capacity. The policy specify the certification of trainers under the TDP to be on a renewable basis related to their conducting a required number of training programmes and also attending courses for upgrading their skills. The policy also suggests different ministries and departments to take initiatives to develop trainers in the areas of their responsibility.

Drawing upon this approach as a good practice existing in the Indian context, the principle is adopted for application to the DM training processes and will have a significant implication in the accreditation and quality management mechanism too. The Master Trainer will play a critical role in the accreditation process. The system of Master Trainers, trained and developed intensively at the top level, and Resource Persons to support them, drawn from various institutions and positions in the practice domain will form the backbone for the system. The approach, to be deployed for capacity building and training, will need to pass through the accreditation system and will also subsequently play the role of key actors in implementing the accreditation system. The accreditation process of courses for developing
Master Trainers will be in conformity to training design template and steps for training of Master Trainers given in the Strategic Framework for Implementation of Training.

Compliance Systems

ISO is the world's largest developer of voluntary international standards. They give state of the art specifications for products, services and good practice, helping to make industry more efficient and effective. These standards have been developed through a global consensus. ISO International Standards ensure that products and services are safe, reliable and of good quality. For business, they are strategic tools that reduce costs by minimizing waste and errors and increasing productivity. Sevottam on the other hand is an Indian standard meant to bring about an improvement in public service delivery. It is itself broadly based on ISO 9000. Elements of these standards can be used for bringing about an improvement in delivery of DM education and training. The third component 'Excellence in Service Delivery', postulates that an organization can have an excellent performance in service delivery only if it is managing the key ingredients for good service delivery well, and building its own capacity to continuously improve delivery. Similarly in case of DM education excellence in delivery of training can be achieved only when standards for good training delivery are rigorously adhered to. In order to ensure proper training delivery qualified trainers, adequate equipment and updated course material will be required. This can only be ensured through the multi tiered system of accreditation which will be reviewed from time to time.

5.3 Implementation Approach

It is envisaged that the strategy for quality accreditation and certification for short term DM trainings, research and education developed under the current programme will be approved and implemented in a phased manner in coming times. The first step will need to be the establishment of the proposed national body for accreditation. The subsequent steps will include development of a policy and manual, development/strengthening of state bodies as focal points, accreditation of institutions, courses and faculty, and finally assessment and review of the system. This process for implementation of the strategy is illustrated as below.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Establishment of National Accreditation Council for DM (to cover short term trainings, research and education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Development of National Policy and Accreditation Manual for DM Trainings, Research and Education, including certification and compliance parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Development / strengthening of state level bodies for facilitation of accreditation mechanism through state focal points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Identification / invitation of applications from institutions for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Identification / invitation of applications from courses for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Invitation of applications from Master Trainers and Trainers for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Assessment and review of the national accreditation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salient features of the implementation approach will include:
- An integrated approach linking collaborative platforms at the national level
- Contextualised programming at the state and local levels
- Inclusion of hands-on components for skill based courses
- Time based re-training
- Communication and networking among peer groups
Financial and facility incentives to improve institutional capacities and faculty strength and quality to support the larger objective of quality enhancement.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Findings

The study has lead to a number of key findings that illustrate the complex nature of accreditation in the field of disaster management. It further highlights that accreditation of short term trainings brings additional challenges. Major findings are as listed below.

1. The number of institutions and programmes imparting DM training are very few as compared to the need in India. DM training cuts across a large number of sectors including the fourteen identified as emergency support functions and additional developmental ones for the purpose of training on risk management. All of these institutions and programmes across all sectors operate in an almost total absence of a quality accreditation system.

2. Most institutions largely impart certificates of participation that are issued to all participants or trainees who enrol for the courses and are able to attend and complete the course itself. There are no set examination, grading and quality assurance aspects to the short term disaster management training courses in the mainstream training programmes or even in allied sectors or non-government programmes.

3. Certification is ad-hoc and certificates are issued by the institutions conducting the courses themselves. Some carry the name of the institution, and some also include partner institutions, funding organisations or host agencies. In most cases institutions conducting the programmes are the absolute decision makers in the design and award of the certificates.

4. There is no system of accreditation; neither of institutions nor courses nor trainers for DM training. The best practices studied from national and international domains also present lessons highlighting the need for accreditation, and present cases where accreditation is based on approaches of the institutions or else aligned to the international standards that are more general in nature than what is needed for short term disaster management trainings in a specific context.

5. In order to establish an elaborate system of accreditation, there is a need to overcome a number of challenges. These include multi-sectoral nature of the subject, pre existing systems of training and certification in allied sectors, legislation based complexities, open systems in training courses other than in government institutions, accountability issues around volunteers, location specific contexts, low capacity of institutions at present, and absence of suitable central accreditation agencies.

On the basis of findings drawn from various sections, different options have been recommended to develop accreditation for short-term disaster management training which are discussed in the following section.

6.2 Accreditation Mechanism

The study of disaster management institutions and courses in the country has revealed that there is currently no established system to accredit courses or certify professionals who obtain disaster management training. Developing education curriculum according to certain criteria and ensuring that disaster management professionals develop the requisite skills is important to ensure proper disaster management in the country.

It may be viable to initially take up accreditation of courses other than very short orientation, sensitization and awareness programmes, for which certificates of participation

will suffice. This is also applicable for programmes conducted for volunteers where no liabilities can be put on the training institutions or trainers.

For other short term training programmes it is recommended to have a central agency that brings quality assurance and standardization. The main role of this agency will nonetheless be of advocacy with respective accreditation bodies in engineering, medical, architecture, town planning and allied fields where avenues for accreditation already exist within their domains.

It is also to be highlighted that short term trainings need to be seen along with graduate and post graduate courses, for which the same structure should serve the purpose of accreditation, though with different criteria. Subsequent reports of the ongoing study will deal with this aspect and will align the findings and recommendations regarding short term trainings with other higher education programmes.

It is also felt that a national approach needs to be developed and established, which may be achievable with a national guidelines on accreditation of disaster management research, training and education programmes. Such a guideline setting exercise can be aligned with the ongoing efforts of the National Disaster Management Authority for bringing out guidelines for various dimensions of disaster management as mandated by the National Disaster Management Act.

As an outcome of this study, various options have been identified that can be exercised for accreditation of the courses in the country. These are discussed below.

1. **An Independent Council for Disaster Management Education and Certification**

   This would be similar in function and constitution to the Council of Architecture. It would be an autonomous body, which would need to be formed under a separate Act of the Parliament like the Council of Architecture. It would have members from the All India Council of Technical Education, capacity development experts related to the core subjects of line ministries and departments, and other nominees from NDMA. The council will ensure that the institutions running the courses have the necessary infrastructure; that the curriculum meets certain standards; that the faculty members have requisite qualifications; and that intake of students and examination systems are as per standards of education for such courses. The Institutes will need to submit to periodic inspection of the council for continued recognition of the courses. This would be necessary to prevent dilution of standards. An independent council will facilitate standardization across the country through a centralized system. However, it may face some hurdles at the local level in bringing together institutions of different legal and economic interests. The detailed structure of this option will develop further in the subsequent reports. The council will in turn identify or establish other support institutions at national and state levels as part of its institutional strategy to support its functions.

2. **A Council Established Under NDMA/ Ministry of Home Affairs**

   Nominees of all line departments will be members of the council. The council would ensure certification of Institutions, courses and professionals. These bodies, with their experience in the handling of disasters, are the best equipped to certify courses and professionals and to ensure inclusion of all necessary issues in the course curriculum. They can also ensure that the professionals taking these courses...
develop the necessary skills and can ensure moulding of courses to suit these professional needs. Establishment of council at NDMA may also ensure the application of National Disaster Management approach. However, this may also create a distance from the planners and resource development organizations.

3. **A Council Established under the Ministry of Human Resource Development**

A council like the Indian council for social science research can be established under the Ministry of Human Resource Development. Besides certifying organisations and professionals for disaster management, the council will be mandated to ensure development of institutional infrastructure, identify research talents, formulate research programmes, support professional organisations and establish linkages with disaster management professionals in other countries. It would also provide maintenance and development grants to various Research Institutes and disaster management training centres across the country. By its location in MHRD, the council may attract professionals and resources from other line ministries for resource development and capacity building. This may however, also create a distance from NDMA or NIDM, which are more domain based institutions.

4. **NIDM as an Accreditation Body for Disaster Management Courses**

NIDM can act as an accreditation body for disaster management courses and professionals in the country. NIDM is the primary training and capacity building body in the country with a lot of experience in running disaster management courses and a vast pool of experienced professionals. The experience of the organisation and its faculty members could be used for certification of courses in the country. The Institute would need to develop detailed guidelines on the teaching infrastructure required in training institutes; subjects to be covered in the courses; practical and theoretical aspects of the course; and qualification of faculty members. Guidelines for updating of the courses and their duration for different level of trainees (varying from fresh graduates to experienced officials) will also need to be drawn up. At NIDM the council may rejoice the availability of resources and expertise in its vicinity, but instead of advantage, it may turn into a disadvantage due to overload on infrastructure and responsibilities of the faculty and other resources.

5. **Accreditation through Linkages Established with National/International Systems**

Accreditation of courses can also be done through tie-ups with international bodies such as the Indian Standards Organisation which provides the ISO certification. The tie-ups could also be with professional organisations like FEMA or the Joint Committee that established the Australia and New Zealand standard for risk education. These organisations have detailed guidelines which will need to be followed to the extent possible. However, the guidelines might need to be suitably modified to ensure that it meets the need of courses in India. Such modifications will need to be carried out in consultation with these bodies. This option could facilitate exchange and learning through best practices which at times could also overwhelm or overstep the local variations and capacities;

The first option is seen as the most effective one given that this would both have an autonomous status and be aligned with the line ministries and departments. Representation of concerned line ministries in the council or alternate mechanisms is seen as an essential element to address the cross-cutting, multi-sectoral and
multi-stakeholder nature of disaster management training programmes that need to be developed for the country. The following table compares the merits and demerits of the different recommended approaches.

Table: Merits and Demerits of the Suggested Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Merits</th>
<th>Demerits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>An Independent Council for Disaster Management Education and Certification.</td>
<td>Centralization will help in standardization</td>
<td>There will be legislative and institutional hurdles of bringing together the various sectoral establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Council Established Under NDMA/ Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
<td>It carries the advantage of appropriate alignment with the national disaster management approach.</td>
<td>Approach is distant from the central human resource development system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Council Established under the Ministry of Human Resource Development.</td>
<td>The option aligns with the national HRD system and will thus be institutional closer to related sectoral capacity building systems.</td>
<td>The disadvantage of the system is that it will not have a parent organization that itself is a domain based institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NIDM as an Accreditation Body for Disaster Management Courses.</td>
<td>The advantage of this approach is the expertise of NIDM in both the subject and the capacity building and training field.</td>
<td>The disadvantage is that it will load the mandate of the institution, which in itself is also a training and capacity building institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accreditation through Linkages Established with National/International Systems</td>
<td>The advantage of this approach will be the alignment with a pre existing and tested system.</td>
<td>The disadvantage is the lack of local contextualization and flexibility it may offer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These approaches, seen linked with the merits and demerits of the cases studied in the earlier part of the report, will provide specific directions to the implementation process outlined in section 5. An integrated approach linking collaborative platforms at the national level, contextualised programming at the state and local levels, inclusion of hands-on components for skill based courses, time based re-training, communication and networking among peer groups are specific steps that are part of the proposed strategy.
6.3 Accreditation Process

Along with accreditation policy, a detailed process has to be developed for the disaster management subject. It will need to address the aspects of quality assurance of institutions, trainers and courses in the various streams aligned to disaster management. The courses which would need to be re-administered as part of time based re-training process for upgrading of skills or for refreshing of knowledge will follow the established accreditation approach, and will be additionally reviewed for incremental addition of content, appropriateness of process and adequacy of facilities.

While cues can be taken from other sectors and from national systems studied in this report, disaster management poses unique challenges as discussed in the report and this the system will have to be made modular to address needs of different sectors and levels.

The principles of application, self assessment, criteria based assessment, and system of reassessment and reaccreditation need to remain constant for any accreditation system and will also apply to disaster management.

6.4 Certification Principles

In accordance with the accreditation approach outlined above, the certification regime has to be developed and tuned to the accreditation system for the purpose of quality assurance. It also needs to be aligned with the national training framework for the purpose of ensuring flexibility and outreach across different levels, hazards, geo-climatic regions, administrative regions and sectoral areas of intervention.

The first and foremost requirement is that certification systems need to be established and followed across the spectrum of training programmes being conducted in the country. Agencies that are currently carrying out training, but not issuing certificates due to reasons of administrative capacity, transparency or social complexities need to overcome these constraints.

Certification needs to be based on some quality criteria and need to evolve beyond certificates of participation or completion. They need to address quality criterion based on the accreditation principles, going beyond facilities and input-based factors to include outcome-based ones as well.

Sector-wide benchmarking needs to be carried out through the inter-linkage of certification systems in particular streams and with the overall accreditation system. The quality objective can be met only when there is consistency in the certification regime across sectors, levels and institutions.

The overall system of quality assurance through accreditation and certification in short-term disaster management training programmes will also need to be mapped and aligned with the strategic framework for implementation of training.
ANNEXURE: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Date: _____________________

Name: ________________________________________________________

Designation: _____________________________________________________

Organisation: _____________________________________________________

Type of institutional setup: _________________________________________

Do you offer any course or program/s on Disaster Management? Yes/ No. Give Details:

Number of programs/courses in a year: _________________________________

Names of programs/courses: __________________________________________

Number of modules: _________________________________________________

Content: ____________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Duration of the course: _________________________________________________

Average participants in one year: _________________________________________

Total faculty: ____________ Training:__________ Edcuation:__________ Research_______

Qualification of faculty: ________________________________________________

Number of Permanent_____________ temporary___________ or visiting faculty________

Institutional facilities: _____________________________________________________

Research facilities – in-house and outreach:_______________________________

Institutional networks: _________________________________________________

Institutional financial status: ____________________________________________

Details of research conducted on Disaster management in your institute:

Kind of research: _______________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Total publications: __________, National: __________, International: ____________
Institution’s own journal or newsletter on disaster management:

Do you also document disasters and any specific details relating to that? If yes, give details:

Details of participants:

Is there any pre-requisite for admission in this program? Yes/ No. Give details:

What kind of expertise participants gain after doing the course?

What are the future prospects of the participants in disaster management field after this course?

Details of certification:

Do you provide any certificate/ degree for your course on Disaster Management? Yes / No. If yes give details:

Your certificates are recognised or approved by whom?

Is there any upward linkage with apex level national institute to ensure uniformity of standards?

Does your institution follow the credit system? Yes / No. If yes, give details:

Is there any cross linkages in credit accrual? Yes / No. If yes, give details:
Details of accreditation:

Accreditation body for the institution: _____________________________________________

Accreditation status: ____________, duration: ____________, frequency: ____________

Is it for the institute or for the Disaster Management Course? _________________________

Do you think that current Disaster Management [DM] courses can be accredited for DM practices or for standard work in this field? Yes/ No. Give reason for your statement.

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

What you like to suggest for the accreditation of DM courses?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Details of quality management:

How do you ensure quality of your courses, especially for Disaster Management courses?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Is there any internal or external monitoring and evaluation body?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Have you taken any corrective measures in past or intend one for future?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

How the training and development for disaster management can be improved further?

___________________________________________________________________________
Does your institute render any educational, practical or technical support to local, state or national government relating to DM? If yes, give details:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your precious time and inputs.