

A Curriculum with a Difference

Report of A Dialogue on NCF-2005
26-27 July 2005

Organised by
Digantar
and
Azim Premji Foundation
At Jaipur

A dialogue on the Draft National Curriculum Framework (NCF), 2005 developed by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) was held in Jaipur on July 26 and 27. This was organised by Digantar and Azim Premji Foundation. About 70 people from government and non-government organisations as well as multi-lateral agencies participated in this dialogue. (A list of participants is attached as Annex 1).

The dialogue on NCF 2005 generated much debate and discussion. The methodology used in this forum was a presentation of a chapter of the NCF followed by an open discussion on the chapter by the participants. This note presents the issues that were raised during the deliberations. The issues are presented session wise. At present it is listing all the opinions expressed and attempts no analysis.

Inaugural Session

1. In recent times, we have seen some space in the media and public debate on education but usually on the budgetary issues and not on ‘non-controversial’ issues like quality of education available or pedagogical issues like viewing children as constructors of knowledge. The group was urged to look at the NCF as a document that was trying to achieve a social vision through education. In this context a passage from the Mudaliar Committee Report of 1951 was quoted¹ that spoke of the role of education towards developing a true democratic society. It was felt that we were not going in that direction.
2. It was stated by the Secretary Education, Rajasthan that funds would not be a problem as availability of funds for educational reforms is no longer an issue. In response to that statement, it was said that while the statement of availability of funds was often made, there is little evidence to indicate that all children will have access to a decent school in the near future.
3. The draft NCF 2005 comes across as a liberal document. The process it followed was unique because for the first time this document looked at 21 especially produced research-based position papers on issues like gender, peace, language, history, work in education. The complete set of these papers and NCF-2005 comprise 4 volumes.

¹ “A democracy of people who can think only confusedly can neither make progress, nor even maintain itself, because it will always be open to the risk of being misled and exploited by demagogues who have within their reach today unprecedentedly powerful media of mass communication and propaganda. To be effective, a democratic citizen should have the understanding and the intellectual integrity to sift truth from falsehood, facts from propaganda and to reject the dangerous appeal of fanaticism and prejudice. He must develop a scientific attitude of mind to think objectively and base his conclusions on tested data. He should also have an open mind receptive to new ideas and not confined within the prison walls of outmoded customs, traditions and beliefs.”

4. The draft NCF 2005 is also unique because for the first times subjects that were so-far called 'extra curricular', like Arts, Work, Peace have been properly emphasises.
5. It also puts the learner in the central position in a more meaningful manner. It does not however contextualise the immediate reality of society. It takes a position but does not critique the earlier approach, e.g. proposes the constructivist approach and critiques the behaviouristic approach but there is nothing of the other cognitive approaches.



6. Given the fact that all the committees like the Mudaliar, Kothari and Yashpal Committee have been arguing for better schools, we need to research why things were not implemented and we continue to be in this situation. The document says nothing on this.
7. The NCF 2005 is not nuanced enough, e.g. it speaks of greater community participation but does not mention the dangers of community participation and how will one ensure the quality of education with this approach or even how local vested interests will be handled. E.g. in 1 US state, the value of pi is taught not as 3.14 or 22/7 but as 3 because the Bible says so and Darwins theory of evolution is not taught because the Bible talks 'creation' so how can evolution be possible and therefore taught. That is also done according to the people's views and sentiments. It would have been useful to see a balanced view taken where the problems were presented as well.
8. There is also not much discussion on what people expect from education. For example we can speak of curricular reform but unless we do something to influence the public entrance examinations that are 'career oriented', curricular reform shall remain mere rhetoric.
9. The question of the mother tongue has been raised but there is no engagement with the issue. There is acceptance that at the primary stage, children learn best in their mother tongues or home language but how does one define mother tongue? How are materials in these languages to be made available? Not all languages are equally developed. One can argue that all languages have equal potential to develop but the reality is that at the moment they are not. What is the possible effect of learning in the mother tongue? How will the school teacher handle this?

10. The document also promotes the theory of inclusive education so that children of different abilities are not excluded. It is silent on how it will be done? Will there be separate classrooms? How will this disparity be handled?
11. The document points out lot of needs but there is no alternative plan. If the government does not allocate 6 per cent of the GDP to education then what is the source of funds for all the things that need to be done?
12. The issue of value based education was raised but who decides the values? We have not been able to decide on a Uniform Civil Code so far, so how will be arrive at a common set of values?

Session 1: Perspective, Structure and General Issues

1. It was felt that the NCF 2005 shows a major thrust on the constructivist approach to education and articulates it forcefully. It revives the concept of the neighbourhood school. It promotes critical pedagogy. It also stresses on the need for inclusive education. This document was considered to be an advancement over the past approaches as it was an academic approach of looking at things.
2. It was also put on record that the document was written beautifully and some of the boxes were exquisitely worded.
3. There was a view that while the NCF 2005 listed the social concerns it did so in a very diffused manner and did not sharply crystallize them. It also seemed that a social vision was presumed and there is a problem of merely sharing it. In the same vein, the issue of primacy of learner and the primacy of the pedagogy or social vision was raised; the question here was should the issue of primacy of either be raised at all?
4. A concern was expressed on expectations from the teachers. It was felt that there were too many expectations from the teachers. In order to be able to use this framework, the teachers would need to internalise it. The capacity of the existing teachers to adapt to this approach without adequate academic support was questioned.
5. There was a feeling that the NCF 2005 was trying to promote a socio-politically neutral kind of education and it was not possible to do so. On the other hand, there were participants who felt that the document was doing



anything but trying to promote socially-politically neutral education; that a very robust socio-political vision emerged quite clearly.

6. The participation of teachers in a dialogue of this nature was also appreciated.
7. There was considerable discussion on the issue of “stated human ideals versus real issues like employability”. One opinion was it should be remembered that any breakthrough in human knowledge was because of an engagement with the issue. It was felt that this was not a new dilemma either. If education is not of the conditioning variety, then it should lead to freedom of choice.
8. An opinion was expressed that there was a reassertion of identity and a deepening of democracy as well. It was felt that NCF could be successfully implemented in places where democracy was stronger, but it would do better if it was coupled with something like the adult literacy movement of the 1990s that led to a deepening of democracy.
9. A suggestion was made that the framework could have been written in the form of a Socratic dialogue. This would have been particularly useful in the areas of rote learning, examination system, dichotomy of announced ideals and believed ideals; using this format would have enabled the presentation of a counter viewpoint. This would have also helped teachers understand the argument better.
10. The pedagogical change suggested was by and large appreciated but a concern was expressed that the document did not adequately emphasise on the preparation needed for such a change. It was felt that the document should state that the pedagogical shift from rote learning to knowledge formation would imply greater time spent on each theme. This would also have implications on the curricular load. It was felt that there would be resistance to this approach from the parents and one needed to be adequately prepared for it and also work towards changing the system of entrance examinations.
11. It was also said that though this document was perhaps the most progressive of all the NCFs prepared so far, the possibility that it would be able to bring about changes were low. There was a feeling that though the document had words like equality and justice they needed to be articulated more clearly.

Session 2: Learning and Knowledge

1. The NCF 2005 shows a major thrust on the constructivist approach to education. It revives the concept of neighbourhood school. It promotes critical pedagogy. It stresses on the need for inclusive education. The expectation was it would move to eclectic pedagogy but it limits itself by emphasising constructivist approach too strongly.

It was felt that the document does not speak of the implications of following this approach. The implications were in terms of the budget needed as well as the question of reaching all the children.

2. There was a view that the approach to pedagogy should be an eclectic one that takes the best of each approach so that children learn in better manner. This was because the constructivist approach was found to be limited and limiting. It is also a very romantic view of education. It was also felt that with the constructivist approach, the knowledge that children construct is sometimes faulty and different from the accepted theory i.e. a misconception. Children also hold on very tenaciously to misconceptions and these misconceptions are widespread and almost universal in science. There is a need to research to find if these misconceptions exist in other subjects and if they are universal. It was felt that there was a need for discussion of issues before arriving on any one pedagogy.
3. In response to that, a view was expressed that while it was good that the limitations of the constructivist approach were pointed out but these are well known. They were somewhat under stated by the writers and ‘under-read’ by some of the readers. It was felt that there was a need for clarity in understanding on what can and cannot be expected from a curricular framework. A curricular framework is a road map to connect classroom activities to aims of education. It cannot be expected to critique everything.
4. It was reiterated that the role of community involvement was understated in the document and should be clearly written about. Similarly while the idea of a neighbourhood school was a good one but still had not been implemented – maybe because of resistance of bureaucrats and politicians, or may be the society does not need it.
5. Some ambiguities were also pointed out in a box. There were 2 ambiguous questions, “What is 33 take away 27 plus 1?” The question is not clear on whether it means $a - (b+c)$ or $(a-b) + c$. In the first case, the answer will be $33 - (27+1) = 5$ and in the second case the answer will be $(33 - 27) + 1 = 7$. It was strongly recommended that such ambiguities should not be allowed to creep in while making text books.
6. In connection with Chapter Two, its rationale and its degree of difficulty in understanding was another issue raised. Many participants found the chapter difficult to understand and some could not see the reason for its inclusion. It was also seen to be guided by a peculiar meaning of rationality. In response to that it was pointed out this chapter links the perspective on education in chapter I to the practice of education in chapter III. It also tries to provide rounds for the pedagogy chosen and content selected. On the issue of rationality it was pointed out that the limits of rationality, real and imagined, are often hinted at. But no one actually articulates them clearly, nor an alternative other than reason to arrive at shared understanding is suggested. Therefore the ritual hitting at rationality takes us no where.

7. It also struggles between the primacy of the learner and the primacy of pedagogy. It was felt that the question of primacy of learner (leading to primacy of pedagogy) versus the primacy of social vision coupled with epistemology is a futile and misplaced question. Both aspects are equally important and articulating the issue in terms of primacy itself suggests a flawed understanding of education.
8. Another view was that in chapter II there was a tension between the primacy of the learner and primacy of the pedagogy but seemed to shift to primacy of subjects. Some contradiction in the placement of History was also noticed. On page 24, History was said to be different from social studies but in the next chapter included in the section of social studies. Ethics and Philosophy were mentioned here but left out in the next chapter on subject areas and the argument left incomplete. It was felt that the omission was sudden and away from rationality.
9. In response to this it was pointed out that the context at the two quotes are different. One is articulation of forms of understanding while the other concerned with school subjects. No one-to-one correspondence between the forms of understanding and school subjects is necessary.
10. It was felt that there was an overemphasis on the constructivist approach despite knowing its limitations and discouragement of the behaviourism. A



question was raised on whether it was possible to divide 'understanding' and it might be better to use the term of 'forms of knowledge'. In response to that it was clarified that either term could be used to classify the nature of knowledge. The current method used is division on the basis of investigation tools and

validation procedures, this is at best a half-baked method, but it continues in the absence of a more suitable methods. It was also pointed out that an imperfect but working hypothesis that explains the connectedness and nature of knowledge is better than no hypothesis at all. Absence of any hypothesis leads a 'rucksack' view of knowledge. A rucksack is loosely attached behind and is full of useful articles that will be thrown out at the end of the trip. Similarly, the knowledge in this thinking becomes a collection of memorised bits of information to be used in exams and thrown out of mind once the exams are over.

11. The possibility of using of local knowledge seemed manageable at the elementary level, but its limitations were obvious at the secondary level.

12. Opinion was expressed that the nature of knowledge was seen as a common thread running through the entire document. It is true that the boundaries of the subjects have blurred over the years. It was felt that the subjects at the university level created a pressure at the school level and this needed to be stopped. There was a need to be sensitive to other subjects. There was also need to visualise the kind of school experiences one was talking of.
13. A comment was made that the kind of schools that the NCF visualised were almost non-existent. This vision was also far removed from reality and seemed utopian and in that context the document seemed disappointing as it was felt it would not be able to bring about the desired change. Experience showed that parents resisted any change that implied a pedagogical shift. There might be a need to make a document that was not so forbidding. In response to that it was felt that a curricular framework had to be ideal in a sense to know the direction it was aimed at.
14. The NCF spoke of community participation but did not spell out the roles and responsibilities visualised for the Panchayat or the Village Education Committee. The section on the interface between parents and teachers was also rather weak.
15. It was hoped that these views would reach NCERT, but doubt expressed on how many changes were possible in this document. There was hope that it may be possible to make changes in the 2010 document for which we need to begin work now. A suggestion made that every such document should spell out the short term and long term objectives.
16. An opinion was expressed that there are several areas of education that need to be researched. It was expected that the curriculum framework would also provide a vision of educational research. It was also suggested that this document could set off several research studies. This aspect needs to be developed.

Session 3: Curriculum Areas, School Stages and Assessment

1. The NCF 2005 critiques the examination system of assessing learning but is silent on board examinations. It was felt that a position needed to be taken on that as well. Another view was that this was the first document that criticises examination system so strongly. This sets the stage for reform in the system of assessment. It was felt that the pass percentage of 33 per cent was a colonial hangover as the British wanted the Indians to study only till the level of becoming clerks, but we should now move beyond it.
2. It seems that the social sciences component in the NCF is trying to gauge socialisation whereas the sentiment is to understand society. This becomes obvious when the units of society are spoken of rather than exploring the immediate units of society. There is a need to create space for children studying their immediate society.

3. In the health section, there is talk of externalised needs but not on understanding one's own body which is intrinsically linked to the child. Some felt health education should not be restricted to physical health but should include mental and spiritual health as well.
4. Education for peace or peace education – this was a question that was raised but not completely answered. It seemed that there was a feeling that social justice is to be achieved only and only through peace. There was a debate whether this is to be kept. It was felt that there continues to be a need for a better articulation and a better stand on this. Other alternatives that were considered included human rights, conflict resolution, managing conflict. It was also felt that making peace an issue would not help children deal with violence around them unless there was justice for everybody and demonstrated at every stage rather.

It was felt that there was a plurality to the issue of peace. It should be dealt in both ways in subtle ways and clearly. A suggestion was made that this could be done if the school could provide space to the child to explore their own social understanding of themselves and their family. The argument was carried further and a suggestion made that religion be squarely brought in the arena of curriculum but by discussing both the angelic and satanic aspects of it. Another suggestion was that the issues of peace, constitutional values not be treated separately but woven through in other subjects.

5. The relevant position paper defines mother tongue or home language as the language spoken on the street. It was also said that research has also established that multilingualism is also part of being Indian. The NCF is however silent on how to introduce this aspect into schools. It has also been established that multilingualism and scholastic achievement have a direct relationship; therefore it is up to us to consider the 3 language formula as a burden or understand the world in a better manner. The issue of mother tongue or home language was raised in this context as well. It was clarified
6. The 3 language formula seems contradictory as it increases the curricular load rather than decreasing it as is envisaged in the NCF. In response to that it was said that the motivating reason for this was for every child to have the opportunity to understand another culture in the country. At some point in time, it was subverted with the Northern states opting for Sanskrit and imposing Hindi in the South leading to protests.
7. It was suggested that history be looked at in a different manner. There is a need to check whether the perspective of the marginalised is included or not. The NCF suggested that civics be called political science as using the term civics indicated a colonial hangover; some felt that a clear argument should be given rather than merely saying it was a colonial hangover. There was another suggestion that history should not be restricted to political history but could include things like history of science or art as well. Another suggestion was that history, instead of the current chronological treatment it is given,

could be treated according to themes like trade, technology, conquering of Asia etc

Session 4: School and Classroom Environment

1. Chapter IV establishes both teachers and children as learners i.e. children were not always at the receiving end. Some considered it to be the best chapter in the document.
2. The issue of peace was discussed in this session as well. There was some discomfort about 'teaching' peace in school when the environment around is so different. How does the child reconcile with this? How do adults turn into role models rather than just teaching it?
3. Unless there is justice for everybody and demonstrated at every stage rather than making it a subject. This will not help.
4. There was much discussion on classroom environment. It was felt that physical classroom environment left a lot to be desired, especially in rural schools. There were some who felt that the NCF should be applicable all over the country and it would be useful to have minimum norms for schools. There were others who felt that to bring equality in the school there needs to be equal treatment of children which is possible only if teachers understand that and treat children as human beings who have their specific needs. It was felt that school environment is a reflection of relationships – child-child; child-teacher and teacher-teacher.
5. There was also an opinion expressed that the NCF should clearly state that there should be 1 teacher for every grade as under the garb of maintaining a TPR of 1:40, one teacher was handling more than one grade. It was also said that the issue of rural schoolteachers burdened with every development work in the village should be raised strongly so that the teachers were responsible only for school related activities.
6. The issue of flexible timing to facilitate education was raised. Some felt that better access to schools was a better approach. Others felt that physical environment of the school like provision of toilets for girls and female teachers would help in increasing retention. Other facilities like playground and play material also had an effect on school environment. Others felt that the real issue was space to play and rural schools perhaps fared better on this count.
7. It was remarked that the power of technology was not fully explored in the NCF but had discouraged the use saying that in our country it was not possible to ensure that computers were available to all. Some of participants of the focus groups of the NCF remarked that there was much debate on the issue and the space of technology in education. Barring the fact that it increases access to information, there is no clear argument on the benefits that

it brings to education. It was felt that the group needs to look at the question of how does technology help children learn better.

8. It was felt that the NCF was adopting a minimalist approach to school needs. We need to remember that we are dealing with 8 lac primary schools, of which 2 lac are single teacher schools. This number is increasing constantly with the introduction of new schemes like the RGSJP, EGS. In middle schools in Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh the number of teachers is half the number of classes! This indicates the scope of educational reform that a minimalist approach cannot hope to achieve. When will we move towards providing conditions needed for education in all primary schools? It was felt the current situation was difficult. It was suggested that there should be an upper primary school and at least 2 primary schools at every panchayat.
9. Another view was that the document as far as school spaces are concerned presents an ideal view. If we cannot make the required arrangements then this document like the earlier ones will not prove effective even though they promote a new approach.
10. On competition – there was a feeling that the concept cannot be healthy as it implies beating others. Enthusiasm is not borne out of competition but from the interest level of the child. In the classroom, it means teaching what they like in an interesting manner.
11. Some felt that there wasn't a clear articulation of value based education in the NCF which was probably why these issues are raised. There was a need to articulate values clearly.
12. An inconsistency in text and a box item was pointed out. In one place it is mentioned that library should not be restricted to one period a week and in other place it was mentioned that there should one period per week for the library!
13. School discipline is looked at but the document ignores classroom discipline. Work was dealt with in detail but not art. A need to include the role of art in children learning discipline was expressed, e.g. clay has its own discipline and working with clay will help children understand discipline and internalise discipline.
14. An opinion was expressed that there is a need to interpret the document in its spirit. The nature of activities is not so important as the spirit with which they are carried out. It is important that children have access to resources and the form they take is not always important. If we cannot resolve all the issues but



we should try to equip our children to face them with equanimity. We need to work towards a change in environment where the teachers believe that every child, no matter what effect, wants to can learn. The challenge was to convert a *kattar* teacher to a creative teacher. It was felt that at least one should have a dream to work towards.

Session 5: Systemic reforms, issues of equity and implementation

1. This NCF is stronger than the earlier ones. If this is implanted then it will be a real breakthrough in education but it is definitely not an action plan. A suggestion was made to have smaller discussions on areas of discomfort before making an action plan.
2. This is possibly written with child psychology in mind. Not enough attention to the needs of the adolescent keeping in mind their physical, psychological, social needs. It has ignored the reality of the adolescent, issues of reproductive health and sexuality of adolescents. The challenges for adolescents are also not there. Adolescents are seen as an extension of childhood because it is management and theory friendly.
3. In the section of systematic reform, looks only at panchayat and ignores all other educational management institutions. Unless all the stakeholders are involved reform not possible. A hope was expressed that this would impact the government system so all educational management institutions need to be involved.
4. On the issue of gender, it was felt that the object was clearly spelt out on page 6, with, 'Education should function as an instrument of social transformation and an egalitarian social order.'; and even though the box item on page 20 questions the persistence of stereotypes, it was felt that this NCF also does not also rise above the stereotypes, it gives greater emphasis to pedagogical innovations. The section on teachers is well written, it says that women teachers are also victims of stereotype but is silent how to bring about change. If we cannot empower our women teachers then how can we break the stranglehold of the stereotypes? Similarly the section on active learning and interactive learning is well written but it ignores the fact that dalit children are not allowed to sit with others. It also ignores the fact that girls are passive learners in schools. The NCF is silent on what steps to make this transformation possible. The Lok Jumbish experience tells us girls cannot become active learners unless there is a change in the way society looks at the position of girls.
5. There was a feeling that the management systems of education was male dominated and there was a need to engender it without which it is impossible to work towards gender equity. It is similar for dalits. It was also said that prima facie this may seem unrelated to curriculum, but it was felt that these were minimum conditions to bring about change.

6. The overall impression of the NCF 2005 was it was written patriarchal elite people and needed to be rewritten in the most basic way. On the other hand, opinions were also expressed that the aims of education were quite well crystallised. There was however some doubt on whether the issues of dalits and girls would be sorted by this NCF alone. It was felt that a change in curriculum alone will not bring out social change but a strong programme of adult literacy like the BGVS programme of the 1990's.
7. There was agreement that this document needed gendering. At present it was seen as an elite male document in its nuances.
8. It was felt that the document should be sensitive about the use of words like 'upper caste, lower caste, classes, masses' etc. In response to that it was felt that the use of words has to be taken in context.
9. It seemed that the purpose of NCF is to create a learning society; it talks of bringing in change in the education system with the fulcrum being the teachers. This implies that the load will also go to them. This has implications on the preparedness of the current system to handle change. There is a need to question the state of current in-service teacher training and level of activity of the DIET/SCERTs. The question of adequacy of teachers for vocational education was raised. The question of initiating a debate with teachers was also raised. The NCF was also not clear about the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
10. There was an opinion that some things need to be stated explicitly even in a curricular frame document, e.g. teacher management is missing from the NCF; there is reference to institutions but not their analysis; examinations are discussed but not boards. The systemic reforms chapter critiques the earlier document. The entire document speaks of equity and plurality but needs to be explicit in stating positions on gender and caste.
11. An opinion was expressed that there is a conceptual vacuum in the document that is camouflaged by using words like equality, plurality, management, 'they were like *gangajal!! Chidak kar sab pavitra!!*' The use of equality in plurality and the sameness of distributive system ensures quality as far as manager is concerned; though actually it promotes inequality and this needs to be debated. In response to that it was said that while it is true that details had not been clarified but that does not constitute conceptual vacuum. Words like equity and justice still retain meaning.
12. The issue of innovation in systemic reform was raised. It was felt that research given space but only as an innovation, it needs greater attention and as a separate programme, e.g. how do children learn, how do they form concepts, children's declining interest in the same concept in higher classes so that the subjects become difficult. It was felt that this will help textbook makers. A separate kind of orientation of education managers was talked of in the NCF and that needs to be articulated clearly. It was also felt that school support systems did exist but needed to be stronger and that too needs to be

included in the section of systemic reform. One of the reasons for poor implementation not being there was that the kind of support that the teachers needed is not in place.

13. A suggestion to have a pool of resource people who could share the NCF with teachers was also made.

Concluding Remarks

1. The NCF is good but far from ideal. There is a need of a road map to make it achievable and also state the financial needs and then move towards allocation. It needs to define what is adequate that will in turn determine finance. It was felt that if there is a clear conceptual frame, then it will show detailing. The conceptual clarity will reflect in language and nuances. If there are problems in language and nuances then it is an indicator of a problem in conceptual clarity. This document should not fall into a trap of skirting 'sensitive issues of muslims, adivasis and girls'.
2. A suggestion was made that the NCF should define what it is and the need for it in the beginning. The aims of education and the child as a constructor need to be emphasised and repeated through the document. It should also give the rationale of the principles used in making this document. It was also suggested that a summary of the 21 position papers should also be made available to avoid misgivings.
3. There was a general complaint that it should be easier to read and understand. It was also felt that here is a danger of simplification as many concepts cannot be simplified. How can one talk of NCF in 20 bullet points? One should thank the writers for a commendable document. A suggestion was made to have more discussions as this was not only the responsibility of the government but also other groups. It was felt that so far the media has ignored the conceptual issues but highlighted only controversial issues like history and there is a need to change it. It was felt that one also needed to avoid debunking the NCF. It was pointed out that the NCF is a dynamic document and this is open ended and a continuous process. Our educational policy provides for this and we need to use it. In 2010 there will be another one.
4. It was also pointed out that while the responsibility of making it is with NCERT but it is not a NCERT document, it is a public document. It belongs to everyone as it affects every child. This needs to be remembered when the NCERT will try to resist changes "*hamse kum ki baat na kahiye, hame to poorie ki poorie duniya chahiye*, (do not talk of minimalist language with us, we want the whole world).

Report by Jyotsna Lal

DIGANTAR

Shiksha Evam Khel kud Samiti

Todi Ramjanipura, Kho Nagoriyan Road, Jagatpur, Jaipur-25

Ph : 0141- 2750310, 2750230, Fax : 2751268