

**MINUTES OF THE 10TH MEETING OF THE PROJECT APPROVAL BOARD FOR
SARVA SHIKSHA ABHIYAN HELD AT 11.00 A.M. ON 28.1.2002**

The 10th meeting of the Project Approval Board for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan was held under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, Elementary Education & Literacy at 11.00 a.m. on 28.1.2002. A list of participants is annexed.

Item No.1: Confirmation of Minutes

1.1 The Minutes of the 8th meeting of the Project Approval Board held on 15.1.2002 were confirmed.

Item No.2: Action Taken Report

2.1 Action Taken on the decision of the 8th Minutes of the Project Approval Board was noted.

Item No.3: Consideration of Plans from Orissa.

3.1 The meeting began with the observations of the Appraisal Mission for Orissa by Dr. Pramila Menon of NIEPA. Dr. Menon pointed out that the District Plans have been prepared on the basis of data collected through household survey and school survey and also with participatory meeting of different groups. However, the data from the survey has not been fully utilized in the planning exercise. Similarly, the State has not carried out focussed group discussions or microplanning/school mapping exercises. Also, the Baseline Assessment Study with regard to access, retention and achievement and survey of equity and physical infrastructure has not been undertaken. The Mission also observed that the data provided in one place in some of the Plans was at variance with the similar data in other places. The data is incomplete in regard to number of schools, enrolment and number of teachers. The State Government also needed to organize training of community leaders and VEC members. The media publicity campaign for community mobilization for higher enrolment need should be given priority. In the light of above the district plans need to be revised.

3.2 The State Project Director, responding to the issues raised by the Appraisal Mission, stated that there are 30 districts in the State, of which, 14 non-DPEP districts are proposed to be covered now under SSA, 16 districts having been already covered by DPEP. Of these 14 districts, ten are in coastal areas, which are educationally quite developed, while three are tribal majority districts and need a special dispensation under SSA. He further added that the State Government has recently given more powers to the PRIs/VECs as far as control over teachers is concerned. He assured that he would look into the problem of variance of the data and redo the exercise while formulating perspective plan and annual plan for 2002-2003.

3.3 The SPD Orissa further stated that initially the State Government had proposed the plans for four months but the plans were subsequently changed at the suggestion of the Appraisal Mission to make it for two months. In the plan the State had proposed regular teachers for the new schools while para-teachers have been suggested in existing schools. Free textbooks have been not asked for the welfare schools (1024 in number) where the State already provides the textbooks. He further clarified that their demand for 164 new primary schools is based on the norms of habitations without educational facilities within 1 kilometer and population of 300. Regarding staff in BRCs, the SPD stated that they would need two persons for BRCs and eight for CRCs in Blocks with less than 100 schools. For Blocks more than 100 schools the norms were three persons for BRCs and 17 persons for CRCs. Secretary (EE&L) asked the SPD to clarify on the data discrepancy since three sets of data were made available to the appraisal team. The SPD indicated that the data given by him during his presentation to the appraisal team can be used and the appraisal team had also used this data only.

3.4 Director (Finance) pointed out that the figures given in the plans regarding number of existing teachers or the teacher-pupil ratio do not justify the demand for additional teacher. The State Government should, therefore, rationalize the posting of teachers and make up the gaps by redeployment instead of asking for more teachers under SSA. Even the new schools could be filled up through redeployment. SPD, Orissa admitted that some of the districts have teacher-pupil ratio better than the SSA norms, but they also have schools with less than 40 students which need to be provided two teachers as per SSA norms and hence the PTR of 1:40 will not apply in such cases. They are in the process of redeploying teachers to the extent of 5% every year within the district. Secretary, EE&L, therefore, suggested that the State Government should come with a definite policy of redeployment of teachers with school wise data of existing teachers and

additional teachers required for such schools to enable the Board to arrive at a decision on sanctioning of additional teachers to the State for the new schools.

3.5 After discussion on the proposals made by the State Government and the recommendations of the Appraisal Team thereon, following decisions were taken by the Board:

- i) The PAB agreed to permit opening of new 156 primary schools out of 164 proposed by the State. These schools would be opened only in those habitations, which do not have any school within 1 km and had a population of 300. However, no teachers would be sanctioned for these schools until the State does the exercise of rationalisation and identifies the surplus teachers for these new schools sanctioned. Only after this exercise is done and it is found that no surplus is available, new teachers would be sanctioned next year.
- ii) Similarly for upper primary 137 new schools were permitted as per the recommendation of the appraisal team. However, here also teachers were not sanctioned.
- iii) TLE @ Rs 10000/- per primary school and @ Rs 50000/- per upper primary school was sanctioned for these new schools.
- iv) Additional teachers were not permitted till the exercise of redeployment is done.
- v) School grant for 18212 primary schools and 6397 upper primary schools, and teachers grant for 50395 primary teachers and 17668 upper primary teachers were sanctioned as per the norms of SSA.
- vi) Teacher training was sanctioned for 10 days for 67825 teachers
- vii) Free textbooks was permitted for 18,40,061 girls and SC/ST boys in Government schools at the rate of Rs 60/- per student,
- viii) Research, Supervision, Monitoring & Evaluation grant was sanctioned for 24609 schools at the rate of Rs 1400/- per school.
- ix) 137 BRCs and 2264 CRCs were permitted for opening in the state. While contingency grant would be given to these BRCs/CRCs, furniture grant was sanctioned for 126 BRCs and 2262 CRCs.
- x) 405 teachers were sanctioned for BRCs and 2262 teachers for CRCs, with blocks having more than 100 schools getting 3 teachers per BRCs and 17 in CRCs, while blocks having less than 100 schools would have 2 teacher per BRC and 8 in CRCs. These posts in BRCs/CRCs would be filled up by transferring senior teachers to these centres from the schools where they are already serving. The resultant vacancies in these schools would be

- filled up by trained primary teachers or para teachers to fill up the vacancies, subject to the state policy on this and NCTE guidelines. For the purpose of allocation of funds for 2001-02, the salary of para teachers @ Rs 1500/- per month for one month would be considered. The State can ask for a higher amount later to the extent to which it is able to fill up the resultant vacancies by regular primary teachers who have higher emoluments.
- xi) Training of 1,77,536 community leaders was approved for 2 days as per SSA norms.
- xii) IED grant for 45,878 physically and mentally challenged children was approved as per norms.
- xiii) Innovative projects were approved for girls education, SC/ST education and ECCE for Rs 508 lakhs, which is less than the entitlement of Rs 700 lakhs for the 14 districts at the rate of Rs 50 lakhs per district.
- xiv) As far as civil works are concerned, sanction was given for 6 BRCs, 462 drinking water facilities, 1332 toilets, 78 buildings for buildingless primary schools, 27 buildings for buildingless upper primary schools, 159 new primary schools, 126 new upper primary schools, 100 additional class rooms and repairs of 14834 schools for a total amount of Rs 2263.88 lakhs, which is 32.79% of total outlay.
- xv) Management cost sanctioned was Rs 157.55 lakhs, which amounts to 2.28% of the total cost.
- xvi) Based on the above decisions, the total outlay approved by the Board was as follows:

(Rs lakhs)

	District	Total outlay
1	Anugul	4.38
2	Balasore	7.44
3	Bhadrakh	4.97
4	Cuttack	5.58
5	Deogarh	1.79
6	Ganjam	10.23
7	Jagatsinghpur	3.97
8	Jajpur	5.33
9	Jharsuguda	2.18
10	Kendrapara	4.89
11	Khurda	4.10

12	Nayagarh	3.45
13	Puri	5.25
14	Sundargarh	5.49
15	Total	69.05

xvii) State Government should satisfy the following as far as spending the money under SSA is concerned:

- (a) The State Government should give a written commitment for meeting its share of the SSA outlay.
- (b) The State Government should release the above money to the State Implementation Society within one month of the receipt of money in its account.
- (c) First instalment of the State share should also be released to the Society within one month of the release of Central share to the State Government.
- (d) At least 50% of the teachers recruited should be female.
- (e) VECs or equivalent bodies should be constituted and accounts opened to incur expenditure under teachers grant, civil works, maintenance grants, school grants and other such expenditure which has to be incurred only through these bodies as per SSA norms.
- (f) The State Government will maintain their level of investment in elementary education as in 1999-2000 and give the details of this to GOI before the release of second instalment. The contribution as State share for SSA will be over and above this investment.
- (g) The second instalment would only be released after the previous instalment of Central Government and State share has been transferred to the State Implementation Society and substantial progress has been made in expenditure as far as money already released is concerned.

Item No. 4: Consideration of Plans from Haryana

4.1 The Board considered the District Elementary Education Plans for 2001-2002 in respect of 11 districts of Haryana. A brief presentation was made by the State Project Director, Haryana, the highlights being:

- There are 19 districts in the State of which four have been covered under DPEP. Of the remaining districts, DEEPs of 11 districts have been submitted to the Board for consideration.
- 71% of the population in these districts is in rural areas.
- The literacy rate, which was 55.85% in 1991, has improved to 68.59% in 2001 bringing the State to the 20th position at the national level. The female literacy is 51.31%.
- The State Government had held a participatory meeting with the community leaders/representative of the PRI. The following issues emerged in this meeting:-
 - Infrastructure is adequate in the schools.
 - VEC members have been orientated by the State Government.
 - Curriculum needed review with the involvement of teachers.
 - Educational Tours for teachers and students need to be conducted.
 - Each cluster should have five to six schools instead of 8 to 10 schools as at present.
 - Stress on education of girls.
 - Monthly tests should be conducted and progress reported to the parents.
 - Library and Laboratory should be established.
 - No non-teaching work should be assigned to the teachers Services of unemployed youth should be utilized for various kinds of non-teaching work.
 - School heads need to be given orientation on staff management and relation with students.
 - School Annual Function/Sport meets should be celebrated.
 - Sufficient material for sports should be available in schools.
 - Computer education/Vocational education be imparted as a part of curriculum in upper primary schools.
- The State has carried out micro planning exercise in all the 11 districts.
- Percentage of dropout is small but percentage of non-starters is high in the State.
- The drop out rate is higher for 11 to 14 age group.
- The majority of out of school children are girls.
- Children are shifting from Government schools to private schools.

- The State Government has not proposed any new primary schools but only EGS and AIE centers. They also propose to strengthen upper primary schools during 2002-2003.

4.2 Director (Finance) pointed out certain discrepancies in the data. According to him, the data of population of 6-11 age group and that of enrolment/GER does not match. The relevant table of Ambala shows the population of 6-11 age group children as 1.89 lakh whereas the enrolment is only 58 thousand. This does not match either with the NER/GER of 86% or the out of school figure of 11 thousand. SPD Haryana stated that this discrepancy needed examination and would be rectified in the perspective plan.

4.3 Dr. Gupta of NCERT representing the Appraisal Mission pointed out that the State Government has prepared only the perspective plan from 2002-20010 and not the annual plan of 2001-2002. The Mission, therefore, had to ask the State Government to reschedule their activities so that some of them could be taken up in the remaining period of the year 2001-2002. He also stated that the State Government has not transferred to the State Implementing Society Rs. 1.33 crore sanctioned in September 2001 for pre-project activity. However, the districts managed to carry out some of the pre-Project activities such as house to house survey, micro planning and community mobilization out of DPEP funds. Although, the population of urban deprived children is about 40%, this data is missing in the perspective plan. And disabled children presently in school only have be taken into consideration. The quality component was also not adequate in the perspective plan.

4.4 Dr. Neeru Snehi of NIEPA pointed out that there were no proper norms for composition of VECs. In some cases even the Sarpanch were unaware about their being members of VECs. Household survey was also conducted on pilot basis to cover only 40% of the area. School improvement plan was also missing in the plans.

4.5 Shri S.C. Gujaria, Consultant, TSG, also pointed out that funds for pre-Project activity have not been made available to the Society as yet. However, in addition to the SSA funds being asked now, savings from DPEP I, amounting to around Rs 25 crores is to be utilized in these districts. Secretary, EE&L indicated that no further funds would be released to the State Government until pre-project activity funds are transmitted to the State Mission Society. However, Secretary Haryana explained that the release of funds have been held up due to delay in

AG's office in creation of a new head of account for this purpose. Shri Gujaria also stated that the present annual plan has been prepared for only those activities which are not covered under the DPEP I savings plan for non-DPEP districts.

4.6 Responding to the points made by the Appraisal Team, the Education Secretary, Haryana clarified that they would rectify the discrepancies in the data while preparing their annual plans next year. He had also indicated that they had completed the household survey covering 60% rural area earlier and would be completing the survey in remaining 40% urban area by February 2002. Institutional survey was 100% complete and the data used in the Plans was based on institutional survey. They also propose to complete the recasting of the plan by February end. He requested that the Appraisal of the plans during next year should be done as early as possible.

4.7 On the proposal of the State Government to have Block Resource Centres for the educational blocks, the Director, Finance pointed out that Community Development Block has been taken as a unit for setting up of BRCs and that this practice should be followed in the case of Haryana. He stated that the Block is commonly understood as Community Development Block and non-specification of the same should not be used to interpret this word to mean educational blocks.

4.8 After discussion on the proposals made by the State Government and the recommendations of the Appraisal Team thereon, the following decisions were taken by the Board:

- i) It was noted that the proposed annual plan was only for those activities which are not covered under DPEP I savings plan for non-DPEP districts.
- ii) No new primary or upper primary schools were sanctioned.
- iii) School grant for 2049 upper primary schools and teachers grant for 11146 upper primary teachers were sanctioned as per the norms of SSA.
- iv) Teacher training was sanctioned for 30380 teachers for 2 days only.
- v) Under the head Research, Supervision, Monitoring & Evaluation grant Rs 5 lakhs was sanctioned to SCERT towards development of tools for base line study.
- vi) It was noted that the sub-district educational administrative structure in the State was not at the community development block level, but at the level of educational block, which is slightly smaller than the CD block. The State officials stated that it was essential to have the BRCs at the educational block level for reasons of administrative convenience and to

ensure proper monitoring and accountability and stated that similar pattern was being followed by them in the DPEP districts. The members of the PAB deliberated on the issue at great length and the decision in the case of Mizoram taken in the 9th meeting of PAB was adopted. It was recognized that it would be neither feasible nor practical to ask the State to restructure their educational administrative set-up so as to make the Block as the unit of educational administration. The present structure has been existing from the very beginning and any change at this stage would not only be difficult but would also disrupt the entire structure. It was also noted that in the DPEP programme, in which the concept of BRC originated, circle or educational blocks were taken into consideration for opening of BRCs. While Director (Finance) reiterated that Block should be taken to mean CD Block only, the PAB felt that for this purpose the alternate educational administrative unit such as circle or educational block should be treated as 'Block' under SSA. However, since there appeared to be some ambiguity in the SSA guidelines in which the word 'Block' has not been clearly defined, it was felt that this point needed to be clarified first. Therefore, it was decided that, while the State should have 69 BRCs with one BRC in each educational block, only 57 BRCs may be sanctioned this year, corresponding to the 57 CD blocks only. The balance 12 BRCs would be considered in the next year's plan after receipt of necessary clarification. Accordingly, contingency grant for 57 BRCs and 711 CRCs was approved at the rate of Rs 3,000/- per BRC and Rs 500/- per CRC. No salary component was provided for personnel this year.

- vii) Training of 40528 community leaders in 4066 villages was approved for 2 days as per SSA norms.
- viii) No civil works was sanctioned for this year.
- ix) Rs 7.5 lakhs was sanctioned as Management cost, which amounts to 4.25% of the total cost.
- x) Based on the above decisions, the total outlay approved by the Board was as follows:

(Rs lakhs)

	District	Total outlay	Civil Works	% of civil works to Tot. Cost	Manag-ement cost	% of manag-ement cost to total cost
1	Rohtak	10.85	0.00	0.00	0.50	4.61
2	Rewari	14.28	0.00	0.00	0.50	3.50
3	Kurukshetra	15.38	0.00	0.00	0.50	3.25

4	Sonipat	26.57	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.88
5	Yamuna Nagar	14.51	0.00	0.00	0.50	3.45
6	Faridabad	18.08	0.00	0.00	0.50	2.77
7	Panipat	12.06	0.00	0.00	0.50	4.15
8	Panchkula	8.58	0.00	0.00	0.50	5.83
9	Ambala	16.33	0.00	0.00	0.50	3.06
10	Jhajjar	17.11	0.00	0.00	0.50	2.92
11	Karnal	15.71	0.00	0.00	0.50	3.18
12	State Component	7.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	28.57
13	Total	176.47	0.00	0.00	7.50	4.25

xi) State Government should satisfy the following as far as spending the funds under SSA was concerned:

- (a) The first instalment would be sanctioned only after the State Government releases the pre-project funds to the State Implementation Society. The SIS should use the money to carry out the preparatory activities and have the perspective plan ready by April 2002.
- (b) The State Government should give a written commitment for meeting its share of the SSA outlay.
- (c) The State Government should release the above money to the State Implementation Society within one month of the receipt of money in its account.
- (d) First instalment of the State share should also be released to the Society within one month of the release of Central share to the State Government.
- (e) At least 50% of the teachers recruited should be female.
- (f) VECs or equivalent bodies should be constituted and accounts opened to incur expenditure under teachers grant, civil works, maintenance grants, school grants and other such expenditure which has to be incurred only through these bodies as per SSA norms.
- (g) The State Government will maintain their level of investment in elementary education as in 1999-2000 and give the details of this to GOI before the release of second instalment. The contribution as State share for SSA will be over and above this investment.
- (h) The second instalment would only be released after the previous instalment of Central Government and State share has been transferred to the State

Implementation Society and substantial progress has been made in expenditure as far as money already released is concerned.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE PROJECT BOARD ON
SARVA SHIKSHA ABHIYAN HELD AT 11.00 A.M. ON 28TH JANUARY 2002.**

1. Shri S.K. Tripathi, Secretary, EE&L, In the Chair
2. Shri Sumit Bose , Joint Secretary , MHRD
3. Shri Shashi Shekhar Sharma, Director, (representing FA, MHRD).
4. Shri J.C Sharma, Director (Edu), Plg. Commission (Representing Principal Adviser (Edu), Planning Commission).
5. Ms. S. Dave, Director (representing JS (AE) MHRD).
6. Shri Mohan Francis ,Director,(Plg.), (representing JS(Plg.) , MHRD)
7. V.P. Yajuvedi , Director, Ministry of Labour (representing Secretary Labour)
8. Dr. Meena Gautam, Deputy Secretary ,NCTE(representing Chairperson ,NCTE)
9. Ms. Vasudha Gupta, Deputy Secretary, (DWCD) (representing Secretary, WCD).
10. Shri M.I.A. Zaidi, Fellow ,NIEPA (representing Director NIEPA)
11. A.A. C. Lal , Reader, NCERT (representing Director NCERT)

IN ATTENDANCE

1. Shri P.K. Chaudhary, Commissioner & Secretary, (Edu.), Govt of Haryana.
2. Shri R.R. Banswal, SPD, Haryana.
3. Dr. Balkar Singh, Deputy Director, DPEP Haryana.
4. Vijay Arora, SPD, Orissa.
5. Dr. Neeru Snehi, NIEPA.
6. Dr. Subhash Gujaria, Ed.cil.
7. Dr. Swarna Gupta, Reader, DEE, NCERT.
8. Ms. Prena Gulati, Deputy Secretary MHRD.
9. Shri Amit Kaushik, Director, MHRD.
10. Ms. Madhumita., NEIPA
11. Shri R.D. Sharma, Reader, NCERT.
12. Dr. Pramila Menon, Fellow, NIEPA.
13. K. Gopalan, Consultant , TSG. Ed. Cil.
14. Shri R.L. Raichandani, US, IFD, MHRD.
15. Shri S.K. Kapoor, US MHRD.
16. Shri I.S. Kalija, Desk Officer, MHRD.
17. B.M. Saddi US, MHRD.
18. Shri Praveen Kumar, Director, MHRD.
19. Shri O.P. Chaturvedi, US MHRD.