

**MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE PROJECT APPROVAL BOARD
FOR SARVA SHIKSHA ABHIYAN HELD ON 8.10.02**

The 21st meeting of the Project Approval Board for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan was held under the Chairmanship of Shri S.C. Tripathi, Secretary, Elementary Education & Literacy on 8.10.02. A list of participants is annexed.

Item No. 1: Confirmation of Minutes of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth meetings of the Project Approval Board held on 12/9/2002 and 17/9/2002

1.1 Minutes of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth meetings of the Project Approval Board held on 12/9/2002 and 17/9/2002 were confirmed.

Item No.2: Consideration of Perspective Plans and Annual Plans 2002-2003 of Madhya Pradesh.

2.1 Secretary to Government of India, Elementary Education & Literacy, while welcoming the members, wanted to know about the strategies being adopted by the State to get out-of-school children to school. The Mission Director (MD), MP replied that, the drop-out was high in MP after the primary cycle due to absence of upper primary schools in the State. So the State is focussing on increasing the number of upper primary schools. In addition there were certain social factors which militate against girls enrolment. To tackle this problem the State was trying to open ECCE centres and rely on extensive community mobilization. JS (EE) stated that the plans were silent on the initiatives for the urban children.

2.2 Ms. Shalini Prasad on behalf of the appraisal team stated that while perspective plans have been appraised for the non-DPEP districts, only the annual plans have been appraised for the DPEP districts. A team went to the State for the appraisal of non-DPEP districts, while only desk appraisal was done for the DPEP districts. She raised the following issues, particularly for DPEP districts, for PAB to take a decision:

- The State had proposed free textbooks at the primary level under SSA in DPEP districts also, when this could be taken up under DPEP. MD clarified that free textbooks was not part of the EFC approved cost under DPEP and so would have to be taken under SSA only. Further, there were no savings likely under DPEP which was at the stage of closing. Secretary (EE&L) indicated that this could be included in the costing under SSA.
- The state has proposed BRC/CRC in the DPEP districts also when they are already existing under DPEP. MD clarified that the BRCs under DPEP are restricted for primary and the additional personnel proposed would be used for upper primary initiatives. Secretary (EE&L) indicated that this would lead to dichotomy between the DPEP and non-DPEP districts and so the total number of personnel in primary and upper primary would be restricted to 20 in both DPEP and non-DPEP districts.
- Activities like community training, etc have been proposed in DPEP districts also. It was decided that as long as these are directed towards upper primary interventions these could be permitted.
- While the EGS proposals of the State are being processed separately, it has been seen that the total number of primary schools and EGS is more than the number of habitations. MD clarified that the EGS proposed are as per the GOI norms, and the excess numbers are because of habitations, especially larger ones, having more than one school per habitation. Secretary (EE&L) indicated that when EGS has become the alternate system of schools in MP, then the State should examine the possibility of upgrading them into regular schools and take funds under SSA for improvement. However, for them to be eligible to be treated as school under SSA, the schools should satisfy the norms related to distance, minimum pupil strength, number of teachers (at least two teachers), equivalence to formal schools, curriculum, etc.

2.3 Secretary (EE&L) wanted to know about the reasons for the State asking for much less additional teachers than that necessitated by the projected enrolment. For non-DPEP districts the additional teachers proposed is only 3563 in primary against the additional teacher requirement of 17808. It was explained

that with the emphasis having shifted to EGS schools, additional enrolment would be more in these schools and so the teachers may not be required to the same extent. Secretary wanted the training of EGS teachers to be organized in such a manner that they become eligible for D.Ed. after a specified number of years. For this the State could interact with NCTE. Further, it has been reported that there are untrained teachers in the State and the State should take steps to provide training for them.

2.4 Based on the plans prepared, remarks of the appraisal team and discussions thereon, it was decided to approve the perspective plan for non-DPEP districts in principle as per details given in Annex I. However, annual plans would have to be submitted every year based on the provision of the perspective plan, achievement of previous annual plans, new developments and remarks of appraisal and supervision missions. Following decisions were taken regarding the Annual Plans of both DPEP and non-DPEP districts of 2002-03:

- i) For DPEP districts, upgradation of primary school to upper primary were sanctioned only for 2550 schools against that requested by the State since the details required had not been furnished. 5100 teachers and TLE grant for these schools were also approved.
- ii) 2385 upper primary schools were approved in the non-DPEP districts, with the proviso that the State should send revised justification for their opening before funds are released against these item. 4780 teachers and TLE grant were also approved for these schools.
- iii) Teachers grant was sanctioned for the non-DPEP districts, in light of its importance in pedagogy. However, the teacher grant should be given per teacher actually in position and not at the rate of two teachers per school as is being done by the State Government. In the DPEP districts teacher grant and school grant were approved only for upper primary.
- iv) Free textbooks were permitted only for classes IV to VIII since Classes I to III were being already being given textbooks under State policy.
- v) In addition to in-service training for existing trained teachers and induction training to new teachers recommended by the appraisal team, it was also decided to provide for the 60 days training eligible under SSA norms for untrained teachers.
- vi) State's proposal for libraries under the innovative head was not accepted since it is beyond the SSA norms.
- vii) No new BRCs were permitted in DPEP district. But the State was permitted to have additional resource persons in the existing BRC with the restriction that the total number of personnel under BRCs and CRCs under DPEP and SSA put together does not exceed the eligibility of resource persons in the block under SSA norms.
- viii) The requirement proposed for the State Project Office was approved with the condition that no permanent posts should be created and the positions should be filled up only by contract or deputation. In case of deputation no deputation allowance should be paid.
- ix) For SIEMAT, only the net balance from Rs 3 crores after deducting the outlay given under DPEP was approved.
- x) EGS proposals would be analyzed on file, and the State would be allowed additional civil works later to an extent allowed by the additional plan size through inclusion of EGS.
- xi) The proposals regarding R&E grant, maintenance grant, innovation, community training, Management cost (subject to 6% ceiling) and civil works (subject to 33% ceiling) were approved as per recommendations of the appraisal team.
- vii) Based on the proposal of the State Government and the recommendations of the Appraisal Team thereon, a total Annual Plan 2002-03 for an amount of Rs 7707.82 lakhs was approved as per details given in Annex II (for non-DPEP districts) and for Rs 8814.21 lakhs as per details in Annex III (for DPEP districts).

- viii) Since the details about expenditure under various heads in individual districts against the AWP of 2001-02, the spill over plan would be examined on file at the time of the first instalment of 2002-03
- ix) It was directed that the State should also satisfy the following conditions:
- (a) The State Government should give a written commitment for meeting its share of the SSA outlay.
 - (b) 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.
 - (c) At least 50% of the teachers recruited should be female.
 - (d) Teachers appointed against posts created through SSA funds should be made accountable to the VEC for at least salary payment. The latter would monitor the attendance before releasing the salary.
 - (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 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.
 - (h) All appointments under the head of management cost should either be on deputation or on contract basis, with all persons being recruited having functional computer literacy

Item No.3: Consideration of Annual Plans 2002-2003 of Chattisgarh

3.1 It was stated by Mission Director (MD), Chhattisgarh that out of the 16 districts in the State, 15 districts are already covered under DPEP and only the district of Durg was a non-DPEP district. The perspective plan of the districts would be ready in another 30 days time. Since the present 15 DPEP districts were only six districts before bifurcation, District Project Offices are not available in the balance nine bifurcated districts. So the State has proposed DPOs in these districts, along with that in Durg. The State has also proposed upgradation of EGS centres into primary schools and primary schools into upper primary schools.

3.2 Ms Shalini Prasad, on behalf of the appraisal team, stated that only the annual plans of the State have been appraised and, for this only a desk appraisal was done. EGS proposals have not been appraised and would be taken up separately on file. Secretary (EE&L) desired to know about the special interventions proposed for forest areas. JS (EE) stated that education in these areas is being looked into by the Tribal Welfare Department and requested the State to include the Secretary, Tribal Education in the SSA mission so that these areas are not left out under SSA.

3.3 Secretary (EE&L) wanted to know about the strategies for targeting out-of-school children. The MD replied that they have proposed mainstreaming of children through bridge courses under the 'Der Aaye Durust Aaye (DADA)' programme. Under the programme special coaching camps would be conducted through NGOs which have already been identified.

3.4 Based on the plans, remarks of the appraisal team and discussions held, following decisions were taken by the Board:

- i) 99 new primary schools by upgrading the EGS centres were approved as per the recommendation of the appraisal team.

- ii) 708 new upper primary schools, through upgradation of primary schools, and 63 new upper primary schools were approved with three teachers per upper primary school.
- iii) Project offices for Durg and the newly bifurcated DPEP districts were approved. However, State should ensure that the person responsible in the district for regular education administration is also responsible for the implementation of SSA. If these two tasks were entrusted to two different streams of administration then the SSA programme would get severely affected. The staffing of these offices would be done with the condition that no permanent posts are created and the positions filled up only by contract or deputation. In case of deputation no deputation allowance should be paid.
- iv) CRCs and BRCs were permitted subject to the restriction that there would not be more than 20 personnel per CD Block, including the personnel appointed under DPEP.
- v) EGS proposals would be analyzed on file, and the State would be allowed additional civil works later to an extent allowed by the additional plan size through inclusion of EGS.
- vi) Other items like research grant, BRCs, CRCs, IED, teacher training, innovation, civil works, etc. were approved as per the recommendation of the appraisal team.
- v) Based on the proposal of the State Government and the recommendations of the Appraisal Team thereon, a total Annual Plan 2002-03 for a amount of Rs 6763.67 lakhs was approved as per details given in Annex IV.
- vi) Since the details about expenditure under various heads in individual districts against the AWP of 2001-02, the spill over plan would be examined on file at the time of the first instalment of 2002-03
- vii) It was directed that the State should also satisfy the following conditions:
 - (a) The State Government should give a written commitment for meeting its share of the SSA outlay.
 - (b) 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.
 - (c) At least 50% of the teachers recruited should be female.
 - (d) 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.
 - (e) 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.
 - (f) The second instalment would only be released after the previous instalment of 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.
 - (g) All appointments under the head of management cost should either be on deputation or on contract basis, with all persons being recruited having functional computer literacy

4.0 The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks for the Chair.

ATTENDANCE OF THE 21st MEETING OF THE PROJECT APPROVAL BOARD HELD ON
8.10.2002 UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF SECRETARY(EE&L).

1. Shri S.C. Tripathi, Secretary(EE&L) Chairman
2. Shri Sumit Bose, JS(EE), MHRD
3. Ms. Indu Datta, Director, Plg. Commission
4. Shri R.L. Raichandani AFA (representative of F.A)
5. Dr. Meena Gautam, Dy. Secretary (representative of Chairperson, NCTE)
6. Dr. Manju Jain, Reader, NCERT (representative of Director NCERT)

In Attendance

1. Shri Kalyan Chakravorty, Principal Secretary (Education), Govt. of Chattisgarh
2. Shri Sunil Kujur, Mission Director/ Secretary (Education), Govt. of Chattisgarh
3. Shri Pramod Singh, Joint Director, SPO, RGSM, Chhattisgarh
4. Shri Deepak Dubey, Asstt. Director, SPO, RGSM, Chhattisgarh
5. Mrs. Amita Sharma (Mission Director & Secretary (EE), Government of M.P.
6. Shri L.S. Baghel, Addl. Mission Director, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Bhopal
7. Shri Varun Varup, Manager (F) Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Bhopal.
8. Shri Deepak Verma, Programmer -cum -Trg. Officer, RGSM, Bhopal
9. Shri Farooque Siddiqui, Asstt. Manager (Planning & Monitoring), RGSM, Bhopal
10. Shri S.K. Soni, Manager (Civil Works) Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Bhopal
11. Shri D.S. Sisodia (Programmer), DPEP, M.P.
12. Shri Manesh Mulchandani (Programmer) DPEP, M.P.
13. Ms. Archana Bhambal, Deputy Manager, RGSM, Bhopal
14. Shri Shekhar Sarathe, Programmer cum Trg. Officer, RGSM, Bhopal
15. Ms. Shalini Prasad, Director (EE&L), MHRD
16. Sri S.K.Bansal, US, MHRD
17. Shri Praveen Kumar, Director, (MHRD)
18. Shri O.P.Chaturvedi, US, MHRD