

**MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF PROJECT APPROVAL BOARD  
OF SSA HELD ON 30/8/2001**

1. The Second meeting of the Project Approval Board was held on 30/8/2001 under the Chairmanship of Secretary (EE&L). The list of participants is annexed. In the meeting, the District Elementary Education Plans of 15 districts of Uttar Pradesh and 2 districts of Andhra Pradesh were considered for approval.
2. **Agenda Item No. 1:** The Board confirmed the minutes of the first meeting of the Project Approval Board held on 8/8/2001.
3. **Agenda Item No. 2:** The Action Taken Report was taken on record.
4. **Agenda Item No. 3 (Uttar Pradesh):**
  - 4.1 On behalf of the appraisal team, Shri Talukdar of TSG, Ed Cil, briefed the Board about the salient features of the Plans of the 14 districts received from Uttar Pradesh. Regarding the 15<sup>th</sup> district Pilibhit where DPEP is going on simultaneously, it was found that no clear-cut indication had been given on which activities have been suggested for DPEP and which have been considered in SSA. Many activities being carried out under DPEP were also budgeted in SSA. The total annual plan size proposed for the remaining fourteen districts was Rs 170.99 crores, but the appraisal team had recommended Rs 114.63 crores for these districts. He further stated that the upper primary schools were provided for in the 1:2 ratio vis-à-vis the primary schools, taking into consideration the present facilities and requirement. Some deviations were seen in the plans, which were rectified by the appraisal team as follows:
    - i) Civil works in certain districts was above the 33% limit. These were brought down to this level.
    - ii) The number of upper primary schools in the first year has been restricted to 25 or the actual numbers asked for, whichever is lower.
    - iii) The number of teachers has been restricted to 3 for upper primary and 2 for primary.
  - i) The Secretary asked how the objectives of SSA, i.e. universal enrolment by the year 2003 and five years of schooling by 2007 is going to be targeted, when the emphasis in the report appears to be more on the upper primary. The SPD replied that the emphasis on upper primary was because the largest dropout is seen during the transition from Class V to VI. So it

was essential to build up the infrastructure of Upper Primary and hence the emphasis was on this. She also stated that UP Basic Education Project had been in operation in these districts and a considerable amount of infrastructure has been built up in the primary sector while the Upper Primary sector was neglected.

- ii) JS (EE) asked on plans for sourcing of funds under other programmes for elementary education. SPD, UP, stated that UP was dovetailing funds under other schemes like JRY till 1999. But after that, these funds were given directly to Panchayats and each Panchayat got less than Rs 50,000/-. This was not sufficient to take up any school-related civil work. Further, the PMGY funds are being used in the DPEP districts as per the covenant with External Agencies. She further stated that if a direction goes from the RD Department for using a portion of SRY funds for education, this could be followed up with the concerned department in the state.
- iii) Secretary (EE &L) wanted to know how the state planned to fill the gap of around 300 primary schools. SPD, UP replied that phasing would be done over the next few years. Till then EGS centres would be opened for Class 1 and 2, beyond which the students would be taken in regular primary schools. As per UP norms, primary schools are provided for a distance of 1.5 km and population of 300. Where one of the parameters is not satisfied, EGS schools have been proposed. To the query of Secretary on children of Class 3-5, who do not fall within the norms, SPD replied that the option of Alternative Education would be tried for such cases. JS(EE) stated that EGS should be designed for Class 3-5 also, with plans for upgrading them to upper primary too where required.
- iv) To a specific query on increase in enrolment figures by Secretary (EE&L), SPD replied that in 1993 it was 56% and it had increased to 115% in these districts by the year 2000. The increase in enrolment started after the third year of implementation of UP BEP in these districts. The non-enrolment was more due to lack of facilities and less due to absence of motivation. As soon as facilities were provided closer to schools, enrolment went up.
- v) Regarding computer education in the schools, SPD stated that computer education is available in Classes 4 to 8 through private investments in some schools. In the plans, computer education has been suggested in schools at block level. Secretary (EE & L) suggested that this should be expanded to the cluster level also.
- vi) To a query by the appraisal team, SPD replied that school grants have not been proposed in the plans because this was suggested from the state funds under the sustainability plan.

- vii) It was clarified to SPD that POL can be included in the management cost as per the guidelines. Similarly, development of training tools in DIETs can be included in the training cost. However, motorcycles at block level cannot be included in SSA plans.
- viii) As far as beefing up of administrative structure is concerned, it was clarified that only contractual appointments can be done. Even for deputation from other departments, the personnel should be taken on contract only.

4.3 Based on the discussion, following decisions were taken:

- a) It was decided that the priority would be first for the EGS centres, additional primary school classrooms, and new primary schools, in that order. Anything left over after that would be allocated for upper primary schools. It was agreed that the full requirement of EGS centres should be made separately from the funds available under the Centrally Sponsored EGS & AIE Schemes. Construction of about a quarter of the requirement of toilets would be taken up in the first year in view of its importance for girls education. About 50% of total requirement of new primary schools would be taken up in the annual Plan for 2001-2002. Taking note of the large requirement of additional teachers of around 27,000 teachers Unit (1 teacher + 1 Shiksha Mitra) , it was decided to progressively move towards the ideal of 1:40 PTR by filling up 15% posts in the first year. Regarding new primary schools about 50% may be sanctioned in the first year, within the 33% limited. Only then upper primary schools should be taken up with the provision that first the additional classrooms should be taken up and only then new upper primary schools should be considered. Based on this priority the plan would have to be reworked.
- b) Subject to above, following allotment, district-wise, was made for the 14 districts for the year 2001-2002.

(Rs in Lakhs)

i)	Aligarh:	1140.01
ii)	Auraiya:	652.59
iii)	Banda:	1010.84
iv)	Bhadauhi:	762.82
v)	Chandauli:	841.07
vi)	Chitrakoot:	678.90
vii)	Etawah:	650.62
viii)	Gorakhpur:	1540.55
ix)	Hathras:	554.08

x)	Kanpur City:	1449.82
xi)	Kaushambi:	702.68
xii)	Saharanpur:	925.30
xiii)	Sitapur:	1235.25
xiv)	Varanasi:	<u>1570.02</u>
	Total	<u>13714.55</u>

The above would be reviewed in December depending on the funds position and the expenditure incurred till then.

- c) It was decided that the perspective plans for these districts would also be considered in December.
- d) The plan of Pilibhit would be considered after required information as mentioned in Para 4.1 of the minutes is provided.
- e) It was also directed that, in future, integrated plans should be prepared for the district and the goals of the adult literacy programme should be also reflected in the plans.

#### 5. **Agenda Item No. 4 (Andhra Pradesh):**

- 5.1 A presentation on Krishna and Hyderabad districts was made by Shri M. Nagarjuna, SPD, DPEP, Andhra Pradesh. The total Annual Plans proposed by the state were Rs 20.28 crores for Krishna and Rs 22.55 crores for Hyderabad. He highlighted the peculiar characteristics of the two districts and the salient features of the Plan. The strategy adopted by the state was simultaneous targeting of the entire 6-14 age group. He stated that 213 primary schools have been proposed in Krishna district for school-less habitations with 250 and above population. However, construction for this has been proposed in the subsequent years only. He said that special emphasis has been given on upgradation of primary schools to upper primary since it was found that drop outs after Class V was highest due to non-availability of upper primary schools in the locality. In Krishna district, it was proposed to upgrade totally 438 primary schools of which 188 are to be taken in the year 2001-2002. Only 3 teachers have been proposed for UP schools under SSA norms , with the fourth teacher proposed to be provided under state funds. The civil works have been restricted to 33% and in the first year only 250 primary school class rooms construction has been provided for in Krishna district. He also explained about the EGS schemes being proposed. He stated that EGS was integrated with the formal system and each EGS centre was linked to a nearby formal school. Regarding Hyderabad, he explained the special problems of the district, being an urban area. He stated that the plan was prepared based on survey undertaken of the children in the slums. He said that lack of open spaces

prevented opening of new schools and so a number of innovative elements such as transportation of children by bus to nearby schools has been proposed.

5.2 The appraisal team, headed by Ms Perna Gulati, stated that it had recommended a reduced plan size of Rs 16.74 crores for Krishna and Rs 13.16 crores for Hyderabad. It stated that some of the ineligible items like support for DIET, maintenance of TV/VCR, rent for schools, transportation, etc. have been recommended to be dropped.

5.3 Some of the queries and replies to them were as follows:

- i) Secretary (EE&L) asked about the presence of private upper primary schools and whether they have been discounted in calculating the number of Upper primary Schools. SPD replied that the plan was tackling poorer children particularly from slums who do not have access to the costly private schools. Further, most of the private schools have primary schools also attached to the upper primary and their upper primary cater primarily to their own children. So they are not in a position to absorb children from other primary schools.
- ii) Regarding the innovative programme of transportation of urban children in Hyderabad, he stated that the money would be used only for hiring buses from State Public Undertakings and no vehicles would be purchased.
- iii) Regarding computer education, he stated that AP Government has itself introduced computer education in upper primary schools at a cost of Rs 3 lakhs per school per year. So it has not been included in SSA.
- iv) Regarding the query of Prof. Khan of NCTE on presence of untrained teachers in the state, SPD stated that the teachers referred to were selected for the Balajyothi programme, which was an Alternative Education Programme. Only qualified teachers are recruited in the formal system.
- v) To a query by Shri Lal of NCERT on linkages with the Urban Basic Services Project in Hyderabad, SPD stated that no such linkages have been thought of presently but that these possibilities would be explored.

5.4 Based on the discussion, following decisions were taken by the Board:

- a) It was decided that priority followed in the case of Uttar Pradesh i.e. opening of primary schools, construction of toilets and buildings for primary schools, construction of toilets and buildings for primary schools, additional

classrooms & clearance of backlog of primary school teachers, if any, would also be followed in case of Andhra Pradesh. The SPD was asked to rework the plan based on this. Since, AP had proposed opening of all new Primary Schools (213 in Krishna + 583 in Hyderabad) in the first year itself without provision for construction of buildings for these, it was decided that the same may be sanctioned subject to the condition that the provision for rooms or buildings for opening of these new schools would be made by the State, prior to the appointment of teachers for these schools. In case rooms were required to be taken on rent for opening of schools, the cost of rent was to be borne by the State itself. Sanction was also accorded for upgradation of 188 primary schools to upper primary schools in Krishna District + upgradation of 56 schools in Hyderabad District in the first year subject to the above conditions.

b) Following annual plan size for the year 2001-2002 was fixed:

	(Rs crores)
i) Krishna:	12.00
ii) Hyderabad:	<u>9.00</u>
Total	<u>21.00</u>

This would be reviewed in December depending on the expenditure incurred and the funds position.

- c) The decision on perspective plan would also be taken in December.
- d) The innovative programme of transporting children to schools may be taken up provided no vehicles are bought for this.
6. Followings should be followed by all states whose plans have been approved:-
- (a) It was agreed that the requirement of SSA, that the States should maintain its expenditure on elementary education at the 1999-2000 level and that contributions to SSA should be over and above this level of expenditure, should be strictly adhered to for all States. This stipulation should figure in all sanctions and will be monitored closely. If there are any deviations, appropriate deductions will be made from the funds to be released to the States.
- (b) As per SSA, 50% of teachers should be of female teachers.
7. The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE MEETING OF THE PROJECT APPROVAL  
BOARD ON SARVA SHIKSHA ABHIYAN HELD ON 30TH AUGUST, 2001**

1. Shri B.K. Chaturvedi, Secretary, EE & L, In the Chair
2. Shri Sumit Bose, Joint Secretary, MHRD
3. Prof. B.K. Khandelwal, Director, NIEPA
4. Prof. R.S. Khan, Vice-chairperson, NCTE (representative of Chairman, NCTE).
5. Shri A.A.C. Lal, NCERT(representative of Director, NCERT).
6. Ms. Vasudha Gupta, Deputy Secretary, Deptt. of WCD(representative of Secretary, WCD).
7. Shri J.C. Sharma, Director, Planning Commission(representative of Principal Adviser(Edu), Planning Commission.
8. Shri A.K. Qasim, AFA representative of Financial Adviser, MHRD).
9. Shri C.M. Sharma, Under Secretary, (representative of Secretary, M/o Labour).

**IN ATTENDANCE**

1. Shri Job Zachariah, Director, MHRD
2. Shri Praveen Kumar, Director, MHRD
3. Shri M. Nagarjuna, SPD, DPEP, Hyderabad.
4. Ms. Vrinda Sarup, SPD, DPEP, Uttar Pradesh
5. Dr. Swarna Gupta, Reader, NCERT
6. Ms. Prerna Gulati, Deputy Secretary, MHRD
7. Shri P.K. Mohanty, DEA, MHRD
8. Shri O.P. Chaturvedi, US, MHRD
9. Shri M.K. Talukdar, TSG, ED.CIL.
10. Shri Dayaram, TSG, ED.CIL
11. Shri Saurabh Banerjee, TSG, ED.CIL