

**Minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Project Approval Board to consider proposals under Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) held on 13-14<sup>th</sup> June, 2011.**

The 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the **Project Approval Board (PAB)** for Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) to consider Annual Plan Proposal for the year 2011-12 of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan was held on **13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2011** at Jaipur under the chairpersonship of Smt. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

2. The RMSA proposals of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra were considered on 13<sup>th</sup> June, 2011 while the proposal of Rajasthan was taken up on 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2011.

3. Secretary (SE&L) welcomed the participants and invited the State representatives to present the salient features of the Annual Work Plan & Budget for the year 2011-12.

4. A list of participants is **annexed.**

# RAJASTHAN

## **7. Rajasthan:**

7.1 The Principal Secretary, Education, Government of Rajasthan gave a brief overview of the status of Secondary Education in the State. Thereafter SPD-RMSA, Rajasthan made a presentation on the proposal of the State under RMSA. The brief of the same is as under:

- The Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) for the 2010-11 was 61.44% in comparison to 48.67% in 2006-07.
- The target of GER as per perspective plan for 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan was 61.2%, which was already been achieved. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) for the year 2010-11 was 0.65%, whereas in 2006-07 it was 0.57%.
- The total number of schools per 100 sq. km. was 6.78.

7.2. The PAB observed that the increase in GER does not match the Gender Parity Index (GPI), which is not a good signal. The State Government was requested to adopt necessary measures so that there should not be any inconsistency in the data, and also take up activities which will bring about equity in this aspect. The Secretary (SE&L) requested the State Government team to think of specific strategies and interventions to address

this problem since the Gender Parity Index (GPI) should correspond to the GER. The State Government informed that they are implementing a scheme for providing bicycles for girls who have to go to another village to attend school at class X, however, the same is not provided to the girls who are residing in the same village where the school is situated. The State Government was advised to look into providing bicycles to all the girls enrolling in class IX. It was also noted that there is a discrepancy in the SEMIS data and the Principal Secretary, Rajasthan raised the issue that some of the schools at their level have filled in as classrooms even very small rooms which do not conform to the size of classrooms and cannot be used as classrooms. Secretary (SE&L) stated that these rooms should be counted as part of infrastructure and may be used for other purposes but may not be counted as classrooms.

7.3. The State Government had requested for major repair of 1126 classrooms during the current financial year. The appraisal team had clarified that since these are composite schools which have elementary classes, and since it was not clear from the proposal that the classrooms are meant only for secondary section, it was not possible to appraise the same. The State Official clarified that the classrooms are not earmarked for elementary or secondary classes and depending upon the convenience and availability these classrooms are used. The PAB suggested the appraisal team that there should not be any rigid approach or micro examination of the proposal of major repair received from the State Government. After considering the same, the State Government was requested to provide necessary certification to the appraisal team. The same had been received and appraised by the appraisal team. Accordingly 1324 nos. of classrooms have been approved for major repair in 564 schools with the project cost of Rs.1130.75 lakhs.

7.4. The State Government had submitted a proposal for additional teachers for existing secondary school and had requested for sanctioning of 18623 numbers of additional teachers. The appraisal team after examining the proposal found that the total requirement of additional teachers comes to 37279. Since the State had requested for only 18623 posts of teachers, this was agreed to by the appraisal team. However, during the discussion it was found that the proposal for additional teachers also includes the proposal for 4996 schools also, which were upgraded by the State Government during the last two years at the State level. It was stated by the State Government that they have not posted all the teachers required in these schools and only the post of Headmasters have been sanctioned till date. The PAB observed that the filling up of the minimum requirement of posts for these schools is the responsibility of the State Government. Till this has not been done, the proposal for providing additional teachers for these schools cannot be considered by the PAB. However, the PAB felt that as has been done in the case of Madhya Pradesh, the State Government is eligible for additional teachers for the schools opened prior to 2009 and number of such schools come to 6504. The number of additional teachers required for these schools was discussed in length and after deliberation in detail, it was observed that the additional teacher requirement for these 6504 schools comes to 14602 teachers and the same was agreed to. The State Government was requested to include requirement of additional teacher for 4996 schools in the next annual plan and the number of additional teachers for these schools will be worked out accordingly. Secretary (SE&L) also desired that the State rationalizes teacher posting as well as prioritize postings of teacher in the remote areas.

7.5. The PAB had advised the State Government that so far as excursion trip for class X student is concerned, there may not be any selective process

for determining the eligibility of such student. In fact this programme should be open for all class X students.

7.6. As regards to the various proposals under equity component which the State Government had requested for cash incentives, it was intimated to the State Government that under the scheme such incentives are not possible.

7.7. While discussing the proposal for school grants, the SPD Rajasthan also raised the issue that the amount of Rs 50,000 fixed each school for school grant may not be logical as some schools need less money and some schools need more than Rs 50,000. The Secretary (SE&L) said that this issue needs to be addressed for improvement of the scheme in the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.

7.8. While discussing the proposal for Book Fairs, the Secretary (SE&L) suggested that the States should try to have a convergence with the SSA Book Fair activity while holding the Book Fair at the District level which will result in more resources at the District level.

7.9. While discussing the proposal for study of English through radio broadcast, the PAB approved 100 episodes and also stressed that an impact assessment will be carried out and submitted to the Ministry after one year. Only after the outcomes have been assessed that scaling up of the pilot will be permitted.

7.10. The proposal for assessing learning levels of class IX standard was not agreed to, since it was felt that it is a vendor driven programme and the proposal seems to have been prepared keeping the supply side in mind. The PAB also decided that with regard to the proposal for English language software for schools, this proposal will need to be assessed by the NCERT and the State will need to amend its proposal.

7.11. With regard to the proposal for self evaluation by the students online, the PAB had decided that the State should take up a pilot first and that CCE (Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation) should also be integrated into the teaching learning process. The PAB also stressed that the classrooms processes should be strengthened. The Secretary (SE&L) also mentioned that SSA Rajasthan has already carried out some activities under CCE and it appears to be a good effort. It was suggested that RMSA, Rajasthan should also take up a pilot first and this proposal was agreed to "in principle".

7.12. The State had also proposed GIS mapping of Educational Institutions in the State. However, the PAB decided that the State may carried out these activities from the left over funds released for preparatory activities. The State had also asked for revalidation of this amount.

7.13. In conclusion Secretary (SE&L) maintained that quality and equity interventions and activities should be aimed to improve the whole system and strengthen classroom processes, rather than becoming isolated interventions with random and haphazard outcomes. She also desired that other departments like Tribal Affairs, Minority Affairs department, Health Department, Women and Child Development Department, Sports and Youth Affairs department, Social Justice department and Science and Information Technology department may also be involved in the Planning process.

7.14. Following activities were approved by the PAB.

**(A) Non-Recurring Components**

(Rs. in lakh)

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Physical</b>	<b>Unit cost</b>	<b>Total outlay</b>
1.	Strengthening of 2392 existing secondary schools with following components:	1560	5.63	8782.80

	i. Additional classrooms	2073	6.10	12645.30
	ii. Science lab	2073	1.00	2073.00
	iii. Lab equipment	1496	5.00	7480.00
	iv. Computer room	1093	7.00	7651.00
	v. Library	2221	5.00	11105.00
	vi. Art/Craft room	661	1.00	661.00
	vii. Toilet Block	116	0.50	58.00
	viii. Drinking water facility			
2.	Major repair	564		1130.75
3.	<b>Total approved outlay</b>			<b>51586.85</b>
4.	<b>Central share @ 75%</b>			<b>38690.14</b>
5.	<b>MMER @ 2%</b>			<b>773.80</b>
6.	<b>Total central share including MMER</b>			<b>39463.94</b>

**(B) Recurring Components**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Activities	Physical	Unit cost	Total outlay
1.	Annual School grant	11500	0.50	5750.00
2.	Minor repair grant	11167	0.25	2791.75
3.	Excursion trip for class X students (intra State)	6600	0.002	13.20
4.	In-service training for existing secondary school teachers	28966	0.015	434.49
5.	Training for Headmasters	3242	0.015	48.63
6.	Training for librarians	496	0.009	4.46
7.	Training for radio programme	729	0.003	2.18
8.	Yoga training for physical education teachers	1376	0.015	20.64
9.	Study tour for students (inter State)	660	0.02	13.20
10.	Book-fair	33	1.00	33.00
11.	Leadership training for educational officers (DEO's, DD's)	50	0.05	2.50
12.	Training of SMDCs members	20058	0.003	60.17
13.	Additional teachers for existing schools	14602	1.20	17522.40
14.	Training for radio programme (100 episode)	100	0.003	0.30
15.	Total approved outlay			26696.92

16.	<b>Central Share @ 75%</b>			<b>20022.69</b>
17.	<b>MMER @ 2%</b>			<b>400.45</b>
18.	<b>Total Central share including MMER</b>			<b>20423.14</b>

## **7. Miscellaneous matters:**

- (a) Additional teachers for existing secondary schools: The issue of additional teachers for existing Government Secondary Schools was discussed in detail during the meeting. NUEPA had a view that sanctioning of additional teachers should be linked with sanctioning of additional classrooms and for an additional section two additional teachers may be provided under RMSA. Depending upon the availability of subject in that school, the subject of these teachers may be decided accordingly. However, the PAB as well as the State Government was not in favour of this methodology of determining the requirement of additional teachers for existing secondary schools. NCERT had a view that expansion of activities in these schools requires appropriate number of teachers. SPD Maharashtra submitted that determining additional teachers on the basis of enrolment in such schools would be beneficial more to the Government aided schools in Maharashtra as there are many Government aided schools, which has crowded secondary sections. After detailed deliberations the PAB decided that the matter may be placed before the working group on teacher education, constituted by the Planning Commission.
- (b) Definition of existing schools for mapping exercise: The issue of existence of secondary school within a radius of 5 km for determining eligibility of opening of a new secondary school under RMSA was raised during the meeting. NUEPA had a view



that during mapping exercise, existence of private unaided secondary schools should be taken into consideration within a radius of 5 km for determining the eligibility of opening another Government / Government Aided secondary school in a particular area. The opening of Government secondary school in that area would not be as viable as opening of schools in those areas where there are no schools at all. He further opined that since the area is already served by a secondary school the students of that area can be benefited from that. However, JS(SE) had a view that taking into consideration of existing unaided school would not be a good idea as these unaided schools are catering the need of some specialized group in those areas. The marginalized people in such area may not be benefited from those schools. After detailed deliberations the PAB decided that opening of school is the prime responsibility of the State Government and they may decide the viability of opening of new schools based on the student enrollment. In any case the burden will be on the State Government of a later stage after RMSA programme comes to a close.

- (c) Quality interventions under the framework of RMSA: The framework provides a lot of interventions for improving quality of education at secondary stage. During the last 2 years a lot of interventions have been proposed by the State Government under their plan for improving quality of secondary education in their State. However, in view of lack of clarity of these interventions and unavailability of financial norms under the framework for these interventions, the PAB sometimes finds difficulty in appraising and approving the proposals of the State Government. The PAB therefore decided that a detailed note of

quality issues regarding improvement of quality in secondary education be prepared and put before the working group on secondary education.

- (d) The Secretary (SE&L) also mentioned that while proposing interventions for quality, the State should ensure that these interventions be of the kind which will ensure improvement of the system in the secondary school system and not isolated intervention where the outcomes will be of only one time results. She also desired that different Departments and Ministries (eg. Tribal Development Department, Minority Affairs Department) which run schemes and programmes in the field of secondary education be also taken on board while preparing the proposals.

The meeting ended with thanks to the chair.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Meeting of Project Approval Board (PAB) to consider Annual Work Plan and Budget, 2011-12 under RMSA held on 13-14<sup>th</sup> June, 2011 at Jaipur.**

**List of Participants**

1. Ms. Anshu Vaish, Secretary,  
Department of School Education & Literacy,  
Ministry of HRD, New Delhi In the Chair
2. Shri R.P. Sisodia,  
Joint Secretary (Secondary Education),  
Department of School Education & Literacy,  
Ministry of HRD, New Delhi
3. Ms. Caralyn Khongwar Deshmukh,  
Director,  
Department of School Education & Literacy,  
Ministry of HRD, New Delhi
4. Ms. Sarita Mittal,  
Director (Finance),  
Ministry of Human Resource Development
5. Shri Deepak Kumar Sah,  
Section Officer,  
Department of School Education & Literacy,  
Ministry of HRD, New Delhi

**Planning Commission**

6. Dr. C. Chandramohan  
Adviser (Education)  
New Delhi

**NCERT**

7. Ms. Shipra Vaidya  
Associate Professor, New Delhi
8. Ms. Ranjana Arora  
Associate Professor  
Department of Secondary Education  
New Delhi

### **Ministry of Minority Affairs**

9. Dr. Pardeep Kumar  
Research Officer  
Ministry of Minority Affairs  
New Delhi

### **Ministry of Tribal Affairs**

10. Dr. Punam Srivastava  
Joint Director, New Delhi

### **NUEPA**

11. Dr. K. Biswal  
Associate Professor, New Delhi

### **Govt. of Maharashtra**

12. Ms. V. Radha, IAS  
State Project Director  
SSA & RMSA  
Government of Maharashtra
13. Dr. Sunaina Khaial  
State Project Coordinator  
RMSA, Mumbai
14. Ms. Vibha Verma  
Consultant, RMSA
15. Shri R. N. Shahade  
Chief Consultant, (Project)
16. Shri S. J. Shastri  
RMSA, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai

### **Govt. of Madhya Pradesh**

17. Shri Ashok Barnwal  
SPD, RMSA

18. Ms. Sunita Tripathi  
Addl. P. D., RMSA
19. Shri Prabhat R. Tiwari  
Deputy Director (RMSA),  
Directorate of Public Instruction
20. Ms. Kamna Acharya  
Deputy Director (RMSA),  
Directorate of Public Instruction

**Govt. of Rajasthan**

21. Shri Ashok Sampatram  
Principal Secretary (Education)
22. Shri Bhaskar A. Sawant  
SPD, RMSA
23. Shri B. L. Naval  
Addl. SPD, RMSA
24. Shri Ravindra Kumar  
RMSA
25. Shri D. N. Sharma  
Sr. Accounts Officer, RCSE
26. Ms. Brindra Singh  
Executive Engineer
27. Shri Veer Singh Meena  
Programme Officer, RCSE