

No F. 12-9/2010-Sch.1  
Government of India  
Ministry of Human Resource Development  
Department of School Education & Literacy  
School-1 Section

Room No. 428, 'C' Wing, Shastri Bhawan  
New Delhi, dated 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2011

To

The Education Secretaries of all States/UTs  
(Dealing with Secondary Education)

Subject: Conference of Secretaries in charge of Secondary Education of all States/UTs held on 15.12.2010 – Forwarding of minutes-reg.

Sir/Madam,

I am directed to forward herewith the minutes of the above mentioned meeting for information and necessary action at your end.

This issues with the approval of Secretary(SE&L).

Yours faithfully,



(Bhaskar Dasgupta)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Tel: 2338 6802

E-mail: [bhaskar.edu@nic.in](mailto:bhaskar.edu@nic.in)

Encl: As above

Copy to:

- i. National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, 18/2, Satsang Vihar Marg, Special Institutional Area, New Delhi-110067.
- ii. National Institute of Open Schooling, A-24-25, Institutional Area, NH-24, Sector-62, NOIDA, Distt-Gautam Buddha Nagar (UP).
- iii. National Council of Educational Research & Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-16.
- iv. National University of Educational Planning and Administration, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-16.
- v. All Divisional Heads in SE Bureau for necessary follow up action on points pertaining to their Divisions.

39  
6/2/2/11

Copy also to:

- 12/05  
21/2
- i. Senior PPS to Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development
  - ii. Joint Secretary (SE), Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
  - iii. Director (SE), Department of School Education & Literacy.

12/05  
21/2



(Bhaskar Dasgupta)  
Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

**Minutes of the meeting of the conference of State Secretaries In-charge of Secondary Education and State Project Directors for RMSA held in New Delhi on 15.12.2010**

A conference of State Education Secretaries in charge of Secondary Education and State Project Directors for RMSA was held on 15.12.2010 in New Delhi to review implementation of centrally sponsored schemes in secondary education. Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy chaired the meeting. A list of participants is annexed.

2. Initiating the discussions, Secretary (SE&L) pointed out that this was the first occasion when a full day had been dedicated for discussions on programmes in Secondary Education sector. She mentioned that there has been a huge increase in allocation for secondary education under the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan and a full day deliberation to review implementation of various programmes was therefore quite apt. The objective of the conference was to focus on the pending and outstanding issues with a view to understand as to why we were not able to tide over the problem. With this introductory remark, she invited JS(SE) to make his opening statement.

3. JS (SE) in his statement elaborated on various aspects of planning under Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA). He mentioned that secondary education was gaining in importance through out the world. In many countries, education has been made free and compulsory upto 16 years. There is a definite realization that every child must go through at least 10 years of schooling, i.e., upto the age of 16 years. RMSA is therefore the logical extension of SSA. Following issues were flagged by him for attention of the State Governments:

- (i) School mapping: RMSA envisaged universalisation of access to secondary education by providing a secondary school within a reasonable distance of every habitation. JS (SE) emphasized that new schools should be proposed by State Governments based only on an objective school mapping exercise, and not on arbitrary criteria. All State Governments are therefore required to complete the school mapping exercise at the earliest.
- (ii) Improvement of existing schools: So far as the existing schools are concerned, it is necessary to create a directory of what is lacking in each school. Once this is done, efforts should be made to make good the shortfalls within a year. Improvement of all existing Government schools should be taken up within the 11<sup>th</sup> Plan period.
- (iii) Planning based on SEMIS: It was pointed out that SEMIS is the basis to find out what is lacking in a school. It is therefore of utmost importance for all states to complete data entry for SEMIS at the earliest. The Data Capture Format (DCF) for 2010-11 has already been uploaded on the website of the Ministry, and all states should ensure completion of data entry by 31.01.2011 positively. JS (SE) clarified that annual plan for 2011-12 should be based on analysis

of SEMIS data. Filling up of DCF and use of SEMIS data in planning would be mandatory, and will not be substituted by other methods of data collection. No appraisal for the next year's annual plan proposals will be undertaken unless it is based on analysis of SEMIS data. He also pointed out that data entry for previous years, i.e., 2008-09 and 2009-10 should also be completed, if not done already, as base line data was also required. In case any state feels that some important indicator is missing from SEMIS DCF, the same may be communicated to the Ministry. He also suggested that the filling up of DCF should be done at the school level. In future, each school would be given password and code, so that data entry can be done at the school level itself. For those schools not having internet access, the State Governments can make arrangement to get the data entry done at the nearest Government office or internet kiosk.

- (iv) Major repair: JS (SE) clarified that Rs 4.00 lakh would not be given uniformly to all schools. As has been explained in several meetings of the PAB, proposals for major repair would be based on school level actual need assessment. A format has already been made available to State Governments for furnishing details in this regard.
- (v) In-service training: JS (SE) emphasized that RMSA was not about construction of school buildings, but was about ensuring improvement of quality of schooling. The importance of in-service training of teachers, including teachers of aided schools, was emphasized in this connection. Success of this programme would also depend on proper curriculum design for training of teachers, resource persons and master trainer. The broad outline indicated in this Ministry's letter dated 10.3.2010 (copy available on MHRD website) may be followed by the State Governments while preparing proposals for in-service training of teachers. Moreover, induction training programme, training of school heads etc. should also be undertaken under RMSA. States should come out with a detailed plan in this regard.
- (vi) Quality enhancing interventions: JS (SE) clarified that quality enhancing interventions must find pride of place under RMSA. Any number of quality enhancing interventions can be proposed under the scheme. The proposal should be well thought out, and financial requirements should be projected with justification. He also emphasized the need to develop norms and standards for secondary schools in the States, and asked all the States to develop and notify the same.
- (vii) JS (SE) highlighted the need for structural reforms in case of 11 states that still have class VIII in secondary stage. This needs to be shifted to elementary stage particularly in view of the Right to Education Act.

- (viii) School Monitoring: Inviting the attention of the States to the system of school inspection by District Educational Officers, which was prevalent in the past, JS (SE) stated that, in most of the States this practice has practically ceased to exist. He referred to the cases of KVs and NVs, where regular monitoring by departmental officers have contributed to ensuring functional efficiency, JS(SE) felt that States should put in place effective systems for monitoring of schools since a variety of schemes are being undertaken/implemented at the school level. However, the nature of monitoring should be supportive rather than inspectorial.
- (ix) Perspective Plan: JS (SE) stated that several states were yet to submit the Perspective Plan. This needs to be completed on priority and all states will have to submit their Perspective Plan along with their annual plan for 2011-12. Appraisal of annual plan for 2011-12 will not be taken up unless the perspective plan has been submitted. He also clarified that while the national level target for RMSA is to attain a GER of 75% by 2013-14, the target for different states should be different. While some states have already crossed GER of 75%, and therefore needs to set up higher targets, there are other states that would not be able to attain a GER of 75% within 5 years as the maximum enrolment at secondary level is limited by the number of students successfully completing class VIII. The objective of the states should be to ensure a transition rate of 100% from elementary to secondary stage, so that every body passing out of class VIII gets enrolled in class IX. The Perspective Plan document should indicate important targets at least for three time lines:
- 2011-12, i.e., the end of 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.
  - 2013-14, i.e., five year of commencement of the programme.
  - 2016-17, i.e., the end of 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, when 100% enrolment for the country as a whole should be targeted.

The Perspective Plan document should also indicate the reform agenda of the state, particularly in three key areas of curriculum, examination and school governance and the sequencing to achieve the outcome.

The Perspective Plan is a rolling plan and should be revised every year based on the actual achievement in the previous year.

- (x) Annual Plan for 2011-12: JS (SE) urged the State Governments to submit the Annual Plan Proposals of 2011-12 in time, before the deadline of 28.02.2011. He pointed out that for the current year (2010-11), the initial deadline for submission of annual plan proposal was 31.05.2010, which was subsequently extended to 15.07.2010. However, only a few proposals were received by that date, and even as on date, proposals from 7 states were yet to be received. Such delays are detrimental to the State Governments as

they are left with very little time to implement the approved annual plans proposals. He informed that appraisal and approval of annual plans and budgets for 2011-12 was proposed to be completed by June, 2011. All State Governments are therefore required to submit their annual plan proposals by 28.02.2011, of letter to this effect has already been issued. A tentative schedule of PAB meetings will also be circulated to the State Governments well in advance.

- (xi) UCs and Audited Accounts: State Governments were advised to submit utilisation certificates and audited accounts for 2009-10 without further delay, as in the absence of these documents, it will not be possible to release more funds in 2011-12.
- (xii) Open and Distance Schooling: JS (SE) emphasized the importance of open and distance learning in the context of RMSA. He mentioned that in spite of Government's best efforts, it might never be possible to bring everybody into the fold of regular schooling. He therefore advised the State Governments to set up or strengthen State Open Schools.

4. Thereafter Director (Sch-1) made a presentation on RMSA. In particular, he emphasized two issues:

- (i) **Submission of Utilisation Certificates, Annual Reports and Audited Accounts for 2009-10**: He mentioned that unless these documents are received by the close of this year, there will be a serious problem with release of fund from next year. It was also highlighted that the Audited Accounts and Annual Reports of State Implementing Societies are required to be laid in the Parliament and therefore these documents should be made available to the Ministry of HRD at the earliest.
- (ii) **Diversion between recurring and non-recurring head**: He mentioned that from the current financial year a new system has been put in place by the Ministry of Finance, dividing the grant in aid under centrally sponsored schemes into two heads, (i) Grant-in-aid for creation of assets and (ii) Grant-in-aid general. Consequently every grant will be booked specifically under one head and no diversion from one head to another will be permissible. This restriction is applicable across all schemes implemented by Government of India.

5. The floor was thrown open to State Governments thereafter:

### **5.1. Madhya Pradesh:**

5.1.1. Following issues were raised by the State Project Director RMSA:

- (i) The existing norm for MMER activities, which is 2% of approved outlay is very low and needs to be enhanced.

- (ii) One week induction training for newly recruited teachers is not sufficient. The duration of induction training should be 10 days at least. Similarly, there should be provision for induction training as well.
- (iii) Release of 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment for 2009-10 needs to be expedited.
- (iv) The whole school approach for improvement of existing schools was not followed by the State of M.P. in the Annual Plan 2009-10, and sanction of few additional interventions in respect of 1459 schools earlier approved for strengthening was requested.
- (v) Sanction of additional teachers in existing schools to improve Pupil Teachers Ratio (PTR) was also requested.
- (vi) It was stated that district plans for 2011-12 are ready and the process of aggregation is under way. However, the on-line data entry under SEMIS is not working.

5.1.2 JS (SE) clarified the issues as under:

- (i) A proposal to enhance norm for MMER activities is under consideration of the Ministry. Till the proposal is approved by the competent authority, the State Governments have to manage within the existing norms.
- (ii) Induction training is permissible under RMSA: If the State Governments feel very strongly about the need for longer training and higher unit cost, they may give their suggestions in writing.
- (iii) 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment for 2009-10 has been approved and will be released shortly.
- (iv) The State Government should have followed the whole school approach from the 1<sup>st</sup> year as this is being emphasized from the very beginning. In case some gaps were left out, State Government may indicate the components requiring additional sanction.
- (v) Under RMSA, full complement of teachers as per state norm is being sanctioned for new schools. So far as the existing schools are concerned, besides overall PTR, subject specific availability of teachers is also required to be taken into account. State Governments are therefore required to furnish detailed information for consideration.
- (vi) As regards SEMIS data capture, data processing and report generation are concerned, NUEPA may designate an official for interaction with State Governments so that the problems encountered by them are addressed immediately.

## 5.2 Maharashtra:

Secretary (School Education), Maharashtra wanted to know whether aided schools can be included in the annual plan for 2011-12. Secretary (SE&L) clarified that while a proposal to extend RMSA to aided schools is under consideration in the Ministry, it is yet to be approved by the competent authority. For the present the State Governments will have to plan within the approved norms.

## 5.3 Jharkhand:

Principal Secretary (Education), Jharkhand requested for supply of text books under RMSA. She informed that at present textbooks are provided in the schools run by the State Welfare Department. Secretary (SE&L) stated that the scheme currently does not allow provision for textbooks.

## 5.4 Gujarat:

Principal Secretary (Education), Gujarat suggested that the available fund should be distributed among the States based on some objective criteria like enrolment at secondary level, and thereafter project based approval may be given to utilize the allocated amount. He also requested to include aided schools under the scheme.

Secretary (SE&L) clarified that project based funding is the mechanism approved at present. Formula based allocation among States may result in non-utilization of funds in some cases. Further, the allocation of funds in other centrally sponsored schemes is also project based and not formula based. She further clarified that a proposal is under consideration to cover aided schools under RMSA keeping in view the problems faced by states like Gujarat, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra.

## 5.5 Uttarakhand:

State Project Director, Uttarakhand requested to use State Schedule of Rates (SORs). She stated that Uttarakhand being a hilly state, the civil works much more than the norm specified under RMSA. For 2009-10, State Finance Department had agreed to bear the additional burden. However, there is no such commitment for the current year.

Secretary (SE&L) clarified that a proposal to allow the State Governments to allow SORs for civil works is under consideration. However, this is yet to be approved by the competent authority.



## 5.6 **Sikkim:**

State Project Director, Sikkim requested for use State PWD rates and stated that these rates are already permitted under other centrally sponsored programmes.

Secretary (SE&L) stated that this issue has already been explained.

## 5.7. **Haryana:**

5.7.1 Principal Secretary (Education), Haryana raised the following issues:

- (i) She requested for enhancement of financial norm for in-service training of teachers. She wanted to know whether under the teachers training component approved in the current year, training can be conducted in the first quarter of the next year, as it may not be possible to conduct such training in the January-March quarter due to examination. Similar views were expressed by **DG General (SE), Government of Punjab**.
- (ii) She pointed out that the PAB had earlier directed NCERT, NUEPA and NIOS to appraise certain components of annual plan proposal of Haryana. She requested for expeditious action.
- (iii) She pointed out that additional teachers are required in existing schools based on PTR.

5.7.2 Following clarifications were provided:

- (i) JS (SE) clarified that there was no objection to conduct of in-service training of teachers in the first quarter of the next year even if it is approved during the current year. The only condition to be followed is to ensure that the training is conducted once every year. As regards enhancement of financial norm, the views expressed were noted for consideration at an appropriate time.
- (ii) NCERT, NUEPA and NIOS have been instructed to take up appraisal of State proposals related to academic and management issues, and will be requested to expedite the process.
- (iii) As regards appointment of additional teachers in the existing schools, besides overall PTR, subject specific availability of teachers is also required to be taken into account. State Governments are therefore required to furnish detailed information.

## 5.8 Lakshadweep:

The UT representative requested for assistance for capacity building of Master Trainers, particularly in Malayalam. Secretary (SE&L) advised the U.T. Government to explore the possibility of taking assistance from the State of Kerala. She also requested NCERT to take note of the request of the UT Administration.

Director, NCERT informed that they could help the UT in training of Master Trainers.

## 5.9 Punjab:

5.9.1 DG (SE) & State Project Director for RMSA raised the following issues:

- (i) Expeditious release of 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment for annual plan 2009-10.
- (ii) The proposal for Guidance and Counselling under annual plan 2010-11 was not reflected in the minutes of PAB.
- (iii) He also requested for consideration of the proposal to provide bicycles to girls under annual plan 2010-11. Similar issue was also raised by **Chhattisgarh**.

5.9.2 The clarifications provided were as under:

- (i) Release of 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment for annual plan 2009-10 has been approved and the grant will be released to the State Society shortly.
- (ii) The details regarding guidance and counselling have been received and are being appraised.
- (iii) As per the RMSA framework, State Governments are expected to finance provisions like bicycles for girls, and therefore this was not approved. JS (SE) also clarified that it was important to recognise that RMSA was meant to complement the efforts of State Governments in the field of secondary education, and not to substitute State responsibility.

## 5.10. Tripura:

Principal Secretary, Tripura raised three issues:

- (i) The State wanted the NCERT to help its curriculum planning and for training the master trainers. Director NCERT offered to make available the services of its representative.

- (ii) State Governments proposal for additional teachers, as decided in the PAB early this year, is being finalised and is being forwarded to the Ministry.
- (iii) The State Government also wanted to know the exact nature of job that the Building Committee of SMDCs was expected to do. In this regard, JS (SE) said that the Building Committee is expected to concentrate on planning, supervision and social auditing, and this issue shall be further elaborated when the FMP Manual is taken up for discussion.

#### 5.11. Assam:

State Project Director, Assam wanted to know whether it would be possible to ask for another instalment for pre-project activities since only Rs 10.00 lakh per district had been released as against Rs 25.00 lakh per district permissible under the scheme. She also requested for guidance in respect of major repair work, which was proposed for 359 schools @ Rs 2.00 lakh per school.

JS (SE) clarified that since the scheme is in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of its implementation, it was not possible to consider further release for pre-project activities. The State Government was advised to project their present and future requirements under the MMER head.

As regards major repair, JS (SE) clarified that the proposals should be based on school specific assessment. The sanction would not be given uniformly at the rate of Rs 2.00 lakh per school. Secretary (SE&L) desired that the State Government should assess school specific requirement and submit the same in the next PAB scheduled on 23-24 December, 2010.

#### 5.11 Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh:

All three States raised the issue of release of 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment for Annual Plan 2009-10. They were informed that this was under process. SPD Rajasthan also wanted the amount spent by the State towards teacher training, over and above that released as 1<sup>st</sup> instalment last year, to be reimbursed. JS(SE) said that this was possible and State should send request with all details.

6. Secretary (SE&L) in her closing remarks stated that she would like feedback from the States whether it would be desirable to subsume other centrally sponsored schemes in secondary education under RMSA, as has been done under SSA with respect to the schemes in elementary education.

Secretary also flagged the point of States having to pay adequate attention to the “whole school” concept while planning School Buildings. In this regard, she drew the attention to some of the issues listed in the agenda note under the topic of ‘environment assessment of schooling system’ which can serve as a good reference point while drawing up the designs of the school buildings.

During her summing up, Secretary (SE&L) reiterated the need for timely submission of AWP&B documents by the State Governments in order to enable the RMSA-PAB meetings for 2011-12 to be completed no later than June, 2011.

## **Model School and Girls' Hostel schemes**

1. Model School and Girls' Hostel schemes were taken up together for discussion after the session on RMSA. Director (Sch-1) made brief presentations on the present status and the important issues so far as the implementation of the two schemes was concerned. It was also mentioned that the agenda note circulated contained a very comprehensive and detailed write up on both schemes, along with State specific issues. All State Governments were advised to carefully go through the agenda note.

2. Secretary (SE&L) stated that she would like to hear from the State Governments who were yet to submit any proposal under these schemes and to understand the reasons for the delay.

3. Secretary (Education), **Arunachal Pradesh** stated that being a hilly state, getting adequate flat land was not easy. Besides Arunachal Pradesh is by far the State with lowest density of population in the country, and total enrolment at secondary level is only about 40,000. The State Government has therefore proposed conversion of existing schools as model schools through improvement of those schools. However they had been advised to reconsider their proposal.

JS (SE) stated that improvement of existing schools could be done under RMSA. Model school is a unique initiative, under which funds are sanctioned to the State Governments to set up high quality schools at block level. He advised the State Governments not to forego such an opportunity. This is particularly so for Arunachal Pradesh, which has to bear only 10% of the cost under model schools, and where the GER is still low.

Secretary (SE&L) advised the State Government to explore the possibility of setting up model schools from classes IX-XII, if it was felt that there was no need to add capacity at elementary level.

4. Secretary (School Education), **Meghalaya** informed that land has been identified for model schools. She wanted to know whether it was possible to construct girls' hostels in the same compound as the model schools.

Secretary (SE&L) clarified that it was permissible to construct girls' hostels along side model schools, and many States have been doing so. The only requirement is that State Governments should earmark additional land for girls' hostels so that the model school itself has at least 5 acres of land.

5. Secretary (School Education), **Tripura** informed that proposal for 8 model schools were ready and had been brought by him for submission.

6. SPD (RMSA), **Karnataka** wanted to know whether selection test would be permissible for admitting students in model schools.

Secretary (SE&L) stated that as and when a decision is taken, it would be conveyed to State Governments.

7. State Project Director, **Rajasthan** stated that 95 model schools have been approved in the state. Proposals for another 39 schools have been submitted. Proposals for 28 more blocks are ready and will be submitted shortly. This would leave only 24 out of 186 EBBs in the state. Girls' hostels have already been sanctioned in all 186 EBBs. He wanted to know whether it would be possible to convert any existing school into a model school as a full fledged new school may not be required in blocks in the border region.

JS (SE) stated that this was discussed in detail in the context of Arunachal Pradesh. It is also worth pointing out that model schools are meant to cater to the entire block, which would not happen if an existing school is converted as model school.

8. State Project Director, **Madhya Pradesh** stated that the State Government has been running schools of excellence for meritorious students for several years now. He wanted to know whether it would be possible to combine the model school with the existing school of excellence at least in those blocks, which also happen to be the headquarter block of the district.

JS (SE) stated that there is always scope for another good quality school. Besides the district level school of excellence caters to the entire district whereas model schools cater to blocks

9. State Project Director, **Assam** stated that 59 more proposals for model schools are ready and will be submitted shortly along with the revised building design desired by the PAB.

## **Financial Management and Procurement (FM&P) Manual**

The first draft of the Financial Management and Procurement (FM&P) Manual prepared in collaboration with National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP) had been circulated to the State Governments vide this Ministry's letter dated 14.09.2010. Subsequently, based on feed back received from various stakeholders, a revised draft of the manual was prepared. This was circulated to the participants in the conference. A brief presentation highlighting the issues requiring attention of the State Governments was made by Dr. Anit Mukherjee and Dr. H.K. Amarnath of NIPFP.

2. The following issues were flagged in the presentation:
  - (i) Feasibility of the proposed **fund flow system** to track utilisation on real time basis.
  - (ii) **Fall clause**: whether it should be retained or not.
  - (iii) **Standard bidding document**: whether State Governments are agreeable to its adoption.
  - (iv) **Single envelop system**: whether it would be acceptable to the State Governments.
  - (v) **E-procurement**: Whether mandatory E-procurement is acceptable to the States and whether a common platform suggested by the Government of India would be acceptable to the States.

3. Following issues also come up for discussions:

- (i) **Whether the School Management Committee for elementary schools can function as SMDC under RMSA:**

Several states wanted to know whether the existing School Management Committee functional at elementary level can be expanded to function as School Management and Development Committee (SMDC) under RMSA.

JS(SE) clarified that when an upper primary school is upgraded, two different situations may arise. If the secondary section is started as separate school or a distinct entity with a separate Headmaster, a new committee attached to the school may be formed. In case of an integrated school (with common head-master), the existing management committee will be empowered to execute activities under RMSA, which may be expanded to include additional members. Separate accounts for SSA and RMSA will have to be maintained in such cases.

Secretary (SE&L) stated that there is a distinction between the Management Committees for elementary and secondary schools. There is a clear and binding mandate to set up School Management Committees for elementary schools under RTE Act, whereas the composition of SMDCs has been prescribed under the RMSA and therefore allows for somewhat greater flexibility within the RMSA framework.

(ii) **Role of SMDCs in Civil Work:**

The RMSA framework envisages SMDCs and the Building Committees constituted thereunder will be actively involved in civil work under RMSA. The nature and scope of involvement of SMDCs in civil work under RMSA was raised by several States. The general view was that SMDCs should be entrusted with the task of civil work only upto a specific limit, which in case of SSA stands at Rs 15.00 lakh. The consensus appeared to be that the scale and complication of civil work under RMSA would require involvement/assistance of specialised agencies with technical expertise.

JS(SE) mentioned three approaches/models that could be considered by State Governments.

- Under the first model, the contract may be awarded centrally at the state level, through an appropriate agency which can be selected through a transparent process.
- Tenders can be invited at the district level by clubbing all the civil works in the district. As the total value of the contract would be significant, it may attract big players with proven track record.
- Construction through SMDCs.

The role of SMDC and the Building Committee under first two options would primarily be of social audit. SMDC will monitor the civil work and also certify the work done before payment is made to the vendor. However, the technical input such as technical design, and specifications would be the responsibility of the selected agency. Under the third model, SMDC would require considerable hand holding and technical assistance in the form of building design, specifications, construction and procurement schedules etc.

The States were also advised to furnish their suggestions in this regard.

3. **Level of delegation:**

The possible level of delegation of according approval for civil work under RMSA was also discussed in the meeting. JS(SE) invited suggestion from the State Government as to whether this power could be delegated to the District Education Officers (DEOs). Most of the States were of the view that it would be difficult for the DEOs to handle such additional responsibility, and it would rather be easier to accord such approval at the State level.

State Governments were advised to furnish their comments in writing.



4. **Applicability of DGS&D rate:**

Himachal Pradesh wanted to know whether the DGS&D rate would be allowed in case State agencies were to make large scale procurement for the entire State or tendering would be mandatory.

It was felt that the formulation in the FM&P Manual for SSA was acceptable to the States.

5. Most State Secretaries felt that it may not possible to respond to the above issues instantaneously, and they would require some time to study their implications. They were requested to furnish their comments on the above issues, and with special reference to the chapters on fund flow, accounting and procurement in the draft FM&P Manual, in writing to the Ministry within 10 days so that the manual could be finalised.

## ICT @ school

1. **Dir(Sch. 5)** made a presentation on ICT, highlights of which are as under:

- All Govt. and Govt. aided secondary and higher secondary schools should be covered under ICT.
- Schools not electrified should be taken at the end.
- Under RMSA there is a provision for payment of electricity bill, part of these funds can be utilised for electrifying these schools.
- Under RMSA funds for construction of labs is available and States can utilise this provision for constructing labs in the schools.
- In higher secondary schools, IT can be a subject as an elective.
- States were requested to prepare an Action Plan so that all the schools can be covered next year.
- Implementation of ICT Scheme under BOOT Model helps as the maintenance of computers would be the responsibility of vendors.
- During State visits, it was found that in some States there is a no dedicated teacher for implementing ICT Scheme and a lot of computers are lying unused.
- There is a provision under ICT Scheme for appointment of teachers and states should take advantage of this provision.
- States were requested to submit CEP by May so as to facilitate early appraisal and release of funds.
- None of the States has submitted external evaluation report by third party even though some States has entered into MOU. External evaluation would help the states to know about the exact status of implementation and also help in further devising ways in improving the implementation of the scheme.
- States were asked to implement ICT Scheme as it will be enable teachers to teach subject in a more enabling manner.
- Develop adequate e-content so that it can be used by teacher for teachings students as well as for self learning.
- Impact evaluation of the scheme would be an eye opener.
- JS(SE) suggested that submission of external evaluation report would be a precondition for appraisal and consideration of CEP of 2011-12.
- Within 3 months, ICT Cell should be created in every State as this will give a thrust in implementation as well as to monitor the scheme. Senior officer should be in charge of this cell.

- Training and capacity building of teachers should be given priority within Directorate of Education.
- **JS(SE)** clarified that purchase of electronic items like computers under DG&D rates has to be done carefully as DGS&D rates are high when compared to market. Further, computer prices are coming down day by day.

2. After the presentation, States raised certain issues, highlights of which are as under:

- **Shri Ashok Barnwal, Commissioner Education, MP Govt.** sought clarification about the utilisation of funds as a communication was received from JS (SE) asking for refund of funds even after carry forward permission was given for utilizing these funds in May, 2010.
- It was clarified that funds were given in 2008-09. As they were not utilised in 2009-10, carry forward permission was granted. Yet again they were not utilised, and carry forward permission was given in May, 2010. However in July, 2010, the erstwhile ICT scheme was revised. As MP has not even called for tender, the amount should be refunded and **a proposal can be sent for fresh approval as the revised ICT scheme has more provisions than the old scheme. Therefore fresh approval could benefit the State.**
- **The representative from Bihar** clarified that due to elections, UC was not sent. However, the computers have been installed and UC would be submitted shortly.
- **The representative of J&K** stated that placement of orders would take place after January and UC would be sent in February.
- **Education Secretary, Karnataka Govt.** stated that UC would be sent within a week.
- **Education Secretary, Maharashtra** stated that there was a problem in tendering process as there is a stay order from a court. **JS(SE)** suggested that the State can refund the amount and fresh approval can be sought. **Education Secretary, Maharashtra will revert back.**
- **Representative of Orissa** stated that only a sum of Rs.0.80 lakh is lying unutilized and this will be refunded within a month.
- **Education Secretary, Haryana** stated that with the funds being released, the State has decided to provide 20 computers instead of 10 in every school and sought permission which was accorded.
- She also requested MHRD to issue a circular stating that States can go in for open source soft ware as it is really difficult for the States to withstand pressure in buying software from Microsoft, which is very costly. JS(SE) stated that MHRD has a neutral platform and it is for the States to decide what is best for the States.

- **Representative of HP** stated that the Broadband connectivity under USOF funds for rural connectivity costs only Rs.150 whereas it is Rs.1000/ for general and requested MHRD to take up the issue with DOT.
- They also requested for restoration of special category status given to HP under the erstwhile ICT programme. **Secretary (SE&L)** stated that this decision cannot be taken at the level of MHRD.

**3. ICT Award: JS(SE)** stated that guidelines have been issued to all States. This will be a regular feature like National Award for Teachers. Only this year the awards are going to be given in March. From next year it will be on Education Day, States were asked to stick to the deadlines, given in the guidelines and also in the presentation made by Director(Sch.5) and submit the proposals.

**4. e-Content:** As there is a provision of financing development of e-content under ICT scheme, States were advised that it would be a good opportunity for them to put in place mechanisms for development of e-content for schools and also for assessment/evaluation of content available in the market. Adequate money is also for developing e-content under the ICT Scheme.

**5. CIET** is also developing e-content, which will be available on web site. It is possible for States to translate/use this. States were also requested to plan for training of teachers for preparation of e-content. States were also requested to join hands for building teachers' capacities and make institutional arrangements for training of teachers in ICT education as well ICT enabled education.

**6. Smart Schools:** Funds for upgrading schools into Smart Schools under the ICT scheme are available and the States should take advantage of this.

## **Integrated Education for Disabled at Secondary Stage (IEDSS)**

1. **Dir(IE)** made a presentation on IEDSS, highlights of which are as under:

- As per the PWD Act, all schools should be disabled friendly having disabled friendly toilet, ramps etc.
- Proposals received from the States for implementing IEDSS scheme do not have details of what aids and appliances are being given to the children.
- MHRD welcomes sharing of best practices.

2. After the presentation, States raised certain issues, highlights of which are as under:

- Proposals of **HP** Govt. is under preparation and would be submitted shortly.
- Unspent balance of **Punjab** under the erstwhile IEDC Scheme would be refunded shortly. They also raised the issue of purchase of aids and appliances on concessional rates from ALMICO. Dir(IE) clarified that this is under process.
- UC for the 1<sup>st</sup> instalment of 2009-10 from **TN** would be sent within 10 days.
- **Rajasthan** is collecting data and proposal would be sent shortly.
- Education Secretary from **Maharashtra** stated that Utilization Certificate (UC) for the grants released during 2009-10 has been sent in May, 2010. It was clarified to him that the UC sent by the State Government was not in order. The MHRD had released an amount of Rs. 2.49 crore as 1<sup>st</sup> instalment during 2009-10 for implementation of scheme of IEDSS in Maharashtra. The funds was released for all the purposes i.e., for 'Student Oriented Component', 'Teacher Oriented Component' and 'Other Component'. But as per the UC, the entire amount of Rs. 2.49 crore was spent over the teachers' salary component. This was also discussed during SIET meeting, wherein the State representative stated that a fresh UC will be submitted and this may be treated as cancelled.
- Education Secretary from **Madhya Pradesh** sought clarification about status of release of funds to NGOs. It was clarified that an amount of Rs. 46.88 lakh was approved for NGO component during 2009-10. However, as the MHRD received some complaints against all the 4 NGOs, State Government was requested for a status report before release of funds. However, no response has so far been received from the State Government and hence funds could not be released.

3. Secretary (SE&L) requested Principal Secretary (Education), **Govt. of Gujarat** to look into the possibility of refunding the surplus amount deposited

by GOI as per the Court's orders. Principal Secretary promised to look into the matter and revert back.

She requested all the States/UTs to send their proposals under the IEDSS Scheme immediately if not already furnished.

**Secretary (SE&L)** brought to the notice of State/UT representatives that the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment is running a scheme under which grants are released for removal of architectural barriers and suggested that they could take benefit of this scheme for Government schools. A copy of the scheme can be seen on the website of Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment.

## **National Means-cum-Merit Scholarship Scheme (NMMSS) and National Scheme of Incentives to Girls for Secondary Education (NSIGSE)**

1. Presentations were made by **Director (SS)** on the two centrally sponsored schemes namely, National Means-cum-Merit Scholarship Scheme (NMMSS) and National Scheme of Incentives to Girls for Secondary Education (NSIGSE). After giving a brief outline of these two schemes, he mentioned the issues about smooth and speedy implementation of these two schemes mainly regarding timely submission of correct and consolidated proposals by States and providing correct data to SBI etc.

2. **JS (SE)** pointed out that proposals under NMMSS are still to be received from 17 States for the year 2010-11 and even for the year 2009-10 seven States are yet to submit the proposals. He requested the defaulting States to submit complete and correct proposals in the relevant proforma immediately in a consolidated form. He explained that a major factor in the delay in disbursement of scholarship is the furnishing of incorrect data by the States, the other major factor being non-submission of proposal. He further added that States have to carry out a campaign to bring about awareness about the scheme so that the number of students appearing in the exam increases, thus facilitating the allotted quota is availed in full by the States. For this purpose, every Govt. or Govt.-aided school having class 8 should be asked by the State Government to ensure that at least 5 students including 2 girls appear in the selection test.

3. The States were requested to indicate the need and suitability of conducting a separate exam for NMMSS after delinking it from NTS test or to continue with NTS. The States and UTs agreed to a separate test exclusively for NMMSS from the next year. The test for NMMSS could be conducted either before the NTS test or after the NTS test in the month of November. The pattern of the examination and other details may be decided by the States in consultation with the NCERT and the test would be conducted by the State Governments. When asked if the qualifying marks should be lowered, a majority of the States were not in favour on the ground that it may dilute the merit envisaged under the scheme. **JS (SE)** suggested all States to set their uniform schedule for declaration of results, completion of formalities and sending the consolidated proposals to the Ministry by end of April every year.

4. On the issue of increase in the ceiling of income, there was consensus among the States on raising the present parental income ceiling of Rs. 1.5 lakh to Rs. 2.00 lakhs. When **JS(SE)** suggested decentralising the Bank operations to the State level, the representatives of the various States welcomed such a move. It was strongly felt that such decentralisation from the present SBI main branch, New Delhi to the State level branches of SBI would speed up implementation of the scheme as the accessibility to the bank at the local level would be easy and exchange of data would be quicker and more reliable. The SBI representatives present in the conference were advised to make necessary arrangements immediately.

5. It was indicated that 17 States have not yet sent the proposals under the above scheme for the year 2009-10 and except for 7 States/UTs, none of the other States have sent proposals for the year 2010-11. **JS (SE)** mentioned that as in the case of NMMSS, the proposals are not being received in the correct proforma, resulting in delay in sanctions and disbursement. He requested all the States to take the scheme seriously and forward the proposals in the relevant format before the end of July every year as by the time all the inputs of the beneficiaries would be readily available and could be compiled.

6. States like Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Punjab and Meghalaya indicated that the SBI returns their proposals repeatedly on the ground that the data are incomplete. The SBI representative clarified that the data provided by these States were not correct and were also not in the required proforma. They requested the States to depute the nodal officers or the persons handling the data entry to the bank premises so that any corrections that need to be carried out could be done instantly.

7. When the representative from Delhi Government raised the issue about return of their proposals pertaining to 2009-10 and 2010-11, it was clarified that the data forwarded by them for 2009-10 and 2010-11 were not in the proper format. Delhi Government representative was advised to submit the correct consolidated proposal immediately. The Delhi Government was also advised to transfer the money sanctioned for the year 2008-09 under the scheme to SBI immediately along with the correct data of the beneficiaries, which they have not submitted so far.

8. When **JS (SE)** raised the issue of delay in delivery of FDCs to beneficiaries by the SBI, the SBI representative assured that they would be in a position to issue 60,000 FDCs within three weeks in respect of those girls in whose case correct data is available with them. **JS(SE)** also desired to know about the ability of SBI to carry out the scheme in a time bound manner in view of the manpower constraints. The bank representative informed that they would be able to carry out the exercise properly and in time.

9. **JS (SE)** in his concluding remarks requested the representatives from the States/UTs to take both the schemes, NMMSS and Incentives to Girls for Secondary Education seriously as the schemes are meant to benefit the economically weaker sections of the society.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the chair.



List of Participants

Smt. Anshu Vaish,  
Secretary, Department of School  
Education & Literacy, Ministry of  
Human Resource Development,  
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

In the Chair

Shri. S.C. Khuntia,  
Joint Secretary, Department of  
School Education & Literacy,  
Ministry of Human Resource  
Development, Shastri Bhawan,  
New Delhi.

**Arunachal Pradesh**

Shri Hage Khoda,  
Commissioner (Education)

Shri Tapang Taloh, Director,  
School Education cum SMD, RMSA

Shri Gautam Saha, FAO  
cum Finance controller, RMSA

Sh. K.K. Pandey,  
State Coordinator, RMSA

**Assam**

Smt. L.S.Changsan,  
Mission Director, RMSA

Sh. P.P. Bora, ACS, OSD, SSA,  
Assam

Sh. Dulu Kumar, AFS,  
Chief Accts. Officer, SSA, Assam

Sh. Syed Inam Jamil,  
Project Leader,  
ICT @ school Project

### **Bihar**

Sh. K.K. Sinha,  
State Project Director, RMSA, Bihar

Sh. A.K. Verma  
RMSA, Bihar

Sh. Ashutosh Kumar  
RMSA, Bihar

### **Chandigarh**

Sh. P.K. Sharma, DPI-cum-State  
Project Director, U.T., Chandigarh

Sh. R.K. Sharma  
Government of Chandigarh

### **Chhattisgarh**

Mr. Sudhir Agrawal,  
Special Secretary, Dept. of School  
Education and Managing Director,  
RMSA

### **Dadra & Nagar Haveli**

Sh. K. J. R. Burman  
Secretary (Education),  
RMSA, Dadra & Nagar Haveli

Sh. Brij Mohan Sharma,  
Director of Education,  
Govt. of Dadra & Nagar Haveli

### **Daman & Diu**

Sh. B.S. Shrimali, Asstt. Director of  
Education

### **Delhi**

Sh. Rakesh Mohan,  
Secretary, Education

Sh. J.B. Singh,  
State Project Director - SSA/RMSA

Sh. M. S. Dahiya,  
Consultant, SSA, Delhi

Sh. B.L. Yadav,  
Deputy Director, Education

### **Goa**

Dr. Celsa Pinto,  
State Mission Director, RMSA

Sh. Anand T. Mamlekar,  
Accounts Officer, Govt. of Goa

### **Gujarat**

Dr. Hashmukh Adia,  
Principal Secretary, (Education),  
Govt. of Gujarat

### **Haryana**

Smt. Surina Rajan,  
Principal Secretary,  
Govt. of Haryana

Sh. Vijayendra kumar,  
Director, (Secondary Education),  
Govt. of Haryana

Sh. Dinesh Gupta,  
Finance Officer, Govt. of Haryana

### **Himachal Pradesh**

Sh. Rajesh Sharma,  
Govt. of Himachal Pradesh

Dr. Narendra Awasthi,  
Deputy Director (Higher Education),  
Govt. of Himachal Pradesh

Sh. B.L. Shukla,  
Planning Coordinator, Govt. of  
Himachal Pradesh

### **Jammu & Kashmir**

Sh. N.A. Kakpre, Nodal Officer,  
Education Dept., Civil Secretariat,  
Jammu & Kashmir

Smt. Murtaza Hussain,  
System Analyst (I/C Planning &  
SEMIS), RMSA

### **Jharkhand**

Smt. Mridula Sinha,  
(Principal Secretary), Govt. of  
Jharkhand

Sh. Mukesh K. Singh,  
State Project Director, Govt. of  
Jharkhand

Sh. P.K. Jha,  
OSD (Planning), Govt. of Jharkhand

### **Karnataka**

Sh. Kumar Naik G., Secretary,  
Primary & Secondary Education,  
Karnataka

Smt. Sandhaya Venu Gopal Sharma,  
State Project Director, RMSA,  
Karnataka

Sh. K.S. Shashidhar,  
Chief Accounts Officer, Karnataka

### **Kerala**

Shri U.K.S. Chauhan,  
Resident Commissioner, Kerala

Shri R. Pramod, Asstt. Liaison  
Officer, R.C. Kerala

### **Lakshadweep**

Sh. J. K. Dadoo, Administrator,  
Govt. of Lakshadweep

Sh. Azar Pal Singh,  
Liaison Officer, Lakshadweep

### **Madhya Pradesh**

Sh Ashok Barnwal,  
Secretary (Education),  
Govt. of Madhya Pradesh

Mrs. Sunita Tripathi,  
Additional Project Director, RMSA

Ms. Kamna Acharya,  
Deputy Director, RMSA.

### **Maharashtra**

Sh. Nand Kumar,  
State Project Director, RMSA

Sh. Bhushan Nalge,  
Programme Officer, RMSA

Sh. Srinivas Shastri,  
Under Secretary (Secondary  
Education), Maharashtra

Dr. Suvarna Kharat,  
Under Secretary (Secondary  
Education)

Sh.N.B.Ringane,  
Joint Director (F&A)

Sh. Rajendra Shahade,  
Chief Engineer (Project)

Sh. S.S. Shintre, Superintendent  
(Secondary Education),  
Director of Education office

## **Meghalaya**

Smt. L.R. Sangma,  
Secretary (Education), Govt. of  
Meghalaya

Sh. J.D. Sangma,  
State Project Director, Meghalaya

## **Manipur**

Sh. Ranjan Yumnam,  
Asst. State Project Director,  
Manipur

Sh. Churamani Kharrel,  
Account Officer, RMSA

## **Mizoram**

Mr. Lalliansanga,  
Financial Controller, Govt. of  
Mizoram

Mr. Lalhmachhmiamia,  
OSD, MEMS, Govt. of Mizoram

Mr. Francis  
Govt. of Mizoram

## **Orissa**

Sh. Srikant Prusty,  
Director (Secondary Education),  
Orissa

Sh. Dipak Ray,  
Asst. Director (Planning) OPEPA

Sh. Pravat Kumar Mishra,  
Asst. Director (MIS) OPEPA

## **Puducherry**

Sh. Partha Sarthy,  
State Project Director, RMSA

Dr. Sundara Vadivelu,  
Director (Secondary Education)

**Punjab**

Sh. C. Roul  
Principal Secretary (School  
Education), Govt. of Punjab

Sh. Krishana Kumar  
DGSE/SPD, RMSA

**Rajasthan**

Sh. Ashok Sampatram,  
Principal Secretary (School  
Education), Govt. of Rajasthan

Mr. Bhaskar A. Sawant,  
SPD & Director (Secondary  
Education)

Mr. Banwari Lal Srwa,  
CAO, Govt. of Rajasthan

**Sikkim**

Sh. C.S. Rao,  
IFS, State Project Director, RMSA

Sh. Deepak Dharnal,  
Director, Accounts Dept.

**Tamil Nadu**

Sh. R. Venkatesan,  
State Project Director, SSA  
represented Secretary (S.E.)

Dr. P. Perumalsamy,  
State Project Director, RMSA,  
Director of School Education

Sh. R. Karunakaran,  
Addl. State Project Director, RMSA

Sh. S. Karmegam,  
Joint Director, RMSA

Sh. Kirubanandan,  
Chief Accounts Officer, RMSA

### **Tripura**

Sh. B. Sinha,  
Principal Secretary (School  
Education)

Sh. Shiladitya Bhowmik,  
Financial Controller, RMSA

### **Uttar Pradesh**

Mr. Jitendra Kumar,  
Secretary (Secondary Education)

Sh. S.V. Singh,  
Asst. State Project Director, RMSA

### **Uttrakhand**

Smt. Manisha Panwar,  
Secretary (Education)

Ms. Sowjanya,  
State Project Director, RMSA

### **West Bengal**

Sh. T.K. Adhikary,  
Joint Secretary (School Education)  
(I/C of Secondary Education)

Sh. U. Chatterjee,  
Addl. State Project Director, W.B.

### **NCERT**

Ms. Shipra Vaidya,  
Associate Professor

Ms. Nirmala, Asst. Professor



Mr. G. Ravindra, Director

Prof. H. O. Gupta, Head, DSE

Ms. Ranjana Arora,  
Associate Professor, NCERT

Prof. Vasudha Kamal, JD, CIET

**NUEPA**

Mr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Professors Head

**NIOS**

Sh. S.S. Jena, Chairman

**NIPFP**

Mr. Anit Mukherjee

Mr. Amarnath H.K