

No.F. 1-77/2009-Sch.1
Government of India
Ministry of Human Resource Development
Department of School Education & Literacy
School-1 Section

Dated 19th February, 2010

To

The Secretaries, In-charge of Secondary Education of Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand and Haryana.

Sub:- Third meeting of Project Approval Board (PAB) for Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) chaired by Secretary (SE&L) to consider proposal from Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand and Haryana.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith minutes of the Third meeting of PAB for RMSA held on 22.1.2010 to consider proposals received from Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand and Haryana for information and necessary action at your end. In particular the following information/document may be furnished to the Ministry immediately:-

- (i) Bond, resolution, authorization letter ,details of implementing society etc. (for States of Manipur, Tripura, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand)
- (ii) Provision for State/UT Budget to meet applicable matching share (except for the State of Tripura)

Yours faithfully,

(Bhaskar Dasgupta)
Under Secretary to the Government of India
Tel. No. 23386802

Encl: - as above

Copy to:-

1. Sr. PPS to Secretary (SE&L)
2. PS to AS & FA
3. PPS to JS(SE)
4. The Vice-Chancellor, NUEPA, New Delhi.

5. Chairman, NIOS, Noida, Uttar Pradesh.
6. Deputy Adviser (Education), Planning Commission.



**Minutes of the 3rd meeting of the Project Approval Board
(PAB) held on 22.1.2010 to consider the
proposals of State/UT Governments under
Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA)**

**Department of School Education and Literacy
Ministry of Human Resource Development
Government of India**

Sub: Minutes of the third meeting of the Project Approval Board (PAB) to consider proposals under Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan held on 22.1.2010.

The Second meeting of the Project Approval Board for Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan to consider annual plan proposals of Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand and Haryana was held on 22.1.2010 under the chairmanship of Smt. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, School Education and Literacy, Government of India. A list of participants is appended.

2. Initiating the discussions, JS (SE) advised the State governments to make a brief presentation highlighting the targets set in their perspective plans, the strategy to achieve the targets, annual plan targets for 2009-10 and the financial implications of the same. Thereafter, the annual plan proposals of various States were taken up for appraisal by the PAB.

3. Andhra Pradesh

3.1 Principal Secretary (Education) Government of Andhra Pradesh presented the annual plan proposal for 2009-10 of the State government. As per the SEMIS data, the GER for secondary stage in 2007-08 was 67.99%. It is targeted to achieve a GER of 100% by 2016-17. The target for 2009-10 is 69% and for the end of the 11th Five Year Plan (i.e. 2011-12) is 77.10%. The Implementing society for RMSA, 'Andhra Pradesh Secondary Education Society' has been registered on 21.10.2009. Rs 2.30 crore has been received for preparatory activities for RMSA from Central government and the applicable State share of Rs 76.67 lakh is being released by the State government through re-appropriation from State budget. Out of the total 17,385 secondary schools in the State, 8,548 schools are under State government. District and state level committees have already been constituted and bank account at State level has been opened.

3.2 It was observed that the State government was still following 5+2+3 structure in school education with classes VIII to X coming under secondary

education. While elementary and secondary education (i.e. upto class X) come under the jurisdiction of Commissioner, School Education, classes XI and XII are under the Commissioner Intermediate Education. PAB advised the State government to carry out structural reform to bring class VIII under the elementary education system so that school education structure was aligned with the nationally accepted norm. Secretary (SE&L) pointed out that adoption of 8+2+2 structure had assumed greater importance in view of the Right to Education Act. Besides, classes XI and XII should also be brought under the purview of Department of School Education.

3.3 While perspective plan and detailed school mapping exercise were yet to be carried out, it was mentioned that more than 85% habitations in the State were already having access to a secondary school within a radius of 5 k.m. Following interventions were proposed under the annual plan for 2009-10:

- Upgradation of 357 upper primary schools to secondary level.
- Strengthening of 8548 existing Government secondary schools through provisioning of additional classrooms, science laboratories, art & craft room, library room and separate toilet for boys and girls
- Annual school grant for 8548 existing Government secondary schools and recently upgraded 1615 Government secondary schools
- In-service training of 1,20,000 teachers
- 250 residential quarters for teachers
- Science exhibitions at district level in 23 districts @ Rs 1.50 lakh per district
- Provision of educational kit for 7.05 lakh students of class IX @ Rs 750 per child
- Strengthening of resource institutions such as SCERT, SIET, CTE, DIET, divisional lead schools, mandal lead schools etc.
- Major repair of 4000 existing schools @ Rs one lakh per school

3.4 So far as the 357 schools proposed for upgradation were concerned, it was observed that these schools were part of 1615 recently upgraded

schools. PAB therefore decided that these schools would be treated as existing secondary schools and were eligible for strengthening of infrastructure in existing schools as per the scheme norms. Therefore 2 classrooms each were sanctioned for these 357 schools along with one science lab, library, computer room, art/craft/culture room, separate toilet block for boys and girls (along with drinking water facilities).

3.5 As regards strengthening of existing schools, the State government had initially projected the following requirements:

➤ Classrooms	:	2598 (@ 2 classrooms in 1299 schools)
➤ Science Laboratories	:	857
➤ Lab Equipments	:	1118
➤ Computer room	:	472
➤ Art, Craft & Culture room	:	1867
➤ Library	:	1789
➤ Toilet block/Drinking water facilities	:	1153

3.6 It was observed that school wise details had not been furnished and the projections were not based on the analysis of SEMIS data. It was also not clear as to how many of the existing secondary schools were to be taken up for strengthening. PAB felt that when one particular school was taken up for strengthening, all requirements as per the State norms should be addressed simultaneously rather than staggering the construction activities. The appraisal team pointed out that additional classrooms had been proposed in 1299 schools. PAB therefore advised the State government to identify full set of requirements in these 1299 schools and complete their strengthening in the first year. The State government was also advised to provide a district-wise list of these schools along with the complete matrix of additionalities required. The State government subsequently furnished a list of 1299 schools with requirement of a total of 7193 classrooms and one science lab, library, computer room, art/craft/culture room, separate toilet block for boys and girls (along with drinking water facilities). For the present as decided by the PAB, 2

additional classrooms in each school along with other additionalities are recommended.

3.7 JS (SE) also advised the State government to complete strengthening of all existing schools within the current five year plan so that all schools would be having facilities as per the State norms by the end of 11th plan.

3.8 As regards the major repair, the appraisal team informed the PAB that school wise estimates for 4000 schools had been received from the State government only the previous day, and the same were yet to be appraised. However, it was suggested that schools with requirement of upto Rs. 4.00 lakh might be sanctioned for major repair. State government requested for sanctioning of all 4000 schools restricting the amount to Rs 4.00 lakh per school. Secretary (SE&L) clarified that if the projected requirement was well above Rs 4.00 lakh, State government would have to commit the remaining expenditure, else there was a possibility of the repair work remaining incomplete. For such schools, State government was advised to come back next year after appropriate prioritizing. The appraisal team subsequently reported that requirement of upto Rs 4.00 lakh was projected for 3087 schools and the same was recommended. The total amount recommended for major repair was Rs 64.85 crore.

3.9 Annual school grant @ Rs 0.40 lakh was recommended for 10,163 schools including the 1615 schools upgraded recently. Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was sanctioned for 8548 schools as this grant is available only for schools having their own building.

3.10 As regards in-service training of teachers, the Principal Secretary, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh conveyed the readiness of State government to train a large number of teachers during the current year. PAB approved in-service training of 50,000 teachers as part of annual plan of 2009-10.

3.11 The State government was advised to submit the requirements for children with special needs under the IEDSS scheme. As regards

strengthening of resource institutions and science exhibitions, they were advised to come back with a detail proposal next year as there was hardly enough time left for its implementation in the current year. So far as the bridge course for out of school children was concerned, the PAB felt that bridge course might not really work in secondary education and the State government should concentrate on catering to those that have completed class VIII. For out of school children, open schooling would perhaps be a better option at the secondary stage.

3.12 A statement of components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Andhra Pradesh is at **Annexure – I**.

3.13 The State Government was also advised to utilize the fund sanctioned for classes IX and X, as the RMSA scheme at present covers only those classes. For the year 2010-11, the State government was advised to submit the annual action plan by 31st March 2010 so that it could be appraised early allowing the State government enough time for its implementation.

3.14 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) A list of 1299 schools to be strengthened, with complete matrix of additionalities to be provided;
- (ii) List of 357 recently upgraded schools approved for strengthening;
- (iii) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (iv) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format.

4. Manipur

4.1 Commissioner and Secretary, Government of Manipur presented the Annual Plan 2009-10 of the State. It was informed that the GER at secondary level was 65.10% based on SEMIS data 2008-09. GER for girls at 67.30% was higher than that of 63.8% for boys. 39% of the enrolment is accounted by scheduled tribes. RMSA will be implemented by the existing SSA society

which has opened a separate bank account for RMSA. SMDC has been constituted in each of the 224 government secondary schools. State RMSA office is also being strengthened. School mapping exercise is under way and almost 80% work has already been completed. The State government has also planned an extensive publicity campaign and prepared several video capsules for this purpose. These capsules were played before the PAB. The effort of the State government in creating the video programmes for awareness and publicity was appreciated by the PAB and other governments were advised to take similar initiatives.

4.2 Out of the 60 new schools proposed by the State government, it was observed that 43 schools were at a distance of 5 k.m. or more from the nearest secondary school. The potential enrolment was reported to be adequate, and in certain cases in excess of 500. The State government representative clarified that this was because of the existence of several upper primary schools in the catchment area. PAB recommended 43 schools in the current year, which were proposed at a distance of 5 k.m. or more from the nearest secondary school.

4.3 The State government proposed to strengthen all 224 government secondary schools with the following additionalities:

Additional classroom	255
Science laboratory	128
Lab equipment	128
Computer room	165
Art/ craft/ culture room	224
Library	95
Separate toilet blocks:	
Boys	124
Girls	224

4.4 It was observed that more than 2 additional classrooms had been proposed in several schools. PAB felt that sanctioning of more than 2 additional classrooms needed objective assessment of potential enrolment. Upto 2 additional classrooms were therefore recommended for such schools,

and a total of 202 additional classrooms were recommended. The other additionalities were also recommended as per the school level details that were furnished.

4.5 So far as the major repair is concerned, it was observed that the requirement had been projected uniformly @ Rs 4.00 lakh per school, irrespective of the number of activities. This was not recommended and State government was advised to come back with detailed school level assessment next year.

4.6 Annual school grant and minor repair grant for 224 schools @ Rs 0.40 lakh and 0.25 lakh respectively was approved.

4.7 In service training of 3051 govt. school teachers were also recommended. However, the State government was advised to include teachers of aided schools also in the next year's annual plan.

4.8 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Manipur, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – II.**

4.9 As regards the proposal for bridge course, the PAB felt it might not serve any meaningful purpose at secondary stage. For 'out of school' children, open and distance learning could be explored and the State Govt. was advised to submit a detailed proposal next year. The need for remedial teaching was appreciated, and the State Govt. was asked to formulate a detailed proposal for next year after assessment of additional teaching hours and the number of teachers required to be paid additional remuneration for remedial teaching. A learning achievement survey might also be desirable to identify the students requiring remedial teaching.

4.10. The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format.

5. Tripura

5.1 The Annual Plan proposal of the State government was presented by Principal Secretary, Government of Tripura. The GER at secondary stage in 2006-07 was 58.61%, which was targeted to be increased to 73.5% by 2011-12 and 100% by 2013-14. A separate society for implementation of RMSA had been registered in August, 2009. The State Mission for RMSA is headed by the Chief Minister, and the Executive Committee is headed by the Principal Secretary, School Education. Director, School Education has been designated as State Mission Director for RMSA. School Management and Development Committees (SMDC) have been constituted for all secondary and higher secondary schools.

5.2 55 new schools were proposed under the Annual plan 2009-10, with a total of 112 new classrooms in these schools. It was observed that 29 of the 55 schools were proposed at a distance of 5 k.m. or more from the nearest secondary schools. Out of these 29 schools, potential enrolment in excess of 60 in class IX had been reported for only one school, and only 11 schools were projected with potential enrolment of at least 30 students.

5.3 Principal Secretary, Education conveyed to the PAB that these schools had already become functional from the current academic year. PAB felt that in that case these schools may have to be treated as existing schools, and new schools could be started only after approval by the PAB. Principal Secretary, Tripura clarified that in that case State Government would have lost one full year as academic year in Tripura commenced in January. It was also pointed out that the State Govt. had submitted its project sufficiently in advance in September, 2009.

5.4 PAB felt that while an exception could be made in case of Tripura to consider these schools as 'new schools' given their academic calendar, it

would be difficult to recommend all of them in view of the low potential enrolment projected, and the requirement of at least 25 students for starting a new section in the scheme. One way out could be to treat these schools as existing schools and sanction maximum admissible assistance for their strengthening. Up to two classrooms are sanctioned for strengthening of existing schools, and since State Govt. had proposed these schools as 'one section' schools, PAB felt that even strengthening of these schools would serve the requirement of the State government. Only difference would be that full complement of teachers would not be available in case of existing schools. The State government was therefore asked whether they would like to treat these as case of strengthening of existing schools (in which case all 55 schools could be sanctioned for strengthening) or insist on treating them as 'new schools' (in which case their sanctioning was to be examined from school mapping angle). Principal Secretary, Government of Tripura conveyed his willingness to treat these cases of strengthening of existing schools. PAB therefore sanctioned strengthening of these 55 schools by providing for 2 additional classrooms, one laboratory with lab equipment, one computer room, one art & craft room, one library and separate toilet block for boys and girls along with drinking water facilities.

5.5 In addition, the proposal of the State government to strengthen 42 more existing schools by providing 49 new classrooms and 42 each laboratory, computer room, art & craft room, library and 49 toilet blocks along with drinking water facilities was approved.

5.6 The State government had proposed major repair of 100 schools at an average cost of Rs 2.66 lakh per school. School wise details were provided, and PAB recommended the proposal.

5.7 Annual schools grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh was sanctioned for 692 government schools having secondary classes (classes IX-X). Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was sanctioned for 592 schools as State government intimated that this grant was not required for 100 schools for which major repair grant was proposed.

5.8 In-service training for 2300 teachers, including 300 head teachers, was recommended. The State government was also advised to include teachers of aided schools in next year's programme. Additionally one day orientation programme for 300 head teachers @ Rs. 200 was also recommended.

5.9 Construction of six residential flats for teachers in 2 locations @ Rs 6.00 lakh per flat was also recommended considering the difficult terrain of the area.

5.10 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Tripura, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – III.**

5.11 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) Provision in the UT budget to meet the share of UT administration;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format

6. Maharashtra

6.1 Secretary, School Education, Government of Maharashtra presented the annual plan proposal 2009-10 of the State government. He informed that a detailed proposal after school mapping exercise and analysis of SEMIS data would be sent next year. However as per the plan prepared by the State government, a total of 1056 new schools were required of which 56 would be opened in rural areas and the remaining in urban area. At present there are 1161 secondary schools under the State government and local bodies which were eligible for assistance under RMSA. Separate society for RMSA is yet to be constituted and current year's programme will be implemented through SSA society, in which a separate account is being opened.

6.2 The current annual plan is indicative in nature and therefore he requested for sanctioning of school annual grant and minor repair grant for existing 1161 schools. This was recommended by PAB @ Rs 0.40 lakh and 0.25 lakh per school respectively.

6.3 In-service training of 5000 teachers was also recommended by PAB @ Rs 1000 per teacher.

6.4 While Secretary, Education, Government of Maharashtra informed that a detailed proposal for strengthening of existing schools would be sent next year after analysis of SEMIS data, under the current year's plan he requested for sanctioning of separate toilet blocks along with drinking water facilities in 120 schools. He assured that details of these schools would be submitted to MHRD within a week. PAB approved the same subject to furnishing of requisite details by the State government.

6.5 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Maharashtra, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – IV.**

6.6 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) List of 120 schools to be provided with separate toilet block along with drinking water facilities;
- (ii) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format.

7. Himachal Pradesh

7.1 The Principal Secretary (Education), Government of Himachal Pradesh introduced the annual plan proposal and the strategy to be followed by the State government. GER at secondary level for the year 2007-08 as per SEMIS data was 89.80%. This is targeted to be enhanced to 100% by 2011-

12, for which enrolment has to rise to 2.64 lakh from 2.30 lakh at present. This is estimated to go up further to 2.70 lakh by 2016-17. The transition rate from elementary to secondary stage is 96% at present, which is targeted to be increased to 100% by 2016-17. The project will be implemented through the SSA society. Rs 1.60 crore towards preparatory activities, including Rs 1.20 crore received from the Central government and Rs 0.40 crore sanctioned by the State government, has already been utilized. Orientation training of the principals has already been completed.

7.2. The State Government had proposed to upgrade 104 schools. Out of these 104 schools, potential enrolment of 50 in class IX has been reported for only 7 schools. The framework for implementation of RMSA allows relaxation of distance norm for hilly areas, areas with difficult terrain and sparsely populated areas. The framework also envisages a minimum classroom student ratio of 1:25. It was therefore suggested by the appraisal team to recommend all schools with potential enrolment justifying one section as per the minimum scheme norm.

7.3 Principal Secretary, Government of Himachal Pradesh stated that State government had its own norm of providing one secondary school within 3 km of every habitation. Besides Himachal Pradesh being a hilly State with low density of population, it would not be possible to move towards universal access if the scheme norm of at least 25 students per section was to be followed. Enrolment in secondary classes is often as low as 17-18 per section, and schools with small student population was the norm, rather than exception in the State. Therefore he requested for approval of all schools with a distance of at least 3 km from the nearest secondary school and potential enrolment of 15 students or more in class IX.

7.4 Prof. Biswal of NUEPA stated that the distance norm suggested in the scheme meant 'walking distance' and natural barriers were taken into account in the norm. Principal Secretary, Himachal Pradesh insisted that 5 km of walking distance in a hilly State was quite different from the same distance in plain land and 3 km norm of the State Government was formulated keeping in

view the local terrain. Besides, the framework also provided for relaxation of norm for such areas.

7.5 In view of the difficult terrain and low density of population in the State, PAB approved all schools which were proposed at a distance of 3 km or more from the nearest secondary school and had potential enrolment of at least 15 students. The number of such schools was reported as 69 by the appraisal team, out of which projected enrolment in class IX exceeded 50 only in 5 schools. These 5 schools were recommended as two section schools @ Rs.58.12 lakh per school. Remaining 64 schools with projected enrolment of less than 50 were recommended with one section each in class IX and X, unit cost being Rs.46.86 lakh per school.

7.6 It was observed that the State Government has proposed major repair for 403 schools at a uniform cost of Rs.2.00 lakh per school. This was not recommended as school-wise estimates were not provided and the State Government was advised to come back next year after assessing school – wise requirements.

7.7 Annual schools grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh was sanctioned for 2015 government schools having secondary classes (Classes IX-X), of which 829 are secondary schools and 1186 are senior secondary schools. Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was sanctioned for the same 2015 schools.

7.8 The State Government has proposed in service training of 13,939 teachers during the current year. Considering the limited time left in the current financial year, PAB recommended in service training of 3,000 teachers in the current year.

7.9 The Principal Secretary, Government of Himachal Pradesh raised the issue of extending the coverage of the scheme to higher secondary level. He mentioned that with already a high GER at secondary stage, the State needed to invest heavily at higher secondary stage. Secretary (SE&L) clarified that at present the scheme was limited to secondary stage. However, RMSA fund is

available for secondary schools and secondary sections of higher secondary schools. With the problem of access being largely attended to, the State Government was advised to concentrate on improving quality of learning. JS(SE) suggested a learning achievement survey, preferably at the beginning of class IX, to identify the learning achievement level of students coming out of elementary stage. Suitable remedial teaching schemes were also suggested at the beginning of class IX based on the outcome of the learning achievement survey.

7.10 It was also observed that the State Government had not submitted any school improvement plan in respect of the existing secondary schools under the current year's plan. JS (SE) advised the State Government to identify the shortfall in existing government schools through analysis of SEMIS data and ensure provisioning of those facilities by the end of current five year plan.

7.11 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Himachal Pradesh, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – V.**

7.12 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format

8. Uttarakhand

8.1 State Project Director, RMSA, Government of Uttarakhand presented the annual work plan proposal of the State government. As per SEMIS 2007-08, GER for the secondary stage was 55.55%, with GER for boys being 58.72% and that for girls being 52.17%. The transition rate from elementary to secondary stage was 82.33%. The RMSA programme will be implemented by 'Uttarakhand Sabhi ke Liye Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad', which has

already been registered. Uttarakhand being a hilly State with scattered habitation and difficult geographic terrain, the cost of construction is in high hilly areas.

8.2 Under the current year's plan, State Government proposed upgradation of 34 upper primary schools to the secondary stage with a total of 136 additional classrooms. SPD Uttarakhand stated that these schools were proposed keeping in view the scheme norm of providing one secondary school within 5 km of every habitation. However, Uttarakhand is similarly placed to Himachal Pradesh as far as the terrain is concerned. Keeping in view the decision of PAB to relax the distance norm for Himachal Pradesh, he proposed to submit a revised proposal for upgradation of larger number of schools. Secretary (SE&L) enquired whether Uttarakhand had also adopted a separate State norm for opening secondary schools like Himachal Pradesh, who had their own distance norm of 3 km. It was clarified by the State Government that their norm was 5 km as had been suggested in RMSA document. PAB therefore, expressed their inability to relax the distance norm for Uttarakhand as their own norm did not justify such relaxation.

8.3 It was also pointed out by the appraisal team that out of 34 schools fulfilling the distance norms of 5 km, potential enrolment of 50 or above had been reported only for 7 schools. However, Uttarakhand is also a State with low population density and therefore one section schools could be considered there in line with the principle adopted for Himachal Pradesh. There were 16 more schools with enough potential enrolment to justify one section. PAB therefore, recommended 23 new schools in the State, 7 with two sections in each class @ Rs.58.12 lakh and 16 with one section @ Rs.46.86 lakh.

8.4 The State Government has submitted school improvement plan for 944 existing schools and 30 schools upgraded between 2002 and 2006, but not having own building. It was observed that in some cases additional classrooms were so proposed that the concerned schools would have more than 2 sections in each class. While there is no explicit bar to sanction more than two sections in one class, PAB felt that sanctioning of more than 2

additional classrooms in an existing school needed objective assessment of potential enrolment. Considering the low population density of the State and low enrolment projected for the new schools, PAB felt that more than two sections in a class needed more careful scrutiny. PAB therefore decided to recommend 87 additional classrooms in the existing secondary schools so that all schools would have a maximum of 4 classrooms in secondary section.

8.5 On the other hand it was observed that in 5 schools having no building, only a single classroom had been proposed. PAB advised the State Government to reassess the requirement for these schools as a secondary school with one section in each class would need a minimum of two classrooms. 50 classrooms in the remaining 25 schools having no building were recommended by PAB.

8.6 Other facilities proposed in the 944 existing schools and 25 schools having no building were recommended as indicated in **Annexure-VI**.

8.7 Annual schools grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh was sanctioned for 1760 government schools having secondary classes (Classes IX-X). Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was sanctioned for 1730 schools, excluding the 30 schools having no building as minor repair grant was available only for schools with their own building.

8.8 The proposal to provide in-service training to 3502 government school teachers was recommended. The State Government was advised to include teachers of aided schools also in the next year's plan.

8.9 The proposal for major repair grant for 241 schools was not recommended as school-wise details were not furnished. PAB advised the State Government to resubmit the proposal next year after assessing school-wise requirements.

8.10 The proposals for provision of playground, study tour/excursion trip were not considered. The PAB advised the State Government to await formulation of clear norms in this regard.

8.11 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Uttarakhand, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – VI**.

8.9 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format.

9. Jharkhand

9.1 Principal Secretary (Education) Government of Jharkhand introduced the Annual Plan proposal of the State Government. She stated that Jharkhand was lagging way behind the all India figures in respect of most indicators in secondary education, and the State would need central support in a big way to catch up with the rest of the country. GER at secondary stage at present year 2007-08 was only 28.49% and GER for higher secondary stage was 16.21%. The transition rate from elementary to secondary education was 56.74%. The target is to raise GER at secondary stage to 50% by 2011-12 and to 100% by 2016-17. The perspective plan is yet to be finalised.

9.2. JS(SE) advised the State Government to accord due importance to the perspective planning process. As enrolment at secondary stage is limited by the number of students completing class VIII, the State Government needs to set realistic targets in respect of GER after taking into account the number of students transiting from elementary stage. Principal Secretary, Jharkhand suggested measures like bridge course considering the large number of

children outside the school system. Secretary (SE&L) stated that bridge course might not work at secondary stage, as lateral entry at this level was difficult. A better option would be use of open and distance learning system in a big way.

9.3 It was observed that the State Government had proposed to upgrade 468 upper primary schools to the secondary stage under the current year's annual plan. The appraisal team pointed out that the criteria of selecting these schools were not clear nor were the school-wise details furnished. The Principal Secretary, Jharkhand clarified that these schools were selected by choosing two schools per block. Besides, the school-wise details in respect of 419 schools had since been collected. Distance of these schools from the nearest secondary schools and projected enrolment were placed before PAB. PAB felt that upgradation of schools should ideally be based on school mapping exercise and schools should not be selected for upgradation without objective analysis of the need. At the same time there was little doubt that the State would need a large number of new schools to improve access and GER. After examining the projected enrolment and distance from nearest secondary school, PAB recommended upgradation of 300 schools under the current year's annual plan. The choice of these schools out of the 419 schools was left to the State Government, to be objective based on the greatest need.

9.4 It was also observed that the State government had proposed strengthening of 50 existing secondary schools. School-wise details however, were not provided. Principal Secretary, Jharkhand informed that requisite details had since been collected in respect of 24 schools and the same was placed before PAB. It was observed that 4 additional classrooms have been proposed for each school. PAB recommended two additional classrooms each along with full complement of additionalities for 24 schools.

9.5 Annual school grant and minor repair grant for 1165 existing Government secondary schools @ Rs.0.40 lakh and Rs.0.25 lakh respectively were recommended.

9.6 In-service training of 350 teachers, including 50 Headmasters, was approved. State government was advised to include teachers of aided schools also in the proposal for 2010-11.

9.7 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Jharkhand, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – VII.**

9.8 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) List of 300 schools selected for upgradation under current year's plan
- (ii) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (iii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format

10. Haryana

10.1 Principal Secretary, Education, Government of Haryana introduced the annual plan proposal of the State government. It was intimated that perspective plan was under preparation. A detailed Annual Plan will be submitted next year. Under current year's plan, only limited activities such as annual school grant and minor repair grant had been proposed. While a comprehensive school improvement plan for the existing schools would be submitted next year after analysis of SEMIS data, one school per block had been selected for providing additional classrooms. A total of 275 additional classrooms were proposed in 131 schools.

10.2 PAB felt that when a particular school was taken up for strengthening, all requirements as per the State norms should be addressed simultaneously rather than staggering the construction activities. PAB felt that recommending only construction of classrooms in isolation was not a good idea. The State Government was therefore advised to come back with a comprehensive

school improvement plan next year after assessing all the requirements for their strengthening.

10.3 The State Government representative suggested that given some time they would be able to submit complete school improvement plan in respect of some of the schools. PAB decided that in case a complete proposal is received within a week, the same might be processed on file.

10.4 PAB recommended annual schools grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh for 3118 government schools having secondary classes (Classes IX-X). Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was also sanctioned for same 3118 schools.

10.5 A statement listing out components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Haryana, and admissible amount as per scheme norms, is at **Annexure – VIII.**

10.6 The State government is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

- (i) Exact provision for State share in the State budget to meet State share;
- (ii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format

11. Projects/ activities proposed by COBSE

11.1 The following 3 projects/ activities submitted by Council of Board of School Education in India (COBSE) were also taken up by PAB,

- (i) Project on 'Examination Reforms for Universalisation of Secondary Education'
- (ii) Financial assistance to COBSE for a meeting on Continuous & Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) for Secondary Education to be held on 18-19, February, 2010 at New Delhi

- (iii) Financial assistance to COBSE for a meeting of Boards of School Education to finalize Core Curriculum for Science & Mathematics for Senior Secondary Stage (to be held on 3-4 February 2010)

11.2 General Secretary, COBSE informed that such proposals were earlier financed under a scheme with the Planning Bureau of MHRD, but its implementation had subsequently been transferred to NUEPA. Under the new guidelines of the scheme, grant to the same organization is not permitted more than once in 3 years, and therefore COBSE was finding it difficult to get any financial assistance on annual basis under the scheme.

11.3 Secretary (SE&L) advised COBSE to submit a detailed proposal, which may be examined in consultation with NUEPA, NCERT and CBSE, and brought up on file subject to ratification by PAB.

12. General Issues: Following issues were also discussed in the PAB meeting:

12.1. Preparation of perspective plans - Target setting and model building

12.1.1 PAB advised all State governments to concentrate on the perspective planning process. The perspective plan document has to indicate at least three clear timelines for achieving important targets

- For 2011-12 - end of 11th Five Year Plan,
- For 2013-14 - end of 5 years from the scheme ` Commencement
- For 2016-17 - end of 12th Five Year plan

12.1.2 It has also been observed that many of the State Governments are coming out with targets and growth projections which are not realistic. It is important for State planners to realize that number of students completing class VIII constitutes the upper limit in secondary enrollment. Unlike elementary level, it is not realistic at secondary stage to bring 'out of school' children within the regular schooling straightway.

12.1.3 Projections for **new schools** should be ideally based on school mapping exercise. PAB therefore advised all State/UT governments to complete the school mapping exercise at the earliest. Further, the following factors should also be kept in view while projecting requirement of new schools:

- Distance to nearest recognized secondary schools
- Potential enrolment in class IX from the catchment area and whether 2 section schools are justified.

12.1.4 Consolidation of norms: In order to prepare a comprehensive perspective plan next year, all state governments were also advised to:

- Consolidate all existing norms in secondary education
- Indicate norms for teaching staff for secondary school
- Develop norms in case norms are not in existence

12.1.5 Clear strategy for achieving the target will have to be indicated in the perspective plan document.

12.2. Preparation of Annual plans

12.2.1 For preparation of a qualitatively superior annual plan document, State governments were advised to provide due attention to the following:

- Collection of baseline data on the secondary education situation based on available data and information, particularly SEMIS;
- A proper method for projection of school age population for estimation of key performance indicators of participation in secondary education;
- Consistency in reporting data and information in the plan document;

- Proper presentation of tables and diagrams with captions and sources;
- Discussion on the criteria/norms and methods for proposing various requirements, including opening of new secondary schools, and additional teachers;
- Establishing linkages between various Chapters in the Annual Plan; and
- Proper organization and presentation of budget estimates.

12.2.2 Improvement of existing schools: While upgradation of upper primary schools or setting up of new schools should only be proposed after school mapping exercise, short fall from norms in the existing secondary schools should be identified from analysis of SEMIS data for bringing these schools upto the normative standards by the end of 11th Five Year Plan. State/UT Governments should try to provide infrastructure in all existing secondary schools as per State norms by the end of the current plan.

12.2.3 Learning achievement survey and remedial teaching: Many of the States had reported a low pass percentage from IX to X and at Xth level Board examination. This is a worrying trend as high dropouts within secondary stage represent wastage of scarce national resources. State/UT governments were therefore advised to conduct learning achievement surveys among the students of class IX, and to provide remedial teaching based on the weaknesses identified. Such remedial teaching needs to be provided at the very beginning of class IX.

12.2.4 Progress in implementation of components already sanctioned: Annual plan proposals for 2010-11 onwards should include a separate chapter detailing the progress made in implementation of activities sanctioned in the previous year(s).

12.3. Flexibility in existing financial norms for construction:

12.3.1. Several State Governments, particularly from predominantly hilly States, such as Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh and North Eastern States like Manipur and Tripura submitted that cost of construction in those States were considerably higher due to several factors including high cost of transporting raw material. It was stated that it would be difficult to carry out construction of school buildings and other infrastructure within the ceiling specified in the scheme.

12.3.2. The appraisal team felt that the norms were reasonable, and most of the State Governments had not reported any difficulty in following them. However, the hilly and NER States might be having a genuine difficulty primarily due to high cost of transporting raw material. Similar problems were reported by them under Model School and Girls' Hostel schemes, and a proposal has been mooted to permit up to 20% higher construction cost for NER States and predominantly hilly States under Model School scheme.

12.3.3. Secretary (SE&L) stated that construction costs should ideally be based on State schedule of rates, and no component wise upper ceiling should have been specified. The experience in implementation of SSA has clearly shown that pre-determined unit cost based approach does not work in the long run. Even under the KGBV scheme, a decision has been taken to switch over to State schedule of rates. However, this would require modifications in the scheme guideline and PAB is not competent to do the same. She desired that a proposal for State schedule based approach should be mooted for approval of the competent authority for both RMSA and Girls' Hostel schemes.

12.4 Formulation of clear financial norms for certain components: It was observed that the RMSA framework was very broad based and provided for considerable flexibility to undertake a large number of activities such as remedial teaching, open and distance learning, specific incentives for girls, minorities, SCs and STs, incentive to female teachers, strengthening of

resource institutions in states, capacity building in states etc. However definite financial norms have not been worked out in the framework for many of these activities. Similarly, it has also been emphasized in the framework to make all civil constructions earthquake resistant, to provide fire safety measures in all schools, to provide for water harvesting system in schools etc. Financial Norms need to be developed in this regard also. The appraisal team informed that the RMSA TSG was yet to be fully functional, but the recruitment of consultants is at an advanced stage. Secretary (SE&L) directed that a comprehensive list of activities permissible under RMSA along with suggestive financial norm for each activity may be drawn up by the TSG in consultation with NUEPA within one month of the TSG becoming functional so that from next year all such activities could be taken up for appraisal.

12.5. Curricular, examination and school governance reform

12.5.1 RMSA prescribes wide ranging reform in curriculum, examination and school governance. It was observed that these aspects were yet to receive adequate importance in the perspective and annual plans presented by the States. The long term road map of reform should be part of the perspective plan.

12.5.2 It is a matter of concern, even after a decade of implementation of SSA that in some of the States class VIII was still part secondary stage. All such State governments are to be advised to align their system with the national norm by adopting 8+2+2 framework. This has assumed greater importance in view of the RTE Act.

12.6. Teachers' recruitment and training

12.6.1 It is observed that untrained and unqualified teachers were being recruited by some of the States even at secondary level. PAB felt that this practice must stop. Under RMSA scheme, Central government would be financing 75% of the salary of regular teachers and this should provide a very good opportunity to the State Education Departments to convince their

Finance Departments regarding the need to recruit good quality trained teachers for secondary schools.

12.6.2 It is also important for secondary teachers to be properly trained in teaching methods. All State governments were advised to draw up a detailed plan for providing in-service training to teachers and to include it in their annual plan proposals.

12.6.3 State governments need to identify adequate number of master trainers and subject experts. Due attention also needs to be provided to development of appropriate curriculum. All these aspects should be covered in the annual plan proposal.

12.6.4 It is also clarified that in addition to the teachers of govt. school, teachers from aided schools should also be included in the plan for annual in-service training.

12.7. Data collection under SEMIS (Secondary Education Management Information System) for 2009-10: Since data collection under SEMIS is required every year, the SEMIS software has been revised in 2009 taking into account the revisions made in the latest Data Capture Format (DCF). All States/UT Govts. had been requested to complete by 31.12.2009 SEMIS data collection with base date as 30.9.2009. Since the States are required to prepare the Perspective Plan as well as Annual Plan to accompany their proposals, PAB advised them to complete the SEMIS related work expeditiously.

12.8. Budget provision for State share: All State/UT governments are advised to ensure adequate provision in their budget to meet the applicable state/UT share and indicate the same alongwith the annual plan proposal. Unless it is done, it would not be possible to release central share.

12.9. Submission of bond, resolution etc.: Delay in the submission of these documents or mistakes in their preparations have been delaying

release of fund. Prescribed formats, a specimen copy complete in all respect and some frequent mistakes in its preparation are available on the website of MHRD. All State/UT governments were requested to accord due importance to preparation and timely submission of these documents. From the next years, these documents should be sent with the annual plan proposal itself.

12.10. Constitution of implementing society: All State governments are advised to complete registration of a society quickly to implement RMSA. If it is not possible immediately, a separate account may be opened in SSA society and the money may be released into that account in current year. However this is suggested merely as a temporary measure and the funds will have to be transferred to RMSA Society once that is in place.

12.11. Constitution of SMDC: PAB advised all State/UT governments to complete constitution of School Management and Development Committees (SMDCs) in all govt. schools as per the scheme guidelines, and endorse a copy of the guidelines/orders issued to MHRD. It was reiterated that members should be elected to the extent possible, while ensuring the predominant role of the parents.

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

Appendix

Subject: List of participants in the Third Meeting of Project Approval Board (PAB) to consider Annual Work Plan and Budget, 2009-10 under RMSA on 22.01.2010.

1	Smt. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	In the Chair
2	Shri S.C. Khuntia, Joint Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	
3	Shri K. Satish Nambudiripad, Director, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	
4	Smt. Sarita Mittal, Director (Finance), Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	
5	Shri Bhaskar Dasgupta, Under Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	
6	Shri Sanjay Kumar, DO (IFD), Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi	
Planning Commission		
7.	Shri K.P. Singh, Deputy Advisor (Education)	
NIOS		
8	Smt. Gopa Biswas, Deputy Director NIOS, Noida	
NUEPA		
9	Dr. K. Biswal, Associate Professor, NUEPA, New Delhi	
10	Dr. N.K. Mohanty, Asstt Professor	

	NUEPA, New Delhi	
COBSE		
11	Prof. D.V. Sharma, General Secretary, COBSE	
Govt. of Manipur		
12	Shri P.K. Singh, Secretary (Education-School), Govt of Manipur	
13	Shri Ranjan Yumnam, Addl. SPD (RMSA), Government of Manipur.	
Govt. of Tripura		
14	Shri B. Sinha, Principal Secretary (School Eucation), Govt. of Tripura	
15	Shri H.L. Chakraborty, Director (RMSA), Govt. of Tripura.	
Govt. of Maharashtra		
16	Shri Sanjay Kumar, Principal Secretary (SE), Govt. of Maharashtra	
17	Dr. Suvarna Kharat, Under Secretary (Secondary), Govt. of Maharashtra	
18	Dr. S.L. Khateeb, Joint Director (RMSA), Govt. of Maharashtra	
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh		
19	Shri Suresh Chanda, Principal Secretary (SE), Govt. of Andhra Pradesh	
20	Smt Poonam Mala Kondaviala, Commissioner (School Education), Govt. of AP	
21	Smt. G.N. Vidya, Addl. Director (RMSA), Govt. of AP	
Govt. of Uttarakhand		
22	Dr. Rakesh Kumar, Secretary (Education), Govt. of Uttarakhand.	

23	Smt. Pushpa Mahas, SPD (RMSA), Director (School Education), Govt. of Uttarakhand	
24	Dr. M.S. Bisht, Junior Prof. (Plan) SIEMAT, Govt. of Uttarakhand.	
25	Shri Shailendra Amoli, Research Officer, Directorate of Education, Govt. of Uttarakhand	
Govt. of Himachal Pradesh		
26	Shri Shrikhand Baldi, Principal Secretary, (Education), Govt of Himachal Pradesh	
27	Shri Rajesh Sharma, SPD(RMSA), Govt of Himachal Pradesh	
Govt. of Haryana		
28	Shri Rajan Gupta, Principal Secretary (Education), Govt. of Haryana.	
29	Shri. Gaja Nand, Consultant (RMSA), Govt. of Haryana	
30	Shri Ajay Thakur, Project Specialist (RMSA), Govt. of Haryana	
31	Shri Pranab Kumar Das, Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojna Parishad, Govt. of Haryana	
Govt. of Jharkhand		
32	Smt. Mridula Sinha, Principal Secretary (HRD), Govt of Jharkhand.	
33	Shri Lakshman Kumar Sinha, Deputy Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Jharkhand	
34	Shri Mukesh Kumar Sinha, Assistant Director (Higher Education), Nodal Officer (RMSA), Govt. of Jharkhand	

Proposals approved by PAB for Andhra Pradesh under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	0	58.12	0.00
Strengthening of existing schools			
	1299		61040.16
Classrooms	3312	5.63	18646.56
Recently upgraded schools	714		
Existing secondary schools	2598		
Science lab	1656	6.10	10101.60
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Lab Equipment	1656	1.00	1656.00
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Computer room	1656	5.00	8280.00
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Art/Craft/Culture room	1656	5.00	8280.00
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Library	1656	7.00	11592.00
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	1656	1.50	2484.00
Recently upgraded schools	357		
Existing secondary schools	1299		
Major repair	3087	1.00	6485.50
Total (Civil work)			67525.66
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	10163	0.4	4065.20
Minor repair grant	8548	0.25	2137.00
In service training of teachers	50000	0.01	500.00
Teachers for new schools	0		0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			6702.20
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			74227.86
Share of Civil work			90.97
MMER @ 1.5%			1113.42
Grand Total			75341.28
Central share			56505.96
Requirement for 1st installment			28252.98

Note: Two classrooms each have been sanctioned for the 357 schools where class IX is presently functional. In addition 1299 existing schools have been recommended for strengthening

Annexure - II

Proposals approved by PAB for Manipur under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	44	58.12	2557.28
Strengthening of existing schools	224		4992.06
Classrooms	202	5.63	1137.26
Science lab	128	6.10	780.80
Lab Equipment	128	1.00	128.00
Computer room	165	5.00	825.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	224	5.00	1120.00
Library	95	7.00	665.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	224	1.50	336.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			7549.34
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	224	0.4	89.60
Minor repair grant	224	0.25	56.00
In service training of teachers	3051	0.01	30.51
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			176.11
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			7725.45
Share of Civil work			97.72
MMER @ 1.5%			115.88
Grand Total			7841.33
Central share			7057.20
Requirement for 1st installment			3528.60

Proposals approved by PAB for Tripura under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	0	58.12	0.00
Strengthening of existing schools	97		3444.37
Classrooms	159	5.63	895.17
Science lab	97	6.10	591.70
Lab Equipment	97	1.00	97.00
Computer room	97	5.00	485.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	97	5.00	485.00
Library	97	7.00	679.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	141	1.50	211.50
Major repair	100	1.00	266.29
Residential quarter for teachers	6	6.00	36.00
Total (Civil work)			3746.66
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	692	0.4	276.80
Minor repair grant	592	0.25	148.00
In service training of teachers	2300	0.01	23.00
One day orientation programme for head teachers	300	0.002	0.60
Teachers for new schools	0		0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			448.40
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			4195.06
Share of Civil work			89.31
MMER @ 1.5%			62.93
Grand Total			4257.99
Central share			3832.19
Requirement for 1st installment			1916.09

Note: Two classrooms each have been sanctioned for 55 newly upgraded schools, which have started functioning from January, 2010. Besides 49 classrooms have been sanctioned in 42 existing secondary schools. Out of the 141 toilet blocks, 92 are meant for 55 newly upgraded schools, and the remaining 49 for 42 existing secondary schools

Proposals approved by PAB for Maharashtra under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	0	58.12	0.00
Strengthening of existing schools	0		180.00
Classrooms	0	5.63	0.00
Science lab	0	6.10	0.00
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	0	5.00	0.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	0	5.00	0.00
Library	0	7.00	0.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	120	1.50	180.00
Major repair		1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			180.00
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	1161	0.4	464.40
Minor repair grant	1161	0.25	290.25
In service training of teachers	5000	0.01	50.00
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			804.65
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			984.65
Share of Civil work			18.28
MMER @ 1.5%			14.77
Grand Total			999.42
Central share			749.56
Requirement for 1st installment			374.78

Proposals approved by PAB for Himachal Pradesh under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	69		3289.64
2 section school with projected enrolment in excess of 50	5	58.12	290.60
1 section school with projected enrolment of less than 50	64	46.86	2999.04
Strengthening of existing schools	0		0.00
Classrooms	0	5.63	0.00
Science lab	0	6.10	0.00
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	0	5.00	0.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	0	5.00	0.00
Library	0	7.00	0.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	0	1.50	0.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			3289.64
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	2015	0.4	806.00
Minor repair grant	2015	0.25	503.75
In service training of teachers	3000	0.01	30.00
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			1339.75
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			4629.39
Share of Civil work			71.06
MMER @ 1.5%			69.44
Grand Total			4698.83
Central share			3524.12
Requirement for 1st installment			1762.06

Note: Potential enrolment of more than 50 has been reported for 7 schools. These 7 schools are approved with 2 sections @ Rs. 58.12 lakh. The remaining schools have been approved with 1 section @ Rs. 46.86 lakh.

Annexure - VI

Proposals approved by PAB for Uttarakhand under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Rs in lakhs

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	23		1156.60
2 section school with projected enrolment in excess of 50	7	58.12	406.84
1 section school with projected enrolment of less than 50	16	46.86	749.76
Strengthening of existing schools	944		3302.81
Classrooms	137	5.63	771.31
Building less schools	50		
Other existing schools	87		
Science lab	75	6.10	457.50
Building less schools	11		
Other existing schools	64		
Lab Equipment	808	1.00	808.00
Building less schools	26		
Other existing schools	782		
Computer room	55	5.00	275.00
Building less schools	9		
Other existing schools	46		
Art/Craft/Culture room	41	5.00	205.00
Building less schools	6		
Other existing schools	35		
Library	69	7.00	483.00
Building less schools	9		
Other existing schools	60		
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	202	1.50	303.00
Building less schools	7		
Other existing schools	195		
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			4459.41
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	1760	0.4	704.00
Minor repair grant	1730	0.25	432.50
In service training of teachers	3502	0.01	35.02
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			1171.52
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			5630.93
Share of Civil work			79.19
MMER @ 1.5%			84.46
Grand Total			5715.39
Central share			4286.55
Requirement for 1st installment			2143.27

Note: Potential enrolment of more than 50 has been reported for 7 schools. These 7 schools are approved with 2 sections @ Rs. 58.12 lakh. The remaining schools have been approved with 1 section @ Rs. 46.86 lakh. The schools to be strengthened include 30 building less schools. The building less 30 schools are not eligible for minor repair grant

Annexure - VII

Proposals approved by PAB for Jharkhand under Annual Plan for 2009-10

Component	Physical	Unit cost	Rs. In lakh
			Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	300	58.12	17436.00
Strengthening of existing schools	24		884.64
Classrooms	48	5.63	270.24
Science lab	24	6.10	146.40
Lab Equipment	24	1.00	24.00
Computer room	24	5.00	120.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	24	5.00	120.00
Library	24	7.00	168.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	24	1.50	36.00
Major repair		1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			18320.64
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	1165	0.4	466.00
Minor repair grant	1165	0.25	291.25
In service training of teachers	350	0.01	3.50
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			760.75
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			19081.39
Share of Civil work			96.01
MMER @ 1.5%			286.22
Grand Total			19367.61
Central share			14525.71
Requirement for 1st installment			7262.85

Annexure - VIII

Proposals approved by PAB for Haryana under Annual Plan for 2009-10

			Rs. In lakh
Component	Physical	Unit cost	Total amount approved
Non-recurring/ Civil component			
New/ upgraded schools	0	58.12	0.00
Strengthening of existing schools	0		0.00
Classrooms	0	5.63	0.00
Science lab	0	6.10	0.00
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	0	5.00	0.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	0	5.00	0.00
Library	0	7.00	0.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	0	1.50	0.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
Total (Civil work)			0.00
Recurring/ other than civil work			
Annual School grant	3118	0.4	1247.20
Minor repair grant	3118	0.25	779.50
In service training of teachers	0	0.01	0.00
Teachers for new schools			0.00
Total (other than Civil work)			2026.70
Total (Civil plus other than civil work)			2026.70
Share of Civil work			0.00
MMER @ 1.5%			30.40
Grand Total			2057.10
Central share			1542.83
Requirement for 1st installment			1542.83