

## CHAPTER - IV

### MONITORING & EVALUATION

#### 4.1 Background

Section 21 of the RTE Act provides that a school shall constitute a School Management Committee consisting of the elected representatives of the local authority, parents or guardians of children admitted in such schools and teachers. SMC shall monitor the management of the school, prepare and recommend School Development Plan (SDP), monitor the utilization of the grants received from the appropriate Government or local authority, and perform any such functions as may be prescribed. Further, as per Section 31 of the Act, National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) and the State Commissions for Protection of Child Rights (SCPCRs) shall examine and review the safeguards for rights provided by or under this Act and also inquire into complaints relating to child's right to free and compulsory education. Further, as per Section 33 and 34 of Act, National Advisory Council (NAC) and State Advisory Council (SAC) shall be constituted to advice Central and State Government on implementation of the provisions of the RTE Act in an effective manner.

#### 4.2 National Advisory Council

MHRD had set up NAC on 08 July 2010 in compliance of Section 33 of the Act. The functions of NAC was to advice Central Government on implementation of the provisions of the RTE Act in an effective manner. The Minister of Human Resource Development is Ex-officio Chairperson of the Council. The Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Director, NCERT, Vice Chancellor, NUEPA, Chairman NCTE and Chairman NCPCR are *ex-officio* Members and nine other members were nominated by the Central Government

As per its own approved schedule (26 August 2010), the NAC was to meet every quarter in the initial three years of the commencement of the Act. Audit observed that the NAC met only twice in 2010-11 and 2011-12, once in 2012-13 and 2013-14 and has not met thereafter. Further NAC has not been reconstituted after November 2014. MHRD informed (January 2017) that formation of new NAC was under process. Thus, the NAC which was entrusted with the responsibilities of advising the implementation of the Act in an effective manner largely remained ineffective and not in existence since November 2014.

MHRD stated that GoI has set up the National Mission of SSA in 2001 with Governing Council (GC) and Executive Council (EC) working under it. GC had met only once since 2001 and the reconstitution of EC is under process. However, the reply is silent about non reconstitution of NAC.

### **4.3 State Advisory Council (SAC)**

Section 34 of the Act, envisages that the State Government should constitute, by notification, SAC to advise them to implement the provisions of the Act in an effective manner.

The Minister in-charge of the Ministry/Department of School Education in the State Government is ex-officio Chairperson of the Council. As per the procedures for transaction of business of the SAC, was to meet regularly, at such times as the Chairperson thinks fit, but three months shall not intervene between its last and the next meeting.

Audit observed that seven<sup>22</sup> out of the 35 states/UTs had not constituted SACs and in 28 states/UTs where the SACs had been constituted, 13 states/UTs constituted the SACs after three years of implementation of the Act. Of these, Maharashtra constituted the SAC only in February 2016.

Further, out of 28 states that had constituted SACs, 17 states/UTs did not comply with the requirements in the Act to hold SAC meetings at intervals not exceeding three months. In fact, 11 states/UTs<sup>23</sup> did not hold even one meeting of the SAC.

MHRD stated (May 2017) that the comments from the respective States are being collected.

### **4.4 School Management Committee (SMC)**

Rule 3 of the RTE Rules provides that the SMC constituted under Section 21 of the Act should be constituted in every school, except unaided schools within six months of implementation of the Act and be reconstituted after every two years. SMC acts as a critical bridge between community and the school, playing the additional role of providing oversight in schools to ensure all basic requirements of the school are being met.

---

<sup>22</sup> Dadra Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Jharkhand, Manipur, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Uttarakhand

<sup>23</sup> Andaman & Nicobar Island, Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Lakshadweep, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Punjab, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh

#### 4.4.1 (a) Non formation of SMCs

Test check in audit revealed the status of constitution of SMCs in 12 states/ UTs as tabulated below:

**Table 21: Formation of SMCs**

Sl. No.	State	Number of Schools test checked	Number of Schools SMC not constituted	Percentage of SMCs not constituted
1.	Bihar	169	21	12%
2.	Karnataka	150	62	41%
3.	Kerala	60	25	41%
4.	Madhya Pradesh	240	28	12%
5.	Mizoram	60	14	23%
6.	Punjab	90	4	5%
7.	Rajasthan	100 <sup>24</sup>	4	4%
8.	Tamil Nadu	150	24	16%
9.	West Bengal	90	79	88%
10.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	60	14	23%
11.	Delhi	60	02	3%
12.	Puducherry	70	7	10%

Non formation of SMCs deprives the oversight as envisaged in the Act.

#### 4.4.1 (b) Delay in formation of SMCs

Audit observed delays in formation of SMCs ranging from one month to three years as detailed below:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Jharkhand	In 120 test checked schools in four selected districts, there was delay in formation of SMCs ranging from three months to two years
2.	Mizoram	Only three out of 60 test checked schools had constituted SMC within six months of implementation of the Act. 23 out of 60 schools did not reconstitute SMC every two years.
3.	Punjab	In 47 schools, SMC was not formed within 6 months from the implementation of the Act.
4.	Tripura	In 60 test checked schools in two districts, delay of constitution of SMC in 18 schools ranged from 1 to 37 months
5.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	Out of 60 test checked schools, in 10 schools SMCs were not constituted within the prescribed six months period.
6.	Chandigarh	Out of 30 test checked schools, 18 schools have not formed SMCs within six months.

<sup>24</sup> Test checked Government Schools

7.	Delhi	Out of 60 selected schools, in 50 schools, SMCs were constituted with delays ranging from 1 to 31 months. In two DMC schools, SMCs were not constituted till March 2016.
----	-------	--

#### 4.4.2 Shortfall in meetings of SMC

Rule 3(5) of the RTE Rules stipulates that the SMC shall meet at least once a month, the minutes and decisions of the meetings properly recorded and made available to the public. The status of meetings of SMCs in various states is detailed in *Appendix-VII*.

The Appendix indicates that there were shortfalls in SMC meetings which deprived constructive dialogue with the stakeholders and reinforcing the well-functioning of school system.

#### 4.4.3 Non preparation of School Development Plan (SDP)

As per Section 22 of the Act, every SMC shall prepare a SDP, which is the basis for the plans and grants to be made by the appropriate Government or local authority. SDP is a strategic plan for improvement in school functioning. Test check in audit revealed that during 2015-16 in nine states/UTs namely Bihar, Haryana, Jharkhand, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal no SDP was prepared by the SMCs whereas, in the following states/UTs, the status was as below:

**Table 22: Preparation of School Development Plans**

Sl. No.	State	Schools test checked	SDP prepared	SDP not prepared	Percentage not prepared
1.	Chhattisgarh	120	87	33	27 %
2.	Goa	60	4	56	93 %
3.	Gujarat	117 <sup>25</sup>	59	58	50 %
4.	Karnataka	150	105	45	30 %
5.	Kerala	60	47	13	21 %
6.	Madhya Pradesh	231	52	179	77 %
7.	Manipur	60	27	33	55 %
8.	Odisha	150	85	65	43 %
9.	Punjab	90	26	64	71 %
10.	Sikkim	57	12	45	79 %
11.	Tamil Nadu	150	37	113	75 %
12.	Chandigarh	30	6	24	80 %
13.	Daman and Diu	60	30	30	50 %
14.	Delhi	60	38	22	37%

<sup>25</sup> Test checked Government schools

To contribute effectively to child development, the school and local community have to work in unison. In the absence of SDP, the schools were deprived of harmonized development.

#### 4.4.4 Special training not provided to identified children

Rule 5 of the RTE Rules stipulates that the SMC of a school owned and managed by the State Government or local authority shall identify children requiring special training. SMCs were required to organize such training based on specially designed appropriate learning material.

Audit noted that no training for identified children was conducted by SMCs in eight states, viz., Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu whereas in five states given below, training for identified children was partly extended by SMC's:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Assam	In 95 (79 per cent) out of 120 selected schools, SMCs neither identified any children for special training, nor organized such training.
2.	Jharkhand	During 2010-16, out of target of 1.60 lakh children requiring special training, only 1.21 lakh (77 per cent) children were provided special training by SMC's despite availability of funds.
3.	Kerala	In 60 selected schools in 2 districts, SMCs did not provide special training to 52 students who were given age appropriate admission in three schools.
4.	Maharashtra	No special training was arranged by the concerned SMCs in 9 out of 72 selected schools where it was required.
5.	Rajasthan	During 2010-16, out of 2.80 lakh children needing special training, only 1.30 lakh (46 per cent) children were provided special training by SMCs.

Failure of SMCs to provide special training resulted in identified children not being given special training to enable them to successfully integrate with the rest of the class academically as envisaged in the Act.

MHRD stated (May 2017) that the comments from the respective States are being collected.

#### 4.5 Shortfall in inspections

Regular inspections of schools were to be conducted by officers/staff of respective State Government e.g. Block Level Officers (BLOs), Block Resource Centres (BRCs), Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs) and various

Nodal Officers nominated by the State Government. Test check in audit revealed the status of inspections in following states:

Sl. No	State	Audit Observation
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	In the test checked 60 schools, inspection was carried out by BRC and CRC only once a year instead of once in every two months during 2010-16.
2.	Andhra Pradesh	In two selected districts, out of 37,296 inspections targeted for 2010-16, only 21,415 inspections were conducted by various Nodal Officers e.g. District Education Officers (DEOs), Deputy Education Officers (Dy EOs) and Mandal Education Officers (MEOs).
3.	Chhattisgarh	Out of four test checked DEOs, in one district, 91 <i>per cent</i> of schools were not inspected during 2010-16. Further, out of 16 test checked Block Education Officers (BEOs), in 10 BEOs two to 89 <i>per cent</i> of schools had not been inspected.
4.	Himachal Pradesh	In test checked blocks, against 3,189 inspections, only 1198 inspections were carried out during 2010-16.
5.	Kerala	In two selected districts, out of 1,080 inspections targeted for 2010-16, only 267 inspections were conducted by various Nodal Officers e.g. Deputy Director of Education (DDE), DEO and Assistant Education Officer (AEO).
6.	Madhya Pradesh	The inspection of schools conducted by district level officials ranged from 853 to 11,047 during 2012-13 to 2015-16 against the target of 15,300 per year.
7.	Maharashtra	Out of 2,66,715 schools, 28,532 schools were not visited even once by BLO/ BRCs/ CRCs and 41,657 schools were visited by BRCs/ CRCs less than five times in a year during 2011-12 to 2014-15.
8.	Meghalaya	In 60 test checked schools in two selected districts, the percentage of schools which were not inspected even once during 2010-16 was 42 <i>per cent</i> in one district. Majority of the schools (68 <i>per cent</i> and 42 <i>per cent</i> in two districts respectively) were inspected only 1-5 times during 2010-16.
9.	Tamil Nadu	Out of 150 test checked schools, nine schools were not at all inspected, 31 schools were inspected between 1 and 5 times, 21 schools between 6 and 10 times during 2010-11 to 2015-16.
10.	Uttar Pradesh	During 2010-16, shortage of inspections by BRC, Nyay Panchayat Resource Centre (NPRC) and BRC/NPRC ranged between 9 to 100, 7 to 100 and 2 to 100 <i>per cent</i> respectively.
11.	West Bengal	None of the Sub-Inspectors of School of the 12 test-checked Blocks except one in a district visited the schools. In 10 Circle Resource Centres (CLRCs), percentage of visit by Sub-Inspectors of Schools ranged between 3 and 50 <i>per cent</i> and in 9 CLRCs, the same ranged between 51 and 117 <i>per cent</i> from 2010-11 to 2015-16.

Inspection of school is important to monitor the status of basic facilities like drinking water, toilets, mid-day meal, quality of education, attendance of

teachers etc. Absence of periodic inspection/supervision of schools, hampers the monitoring of continuous assessment of the implementation of RTE.

MHRD stated (May 2017) that the comments from the respective States are being collected.

#### 4.6 Grievance Redressal Mechanism

Section 31 of the Act provides additional powers to National Commission for Protection of Child Right (NCPCR) & State Commission for Protection of Child Right (SCPCR) to examine and review the safeguards to rights provided by or under the Act, and inquire into complaints relating to child's rights to free & compulsory education

##### 4.6.1 National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR)

Section 3 of the Commissions for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 read with Section 31 of the Act provides that the Central Government shall constitute the NCPCR to exercise the powers conferred on, and to perform the functions assigned to it. At National level, NCPCR monitors the Protection of Child Rights and matters of violation of child's rights and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

##### 4.6.1.1 Difference in UDISE data and monitoring surveys conducted by NCPCR

During July- August 2014, NCPCR conducted a survey of 38 schools in four educationally backward blocks in Bihar, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Odisha for the year 2014-15. The purpose of this survey was to assess the veracity of UDISE data collected by National University of Educational Planning and Administration, MHRD (NUEPA) for the year 2012-13 in April 2014. However, there were discrepancies between UDISE and data collected by NCPCR survey team as mentioned below:

**Table 23: Discrepancies in UDISE data and NCPCR data**

Sl. No.	State / Block	Indicators	No of schools having the indicators	
			As per UDISE data(2012-13)	As per NCPCR data(2014-15)
1.	Karnataka/ Lingasugur	Boys toilet	10	8
		Girls toilet	10	8
		Drinking water	10	9
		Student classroom ratio	7	5
		Pupil teacher ratio	8	7
		Teacher classroom ratio	9	6
2.	Maharashtra/ Dharur	Girls toilet	10	9
		Drinking water	7	1
		Library	6	4
		Boundary wall	3	2
3.	Odisha/ Lanjigarh	Ramp	8	6

4.	Bihar/ Pupri	Ramp	9	7
		Student classroom ratio	2	0
		Pupil teacher ratio	2	0
		Teacher classroom ratio	4	0

The above table indicates that the number of schools having the indicators were lesser as per NCPCR survey as compared to UDISE data which raises doubts about the veracity of UDISE data.

For successful implementation of any educational programme, reliable information system is essential. In the absence of veracity of UDISE data, the effective monitoring of the Act was difficult.

#### 4.6.1.2 Pending complaints

Para 31(1) (b and c) of the Act stipulates that NCPCR shall, in addition to the functions assigned to it, shall also inquire into complaints relating to child's right to free and compulsory education, and take necessary steps as per provisions of the Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005. Further, Para 8.3.4 of SSA framework empowers NCPCR for following areas of Grievance Redressal System - (i) Registration of complaints; (ii) Investigation of complaints; (iii) Response to complaints; and (iv) Appeal process.

As on March 2016, 993<sup>26</sup> complaints were pending with NCPCR as tabulated below:

**Table 24: Status of complaints - NCPCR**

Year	No. Of complaints received	No. Of complaints disposed	No. Of complaints pending	Nature of Complaints pending	
				Infrastructure	Others
2010-11	1,742	1,588	154	23	131
2011-12	1,677	1,156	521	327	194
2012-13	726	568	158	33	125
2013-14	297	201	96	23	73
2014-15	115	88	27	7	20
2015-16	61	24	37	7	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,618</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>993</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>573</b>

Source: Data provided by NCPCR management.

Section 14(1) of the Commissions for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 provides that the NCPCR shall, while enquiring into any matter relating to complaints, have all the powers of a civil court trying to suit under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 e.g. summoning and enforcing the attendance of any person and examining him on oath.

<sup>26</sup> This included 455 complaints pertaining to Andhra Pradesh.

Test check of pending complaints in NCPCR revealed that as of March 2016, 25 complaints received pertaining to issues like corporal punishment, denial of admissions, non-attendance of teachers, etc. were pending disposal for more than two years. Despite having above mentioned powers under Section 14 of the Commissions for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005, NCPCR did not utilize its power and wrote letters and reminders in a routine manner to the state agencies for furnishing the reports resulting in delay in settlement of pending complaints. Two summons pertaining to six complaints only were issued by NCPCR till 2016 for hearing.

NCPCR replied (Nov 2016) that inquiring into complaints is a part of broad monitoring role of NCPCR that also includes undertaking research programmes, visits, etc. which is affected due to appointment of short term contractual staff. Regarding summon hearings, NCPCR replied that the summons can only be issued with the approval of the Chairperson, NCPCR and the process of reviewing the summon hearing procedure has already been initiated in the Commission.

#### **4.6.2 State Commission for Protection of Child Right (SCPCR)**

At State level, SCPCRs monitor the protection of Child Rights, matters of violation of child rights and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

##### **4.6.2.1 Constitution of SCPCRs**

Section 31(3) of the Act provides that where the SCPCR has not been constituted in a State, the appropriate Government may, for the purpose of performing the functions specified in Section 31, constitute such authority, in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed. Audit observed that out of 35 states, in ten states SCPCR/ Right to Education Protection Authority (REPA an interim authority) were constituted till April 2010, whereas in the remaining 25 states, SCPCR/ REPA were constituted during June 2010 to April 2015 (*Appendix-VIII*).

##### **4.6.2.2 Non setting of Child Helpline**

Rule 28 of the RTE Rules provides that SCPCR may set up a Child Helpline under which complaints regarding violation of child rights are to be registered, which may be monitored by it through a transparent on line mechanism. However, in 12 states namely Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and Puducherry child helpline for receiving complaints and further monitoring was not set up.

#### 4.6.2.3 Pending complaints

Section 32 of the Act stipulates that the appeal relating to complaint preferred shall be decided by SCPCR as provided under relevant provisions of Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005. Test check in audit revealed that there was pendency of complaints in the SCPCRs/State Grievance Redressal Authorities of 11 states as of March 2016:

**Table 25: Status of complaints - SCPCR**

Sl. No.	State	Year	Complaints received	Complaints settled	Complaints pending
1.	Assam	2010-16	356	nil	356
2.	Goa	2010-16	46	10	36
3.	Gujarat	2013-16	49	23	26
4.	Karnataka	2015-16	117	68	49
5.	Madhya Pradesh	2010-16	426	128	298
6.	Odisha	2010-16	17,796	17,527	269
7.	Punjab	2012-16	156	107	49
8.	Rajasthan	2010-16	1,041	378	663
9.	Telangana	2014-16	323	296	27
10.	Uttarakhand	2013-16	176	137	39
11.	West Bengal	2010-16	360	50	310

Absence of child helpline and delay in settlement of complaints, resulted in children being deprived of an important right of grievance redressal as envisaged under the Act.

#### 4.7 Irregularities noticed in monitoring by institutions

According to para 7.12.3 of SSA Framework, institutions including Universities under Departments of Education, Social Science and Institutes of national stature have been assigned the work of periodic monitoring of SSA implementation in State and UTs. The monitoring institutions were required to make field visits and report on progress of SSA at the ground level every six months.

Cases of irregularities in monitoring by institutions are mentioned below:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Gujarat	An amount of ₹ 50 per school per annum was allotted to Gujarat State Commission for Protection of Child Rights (GSCPCR) for Supervision and Monitoring, which was to be utilised on approved monitoring plan by GSCPCR. As per norms, monitoring plan of GSCPCR was to be approved by the Executive Committee of the SSA. An amount of ₹ 86.83 lakh was allotted to GSCPCR for monitoring during 2013-16 of which only ₹ 18.69 lakh (15 September 2016) was utilised by the Commission. Non-utilisation of funds allotted was mainly attributable to non-approval of monitoring plan by the Executive

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
		Committee (August 2016). However, the monitoring plan was submitted only in July 2016 by the Commission.
2.	Tripura	MHRD had assigned Tripura University as Monitoring Institution for monitoring the implementation of SSA. The Monitoring Institutions (MIs) were required to carry out field visits and report on progress of SSA at the ground level every six months. This cycle was to be repeated every two years. During 2010-11 to 2015-16, the Monitoring Institution conducted only three half yearly visits against prescribed 12. Resultantly, there was a shortfall in monitoring of implementation of SSA.
3.	Andhra Pradesh	As per Section 12(1)(c) of the Act, school shall admit in class I, the children belonging to weaker section to the extent of 25 per cent of the total strength of the class in unaided schools. Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Ahmedabad conducted evaluation of implementation of Section 12 (1)(c) during 2014-15 and found that this section was not being implemented in the state. The unaided schools are contesting this provision in the court.
4.	Uttar Pradesh	Rule 25(2) of State RTE Rules provide that any complaint regarding child rights shall be made to Village/Ward Education Committees through its Member Secretary (head teacher), first and second appeal of which shall be made for rural and urban areas to ABSAs and Zila Panchayat/Nagar Palika respectively. Monitoring of these complaints was to be done by UP Basic Shiksha Parishad through online monitoring mechanism. No evidence regarding setting up of online monitoring mechanism for these complaints in Basic Shiksha Parishad was made available to audit. Thus, effective monitoring mechanism was not set up under RTE Rules in the state.
5.	Haryana	A provision of ₹ 5.30 crore was made during 2011-12 for third party assessment regarding overall monitoring of implementation of the provisions of the Act but the assessment from the third party had not been done.
6.	Puducherry	PAB approved a lump sum amount of ₹ 10.00 lakh under Project Management Scheme to carry out third party assessment survey on sample basis. Puducherry University was appointed to conduct the third party assessment survey on SSA for the year 2014-15 from November 2014 to March 2015. An amount of ₹ 8.00 lakh was paid to the Puducherry University in 2014-15 with direction that survey report should reach before the next Project Approval Board meeting. The report however, had not been submitted by Puducherry University as of July 2016.

MHRD stated (May 2017) that the comments from the respective States are being collected.

## 4.8 Absence of Internal audit

### 4.8.1 No Internal Audit mechanism at Central level

Internal audit is conducted through the internal audit wings of the Principal Accounts offices of concerned Ministries/Departments. Principal Chief Controller of Accounts (PCCA) had to conduct internal audit of all schemes of the Ministry implemented by Government of India. During 2010-11 to 2015-16, internal audit of the SSA scheme was not conducted by the Ministry.

The PCCA replied (November 2016) that the internal audit is being conducted on the basis of Annual Audit Plan of the Ministry prepared on the basis of periodicity and availability of manpower and internal audit of the scheme will be conducted as and when the same is included in the Annual Audit Plan. Thus, an important tool for assessing effectiveness of controls in place was overlooked.

### 4.8.2 Internal Audit at State level

As per para 104.3 of Manual of Financial Management and Procurement of SSA, the State Implementation Society should introduce proper internal audit system and strengthen checks of the in-house internal audit system to ensure proper utilization of funds approved in AWP&B. Further, para 104.4 of Manual of Financial Management and Procurement of SSA stipulates that in states where an in- house internal audit team is not available, qualified Chartered Accountant firms may be engaged for carrying out internal audit.

Test check in audit revealed that in seven states/UTs, there were shortcomings in conduct of internal audit as mentioned below:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Haryana	Internal audit system was not in place in the Directorate of Elementary Education (DEE) and the Parishad.
2.	Lakshadweep	Internal audit was not conducted during 2010-16.
3.	Nagaland	Internal audit for 2014-15 and 2015-16 was not done due to non-release of funds.
4.	Rajasthan	Internal audit was not conducted after 2013-14
5.	Sikkim	Internal audit was not conducted during 2010-16.
6.	Uttar Pradesh	Out of 1,61,000 schools, only 39,455 schools were audited by Internal Audit Wing (IAW) during 2010-15 and norm of auditing the schools once in every three years was not complied with.
7.	Puducherry	Accounts of implementing units at the school level were not audited periodically for the year 2013-14.

Shortcomings in conduct of internal audit in states indicates failure of the internal control mechanism.

#### 4.9 Third party evaluation of civil works

Para 6.10.2 of the SSA Framework states that in order to assure quality of civil works, an independent assessment of the technical quality of civil works, through Third Party Evaluation (TPE) is mandatory. Cases noticed in Audit are given below:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Madhya Pradesh	Project Approval Board (PAB) in its 162 <sup>nd</sup> (April 2011) and 177 <sup>th</sup> (March 2012) meetings decided to independently assess the technical quality of all construction works. It was noticed that third party evaluation of civil works was not carried out during 2013-16 in two test checked districts of Burhanpur and Morena.
2.	Goa	Experts were not engaged to conduct the evaluation study. The failure on the part of GSSA to engage the experts for the TPE and get the factual reports on the quality of the works deprived the SSA administration from knowing the good practices in the civil works constitutions under the SSA.

In the absence of proper evaluation and assessment reports, the impact of quality assurance e.g. highlighting good practices, bringing and sharing strengths and weaknesses for further improvement as envisaged under the Act was not being done.

MHRD stated (May 2017) that the comments from the respective States are being collected.

#### 4.10 Learning level assessment of children/Low academic achievement by students

Section 29 of the Act provides laying down the curriculum and evaluation procedure for elementary education by an academic authority to be specified by the appropriate Government. Moreover, under Research Evaluation Monitoring and Supervision (REMS), assessment of enhancement in students' learning achievement should be carried out periodically at primary and upper primary stage.

Cases of four states pertaining to learning level assessment of children/low academic achievement by students are mentioned below:

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
1.	Odisha	<p>Odisha Primary Education Programme Authority (OPEPA) conducted studies in language, Mathematics and Social studies during 2013-14 covering all 30 districts and in six sample districts in 2014-15 and 2015-16 respectively. Analysis of latest study report of the State covering 17,887 students of class-II, III, VI and VIII of 666 PS and UPS in 2014-15 revealed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of 4,426 class-II students in 333 Primary schools, 16 <i>per cent</i> children could not read letters while 80 <i>per cent</i> children could not read words.</li> <li>• 4,320 students of class III secured mean average of 52 <i>per cent</i> marks in language paper. The result of three districts out of sampled six was below state average.</li> <li>• In case of class-VI, 4,983 students were evaluated with mean average for six districts being 42.55. In mathematics, the learning achievement varied from 27 to 41 <i>per cent</i>. In Social studies, the achievement varied from 27 to 39 <i>per cent</i>.</li> <li>• Out of 4,158 students assessed in class-VIII, only one district reached the level of 50 <i>per cent</i> achievement in language against mean average of 48.75 <i>per cent</i>. In Social studies, 65 <i>per cent</i> of students scored less than 40 <i>per cent</i>. Achievement level in mathematics was below 40 <i>per cent</i> in all six districts.</li> </ul>
2.	West Bengal	<p>A learning level assessment taken up by the School Education Department during 2013 to 2015 through an evaluation programme called 'Utkarsha Abhijan' revealed that there was lack of reading and mathematical skills especially in 7 to 10 districts of the State including the test checked districts.</p> <p>An assessment exercise was undertaken in Shiksha kendras (SSKs) and Madhyamik Shiksha Kendras (MSKs) in 18 educational districts during November-December 2014 in which 2,37,301 SSK learners (out of 11,88,992) and 70,798 MSK learners (out of 3,40,641) had participated. Results of evaluation indicated that 17.97 <i>per cent</i> of the SSK students and 54.58 <i>per cent</i> of the MSK students scored C grades scoring below 45 <i>per cent</i>.</p>
3.	Himachal Pradesh	<p>A survey to assess the enhancement in students learning achievement and progress undertaken by the SPD, SSA during 2013-16 was conducted for Hindi, English, Mathematics and Environmental Science. Comparative achievement of children over the period of three years (2013-16) <i>vis-à-vis</i> baseline survey (start of academic session 2013-14) showed that there was increase in learning levels in respect of primary classes whereas in upper primary classes VI and VII, there was decrease in learning level by 17 and 7 <i>per cent</i>.</p>
4.	Chhattisgarh	<p>In September 2013, the State Government launched Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Shiksha Gunavatta Abhiyan to improve the</p>

		<p>quality of education and deputed officials of various departments of the State to survey the schools through questionnaires. Out of total 53,269 schools in the state, 43,529 schools (82 <i>per cent</i>) were covered under the programme as of March 2015, details are shown as below:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 26: Grades achieved</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="687 409 1358 512"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">No. of schools</th> <th rowspan="2">School covered</th> <th colspan="4">Categories</th> </tr> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>53,269</td> <td>43,529</td> <td>11,094</td> <td>16,569</td> <td>10,676</td> <td>5,190</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above table shows that only 25 <i>per cent</i> of the total schools have achieved Grade “A” and three fourth of schools were under grades B, C and D needing improvement in quality education.</p>	No. of schools	School covered	Categories				A	B	C	D	53,269	43,529	11,094	16,569	10,676	5,190
No. of schools	School covered	Categories																
		A	B	C	D													
53,269	43,529	11,094	16,569	10,676	5,190													

This indicates that greater attention is required for improving the quality of education.

#### 4.11 Conclusion

National Advisory Council was formed to advice Central Government on implementation of the provisions of the RTE Act in an effective manner but was not reconstituted after November 2014. School Management Committee (SMC), which were required to be formed to prepare School Development Plan and monitor the management of the school, were not formed in number of schools test checked in Audit. Training for identified children was not conducted by SMCs in eight states and was partly extended in another five states.

In the absence of a proper system of periodic inspection/supervision of schools, the school progress was not monitored and the purpose of comprehensive and continuous assessment of the scheme implementation was defeated. Further, internal audit of the scheme by Chief Controller of Accounts was also not conducted at the Ministry level.

Continued and effective monitoring as envisaged in the Act is vital to ensure quality elementary education to all eligible students.

#### **4.12 Recommendations**

We recommend that,

- i. National Advisory Council needs to be reconstituted.
- ii. The State Governments may ensure that School Management Committees (SMCs) are constituted in all schools, School Development Plans are prepared by all SMCs and prescribed number of SMC meetings are held for improving the management and monitoring of the scheme.
- iii. Monitoring mechanism needs to be strengthened and necessary periodical inspections may be conducted by Block Resource Centres and Cluster Resource Centres.
- iv. Chief Controller of Accounts may ensure that internal audit of the scheme at Central level is conducted regularly.

**New Delhi**  
**Dated: 16 June 2017**



**(MUKESH PRASAD SINGH)**  
**Director General of Audit**  
**Central Expenditure**

**Countersigned**



**New Delhi**  
**Dated: 22 June 2017**

**(SHASHI KANT SHARMA)**  
**Comptroller and Auditor General of India**