Chapter-8

Monitoring and Evaluation

CHAPTER- 8

Monitoring and Evaluation

8.1 Monitoring & Evaluation

Effective monitoring and regular evaluation of a scheme helps identify shortcomings in policy, planning and implementation, enabling timely interventions for course correction and ensuring achievement of intended objectives. Monitoring mechanism should involve authorities at different levels overseeing implementation of the scheme. SSIF provides for Governing Council, District Level Committees and School Management Committees (SMCs) to oversee implementation of the Scheme at State, District and School levels respectively.

8.1.1 Governing Council (GC)

As mandated by the SSIF, a Governing Council (GC), chaired by the Chief Minister or State Education Minister, was to be set up in the State which would be responsible for policy directions and Centre-State coordination. The GC, though established, had not met during the entire period under Audit. PBSSM could not produce the record of any meeting of GC after April 2005. The reasons, though called for, were not made available to Audit. Thus, GC could not provide guidance and direction regarding implementation of the Scheme in the State as envisaged in SSIF.

In reply (August 2025), the Department stated that meeting of Governing Council did not take place for last few years.

8.1.2 Non-constitution of District Level Committees

Paragraph 8.5.3 of SSIF mandates the formation of a District Level Committee (DLC) with representatives from various departments to monitor the Samagra Shiksha Scheme through field visits. However, the test-checked districts did not establish these Committees, leading to gaps in the monitoring process. As a result, the scheme lacked structured supervision, affecting its effective implementation.

In reply (August, 2025) the Department stated that Murshidabad district had not formed DLC during the period of audit. However, the reply was silent on other five test-checked districts.

8.2 Laying of Annual Report before the Legislature

The Financial Management and Procurement (FMP) guidelines of Samagra Shiksha required that the Annual Report on the functioning of the SIS (PBSSM) be approved by the Executive Committee of PBSSM and be submitted to the GoI and the State Government. The State Government, in turn, must present this report to the State Legislature. It was noted that although the Reports for the period 2019-23 were prepared by PBSSM and submitted to GoI, however, these were not placed before the State Legislature by PBSSM/ Department.

In reply (August 2025), the Department stated that Annual Reports were provided to GoI but not sent to the legislature. The reply was not acceptable as laying of the Reports was mandated by the FMP of the Scheme.

8.3 School Management Committees (SMCs)

Para 13.6 of SSIF mandates that every school must establish a School Management Committee (SMC) comprising local authority representatives, parents or guardians of enrolled children and teachers. The SMC was responsible for monitoring school management, formulating and recommending the School Development Plan (SDP), overseeing the use of government or local authority grants and carrying out prescribed functions. Additionally, training programmes to support SMC, SDMC[55] and PRI[56] members in fulfilling their roles as outlined in the RTE Act, 2009 were to be organised by District SSM office, which were not done during 2019-24. As a result, the members of the SMC were not aware of their roles and responsibilities regarding preparation of school development plan, disaster management plan, *etc*.

- **Non formation of SMCs**

  Scrutiny of UDISE 2023-24 of test-checked districts revealed that SMCs were not constituted in a substantial number of schools as detailed in **Table 8.1** below:

Table 8.1: **Status of constitution of SMC in test-checked districts**

District	Total number of schools	Number of schools without School Management Committee (*per cent*)
Bankura	4,365	3,258 (75)
Uttar Dinajpur	1,833	639 (35)
Murshidabad	3,975	1,536 (39)
Purulia	3,780	3,076 (81)
Dakshin Dinajpur	1,501	1,262 (84)
Paschim Medinipur	4,423	3,614 (82)

Source: UDISE 2023-24

Non constitution of the SMCs led to lacunae in the oversight and monitoring process. Non-compliance was very high in Dakshin Dinajpur (84 *per cent*), Paschim Medinipur (82 *per cent*), Bankura (75 *per cent*) and Purulia (81 *per cent*). The reasons for non-formation of SMCs were not on record.

[55] *School Management Development Committee*
[56] *Panchayati Raj Institution.*

The GoI had urged States (June 2021) to expedite the formation of SMCs, recognising their crucial role in school governance and community involvement. However, non-formation of SMCs as pointed out above had weakened school governance and diluted the effectiveness of the RTE Act, emphasising the need for urgent corrective measures.

In reply (August, 2025), the Department stated that formation of SMC was a subject matter relating to policy of the SED. The reply is not tenable as formation of SMC in each school was advocated under SSIF and RTE Act.

- **Non preparation of SDP by SMC**

  SSIF and the RTE Act requires SMCs to create School Development Plans (SDPs) to improve school functioning *inter alia* including requirement of staff, infrastructure, school safety plan etc. However, during audit it was noticed that SDPs were not prepared in any of the 72 test-checked schools.

Recommendation 14: For effective monitoring of the Samagra Shiksha Scheme, the Department may ensure formation of District Level Committees (DLCs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) for effective implementation of the Scheme.

8.4 Inadequate Research and Impact Assessment

Paragraph 14.25 of the SSIF outlines a structured approach to evaluate the Scheme's impact on education indicators like enrolment, attendance and retention through national and state-level research. It emphasises collaboration with institutions to build research capacity within SCERTs, State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT[57]) and DIET.

However, several shortcomings were noted by Audit, including the following:

- The SSIF envisages setting up of Research Approval Committee (RAC) by the School Education Department for processing and approving all research and evaluation studies to be undertaken at the State level. However, the RAC was not set up by the State as of March 2024 to assess the Scheme’s effectiveness. Additionally, the SIEMAT which was to provide technical and professional support was also not established, weakening research capabilities.

---

[57] *It provides technical and professional support for strategic planning and management at State, district and sub-district levels.*

- As per the SSIF framework, the SCERT plays a central, apex role in promoting educational research at the State level. The SCERT prepares Annual Work Plans for various research proposals under Teacher Education component of Samagra Shiksha. However, based on the Annual Work plans for the period from 2019-20 to 2023-24, examined during Audit, it was noted that SCERT managed only 10 research studies against the targeted 100 (for the period 2019-20 to 2023-24) as mentioned in approved work plans. As a result, the Scheme's impact across the State against educational indicators like enrolment, student/ teacher attendance and retention etc. could not be assessed properly.

- Based on the Annual Work Plans, funds were to be made available by the SPD, PBSSM to SCERT for carrying out activities approved in the annual plans. It was noted that against a requirement of ₹ 78.26 crore of funds (as per the approved work plans), only ₹ 24.09 crore (31 *per cent*) was made available during 2019-24. Further, SCERT could utilise 91 *per cent* of fund received during 2019-24. Thus, funds as required for carrying out approved activities were not made available by SPD, PBSSM to SCERT, impacting the attainment of intended outcomes.

  Details of funds approved, received and utilised are mentioned in the **Table 8.2** below:

Table 8.2: Funds approved, received and utilised by SCERT during 2019-24

(₹ in crore)

Period	Approved by PAB	Fund received (*per cent* of approved fund)	Expenditure incurred (*per cent* of received fund)
2019-24	78.26	24.09 (31)	21.91 (91)

Source: Records provided by SCERT

- It was also noted that an amount of ₹ 8.55 crore was lying in the bank accounts of SCERT as of March 2024 which included the unspent balance of previous years. This indicated potential delays in execution of assigned works *viz.* research works, surveys *etc.*

- Besides fund limitations, lack of trained manpower also affected the functioning of SCERT. Against sanctioned posts of 23 Research personnel at SCERT, only nine[58] were in-position as of March 2024.

[58] *Senior Research Fellow- 0 against sanctioned 4; Research Fellow, Grade- I- 0 against sanctioned 8; Research Fellow, Grade- II- 9 against sanctioned-11*

Thus, institutional structures necessary for research and guidance were absent due to non-formation of RAC and SIEMAT. Moreover, shortfall in receipt of funds coupled with inadequate research personnel adversely affected the activities of SCERT.

Kolkata
The 08 APR 2026

(BIBHUDUTTA BASANTIA)
Principal Accountant General (Audit-I)
West Bengal

Countersigned

New Delhi
The 10 APR 2026

(K. SANJAY MURTHY)
Comptroller and Auditor General of India