

## **Chapter 9**

# **Monitoring and Evaluation**



## Chapter 9

## Monitoring and Evaluation

Both the RTE Act and Samagra Shiksha Implementation Framework envisaged creation of layers of monitoring and supervision mechanism to ensure that various provisions provided therein are implemented efficiently. Audit examined constitution of oversight mechanisms as well as their working and findings thereon are discussed in this Chapter. Gist of some of the important audit findings are as follows:

- The State Advisory Council (SAC), constituted in accordance with the provisions of the RTE Act to advise the State Government on effective implementation of provisions of the RTE Act, had met only once, against requirement of 20 meetings during 2018-23.
- The recommendations of the SAC for rationalising deployment of teachers in all Primary and Upper Primary schools to bring the PTR within the mandated norm, implementation of school safety measures, preparation of School Development Plans and admission of children belonging to Weaker Section and Disadvantaged Groups in private schools, had not been acted upon.
- The Executive Committee (EC), constituted as per SSIF which is headed by the Chief Secretary/ Commissioner/ Education Secretary of the State for facilitating decision-making process towards implementation of the Samagra Shiksha Scheme, had only met four times against the requirement of 20 meetings during 2018-23.
- Against a minimum of 120 schools required to be inspected annually by the District Education Officers (DEOs), the quantum of inspection by the DEOs of three sampled districts (Bhadrak, Koraput and Nuapada) was less than the norm.
- School Management Committees, responsible for preparation of School Development Plan, had not been constituted in seven out of the 85 sampled Government and Government aided schools during 2018-23.

### 9.1 State Advisory Council

Section 34 of the RTE Act provides that the State government shall constitute a State Advisory Council (SAC), consisting of not more than 15 members, who are to be appointed from amongst persons having knowledge and practical experience in the field of elementary education and child development. The Council shall advise the State government on effective implementation of provisions of the RTE Act. Rules 25 and 26 of Odisha RTE Rules, 2010 provide for the constitution of a Council consisting of a Chairperson and 14 members. The Council shall review compliance with various norms and standards specified in the RTE Act including teachers' qualification, training and

implementation of Section 29 of the RTE Act. The Guidelines<sup>59</sup> issued by the SME Department on functioning of the SAC stipulated that the council shall meet once in three months.

Audit noticed that the SAC was constituted (July 2014) under the Chairmanship of the Minister, SME Department and 14 other members. Audit reviewed the functioning of the SAC and noticed the following:

- **Shortfall in holding required number of meetings:** Against the requirement of 20 meetings during 2018-23, the SAC had met only once (February 2019) resulting in shortfall of 19 meetings. The deficiencies like delayed and short supply of free textbooks/uniforms to students, shortfall in admission of Weaker Section & Disadvantaged Group (WS&DG) children in private schools, adverse pupil to teacher ratio in schools *etc.*, pointed out in different chapters of this Report, indicated that the SAC had not ensured effective implementation of the provisions of the RTE Act in the State.
- **Inaction on the recommendations of SAC:** In the one meeting held during 2018-23, SAC had recommended rationalization of teachers in all primary and upper primary schools to bring the PTR within the mandated norm, as prescribed in the RTE Act 2009. Besides, SAC had recommended implementation of school safety measures in all schools, preparation of School Development Plan (SDP) by School Management Committees, admission of children belonging to WS&DG category in private schools under 25 *per cent* quota of the RTE Act, 2009. The SME Department, Government of Odisha including the Director, Elementary Education, OSEPA, were required to act on the recommendations of the SAC and submit an action taken report. However, the SAC did not meet further to review the action taken on its recommendations. Although OSEPA intimated Audit that action had been taken by issuing instructions, circulars and guidelines to the district authorities to carry out the SAC's recommendations, it was noticed that the issues still persisted in sampled schools. This indicates that the recommendations of the SAC were not taken on board by OSEPA for the betterment of school education.

The Department stated (October 2024) that SAC had convened meetings from time to time as per needs and identified gaps in terms of lack of infrastructure, PTR and school level planning *etc.* and had recommended action for bridging the gaps on priority basis. The reply is not acceptable as SAC had met only once during 2018-23 and had not reviewed the action taken report to ensure that its recommendations were carried out.

## **9.2 State Executive Committee**

Paragraphs 14.2.6.2 and 14.23 of SSIF provide for the constitution of an Executive Committee (EC) at the State level, headed by the Chief Secretary/ Commissioner/ Education Secretary of the State for facilitating decision-making process towards implementation of the Samagra Shiksha Scheme. The EC, with full administrative powers to implement the programme, had to meet periodically to monitor the implementation of the Samagra Shiksha Scheme.

---

<sup>59</sup> No 16316/SME, dated 31.08.2017 of S&ME Department

Audit noticed that the EC had met only four times during 2018-23, against the requirement of 20 meetings (once in a quarter). Thus, the EC could not ensure effective review of the progress and performance of various aspects of scheme implementation, which resulted in non-compliance with norms and standards, envisaged under Samagra Shiksha, as discussed in previous Chapters of this report.

### **9.3 Non-constitution of District-Level Committee**

Paragraph 5.5 of Manual on Financial Management and Procurement (FMP) of Samagra Shiksha Scheme and Paragraph 8.5.3 of SSIF stipulated constitution of a District Level Committee (DLC) comprising public representatives, District Collector and officials from Education, Health, Women and Child Development and Tribal Welfare Departments among others, to monitor the implementation of the Samagra Shiksha scheme. The senior-most Member of Parliament present in the meeting would chair the Committee. The District Education Officer would be the Member Secretary of the Committee. The Committee would meet once in a quarter and review the progress of the scheme implementation in the district.

Audit noticed that DLCs had not been constituted in any of the six sampled districts during 2018-23. In Koraput district, the RTE-SSA committee chaired by the District Collector met last in July 2017. This indicated lack of review on the part of the District Education Authority in the constitution of the Committee for monitoring of scheme implementation at the district level. Due to absence of monitoring by DLCs, deficiencies in infrastructure and other facilities in the sampled schools, timely completion of infrastructure work in the sampled districts (discussed in Chapter 5 of the Report) remained unaddressed.

The Department stated (October 2024) that there was no provision of constitution of DLC under Samagra Shiksha. The reply is not acceptable as Paragraph 5.5 of FMP and Paragraph 8.5.3 of SSIF stipulated constitution of a DLC to monitor the implementation of the Scheme in the districts.

### **9.4 Laying of Annual Report before the Legislature**

Paragraphs 5.6.1 and 6.3.1 of FMP stipulated that the Annual Report of the working of the State Society and the work undertaken by it during the year shall be approved by the EC and furnished to GoI and the State Government. The State Government shall lay the Annual Report on the implementation of the scheme before the State Legislature. Audit noticed that in none of the years between 2018-19 and 2022-23, had the Annual Report been placed before the State Legislature for appraisal of implementation of the scheme in the State. Thus, the Legislature remained unaware of the progress of the implementation of the scheme.

The Department stated (October 2024) that the Annual Audit Reports indicating physical progress were submitted to MoE, GoI and the Annual Audit Report indicating financial progress was laid in the State Legislature. The reply is not acceptable as Paragraph 5.6.1 of FMP stipulated that the Annual Report on the implementation of the Scheme should be laid before the State legislature, but the same was not done.

**Recommendation 9.1**

*The State and district level monitoring bodies should actively review the programme implementation and carry out corrective measures for improvement in school education.*

**9.5 Inspection by district and block authorities****9.5.1 Inspection by district authorities**

As per the Job Chart of SME Department, the DEO shall be in-charge of the affairs of the districts relating to elementary, secondary and higher secondary education. The DEO shall inspect at least 10 schools, devoting a minimum of 10 days in a month for evaluating the functioning of schools.

Audit noticed that against a minimum of 120 schools required to be inspected annually by the DEO, the DEOs of three sampled district (Bhadrak, Koraput and Nuapada) had inspected less than the required number of schools, during 2018-22. The DEO, Bhadrak inspected 53 schools (2020-21), the DEO, Koraput inspected 40 to 92 schools during 2018-21 whereas the DEO, Nuapada inspected 12 and 67 schools during 2020-22. The DEO, Sonapur had not provided any inspection details of schools. Details are given in **Table 9.1**.

**Table 9.1: Number of schools inspected by DEOs of the sampled districts**

Sampled District	No. of school inspected by DEO				
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Bhadrak	Information not provided	178	53	180	276
Koraput	92	62	40	127	338
Nabarangpur	132	129	161	122	133
Nuapada	160	124	12	67	145
Sambalpur	123	131	127	121	129

(Source: Information furnished by the DEOs of the sampled districts)

The DEOs of the sampled districts did not provide inspection reports, due to which Audit was unable to ascertain the follow-up action thereof.

The Department stated (October 2024) that all the DEOs, had been advised to conduct inspection as per the norms.

**9.5.2 Inspection by Block authorities**

As per the Job Chart of SME Department, the Block Education Officer (BEO) would inspect and supervise all high schools in the Block. To ensure quality education, the BEO would test the work of the teachers and see the pedagogical improvement in the schools. The BEO would visit the schools for a minimum of 12 days in a month beyond the routine visits to ensure implementation of pedagogical initiatives, inclusive education, regular curricular and co-curricular activities at the school level, implementation of Mid-Day-Meal programme, etc. The BEOs would be assisted by minimum of three Assistant Block Education Officers (ABEOs), who will supervise / inspect primary / upper primary schools and other schools as and when assigned by the DEO/BEO.

Considering that the BEOs would visit at least one school per day of the visit, the BEOs were required to inspect a total of 144 schools in a year (during 12 days of tour in a month). Audit, however, noticed that out of the 12 sampled

BEOs, six BEOs inspected schools ranging from 0 to 69 per year during 2018-23, whereas three other BEOs failed to inspect the minimum number of schools for one to three years, during 2018-23. The remaining three BEOs<sup>60</sup> did not provide inspection details and records of inspections made by them to Audit. Thus, there was a shortfall in conduct of inspections of schools by nine BEOs during 2018-23. Audit observed that against the sanctioned posts of 33 ABEO<sup>61</sup> in the 11 sampled Blocks, nine posts of ABEO<sup>62</sup> were vacant, affecting the inspection and monitoring of the implementation of schemes of school education.

The Department did not offer any views with respect to shortfall in inspections by the BEOs.

### 9.6 Functioning of School Management Committee (SMC)

Section 21 and 22 of the RTE Act, 2009 prescribed the constitution of a School Management Committee (SMC) in elementary schools for monitoring the working of the schools and preparation of School Development Plan for receiving grants from the Government / local authority. Paragraph 13.6, 13.8 and 13.9.2 of SSIF stipulated that every school should constitute a School Management Committee (SMC/SMDC) involving representatives of local authorities, academicians, women, parents, *etc.* The School Development Plans (SDP) would be developed with the involvement of the SMCs/SMDCs. The capacity of the SMC/SMDC was required to be built to give support in improved governance, monitoring, oversight and innovations. The Headmaster and the teachers of schools were to organize trainings for the SMC/SMDC members before the opening of the schools every year.

As per the guidelines (February 2018) of the SME Department, SMC comprising 19 members would be constituted in every government and government aided primary, upper primary as well as composite schools<sup>63</sup>, and SMDC comprising 17 members, in every government and government aided high schools. Further, as per the guidelines (October 2022) of the Director of Higher Secondary Education, SME Department, SMDC comprising 18 members, would be constituted in all government higher secondary schools.

Audit noticed that:

- SMC/SMDC had not been constituted in seven out of the 85 sampled government and government aided schools<sup>64</sup> during 2018-23.
- In 14 out of the 77 sampled schools, where SMC/SMDC had been constituted, the SMCs were functioning with members ranging from 10

<sup>60</sup> Birmaharajpur, Maneswar, Ulunda

<sup>61</sup> Three ABEOs in each of the 11 blocks of Bamra, Bhandaripokhari, Bonth, Komna, Kosagumuda, Maneswar, Nandahandi, Nuapada, Semiliguda, Ulunda, Boipariguda

<sup>62</sup> One ABEO posts each in Boipariguda, Komna, Ulunda Block and two ABEO posts in Bamra Kosagumuda, Semiliguda Block

<sup>63</sup> Having elementary (Class-I to VIII) and secondary classes (CI-IX to X).

<sup>64</sup> As per the guideline (October 2022), of the Director of Higher Secondary Education, SME Department, SMDC shall be constituted in all Government Higher Secondary schools, accordingly, 10 test checked Government aided higher secondary schools had been excluded

to 18 against the requirement of 19 members, whereas in one school, the SMDC was functioning with 10 members, against requirement of 17.

- In 30 sampled schools, capacity building/training support had not been provided to any of the SMC/SMDC members, whereas in another 33 schools, there was shortfall (ranging one to 18) in providing training to members.
- In 70 out of 77 sampled schools, the conduct of SMC meetings was inadequate, as it had met one to 59 times against requirement of 14 to 60 times, during 2018-23. While SMC of Champamal Project Upper Primary School Sonapur met only once, SMC of G.P. Govt. high school, Jarabaga, Sambalpur met 59 times during 2018-23.

The above-mentioned facts indicate that SMCs/SMDCs were not proactive in monitoring the affairs of schools, thereby defeating the purpose of their formation.

The Department (October 2024) noted the recommendation of Audit for future guidance for development of School Education.

#### **Recommendation 9.2**

*The Department may ensure that inspections by district and block level authorities are increased to the level as stipulated. Representatives of all the stakeholders should be included in the School Management Committees and the Committees should remain engaged with the issues relevant to the development of schools.*

#### **9.7 Research and impact assessment**

As per Paragraph 14.25 of SSIF, Surveys and Research Studies would be conducted at the National/State levels to assess the Samagra Shiksha scheme's impact on education indicators and the needs and gaps for course correction. Each State would set up a Research Approval Committee for processing and approving research and evaluation studies at the State level. The scheme supports independent research and supervision by autonomous research institutions of proven excellence through MoUs.

Audit noticed that the State had not constituted the Research Approval Committee for approving research and evaluation studies for assessment of the Scheme's impact. The TE&SCERT completed only one research on "Impact of UJJWAL and UTHHAN - learning enhancement" during 2018-23. Research analysis on "Home-based learning at elementary level during COVID-19 pandemic" and the Research on "Reflection of transaction of training inputs of 'NISHTHA' in classroom practices in elementary schools", taken up during 2021-23, were still under progress. Thus, research and impact assessment of the programme on school education had not been adequately carried out by the State. In the absence of assessment of the Scheme's impact on education indicators, gap identification and course correction needs could not be addressed.



## 9.8 Protection of Rights of Children

Section 31 of the RTE Act, 2009 stipulates that State Commission for Protection of Child Rights (SCPCR) would examine and review the safeguards provided by or under the RTE Act and inquire into complaints relating to children's rights to free and compulsory education.

Audit noticed that 117 cases of violation of children's rights were pending for settlement at the beginning of 2018-19. The SCPCR registered 416 cases during 2018-23. Against the total 533 cases, SCPCR disposed of only 86 cases (16 *per cent*), whereas 447 cases pertaining to the period prior to 2018-19 to 2022-23 were still pending for want of action.

Further, Audit noticed that against the requirement of 15 meetings of SCPCR during 2018-23, the Commission had met only four times, resulting in a shortfall of 11 (73 *per cent*) meetings of the SCPCR. Inadequate hearing of cases by the Commission was due to vacancy of two to five posts of members against the strength of six and delayed submission of compliance by the district administration to the Commission. Thus, issues related to protection of children's rights had not been timely resolved by the SCPCR.



(SUBU. R)

Bhubaneswar

Dated 11 SEP 2025

Principal Accountant General (Audit-I)

Odisha

Countersigned



(K. SANJAY MURTHY)

New Delhi

Dated 23 SEP 2025

Comptroller and Auditor General of India