

**DISTRICT PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMME  
(DPEP)**

**G.O.I PRE-APPRAISAL MISSION TO U.P. (DPEP-III)**  
(25th May – 6th June, 1999)



**Educational Consultants India Limited**

**(A Government of India Enterprise)**

**Plot No. 18A, Sector 16A,**

**Noida, U.P.**

NIEPA DC



D10375

**LIBRARY OF THE INFORMATION CENTER**

**National League for Educational  
Planning and Administration.**

**17-B, 311 Wisconsin Marg.**

**New Delhi-110016**

**DOC. No.**

*D-10375*

**Date**

*11-11-88*

## Contents

Introduction	:	i - v
1. State and District Background	:	1-11
2. Planning Process	:	12-20
3. Project Concept & Composition	:	21 – 59
3.0 Introduction	:	21
3.1 Access	:	21 – 24
3.2 Retention	:	25 – 36
3.3 Quality Improvement	:	36 – 42
3.4 Capacity Building	:	42 – 50
3.5 Civil Works	:	50 – 59
4. Management Structure and MIS	:	60 – 69
5. Project Cost and Procurement	:	70 – 82
6. First Year AWP&B	:	83 – 86
7. Benefits and Risks	:	87 – 88
8. Report on Issues / Recommendations of IDA Identification Mission	:	89 – 96
9. Recommendations & Suggestions	:	97 – 101
<i>Annexures</i>		
I. Tables	:	1 – 8
II. District Visit Reports	:	9 – 16
III. Itinerary	:	17

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Pre-Appraisal Mission was launched by Government of India to appraise the plans of 38 DPEP-III expansion districts of Uttar Pradesh as well as the State Component Plan during May 25 - June 6, 1999. The Mission comprised 11 members namely Dr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, NIEPA New Delhi, Dr. A.C. Mehta, NIEPA New Delhi, Ms. Suman Sachdeva, New Delhi, Dr. A.K. Singh, NSDART, Mussoorie, Shri Chittapriyo Sadhu, NSDART, Mussoorie, Dr. I.D. Gupta, R.I.E. Bhopal, Shri Nabesh Bohidar, AIMS Research, Bhubaneshwar, Dr. Manjari Gopal, University of Delhi, Delhi, Dr. B. Shiva Reddy, Osmania University Hyderabad, Shri Harshwardhan and Shri A.P. Sharma, Civil Work Consultants, New Delhi.

The Mission visited Uttar Pradesh during May 25-31, 1999. The team had a discussion with State Project Officials on state component plan at Lucknow on May 26, 1999. In three groups Mission visited three districts namely Faizabad, Raibareli and Sultanpur on May 27 and 28, 1999. Mission interacted with Directors, Basic Education, Mahila Samakhya, SCERT, SIEMAT and representative of SIET at S.P.O. Lucknow on May 28 in the afternoon. Discussions with 10 selected district planning teams were held in three groups simultaneously on May, 29 and 30, 1999 at S.P.O. Lucknow. Mission had a wrap-meeting at S.P.O. on May 31, 1999 with Principal Secretary (Education) Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. All key officials of various departments and institutions as well as officials of S.P.O. were present in this meeting.

Mission is grateful to the officials of State Project office as well as the District Officials of Faizabad, Raibareli and Sultanpur for the hospitality they extended to the team during its stay in the state. Mission highly appreciates the enthusiasm of the state project team as well as the district teams in responding to the questions and queries of Mission members. Prof. Ved Prakash, NCERT New Delhi was kind enough to go through the 38 districts B.A.S. and give his valuable comments to the Mission for incorporation in the report. Mission is grateful to him. Special thanks are due to the Appraisal & Supervision Unit of TSG, Ed.CIL for the help and assistance they extended to the Mission during course of its

work. Without active support of the Unit, Mission could not have satisfactorily accomplished its task. So thanks are due to Dr. Subhash C. Gujaria, Consultant, Shri Sanjeev Khurana, Ms. Poonam Gogia, Shri Assim Dabas, Shri Dev Bahadur, Shri Dhirender Patwal, Shri Anurag Mittal and Shri Vijay, who helped in bringing out the report in time. Last but not the least, Mission is grateful to members of DPEP Bureau for their briefing and valuable suggestions and comments which helped in finalising the report.

### **The Programme (UPBEP and DPEP)**

The U.P. Basic Education Project became operational in 10 districts of the state in October 1993. Subsequently 7 more districts were added in the project on account of reorganisation of existing districts. The project is implemented in these 17 districts by Government of Uttar Pradesh through U.P. Education for All Project Board which was established under Societies Registration Act for this purpose. The goal of BEP is universal enrolment in and completion of basic education (class 1 to 8) and improvement in its quality.

The objectives of UPBEP are : (i) Building Institutional Capacity to plan and evaluate a basic education development programme by establishing a strengthened framework of state, district, block, cluster and village level planning, management and professional support organisations. (ii) Improving Quality and completion of elementary education through strengthened community participation, early childhood education, curriculum and textbook revision, in service training, targeted programmes for women and girls, strengthened school management and encouraging pilot projects and innovations. (iii) Improving Access to basic education in project districts by constructing additional primary and upper primary schools in unserved habitations and supporting implementation of a redesigned programme of non-formal primary class for children unable to attend formal schools.

The progress made in the project implementation in 3 years was reviewed in 1996 by World Bank Mission which commended the progress. The Mission recognised that in order to meet the demand for quality education that had been created in project districts, it would be necessary to support further interventions. Accordingly a proposal for extension of the project, in terms of provision for further infrastructure and more intensive pedagogy inputs was done and it emerged as UPBEP-II which became operational in September, 1997.

The UPBEP-II was expected to sustain the pace of implementation in U.P.BEP-I in order to, (i) provide access to primary education to all 6-10 year old children and upper primary education to 75 percent of 11-13 year old children, especially to all disadvantaged groups and (ii) enhance the quality of education and improve completion rates by the year 2000.

The achievements made in UPBEP against the set targets, as given in the state component plan, are impressive. The enrolment at primary and upper primary level as well as GER have increased substantially and the targets have been more than achieved. The targets in civil works programmes have also been nearly achieved the trainings proposed have been taken for all the personnel as per plan. These include training for teachers : induction and in-service, district and block level trainers, VEC members, NFE instructors, BRC coordinators and Asstt. Coordinators, NPRC coordinators and ECE workers.

## **DPEP-II**

The District Primary Education Programme in Uttar Pradesh was sanctioned in September 1997 and will continue till December 2002. This programme known as DPEP-II is also implemented by GOUP through U.P.E.F.A. Project Board in 18 districts. Four districts namely Barabanki, Rampur, Bahraich and Sravasti having equally disturbing female literacy rates were proposed for inclusion in UPBEP but due to insufficiency of funds under that project, these districts have been taken under DPEP-II. The interventions in these districts will start very soon. The main programme interventions in DPEP-II are with respect to : (i) Expanding access (ii) Promoting retention (iii) Quality improvement

(iv) Capacity building (v) Planning, Research and Evaluation, and (vi) Supervision and Monitoring.

The progress made under DPEP-II till February 1999 i.e. about one-and-a half years of implementation as shown in the state component plan, seems to be up to mark. This is in terms of increase in enrollment, program against targets for civil work and trainings.

### **DPEP-III**

On the basis of progress achieved and lessons learnt from UPBEP-I and DPEP-II, the state government proposed to replicate these interventions in remaining districts of Uttar Pradesh. Out of 44 districts left uncovered 38 districts qualified for immediate project interventions in DPEP-III.

The Identification Mission of World Bank and State government agreed to cover 38 eligible districts and it is expected that the programme would be launched in these districts by October 1999.

Mission visited three districts namely Faizabad, Raibareli and Sultanpur in three groups. During these visits Mission got opportunity to see DIET, ECCE Centres and interact with community members at the grassroot level including the members of Village Panchayat, Village Education Committee, parents and other stakeholders. Reports of the three district visits are presented as Annexure II.

Mission appreciates the enthusiasm of people at grassroot level and their concern for primary education. It is heartening to note that people are mobilised to work and contribute towards primary education as good environment has been built for launching the programme. We hope that this enthusiasm does not diminish due to delay in launching the programme in the districts.

Mission interacted with 10 district planning teams at State project Office, Lucknow and 3 district planning teams at the respective districts. The discussion was focussed on the district plan proposals. Mission found the district planning teams very enthusiastic. It is heartening to note that some capacity building has already been done at the district level in the process of developing the district plans.

Mission during interaction with district teams offered many suggestions to revise and improve the plans and it was agreed that the revised plans will be available by the time IDA Mission visits state. It is therefore expected that many suggestions made by Mission would have been incorporated in the revised plan document.



## **SECTION 1 : STATE AND DISTRICT BACKGROUND**

Uttar Pradesh, as the name suggests, is situated in the northern part of the country. Demographically it is the biggest state in India. Being the most populous state Uttar Pradesh has the highest share (16.44 percent) of the country's population which shows that roughly one out of every six Indians come from this state. However, in terms of area Uttar Pradesh accounts for about 9 per cent of the total geographical area of the country. Having a total area of 2,94,411 sq. kms. the density of population in the state was 473 as per the 1991 census. The state therefore has far more number of persons per square kilometers when compared to the country as a whole (473 for U.P. as against 274 for India).

The state can geographically be divided into 5 regions namely Hill region, Western region, Central region, Eastern region and Bundelkhand region. The latest data, i.e. for 1998-99 shows that there are 83 districts in Uttar Pradesh with 902 development blocks and 112804 inhabited villages.

The population of Uttar Pradesh, according to 1991 census was 1391.12 lakh which includes 740.37 lakh males and 650.75 lakh females showing sex ratio of 879 females per 1000 males which is far less than sex ratio in the country (929). The decadal growth of population in the state during 1981-91 decade was 25.49 percent which was more than the decadal growth rate of the population of the country (23.85 per cent). It is interesting to note that the decadal growth of population in Uttar Pradesh has not changed over a period of time as the growth rate during 1971-81 decade was also 25.50 whereas this rate has declined in the country during the 1971-81 to 1981-91 decades.

The state has a sizeable population of scheduled castes whereas the population of scheduled tribes is quite low. The population of scheduled caste in 1991 was 292.76 lakh which is about 21 per cent of the state population. This is quite high as compared to 16.5 per cent share of scheduled castes in the country's population. However, the population of scheduled tribes in Uttar Pradesh in 1991 was only 0.21 per cent of the state's population as against about 7.5 per cent in the country. The

population of Muslims in the state was about 17.43 per cent as against about 11.2 per cent in the country in 1991. The state had 19.84 per cent urban population which shows that about 80 percent population lives in rural areas in Uttar Pradesh.

### Literacy Scenario in State

Educationally Uttar Pradesh is one of the most backward state of the country. It has been identified as one of the 10 educationally backward states about 2 decades ago and still continues to be backward. According to 1991 census the literacy rate of the state was 41.6 per cent as against 52.2 per cent for the country. The male literacy in Uttar Pradesh (55.7 per cent) is also lower than the same for the country (64.1 per cent). But the female literacy in the state (25.3 percent) is far below the female literacy of the country (39.2 per cent).

The following table presents the literacy rates for Uttar Pradesh as per the census of 1991 for 7+ population.

**Table 1.1**  
**Literacy rate in Uttar Pradesh - 1991 (for 7+ population)**

Category		Literacy Rates		
		Persons	Males	Females
Total Population	Total	41.60	55.73	25.31
	Rural	36.66	52.05	19.02
	Urban	61.00	69.98	50.38
S.C. Population	Total	26.85	40.80	10.69
	Rural	24.76	38.87	8.47
	Urban	42.30	54.79	27.36

The literacy figures reported in the table show all types of disparities in the state namely spatial (i.e. rural-urban), gender (male-female) and social (S.C. and others) disparities. Further, it is evident that gender disparities are wider in rural areas as compared to urban areas which is true not only for total population but even for scheduled caste population also. The literacy figures reveal that about 3 out of every 4 females in the state are illiterate while among scheduled castes 9 out of every 10 females are illiterate.

Despite the fact that all the districts in the state are covered under Total Literacy Campaigns and 22 districts are in Post Literacy phase while 2 districts are in the continuing education phase, the state still has to make substantial progress in this regard to catch up other states like Kerala, Mizoram or Himachal Pradesh.

### Primary Education in Uttar Pradesh

Though the state has made significant progress in the field of education during last four decades but it still seems to be far from achieving the goal of UPE. With respect to primary education the number of primary schools has increased from 32 thousand in 1950-51 to about 1.17 lakh schools in 1998-99. The number of primary school teachers has increased from 70 thousand in 1950-51 to 3.67 lakh in 1998-99 whereas the primary level enrolment marked an increase from 27.3 lakh to 180 lakh during the same period. Still about 2.58 lakh children of the age group 6-10 were not enrolled in primary schools in the state in 1998-99. A large number of these out of school children comprise of girls and scheduled castes. This is the reason that the enrolment figures display rural-urban disparity, gender differences and disadvantage to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.

The following table presents primary level enrolment (i.e. class I - V) in Uttar Pradesh alongwith the relevant age group population and Gross Enrolment Ratio.

**Table 1.2**  
**Primary Level (I-V) Enrolment in Uttar Pradesh**

(Numbers in Thousands)

Category/ year	1991-92			1998-99		
	Pop.(6-10)	Enrol (I- V)	G.E.R.	Pop.(6-10)	Enrol (I- V)	G.E.R.
Boys	9744	9274	95.17	11080	11368	102.60
Girls	8572	5546	64.70	9810	9264	94.43
Total	18316	14820	80.91	20890	20632	98.76

Source: i) Directorate of Basic Education,  
ii) UNICEF, District-wise distribution of estimated population by age group and gender in U.P.: 1951-1991 census.

It is heartening to note that the gender disparities in enrolment ratio have declined during last 7 years from about 30 per cent points to about 8 percent points. This is because of the fact that enrolment of girls has increased with faster rate (67 percent) than that of boys (22.58 percent) during the period 1991-92 to 1998-99.

The following table presents the data pertaining to the primary schools coming under the purview of Directorate of Education, Uttar Pradesh in 1998-99.

**Table 1.3**  
**Primary Schools Data (1998-99)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No. of schools</b>	<b>No. of teachers (in lakhs)</b>	<b>Enrolment in (in lakhs)</b>
Parishad Schools	97853 /	2.78	152
Recognised Schools	18700	0.89	54
<b>Total.</b>	<b>116553</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>206</b>

The data presented in the above table clearly shows that about 26 per cent of the enrolment at primary level is accounted by private recognised schools. Of late the Government of U.P. is keen to encourage private participation in primary education to supplement the government efforts towards achieving the goal of Universalisation of Primary Education.

Despite progress achieved in terms of enrolment in Uttar Pradesh, high dropout rate from primary schools/classes is a major obstacle to the fulfillment of the goal of universalisation of primary education in the state. In Uttar Pradesh around half of the children enrolled in Class - I dropout of the system without completing primary schooling and the dropout rate among girls and scheduled caste children is still higher.

## **DISTRICT PROFILE**

Out of the total 83 districts in Uttar Pradesh the DPEP-III will cover 38 districts. These 38 districts have lot of variations in terms of geographical, economic, social and cultural characteristics. There are not only wide inter-district variations but also intra-district variations in respect to indicators of socio-economic and educational development. These 38 districts are geographically located in all nooks and corners of

the state. As far as representation of districts from five regions of the state is concerned all the regions are represented. These districts include 14 districts from western region namely Agra, Baghpat, Bijnor, Bulandshahar, Etah, Farrukhabad, Gautam Budh Nagar, Ghaziabad, Haridwar, Kannauj, Mainpuri, Meerut and Muzaffar Nagar. From central region there are 4 districts namely Fatehpur, Kanpur Dehat, Raibareli and Unnao. The eastern region in DPEP-III is represented by 11 districts which are Ambedkar Nagar, Azamgarh, Ballia, Faizabad, Ghazipur, Jaunpur, Mau, Mirzapur, Padrauna, Pratapgarh and Sultanpur. The Bundelkhand region is represented by 4 districts viz. Hamirpur, Jalaun, Jhansi and Mahoba while there are 5 districts from hill region namely Bageshwar, Champawat, Pithoragarh, Tehri and Uttar Kashi.

The 38 districts covered under DPEP-III account for a total area of 141838 sq. kms. which is about 48.17 percent of the area of state. These districts account for 425 out of the total 902 blocks of the state. Further there are 50876 inhabited villages in these 38 districts which constitute about 45.11 percent of the total inhabited villages in the state.

The districts have wide variations as far as their geographical area is concerned. These districts include as small districts as Baghpat (1028 sq. kms.) and Gautam Budh Nagar (1456 sq. kms.) to as big as Uttar Kashi (8016 sq. kms.) and Pithoragarh (7242 sq. kms.) Out of 38 districts 5 have individual geographical area of less than 2000 sq. kms. while 3 districts have geographical area more than 6000 sq. km. However 15 districts each have area between 2000 and 4000 sq. kms. and between 4000 and 6000 sq. kms.

According to the size of the districts the number of development blocks also differ from district to district. The variation are to the extent that 3 districts namely Champawat, Gautam Budh Nagar and Mahoba have only 4 blocks each as against one district namely Sultanpur having as many as 22 blocks. Further there are 17 districts having number of blocks between 5 and 10 each, 10 districts each have 11 to 15 blocks whereas 4 districts have 16 to 20 blocks each. The district-wise details are given in Annexure Table 1.1.

The total number of inhabited villages in 38 districts is 50876 which is about 45.11 percent of the total inhabited villages in the state. However the districts have wide variations in terms of the number of inhabited villages. For example Baghpat having only 369 inhabited villages is smallest while Azamgarh having 3721 inhabited villages is the biggest out of 38 districts in this regard. There are only 3 districts having less than 500 inhabited villages, 16 districts have 500 to 1000 inhabited villages while further 4 districts have inhabited villages numbering between 1000 and 1500. There are 8 districts having 1500 to 2000 inhabited villages whereas 4 districts have number of inhabited villages between 2000 and 2500. There are 3 districts namely Ghazipur (2583), Jaunpur (3269) and Azamgarh (3721) which have more than 2500 inhabited villages each. Detailed district-wise number of inhabited villages is presented in Annexure Table 1.1.

The total population of these 38 districts is 616.60 lakh which accounts for about 44.32 percent of the total population of the state. Demographically these 38 districts have high degree of variations. On the one hand there are 4 districts having population less than 5 lakhs each including Champawat (1.65 lakh) while as many as 7 districts have individual population more than 25 lakhs on the other Jaunpur having population of 32.14 lakhs is demographically the biggest district, 5 districts have population between 5 and 10 lakhs, 10 districts have population between 10 and 15 lakhs, 5 districts have population between 15 and 20 lakhs while 7 districts have population between 20 and 25 lakhs. The demographic profile of the districts is presented in Annexure Table 1.2.

The percentage of Schedule Caste population in 38 districts is about 22.51 of the total population of these districts. The population of Scheduled Castes in districts ranges between 13.95 in Tehri to as high as 29.85 percent in Raibareli. There are 4 districts namely Tehri, Baghpat, Gautam Budh Nagar and Ballia where scheduled castes are less than 15 percent of the district population. Further in 9 districts the percentage of SC population ranges between 15 and 20 percent. The SC population in another 18 districts are between 20 and 25 percent whereas 7 districts namely Rai Bareli, Unnao, Mirzapur, Jhansi, Jalaun, Azamgarh and Mahoba have scheduled caste population more than 25 percent of the total population of individual districts. The district-wise details are presented in Annexure Table 1.2.

The population of Scheduled Tribes is insignificant in these 38 districts. Only Pithoragarh has 3.93 percent ST population. As far as minorities are concerned the proportion of Muslims to the total population of the districts vary significantly in these 38 districts. In hill region 5 districts namely Pithoragarh, Champawat, Bageshwar, Uttar Kashi and Tehri the population of Muslims is negligible. In most of other 33 districts the Muslim population is below 10 percent. However in 5 districts the percentage of Muslim population is sizeable. These districts are namely Bijnor (40.3 percent), Muzaffar Nagar (34.5 percent) Haridwar (30.0) percent), Meerut (27.5 percent) and Ghaziabad (21.16 percent).

The number of persons per sq. kilometers i.e. the density of population in of these 38 districts is about 434 which is less than the density of population of the state (473). The reason being the inclusion of 5 hill districts where the population density is quite low. Out of 38 districts, Uttar Kashi with only 30 persons per sq. km. has lowest density of population while Ghaziabad with 1044 persons per sq. kms. has highest density of population. Apart from Uttar Kashi another district having less than 100 persons per sq. km. is Bageshwar. There are 6 districts having density of population between 101 and 250, 8 districts have the population density between 251 and 500. Further in 15 districts the number of persons per sq. km. range between 501 and 750, while 4 districts have this figure between 751 and 1000. Beside Ghaziabad (1044) one more district namely Baghpat (1002) has density of population more than 1000 per sq. kms. The inter-district variations can be seen in Annexure Table 1.2.

The number of females per 1000 males in the total population of 38 districts is 900 which is higher than the sex ratio of 879 in the state. It is interesting to note that there are 4 districts where the sex ratio is more than 1000. This means that in Tehri, Bageshwar, Champawat and Azamgarh the females out number male population. There are another 11 districts where sex ratio is between 901 and 1000. Further 11 districts have sex ratio between 851 and 900 while 12 districts have sex ratio even below 850. If we account for all 38 districts Mathura and Bageshwar have lowest (817) and highest (1065) sex ratio respectively. District-wise details are given in Annexure Table 1.2.

## **Literacy Scenario**

The 38 districts have large variations on count of literacy. Out of 38 districts, 23 districts have literacy rate more than 40.83 percent which is the literacy rate of the state which shows that only 15 districts are below state average in literacy. The highest literacy is found in Pithoragarh (59.29 percent) while Ambedkar Nagar (30.38 percent) has the lowest literacy among 38 districts. In fact 9 out of 38 districts have more than 50 percent literacy while another 5 districts have literacy between 45 and 50 percent. The number of districts having literacy rate between 40 and 45 percent and between 35 and 40 percent are 13 and 8 respectively. It is disappointing to note that 3 districts Unnao (31.30 percent), Ambedkar Nagar (30.38 percent) and Padrauna (32.30 percent) have literacy rate less than 35 percent.

The DPEP districts are selected on the basis of their female literacy rate. Among 38 districts Ghaziabad (38.30 percent) has the highest female literacy and even that is also below the national average though it is higher than the female literacy (25.30 percent) of the state. Further there are 19 districts whose female literacy is above the state average and equal number of districts have female literacy below the state average. The district Padrauna with only 13.90 percent female literacy is at the bottom in 38 districts. There are 4 districts (including Padrauna) where female literacy is below 20 percent. Further 15 districts have female literacy ranging between 20 and 25 percent whereas another 9 districts show female literacy between 25 and 30 percent. The number of districts where female literacy is above 30 percent are 10 out of which 5 districts are from Western region, 2 districts from Hill and Bundelkhand region each and one district from Central region. The inter district variations in literacy are presented in Annexure Table 1.3.

## **Primary Education in Districts**

The total number of Primary schools run by Basic Shiksha Parishad in 38 districts was 40438 in 1998-99. These schools are spread over 50876 villages inhabited in these districts. It shows that on an average 4 schools are available for every 5 villages in these districts. The schools run by Basic Shiksha Parishad known as Parishadiya schools are provided in the districts according to the size of the district. The number



of such schools range from lowest 413 in Champawat district to the highest 2047 schools in Sultanpur district. In fact there are 5 districts, including Champawat, where the number of Parishadiya schools is less than 500. There are another 11 districts where the number of such schools range between 501 and 1000. Further 17 districts have the number of schools between 1001 and 1500. Rest 5 districts have more than 1500 schools each and these districts are Ballia, Jaunpur, Etah, Azamgarh and of course Sultanpur. The district-wise number of Parishadiya schools are presented in Annexure Table 1.3.

In educationally backward areas even access is a problem. In the districts to be covered under DPEP-III in all thousands of habitations have no primary schools within the prescribed norm of 1.5 kilometer. Districts like Baghpat have only 7 such habitations which have no access of primary schooling while the other extreme is the case of Pithoragarh where number of unserved habitations was 344. Out of 38 districts 10 districts have less than 50 unserved habitations while another 13 districts have unserved habitations between 51 and 100. Further 13 districts have unserved habitations numbering between 101 and 250 while the districts namely Ballia and Pithoragarh have more than 250 unserved habitations. District-wise number of unserved habitations are presented in Annexure Table 1.4.

In almost all the districts of Uttar Pradesh there is shortage of teachers and the schools are over-crowded. The teacher pupil ratio is quite high. Barring hill districts of the state where teacher-pupil ratio is below 1:40 in all other regions the ratio is above 1:50. Out of 38 districts 6 districts namely Tehri, Bageshwar, Pithoragarh, Champawat, Uttar Kashi and Baghpat the teacher-pupil ratio is below 1:40 whereas it is between 1:40 and 1:50 in Ghaziabad. Rest all 31 districts have teacher pupil ratio above 1:50. Out of these 31 districts 16 have the ratio beyond 1:60 while 9 have more than 70 students per teacher. The district Padrauna has the highest teacher pupil ratio (1:91) in 38 districts. The teachers pupil ratio of these districts are given in Annexure Table 1.3.

The first important component of UPE is to ensure universal enrolment. The enrolment ratio is an indicator to monitor the coverage of children by schools. The Gross Enrolment Ratio in these 38 districts as per 1998-99 figures show that it ranges

between 64.90 percent (in Ghaziabad) to 104.90 percent (in Pithoragarh). There are 6 districts, including Ghaziabad, where GER is less than 75 percent. Half of the districts i.e. 19, have GER between 75 and 90 percent. The number of districts having GER above 90 percent is 12 out of which Pithoragarh and Champawat have the ratio beyond 100 percent.

The Gross Enrolment Ratio of girls is even less than the figures quoted above for total children. GER among girls is highest in Champawat (103.90 percent) while it is lowest in Muzaffar Nagar (57.52 percent). Bijnor and Mau have also GER of girls less than 65 percent. In another 5 districts the GER of girls is between 65 and 75 percent. Majority of the districts (i.e. 21 out of 38) have girls GER between 75 and 90 percent while 9 districts have this figure above 90 percent. The districts namely Kanpur Dehat, Pithoragarh, Champawat and Mathura have more than 95 percent relevant age group girls enrolled in schools. The Gross Enrolment Ratio of the districts is given in the Annexure Table 1.4.

The universal retention of children in schools for 5 year is the second important component of UPE. The dropouts in Uttar Pradesh are of high order and this is an obstacle the way of achieving the goal of UPE. In the 38 districts the dropout rate at primary level during year 1994-95 to 1998-99 was 43.43 percent. It was 41.44 percent for boys and 46.54 percent for girls. The dropout rates in the 38 districts calculated for 5 regions show the following average dropout rates.

**Table 1.4**  
**Average Dropout Rates in 5 Regions**

<b>Region</b>	<b>No. of Districts</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
Hill Region	5	26.67	28.58	27.03
Western Region	14	46.66	50.14	48.35
Central Region	4	42.69	44.37	43.28
Bundelkhand	4	26.29	33.46	29.54
Eastern Region	11	43.24	46.28	44.55

The table shows that the dropouts are highest in Western region for all the three categories of boys, girls and total while they are lowest in Hill region followed by the districts of Bundelkhand region.

The district-wise dropout rates at primary level shows that it ranges between 21.41 percent (in Uttar Kashi) to as high as 72.00 percent (in Ballia). Apart from Uttar Kashi there are 4 more districts namely Kanpur Dehat, Mirzapur, Pithoragarh and Champawat where dropout rate during 1994-95 to 1998-99 was less than 25 percent at primary level. Further 21 districts had dropout rate between 25 and 50 percent while another 12 districts had this figure more than 50 percent. As far as the dropout rates of girls at primary level is concerned it was minimum (18 percent) in Champawat and maximum (65 percent) in Ballia district. The number of districts lying in the 3 categories of below 25 percent, between 25 and 50 percent and above 50 percent are 4, 22 and 12 respectively. The district-wise dropout rates for boys, girls and total children are presented in the Annexure Table 1.4.

## **SECTION 2: PLANNING PROCESS**

### **2.1 Participatory Planning Process**

DPEP emphasizes local specific planning in a participatory manner which aims to serve purposes of creating a sense of ownership, awareness, capacity building, convergence and local specific planning.

The Mission observed that the planning process adopted in carrying out district plans is intense and participative in nature. The process has contributed to a clear, localized inception of problems and issues, and strategies to overcome them. The Mission is of the view that considerable improvement has taken place concerning planning process from BEP to DPEP-II and DPEP-III.

To carry out the planning process, a District Core Planning Team in each of the 38 expansion districts was constituted in November 1998 with Basic Siksha Adhikari, Accounts Officer, Principal (DIET) and one Assistant BSA as its members. Initially, the District Planning Teams were oriented to DPEP in a one-day workshop organized by the State Project Office (SPO) at Lucknow. Later, each district team underwent a nine day training programme on how to prepare a perspective plan between December 1998 and January 1999. The training to nine district teams was imparted by the NSDART, Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussourie while the rest of the 29 district teams were trained at the State Institute of Educational Management and Training (SIEMAT), Allahabad.

The members of the Planning Teams visited different blocks of the district and carried out Focus Group Discussions with villagers, VEC, Pradhans, etc. At the District, Block and Village level, separate meetings were held. These were attended by the educational functionaries, teacher representatives, ABSAs, SDIs, Deputy BSAs, DLOs, DIET faculty, Gram Pradhans, BDOs, ICDS functionaries and Community Leaders and issues, problems and strategies were identified. To analyse data and identify issues and to formulate plan strategies and interventions, two meetings were held in January/February 1999 at the State level. The District Planning Teams

presented draft Perspective Plans in a two-day workshop held in February 1999 at the State level and the plans were discussed thoroughly.

The problems identified and issues raised, along with the details of meetings and programmes held, dates, venue and number of participants have been documented in the district plans. **However, a few districts, like Kannauj may like to present more detailed information on these aspects.**

The districts envisage to undertake school mapping and micro planning exercises in the first two years of the project, however, details on exactly how micro planning will be conducted have not been given. The State should present more information on this aspect in their plan document. The state experience of BEP and DPEP II districts in this regard will ensure better organisation and use of data collected through micro planning exercises. The State envisages that the micro planning exercises will be conducted by the Community/VECs and will be updated twice a year. The existing micro planning formats that are in use will be suitably simplified and the data collected will be analysed at the local level, as the state has decided not to aggregate data at the block level.

In the first six months (October 1999-March 2000), the districts envisage preparatory work and actual micro planning will be undertaken in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years of the project. The districts have divided blocks into two parts and proposed to undertake micro planning accordingly. **However, the name of the blocks where the micro planning exercise will be undertaken in the first year should be identified in the AWP&B for the first year.** The information presented in the plan documents on micro planning and its implementation schedule irrespective of districts is exactly the same. **The districts may also like to present the number of villages in each of its blocks, as the same would help them to properly conduct micro planning exercises.** The districts should also ensure that discrepancies do not appear in their perspective plans and what has been proposed in the first year's Annual Work Plan and Budget concerning micro planning.

## 2.2 Data

The Mission appreciates the district teams for presenting fairly a good amount of relevant statistics in their plan documents. However, there are some limitations in both the District as well as State Component plans. The State plan contains district-wise information only on population and literacy rates. The State should add a district-specific tables on Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) and Retention (boys & girls), number of habitations that need schooling facilities, pupil-teacher ratio and percentage of female teachers, a few of which has already been presented in the Project Implementation Plan (PIP).

The Mission noticed some inconsistencies in both the State and District plans in presenting information. The district and state teams should ensure that **(a) each table presented should have its number, clear title, year for which the information is presented, unit (if required) and complete source of information; (b) the figures referred in the text should match with the corresponding tables; (c) the consistencies of data presented should be maintained throughout the document; and (d) the data presented in the State plan should match with the figures presented in the district plans.**

The district plans contain information on schools distributed according to (i) enrolment in different slabs; (ii) pupil-teacher ratio; and (iii) type of building which in the Missions view is vital and need thorough analysis and detailed discussion which is lacking in most of the plans. **A few districts also presented block-wise information which gives local-specific flavor.**

The present set of information does not cover unrecognized institutions, which in some districts may be large in number. The State has recently initiated collection of information from unrecognised institutions, its number and enrolment in the five DPEP II districts. The state should ensure to extend it to DPEP III districts, as it will help districts to assess overall picture with particular reference to out-of-school children and educational facilities that are available in the district

During the discussions with the district teams, the Mission was informed that most of the information that the Mission sought was originally available in their perspective plan. As it seems that the members of the district team and DIET faculty worked hard but the same is not reflected well in the documents. The perspective plans prepared in Hindi were later translated and edited at the State level. However, the district teams are eagerly awaiting the launch of the programme.

### **2.3 Targets**

The district plans contain year-wise targets on enrolment and retention separately for boys and girls and SC population. However, as per the DPEP guidelines, year-specific targets on access and achievement have not been set out. This should be spelt out in the perspective plan & AWP&B. The Mission is of the view that targets on GER and Retention appear over-ambitious. In the absence of information on over-age and under-age children, it is rather difficult to set target on GER. The GER in the target year i.e. 2003-04 is assumed to be between 125 per cent in Champawat to 100 per cent in Uttar Kashi district.

The district teams have undertaken a population & enrolment projection exercise (age 6-11 years); however the methodology used needs improvement. This should be integrated into the 1st year training for state & district teams, so that these could be re-assessed at Mid-term.

The districts have set out ambitious targets on retention rates which in the Mission's view need rigorous efforts and efficient monitoring of those who are already in the system. The required enrolment in Grade V at the end of the project i.e. 2003-04 to attain high rates of retention, should be viewed in relation to enrolment in Grade I in the initial year i.e. 1999-2000.

The districts propose to open and construct school buildings mostly in the first three years of the project. However, schools are not proposed in the first year of the project. The districts envisage that enrolment in the first year will increase significantly and accordingly set out target on GER. This may not likely be realised in view of the fact that new schools are not proposed in the first year. The districts

should add adequate strategies as to how they will attain enrolment targets in the initial period.

While projecting additional number of teachers that would be required during the period 1999-2000 to 2003-04, the districts have indicated that the pupil-teacher ratio is assumed to be 40:1 which may not be appropriate to use in view of the existing very high ratio. This should be calculated on the state norms of 1:50. In a few districts, the projected number of additional teachers in 2003-04 is already in existence in the base year of the project.

The projected enrolment has also been used to project number of textbooks that would be required during the project period. All the districts have attempted this. The Mission is of the view that aggregate number of projected textbooks may serve only a limited purpose. It would appreciate to have grade-wise break-up of number of textbooks required.

#### **2.4 Research Studies**

With an aim to provide inputs for plan formulation and to generate benchmark estimates, the state has conducted the following studies:

1. Social Assessment Study (SAS) and
2. Baseline Learners Achievement Study (BAS).

In addition, the 'State Educational Finance Study' conducted in 1997 for DPEP II districts has also been updated.



### **2.4.1 Social Assessment Study**

The SAS was conducted in 5 of the 38 districts each representing one region. The 38 districts have been divided into five regions, namely, Hills (tribal group), Bundelkhand (scattered habitations), Central and Eastern (SC population) and Western (girls education) region. The five districts where the SASs are conducted are Pithoragarh, Mahoba, Unnao, Ambedkar Nagar and Muzaffar Nagar.

The studies have been conducted by the Organisation for Applied Socio-Economic System (OASES), New Delhi, Operation Research Group (ORG), New Delhi, and Govind Vallabh Pant Science Institute, Allahabad with the following main objectives:

- (i) to identify nature and causes of disadvantages adversely affecting participation and achievement;
- (ii) to assess available incidence on the effectiveness of different schemes that are in operation; and
- (iii) to identify strategies to overcome disadvantages and constraints.

#### **The Sample**

The five studies adopted different sampling techniques but the number of sample villages in each district restrict to 10 which is only 0.8, 0.6 and 0.8 per cent of the total villages respectively in Mahoba, Pithoragarh and Muzzaffarnagar districts. In view of the time constraints, the study teams selected a small sample in consultation with the State Project Office. The studies were conducted between January-February 1999. Due to small sample, it is rather difficult to generalize the findings of the study at the district level. The study teams have also listed this as the major constraints of the study. The findings of SASs and its implications in the district, therefore, may be viewed in the light of these constraints. However, the study teams have taken care in selecting sample villages so that the same is representative in nature.

In the Pithoragarh district a two-stage stratified random sampling was adopted where as in Amedkar Nagar district, it was multi-stage sampling. Rest of the studies did not mention the sampling tools they have adopted to draw samples. In these districts 25

each of the parents and students were selected in the sample and interviewed to assess problems of primary education in the district. In Pitoragarh district, five out of eight districts were selected purposely on the basis of concentration of disadvantaged group. Within the selected block, all the villages which have more than 50 per cent SC and ST population were identified. Out of this, a sample of 10 villages was selected on random basis and all the households in a village were included in the sample. Primary schools serving samples villages were also selected and information on students, teachers and facilities in schools were collected and analyzed. The SAS of other districts have not come out with such details. Govind Vallabh Pant Science Institute, Allahabad, conducted the Pitoragarh study.

The reports of all the five districts are now available and the state has organized five-day sharing Workshops at the district level in March 1999, in which other districts of the region also participated. **The findings and details of sharing workshop are documented in the State Component Plan but the district plans are silent on the findings and the sharing workshops. The district teams should document major findings of the SAS and its implications in their districts. During wrap-up at Delhi, the SPD agreed that it will be incorporated in the revised plans which are to be submitted to IDA mission.**

The SASs have come out with little details of effectiveness of different schemes that are currently in operation. However, otherwise, the studies have come out with numerous reasons of low enrolment, retention and achievement and have also recommended possible interventions.

### **Major SAS Findings**

The findings of Social Assessment Studies are classified under (i) low access and low demand for education; (ii) low retention and (iii) low achievement. Financial constraints and illiteracy of parents, non-availability of schools, involvement of children in household work, absence of female teachers, distance between school and home, dissatisfaction with teaching, irregularity in distribution of scholarship and lack

of parent-teacher coordination were the major highlights that are classified under the heading 'low access and low demand for education'.

Involvement of children in household chores and income generating activities, irregular teaching, curriculum not suited to local needs, lack of space and basic amenities for children in schools, school timings were the main reasons classified under 'low retention'.

Lack of proper environment for education at home, lack of efficient teachers, irregular teacher's attendance, lack of adequate teaching-learning material and textbooks not available to all children were the reasons that are identified for 'low learners achievement'.

#### **2.4.2 Baseline Learners Achievement Assessment Studies (BAS)**

Baseline Assessment Study has recently been conducted by the SCERT in all the 38 expansion districts of the State of Uttar Pradesh in which faculty of DIET were also actively involved. The objectives, the design and the tools employed for the study have been in conformity with the guidelines approved by the National Advisory Committee on Achievement Survey. However, it may be mentioned that due to the project preparation cycle having been initiated in November/December, 1998, the exercise of data collection under the BAS could be undertaken during January 21 – February 22, 1999 in the plains and March 5 – April 1, 1999, in hills. Therefore, the children of Classes II and V have been subjected to achievement tests of Classes I and IV respectively. **In view of this, the Mission recommends that the timings of the subsequent survey may be synchronized for the purposes ensuring the comparability of these results.**

Though the final study report is still to be raised, scrutiny of tables generated so far signify that the data that have been collected under the present investigation are being analysed in consonance with the guidelines provided. The study has covered 1,900 schools, 29,973 Class II children, 26,030 Class V children and 5,347 teachers.

A close examination of some of the tables pertaining to students' achievement both in language and mathematics at both the stages reveals low achievement. Besides, it also signifies inter-district variations. There are districts like Mathura and Mainpuri wherein the students have exhibited abysmally poor performance while there are a few districts like Baghpat & Meerut that are found to be placed in a better position than others on achievement scale. District squatting at both extremes require a closer examination with a view to identifying the factors that have been resulted in low/high achievement. This calls for a closer look at students' achievement vis-à-vis other related factors, be it related to gender, social groups, teacher-pupil ratio, teachers' qualifications, impact of teachers' training, physical facilities, supervision, periodicity of testing, availability of instructional material etc.

A presentation based on analysis accomplished was made on May 28, 1999, at the Office of the State Project Director. During the course of the presentation that ran into about 30 tables it was suggested that district-wise implications pertaining to various facets might be drawn and included in the main body of the study report. This would help plan focussed intervention strategies in individual districts.

The Office of the State Project Director has already made necessary preparations for the sharing of the findings of the study with the Planning Teams of all the 38 expansion districts on May 29 and 30, 1999. Besides, detailed schedules have also been drawn by the SPO/SCERT for intensive sharing of the BAS results with the District Education Officers and other stakeholders beginning from July 5, 1999.

### **2.4.3 State Finance Study**

The State Finance Study for DPEP II was conducted in 1997, which has now been, updated and submitted to Government of India. The study contains detailed information on financial aspects of different schemes and programmes that are in operation along with forecasting of financial resources required at the end of liabilities of UPBEP, DPEP II and also DPEP III. In addition, a fiscal study has also been conducted recently which covers education sector also, in the light of which separate study for the expansion DPEP III districts has not been conducted.

## **SECTION 3 : PROJECT CONCEPT & COMPOSITION**

### **3.0 Introduction**

In order to achieve the goal of universalisation of primary education (UPE) the four major components are Access, Retention, Quality Improvement and Capacity Building . All the districts have identified issues and problems related to these components and have planned intervention strategies to address these issues and problems. With respect to all these components the districts have proposed some construction activities also. This section deals with these four major components as well as civil work as proposed in the district plans and state component plan. The mission considered the problems, strategies and project interventions for the entire duration of the project including the first year activities. The mission is appreciative of the effort of the planning team in preparing the plan documents. Taking note of the range and extent of problems in the 38 districts, the strategies and interventions are being appraised with this focus.

### **3.1 Access**

There has been a significant progress in the field of education in the last five years. However, Uttar Pradesh remains one of the most educationally backward states. One of the major problems in this regard is in providing access. This relates both to providing formal primary schools as well as non-formal or alternative schools. It is estimated that about 2.58 lakh children are 'out of school' in the project districts, the majority of them being girls, minorities and SC/ST children. The plan document proposes opening up of new formal primary schools and alternative schools as well as appointment of new teachers, drawing heavily from the experience of UPBEP & DPEP-II.

#### **3.2.1 Opening up of a new formal primary schools**

According to the GOUP norm, one primary school is to be provided in each habitation of 300 people within a distance of 1.5 kms. It is accepted that there are a number of regions still unserved, even though they meet the norm. The project plan recognises the urgent need to bridge these gaps. The plan document identifies a total of 3707

unserved inhabited areas in the project districts out of which the project proposes the opening of 2769 primary schools. The plan documents clearly indicate the number of schools needed in each district. The project also seeks to locate the schools, based on micro-planning and school mapping exercises.

### 3.2.2 New Teachers

In order to make new interventions cost-effective, the GOUP has launched the Shiksha-Mitra (para-teacher) scheme. The scheme is patterned on the successful model of 'shiksha karmi' in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. The shiksha mitra will be a para teacher to cater to single teacher schools or schools which need additional teachers to bring the TPR to 1:40 at the school level. The Shiksha Mitra's qualification will be intermediate and they will be appointed by the village panchayat's education committee on a fixed monthly honorarium of Rs. 1450/- for 11 months. There will be an increase of Rs. 200 after every 2 years of continuous service. There are 16,385 para teachers (according to the state component plan) envisaged in the district proposal to be appointed in the 38 DPEP-III districts. The mission appreciates the launching of the shiksha karmi scheme.

The project seeks to appoint Shiksha Mitra from the first year itself. The training of para teachers will be based on the Lok Jumbish Project (Rajasthan). They will be given a 30 days induction training and a refresher course of 15 days every year. The Shiksha karmis will be trained at the DIETs by master trainers. It is however not clear as to where the master trainers will be trained. While the SPO has a budget of Rs. 3.8 lakh for training of master trainers, SCERT has a budget of 2.00 lakh for the trainers.

The project envisages that at least 2 Shiksha Mitras will be available per school to handle classes I and II, initially. Regular teachers will take up classes III, IV and V. The scheme seeks to have a minimum recruitment of 50% women. It is hoped that there would be two shiksha karmis and three regular teachers who will be redeployed from areas where the TPR is high.

***The mission appreciates efforts at rationalisation of teachers which will be done in order to bridge the differences in TPR among regions. In rationalising teacher appointments/posts, the mission raised the possibility that teachers already catering***

*to a number of students are shifted to another school, adversely affecting children in that school. The SPO stated that the state already has certain broad criteria in this regard which will be followed. It was agreed that provision be made for regular monitoring.*

### **3.2.3. Alternative Schools**

The mission is appreciative of the fact that the plan documents recognize that relying solely on the existing system of education will not help in reaching the project goals. As one of the major challenges facing these districts is to reach out to underprivileged children, who are otherwise unable to access formal education. In order to do so the project proposes to emphasize on alternative schools aimed at providing education to working children, children engaged in agriculture pursuits and domestic chores, dropouts and those who are not been able to enroll because of rigidities of school timings. The alternative schools also take in to account description in teaching in flood prone areas education of minority children especially girls and SC/STs. The models proposed are already operational in DPEP-II. The models proposed are:

- I. Shiksha Ghar : Aimed at providing flexibility in timings alongwith sensitivity, especially with regards to the girl-child. It is targetted at out of school children (6-11 years). It will be managed by the VECs. An evaluation of it's working has already been carried out in 1998. The evaluation makes the following observations (a) comparatively, enrolment of girls is higher in Shiksha Ghars. (b) in semester II, as well, girls out number boys in most Shiksha Ghars. (c) the performance of girls in the achievement tests was better than that of the boys.
- II. Balshalas : This entails a school readiness package to be imparted to the children (3-6 years) alongwith primary education that is being provided to children (6-11 years). This is aimed at increasing access and retention of girls alongwith their siblings.
- III. Prahar Pathsala : This is aimed at girls (9-11 years) who dropped out of formal school or never joined them. As there is the critical age when girls are withdrawn from school, it is important that they be given an opportunity to educate themselves.
- IV. Strengthening of Maktabas / Madrasas : In view of the large minority population in the project districts and their strikingly low rate of educational achievement, it is

pertinent that emphasis is given to their education. One of the models proposed is the strengthening of the maktab/madrasas, in which efforts will be made to strengthen them by upgrading the skills of Hafizji/maulvi, if they have the minimum qualifications. Otherwise an instructor from the community will be appointed. **The Mission suggests the state to consider pre-school education also at maktab. A reference is available that a ceremony named 'Bismillah' may be performed to initiate child into the realm of learning at age 4 years 4 months 4 days.**

Some of the locale specific models operationalised in DPEP II and sought to be replicated in DPEP III are : (a) alternative schooling for working children in Firozabad and Moradabad districts, which has a large number of working children engaged in the glass making industry (b) Rishi Valley Education centres (RVEC), which provides for one instructor, multigrade teaching, self learning materials and continuous evaluation, enabling the learners to learn at their own pace. (c) Short and long term camps, operationalised in Bindha block of Lalitpur district, focussing on the non-school going and working children of the Sahariya community.

*The mission appreciates the advances made in this regard. It also notes that while the working of the shiksha ghar has been evaluated, other AS models have not been as they have been operational for only a year in DPEP-II. There is provision for evaluation of the working of AS models in both DPEP-II & DPEP-III. It is recommended that the results of the evaluation will be taken into account while operationalising subsequent AS centers.*

#### **EGS Scheme:**

The Education Guarantee Scheme launched by the GOUP envisages the opening of a school for class I and II where there are 30 children and where no formal primary school exists within a radius of 1 km. The teachers called Acharyaji will be appointed by the village panchayats' Education Committee at a fixed honorarium of Rs. 600 per month. The Acharya's qualification would be high School and priority will be given to woman Acharyas. DPEP III will fund about 150 centres (Rs. 2350/- per centre) in the 38 districts.



## **3.2 Retention**

Retention of children in primary school is a major challenge for DPEP-UP. The overall dropout rate at primary level in 38 DPEP-III districts is 43.43 percent in 1998-99. It is 41.44 percent for boys and 46.54 percent for girls. The rate varies from 18.88 percent in Champawat district to 65 percent in Ballia district. The situation is worse in the case of SC and Girls. The drop-out rate among girls goes up to 72 percent in Ballia district. In terms of regions, western and eastern regions which contain 25 districts out of 38 new DPEP districts have higher dropout rates (48.35 percent and 44.55 percent respectively) than other regions.

Several problems and issues have been identified with regard to low retention of children in the 38 districts. These include extremely inadequate school infrastructure, poor maintenance of school building, lack of basic amenities, sibling care and parental indifference. Low level of community involvement in the overall management of schools has created an environment that prompts a child to leave the school before completion of the cycle. Further children engaged in household work and child labour make their task of returning to schools more difficult. Girls are withdrawn from school because of early marriage, purdah system, and a sense of physical insecurity that sets in around 9+ years. The DPEP-III has proposed to reduce drop-out rate to less than 10 percent in the participating districts. To that effect, districts have proposed several strategies. The major retention related strategies are as follows:

### **3.2.1 Revamping Infrastructure**

The existing primary schools suffer from a number of infrastructure inadequacies. Analysis of data presented in the plan documents shows that among the existing primary schools in DPEP-III districts, 10 percent schools are buildingless, 40 percent schools require additional classrooms, 64 percent schools are without toilet facilities, 26 percent schools do not provide drinking water and 27 percent schools require major/minor repairs. To revamp existing infrastructure besides the usual departmental grants, the following provisions have been made under DPEP-III.

#### **3.2.1.1 Reconstruction of School Building**

An estimated 3958 schools in 38 DPEP-III districts do not have buildings of their

own. The range varies from 12 in Uttar Kashi to 211 in Azamgarh district. Under DPEP, reconstruction of 3247 school buildings have been proposed leaving a gap of 711 schools buildingless spread over 15 districts. There are districts with larger gaps such as Jhansi (175) and Etah (95). The perspective plan of these districts mention that the gaps would be met through convergence.

### **3.2.1.2 Additional Classrooms**

Overcrowded classrooms/schools is a major infrastructure related problem in DPEP-III districts. Over 60 percent of the schools in these districts have enrolments more than 100 and 25 percent schools have enrolment more than 200 enrolments. Since most of the schools have only two rooms, they are overcrowded. Among the infrastructure related interventions, DPEP-III has prioritised the construction of additional classrooms. Against the requirement of 15950 additional classrooms, 12271 additional classrooms have been proposed under DPEP leaving a gap of 3728 classrooms to be tackled through convergence and double shifting. Jaunpur, Raibareli and Gazipur are the 3 districts with large gaps (600,436 and 401 respectively). The mission is appreciative of the priority given to this intervention.

### **3.2.1.3 Repairs**

The magnitude of repair requirement is very high, as existing 11050 schools require major/minor repairs. Under DPEP, it has been proposed to repair 9435 school buildings leaving a gap of 1705 schools requiring repair in 12 districts. 26 districts would be completing the needed repair through DPEP. Agra, Mau, Meerut and Ballia are the districts with large repair gaps.

### **3.2.1.4 Provision of Basic Amenities**

Drinking water and toilets facilities are two basic amenities which have implication for retention of children in schools. As reported in the plan documents, 25846 primary schools do not have toilet facilities and 10606 schools are without drinking water facilities. DPEP has proposed to meet over 70 percent of the total toilet requirement and of 55 percent drinking water facilities requirements. It was pointed out by the SPO that the remaining requirements would be met through departmental funds. The gap of basic amenities after DPEP provisions is still very high in some districts. In

case of toilet facilities, Ambedkar Nagar, Jaunpur, Raibareli, Bageshwar are having around 1000 schools without toilets even after DPEP provisions. Similarly with regard to drinking water facilities, Tehri, Raibareli and Jaunpur have 893, 839 and 556 schools respectively without drinking water facilities.

With regard to infrastructural gaps discussed under section 3.2.1.1 - 4, it has been mentioned in the plans that these gaps would be filled up through convergence with concerned departments. However, there are certain districts in which the gaps seem to be very large. To make the convergence process effective, the DPO/SPO may pursue the following :

- Filling up of the infrastructural gaps through convergence should be reviewed on annual basis;
- These issues should be taken up in executive committee meetings / others convergence forums;
- More resources should be tapped for districts with larger gaps.

### **3.2.2 Additional Teachers**

The problems of overcrowded classrooms is aggravated by the high teacher-pupil ratio in the 38 DPEP districts. The average teacher-pupil ratio, in the DPEP-III districts is 1:62. Among the districts the range varies from 1:26 in Uttar Kashi to 1:91 in Padsrauna district. Further more, out of sanctioned teachers posts in the 38 districts, 10.15 percent are still vacant. Drawing from the experiences of DPEP provision in other states such as Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, the para teachers as additional teachers have been proposed to be appointed from the first year.

In the district plans, requirement of additional teachers has been worked out at the ratio of 1:40, while current accepted state norm of teacher-pupil ratio, due to low attendance, is 1:50, which indicates a very high requirement of teacher. Teacher-pupil ratio in some districts especially hill districts is lower than the ideal norm of 1:40. Although the transfer from hill districts to the plain districts is not permissible as per the state rule, there is scope for both intra and inter-district teacher transfer. Against the required 52875 teachers, the state has responded that 27000 regular teachers have been appointed who are already undergoing training. Under DPEP,

16340 have been proposed to be appointed beginning from 2000-01. The state is committed to make 1:50 teacher-pupil ratio during the project period. The state would appoint required number of teachers over and above teachers in position and DPEP provisions to maintain the teacher-pupil ratio of 1:50.

**Table : Teacher Requirement and Gap**

		(000) Enrolment 1998-99	(1:50) Required teachers	Sanctioned teachers	Teachers in position	Vacancies
1.	Agra	358	7160	4919	4086	833
2.	Ambedkar Nagar	177	3540	3282	3090	192
3.	Azamgarh	398	7960	7922	5941	1981
4.	Bageshwar	31	620	1038	1038	nil
5.	Baghpat*	114	2280		1993	
6.	Ballia	325	6500	4833	4409	424
7.	Bijnor	216	4320	3909	3525	384
8.	Buland Shahar	217	4340	4160	3750	410
9.	Champawat	23	460	945	665	280
10.	Etah	315	6300	5528	4205	1067
11.	Faizabad	182	3640	2665	2179	486
12.	Farrukhabad	193	3860	3255	2483	772
13.	Fatehpur	296	5920	4196	3514	682
14.	Gautam Buddha Nagar	94	1880	1310	1310	nil
15.	Ghaziabad	247	4940	2787	2468	319
16.	Ghazipur	68	5360	4799	4365	434
17.	Hamirpur	135	2700	1768	1753	15
18.	Haridwar	105	2100	1871	1612	259
19.	Jalaun	129	2580	2835	2631	204
20.	Jaunpur	458	9160	9276	6051	227
21.	Jhansi	70	1400	2275	2243	32
22.	Kannauj*	191	3820		1993	
23.	Kanpur (dehat)	199	3980	3174	2585	589
24.	Mahoba	91	1820	1392	1258	88
25.	Mainpuri	199	3980	3134	2611	523
26.	Mathura	258	5160	3356	3146	188
27.	Mau*	223	4460		2983	
28.	Meerut	371	7420	3477	2710	767
29.	Mirzapur	224	4480	3273	2736	537
30.	Muzaffar Nagar	238	4760	4209	3886	323
31.	Padrauna	310	6200	4151	2620	1531
32.	Pithoragarh	63	1260	2270	1869	431
33.	Pratapgarh	294	5880	5219	4181	1038
34.	Raibareli	366	7320	5598	4768	830
35.	Sultanpur	365	7300	6465	5058	1407
36.	Tehri	90	1800	2816	2462	354
37.	Unnao*	313	6260		3912	
38.	Uttar Kashi*	33	660		616	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8279</b>	<b>165,580</b>	<b>122,107</b>	<b>112,705</b>	<b>17,607</b>

\* Data not available

### 3.2.3 Double Shifts

A large number of primary schools in U.P. suffer from overcrowded classrooms. To derive the maximum benefit from the given school infrastructure, double shifting in primary schools has been proposed as cost effective measure. The strategy is innovative and would be piloted in schools with large enrolment (150-200 children or more). The innovation initially would be taken up in two blocks for each project district where 5 schools will be selected per block. Three following models have been devised to suit varying needs.

- (i) Two simultaneous shift with separate set of teachers.
- (ii) (a) Classes I and II – 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. same set of teachers (teaching)  
(b) Classes III, IV and V – 10 to 1 p.m. self study  
- 1.30 to 4.30 p.m. (teaching)
- (iii) The above model with para teachers for classes I & II and regular teachers for classes III, IV and V.

The field visits showed mixed reactions as some of the villagers were apprehensive about effectiveness of the double shifts. **It is suggested that advocacy campaigns should be launched to prepare community for effective implementation of the strategy.**

Besides, model II proposes three-hour long self study on the part of the students in grades III, IV and V. It is therefore recommended that **the SCERT / SRG may design appropriate and effective strategies for self-study by students of classes III, IV and V for a period of three hours at a stretch daily before the model is tried out.**

### 3.2.4 Girls Education and Women's Empowerment

Like UP-BEP and DPEP-II districts, girls low participation in primary education especially among the SC and minority groups is a major concern in DPEP-III districts. DPEP gives special attention to targeted delivery of project benefits to female students. DPEP-III has built its gender strategies on the experiences of UP-BEP and

DPEP-II. Some of the major gender related strategies proposed under DPEP-III are Early Childhood Care Education, Model Cluster Development for Girls' Education, Mahila Samakhya etc.

#### 3.2.4.1 Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE)

ECCE is a two pronged strategy of pre-school education and redressal of sibling care burden of children especially girls. In U.P. ICDS has expanded its networks and its service is being expanded to cover all blocks. Under DPEP, it is proposed to upgrade existing ICDS centres to ECCE centres which would provide both nutritional care and educational services. The strengthening of ICDS centres under DPEP-III includes the following:

- Constructing an additional room for housing ECCE centre within school campus;
- Providing TLM worth Rs 5000/- and consumable per annum to each centre;
- Providing additional honorarium to the instructors and helpers (Rs 250/- and Rs 125/- per moth respectively) on pro-rata basis for their additional working hours;
- Imparting induction and refresher training to the instructors and helpers.

A recent evaluation of the ECCE programme under UP-BEP by the NCERT has supported the strategy. The ICDS centres for upgradation to ECCE centres would be selected on the criteria of low female literacy, high girls' drop-out rate and presence of ICDS. In districts with blocks not having ICDS centres, ECCE centres have been proposed to be opened. 831 ECCE rooms spread over 8 districts have been proposed to be opened under DPEP. Following the practices of DPEP-II, the remaining upgraded ECCE centres would be located in the school campus or close to each other. The supply of funds to the ICDS functionaries has been reported to be irregular. In the district level convergence forums, issues relating to regular flow of funds to the ICDS centres should be raised in convergence forums and timely supply of funds be ensured. **The mission observed that 'health check-up and referral' under ICDS happens to be very weak and therefore requires to be streamlined urgently.**

### 3.2.4.2 Model Cluster Development for Girls Education

Drawing from experiences of DPEP-II, it has been decided to select a few clusters (two in each district) for enhancing participation of girls in primary education under DPEP-III. The clusters would be identified on the basis of low female literacy rates and would be provided with all possible inputs which include formation and orientation of MTA and women's forum, PRA and micro-planning for identification of problems in girls' education, gender specific community mobilization, opening of AS and ECCE centre on priority issues etc. A core team for each model cluster would be formed which would include active and committed male/female leaders, members of women's groups, youth groups and NPRC co-ordinator. The mission is appreciative of the model cluster approach followed under DPEP-II and III. It is expected that the inputs of model cluster would be of great use in planning and implementation of gender related strategy in other clusters.

### 3.2.4.3 Mahila Samakhya

Mahila Samakhya, a women's empowerment programme is currently in operation in 9 districts of UP-BEP. Drawing from the significant impact of its interventions, it has been proposed to expand the programme to 7 districts (i.e. Mathura, Jaunpur, Tehri Garhwal, Muzaffarnagar, Mau, Uttarkashi and Pratapgarh) in phased manner. In these districts, three blocks from each will be identified on the basis of lower female literacy rates. The programme would cover both girls' education and women's empowerment such as establishing Mahila Saksharta Kendra, Kishori Saksharta Kendra and Bal Kendras, formation of Mahila Sangh, Self Help groups etc. The MS functionaries are also involved in girl child enrolment as resource group in implementation of gender sensitive curriculum. The mission is appreciative of the efforts. **It is suggested that interface between Mahila Samakhya districts and non-MS districts should be established through experience sharing workshops, exposure visits etc.**

### 3.2.5 Distribution of Free textbooks and other incentives to SC/ST and Girls

There is no Govt. policy of distributing free textbooks to socially disadvantaged

children such as SC/ST and girls in U.P. Under UPBEP also, provisions were not made for distribution. With the introduction of DPEP, provisions are being made for distribution of free textbooks to SC/ST and girls. **It is suggested that monitoring mechanism for timely and regular distribution of textbooks should be established, as the task is stupendous in the light of absence of earlier such mechanism.**

The state has policy of distributing stipend / scholarship to SC / ST and children of minority groups. The money is meant for children's school related expenses, such as textbooks, uniforms, stationary etc. During field visits, it come out that the stipend distribution very often was untimely and irregular. In order to make the administration and distribution of incentives such as stipend / scholarship more effective, the state may review the scheme.

### **3.2.6 Book Bank Scheme**

The DPEP-II experience with regard to implementation of free text books shows that a large number of boys from families below poverty line (BPL) are not able to afford school instructional material due to economic pressures. Under DPEP-III, it is proposed to set-up a book bank in each school which will be provided with 10 sets of textbooks for the use of such children on returnable basis. Storage facilities inside the schools would be provided. In the light of large population under BPL (Below Poverty Line), the mission is appreciative of the Book Bank scheme.

### **3.2.7 Integrated Education**

As pointed out in the PIP document, around 5-10 per cent children do not enrol in primary school or drop-out due to a variety of physical or learning related disabilities. Based on the experience of UPBEP and DPEP-II, it has been envisaged that micro-planning data would reveal the number of such children in DPEP-III districts. The strategies proposed include the following.

- Survey of nature and magnitude of childhood disability.
- Formation of a block level Resource Group comprising doctors, DIET experts, BRC/NPRC Co-ordinators and specialist teachers.



- Involvement of NGOs/specialized teachers in the BRG.
- Supervision, training and guidance to teachers and parents in this regard.

It has also been pointed out that the State Resource Group constituted for integrated education under DPEP-II would be used for organising training programmes/workshops for the purpose under DPEP-III. A teachers training module and materials for parents, community and teaching developed under UPBEP and DPEP-II would also be utilized. A district co-ordinator would be appointed to look after IED activities. The interventions under integrated education would be implemented on pilot basis in one block in each district for which a provision of Rs. 17 lakhs per district has been made.

Keeping the widespread nature of the physical disabilities, the IED strategies would be expanded to other blocks in the districts. Districts with high incidence of physical disability due to flurosis poisoning such as Unnao, would be given special attention both in terms of preventive and curative measures. School Health Programme proposed under DPEP-III would also include disability component. Further convergence with Social Welfare and Health Departments would be sought for making specific aids and appliances available to the disabled children. Besides, the Mission suggests that the State IED cell may focus upon utilisation of the provisions for (i) pre-school education and (ii) itinerant teacher model, both under the centrally sponsored IED scheme and (iii) establishment of IED lab/resource unit at DIET as per MHRD Guidelines for DIETs.

### **3.2.8 Community Participation and Decentralisation of Basic Education**

Towards enhancing community participation in primary education, Uttar Pradesh has made much headway by decentralising basic education to Village Education Committees. Under the Education Act of 1972, VECs have been established throughout the state. The VECs have been strengthened through various Government orders. In keeping with the 73<sup>rd</sup> Constitutional Amendment, the Government of Uttar Pradesh has decided to delegate the management of basic education (Class I-VIII) to Village Panchayats. The GO enforces the Uttar Pradesh Basic Shiksha Adhinyam, 1972 and Panchayat Raj Adhinyam 1947 and Uttar Pradesh Kshetra Panchayat and

Zilla Panchayat Adhiniyam 1961, and provides for formation of the following committees.



The major functions of the VECs under Panchayati Raj envisaged are as follows:

- To function under the control of Khand and Zilla Shiksha Samiti;
- To assist the Headmaster and other teachers in organising activities in and outside of the school;
- To assist the basic schools in availing necessary facilities and infrastructure;
- To assist in proper management of the basic schools, supervise the attendance of the teachers and ensure their regular attendance;
- To monitor the attendance of children on a monthly basis;
- To establish new basic school, construct and repair school building;
- To supervise and monitor the construction of school building as per the plan prepared;
- To maintain properties of the school;
- To make necessary arrangements for maintenance of hand pump for drinking water and toilets in the school;
- To assess the requirement for any major repair and undertake necessary repair;
- To undertake school mapping and micro-planning for development of village education plan and be responsible for its execution;
- To forward the proceedings of the meetings to the Director of Education through Khand and Zilla Shiksha Samiti.

As per the Panchayati Raj Act of Uttar Pradesh, the village panchayat has a standing committee on education which coincides with the VEC. The new Panchayati Raj dispensation through GO endorses the powers of VEC in management and control of primary education. **In the light of decentralisation of primary education to Panchayati Raj institutions, Panchayat members at the three levels (village, khand and zilla) should be given orientation and training on planning and management of primary education.**

The membership of VEC has been extended by the recent GO to include more representatives of weaker sections, women, voluntary groups and for DPEP districts to also include parents of disabled child as members of the VEC. Under DPEP, the VEC has been assigned the responsibility of school construction, maintenance and repair of school buildings, mobilization and environment-building, supervising schools and alternative schools, conducting micro-level plans, and ensuring convergence of input/services for primary education. A training manual and a handbook for the VEC members have been developed under DPEP-II. A three day training programme has been proposed for VEC members.

Community Mobilisation is an important strategy for increasing enrolment and retention of children in primary education. Under DPEP-III, it is proposed to extend community mobilisation strategies tried and tested in DPEP-II to additional 38 districts. For instance, Kalajathas, Women's Awareness Camp, School Chalo Abhiyan etc. already in operation would also be organised in new districts. For institutional support to such strategies, NGOs' involvement in programme implementation has been sought. The SPO has drawn up detailed criteria for selection of NGO's to assist community mobilization exercises. Further with the help of Nehru Yuvak Kendra, SRGs and BRGs for community mobilisation have been formed under DPEP-II. Some NGOs such as NYK, Sahbhagi Shikshan Kendra and B.G.V.S are active in mobilisation activities in DPEP-II. A district co-ordinator would be appointed, trained and oriented for the specific tasks. Specific training/workshops/seminars would also be organised from time to time for skill development session and evaluation of field performances.

### 3.2.9 Involvement of NGOs

The DPEP-III has envisaged greater participation of non-governmental organisation to provide technical backstop. Detailed criteria have been developed for proper selection of NGOs. A number of them have already been involved in the process. Following is an account of involvement of NGOs:

LIBRARY & DOCUMENTATION DIVISION  
National Institute of Educational  
Technology and Administration,  
Sector 14, Aurobindo Marg,New Delhi-110016

Accession No. D-10375  
Date: 11/11/85

1. CREDA, Mirzapur, working to eliminate child labour from the carpet industry, helped the DIET in conducting training of Alternative school instructors.
2. Rishi Valley Education Centre, Andhra Pradesh has been engaged as consultant to train, orient and establish Alternative schools in remote areas. It also assisted in preparation of TLM in Hindi, designing of training modules, conduct training and instructors and evolve evaluation system.
3. M.V. Foundation, Andhra Pradesh was involved in organising a residential camp for non-school going and dropout children.
4. The project implementation strategy of Mahila Samakhya projects.
5. The Nehru Yuva Kendra was involved in developing a training manual and a handbook for members of VEC to build an information base and understanding on enrolment, retention, community mobilisation, micro planning etc. The volunteers of NYK, where exists, has also been included in a Resource Groups for community mobilisation at different levels.

### **3.3 Quality Improvement**

Acknowledging the lessons learnt and experience gained in the planning and implementation of UPBEP and DPEP-II, the state has identified some strategies and initiated steps to incorporate quality improvement for more effective classroom transactions. These include :

#### **Constituting State Resource Group (SRG):**

SRG has been duly constituted and they comprise of SCERT faculty, primary schools teachers, DIET faculty, experts academicians, NGOs etc. Their role is mainly to provide academic and/or technical support to the SPO. While the SRG has been oriented to the objectives of the programme and have been successful in focusing on evolving a common pedagogical vision through visioning and concept clarification workgroups, the existing regional, district and block level resource groups have also been initiated to these processes. The orientation and exposure to the resource groups under DPEP-III can build on the experiences of UPBEP and the mission suggests

Careful analysis of problems and issues of the new districts under DPEP-III which will have to be incorporated in the workshops and trainings.

The mission was informed that the SRG network now comprises about 1200 persons spread over the whole state, who are involved in guiding, assisting and implementing the different aspects of the programme. The mission endorses the commendable efforts made by the SPO in this regard.

### **Curriculum : Development and Review**

The goal of pedagogical renewal sought by the programme are to be taken up by building on the processes initiated under DPEP-II for curriculum renewal through a collaborating exercise of the DPEP and the SCERT under the overall guidance of NCERT. A core group was formed for the review of the existing curriculum through feedback from teachers experts and various stake-holders. This was followed by a 10 day workshop which focussed on clarifying essential aspects of relevance to curriculum developers. Through different systems of review the curriculum was fine tuned and accepted by the Basic Shiksha Parishad for adoption for the whole state. The mission appreciates the rigorous exercise undertaken for curricular renewal.

### **Text Book Development**

UPBEP took up the exercise of developing textbooks in languages for class I-III and Maths for Class-I by involving teachers and experts who worked with the core group in the SCERT. These books were trialled in 1997-98 and the feedback obtained was used during the review process to prepare new textbooks which would reflect the new pedagogical principles better. The process was undertaken under DPEP-II after a rigorous exercise for the identification of writers among the teachers was taken up. **The mission is of the view that the participatory mode of the textbook preparation phase needs to be reflected in the trialling and also in the review of feedback stages to ensure due consideration of ground realities.**

## **Text-Book Production and Distribution**

A state-level committee monitors and executes the production and distribution of textbooks since 1997-98. The state textbook officer is the nodal authority for textbook production for class I-VIII.

A review of the production and distribution system was done in September'98 and it suggests that certain measures could be taken for greater cost effectiveness. The preparation of a separate teacher's handbook rather than the current practice of incorporating notes and instructions to the teachers in the regular textbook has been suggested which is appreciated by the mission. Design, layout, readability, preparation of camera ready copy are other areas where right kind of interventions are suggested as being required for improving the quality of textbooks and reducing the manufacturing costs and the sale price of the textbook.

The state has proposed to strengthen the state textbook office by providing DTP machines for ensuring quality control over textbook development as well as their production. **The mission recommends this intervention alongwith the strengthening of the state textbook office for ensuring timely production and distribution of the textbooks. The state plans to print the cover page at the textbook office and tendering out the printing of the cameras ready copies to ensure timely availability of all the text books a clear distribution system needs to be elaborated upon by the state in the plan.**

## **Teaching Learning Material**

Under DPEP-III, SCERT will promote the use of supplementary learning materials developed in 'Indradhanush' series for children for class I to V and will initiate programmes for selected Blocks/Schools to develop wall newspapers, science corners, learning corners and activity banks.

The state has also proposed to produce textbook specific TLM as a part of pedagogical renewal programme. This material will be prepared by the teachers after undergoing training through DIETs and BRCs and will be exhibited in the material

melas to be held regularly at the cluster and block levels. This is a well planned and useful strategy.

DIET will be responsible to develop local specific material in the local dialects in order to facilitate language learning, comprehension and enhanced achievement levels amongst children. Agreeing with the State's view that the content of these material should enrich the teaching learning process rather than adding on to the curricular load, **the mission suggests that the DIETs may undertake development of supplementary materials related to local history, geography and culture alongwith adaptations for disabled children, as highlighted in the 'Guidelines for DIETs' issued by MHRD.**

### **Qualitative Classroom Processes**

The issue of bringing qualitative change in classroom processes has been well-attempted by UP-SCERT. Experiences in DPEP-II have made a dent upon production and usage of TLM in the classroom so as the SCERT intends to bring production of textbook specific TLM under sharp focus in DPEP-III, through the round of motivational training of teachers in Year 1, supported by DIET and BRC level workshops for TLM - preparation and followed by CRC (NPRC) level meetings of teachers to prepare text-book lesson-wise and TLM using locally available materials. Encouragement to teachers' endeavour for making classroom practices effective through TLM has been envisaged through 'material melas' at CRC, BRC, District and regional level.

The State Council (SCERT) does also commit development of supplementary reading materials for children alongwith development of multigrade specific and large-class-specific teaching - learning strategies for use by teachers. **The Mission underlines the crucial role of DIETs/BRC/NPRC in this process through identification of teachers who may really contribute / innovate. It would be desirable if some studies of ethnographic studies/participative observation are conducted on classroom processes in selected/identified multigrade and large-class settings to analyse what really happens there. This will help in planning realistic strategies for classroom transaction.**

## **Teacher Training**

The state plan reflects the importance being assigned by DPEP-III in utilizing the experiences of UPBEP and DPEP-II to spearhead the strategies for training. Recognising the pivotal role of the teachers as key functionaries in the delivery of the quality improvements sought under the programme, the over-all training strategy is important. Also, in this regard the support systems and organisational adjustment at DIET, BRC, NPRC and school level are significant.

### **In-service trainings**

Under DPEP-III, the training packages are committed to be flexible and easily adaptable to time, place and group-specific needs. The 5 theme based in-service training programmes planned for the 5 year period include:

- Motivational round with inputs on teaching-learning methodology.
- Training for use of new textbooks for class I - III
- Training for use of new textbooks for class IV-V
- Content based training : Language & EVS
- Content based training : mathematics

**The state plans to focus on textbook based trainings from the 2nd year onwards. The state may examine the issue of classroom management issues and strategies especially with respect to multigrade and large class settings in these training programmes.**

As an intervention for quality improvement, teacher training strategy has been elaborated in the State plan. While SCERT and SIEMAT budget do show the trainings being costed, greater detailing needs to be provided on the activities.

The district plans need to clearly specify the modalities of trainings that will be the responsibility of the district and sub-district institutions. The training chart (which has



been presented by a large majority of the districts) needs to identify the specific institutions which will be taking up the assigned task. The costing tables for the districts need to specify activities and personnel involved in these exercises.

### **Induction training**

Para teachers and Alternative school instructors will be given 30 day induction trainings and recurrent trainings are also planned. The SCERT will be designing the training packages and training the master trainers also. The costing for para teacher material development in the SCERT budget shows a recurring cost of Rs. 250,000 over the 5 year project period. The costing break-up shows, preparation of induction training module at Rs. 1,00,000 which will be a one-time project activity with revisions and possible review by year 3. Presenting this activity as a recurring expenditure needs to be explained carefully in the plans. The mission suggests the SRG to consider if a common module of induction training could be possible for both groups – AS shiksha karmi and EGS Acharyaji since both are required to teach classes I and II only.

### **Multi-grade Teaching**

The State plans to develop a concrete strategy for focusing on the prevalent situation found in a large number of classrooms viz., multi-grade situation based on exposure visits and collection of materials from different sources. The state has costed Rs. 56.64 lakhs while the SCERT has projected a cost of Rs. 9.15 lakh for the development of training material and self-learning material etc. The State plan needs to reflect the mode of operationalisation the multi-grade strategy so that clarity in role identification and job assignment is established and there is no duplication of activities.

The focus on large classroom teaching has been mentioned as an important issue that needs some strategies for quality interventions. The mission suggests that SCERT may consider the developing/defining of special strategies for large class teaching alongwith those for multigrade teaching during year 1 so that textbook based training programmes in years 2 and 3 could do justice with both settings.

## **Research and Evaluation**

SIEMAT and SCERT are envisaged as the nodal agencies which will undertake the task of conducting action research, programme implementation related studies, training & management related studies and also building the capacity of the district and sub-district institutions to take up action research. These agencies will also be responsible for promoting research through a) sponsored research, b) research fellowship and c) collaborative research with the district, state, national and international organisations, including NGOs and universities.

The State is appreciative of the role of research in promoting quality of education and has entrusted this task to SIEMAT, SCERT, DIETs while SPO will also be responsible for the conduct of emerging related issues.

The SCERT has been identified as the primary agency which will conduct both concurrent and mid-term evaluation studies for project related intervention under DPEP-III. Aspects for research will include AS, integrated education, BRC and NPRC roles, performance of DIETs and it will also continue to conduct the Learner Achievement Studies in the 1st, 3rd and final year of the project. It will ensure dissemination of the districts and to project planners and implementors. The dissemination of research findings are to be incorporated as an integral part of the research activities.

### **3.4 Capacity building programme and Institutional Development**

With the experience of Basic Education Project, the state has established a regular practice of in-service training involving various institutions at state, regional, district and sub district levels. The same will be utilized for DPEP-III districts as well. The mission notes that most of the structures are already established and functioning. However, certain aspects regarding these structures must be carefully looked into.

## **State Council of Educational Research and Training**

The SCERT in UP is an established institution having various departments specialising in different areas of education and pedagogy. Under SCERT, resource groups for specific areas have been established for teacher's training, development of instructional materials, conduct of baseline achievement studies, development of evaluation systems, etc. The capacity of resource groups to plan and effect educational interventions is built up from time to time through provision of specialised training inputs and exposure to advanced information.

SCERT plays a key role in the areas of multigrade teaching, alternative schooling, IED, capacity building of DIETs, teacher training, curriculum & textbook revision, development of supplementary materials, research and evaluation, training for para teachers, EGS teachers etc. It functions through its 11 departments namely Departments of Elementary Education, science and mathematics, humanities & social sciences, education and foreign languages, education expansion & audio visual education. Psychology & guidance, Hindi & other Indian languages, curriculum and evaluation, planning and management, vocational education, non formal education.

SCERT has played a central role in the academic charter of UPBEP I & II as well as DPEP-II. Under DPEP-III, thrust is on building its capacity and that of its subordinate departments. Since it is involved in developing and implementing programmes to improve primary level teaching processes and in building and strengthening the capacity of DIETs, its role is crucial. SCERT is envisaged to play a key role in the areas of multigrade teaching, alternative schooling, IED, capacity building of DIETs, teacher training, curriculum & textbook revision, development of supplementary materials, research and evaluation. The state proposes to build and strengthen its capacity in terms of alternative schooling, integrated education and distance education. Further, realising the scope of SCERT to network with resource institutions and in drawing pools of resource persons from State, NGO sector and national level, its strengthening is considered crucial.

For this the capacity development of SCERT in general and its subordinate department/institutions in particular will be undertaken. It has also been proposed to

build capacity of the resource groups through provision of specialized training inputs. The state has also proposed to strengthen the DPEP cell created in SCERT and the five departments functioning under it.

The strengthening of DPEP cell is proposed in terms of additional staff comprising of consultants, support staff and infrastructure consisting of additional office space, equipment etc. Also the other departments like SISE, Hindi sansthan, Bureau of psychology will be strengthened through library enrichment. The mission feels that the strengthening of SCERT seems justifiable in terms of the extensive responsibilities that it has with respect to DPEP. However, there seems to be duplication in some of the activities proposed to be undertaken at SCERT and SPO levels, especially with respect to module development for AS, multigrade etc. this needs to be looked into and avoided or clarifications must be given in the plans for each of these activities undertaken at these levels.

### **State Institute Of Educational Management And Training**

SIEMAT is an already established permanent institution consciously set up by the state. For undertaking activities such as in-service and pre induction training programmes for teachers, training for educational planners and administrators, orientation of stakeholders, NGOs, community leaders, etc., organisation of seminars, thematic workshops related to educational planning and management, capacity building at district and sub district level, managing and utilising EMIS, carrying out micro planning and school mapping, preparing annual work plans and budgets, providing technical support to SPO and SCERT, activities in research and evaluation, documentation and dissemination of innovations and experiments in the area of educational planning, management and assessment. There are other responsibilities of SIEMAT which involve providing professional and resource support in educational planning and management etc. Under DPEP-III it is envisaged to take up documentation and dissemination by the publication of various research study reports and papers, organisation of seminars, conferences, workshops etc and organisation of training for various personnel.

SIEMAT realises the gamut of activities both for project district staff as well as capacity building for DIETs educational administrators and thus has proposed strengthening in terms of faculty infrastructure as well as training budgets.

While the staff position and technical capacity of SIEMAT has significantly improved since the visit of the identification mission, this mission is of the view that capacity building of SIEMAT faculty must be focussed upon through some training programmes and similar exercises.

**The mission notes that SCERT and SIEMAT are the two nodal agencies undertaking a major part of the DPEP trainings . It is important that they network and establish linkages to evolve more comprehensive understanding of their respective tasks.** In this regard the mission recognises the effort of the co-ordination committee for training at SCERT but feels that a more rigorous communication system needs to be set up. At the state level wrap-up this need has been recognised.

#### **State Institute Of Educational Technology**

UPDPEP aims to evolve a sustainable system of in-service teacher training linked to its pedagogical improvement programme using distance education technology. Under DPEP-III, capacity building of institutions and individuals for the use of distance education technology will be undertaken. Other activities will be development and production of DL material, delivery of distance learning material and feedback collection.

For this, results of various workshops organised at the state level under DPEP-II will be used. These workshops were held specifically to identify specific themes and content briefs, difficult areas in teacher training packages and for reviewing existing DL materials.

The State has also developed a work-plan on distance education which will comprise of the following activities.

- Capacity building of institutions and individuals for use of DE technology. Development and production of distance learning materials, Delivery of distance learning material, Feed back mechanism.
- Deliberations through a series of workshops have led the state team to identification of training areas which require specific video component in distance learning mode.

The state proposes to build the capacity in SIET in the area of designing, developing and producing audio-video and print materials. For this, the state has earmarked an amount of 43.2 lakhs which basically involves capacity building of the SIET staff and strengthening in terms of infrastructure.

SIET is also the key institution to undertake the enormous task of providing effective distance learning materials for varying target groups of district, block, NPRC and village/community level functionaries. The state plans to develop materials addressed to pre-service/in-service training, documentation of good/successful services and development of learning materials/teaching aids for teachers.

The mission appreciates the endeavour of the State so far and suggests that local specificity and relevance may be attempted in the generation of distance learning materials through identification of innovative practices, action research in hard pockets and workshops on local-specific curriculum development organised by DIETs.

SIET will also undertake documentation of good and successful practices and their dissemination. The mission feels that this is an important exercise, which will enable cross-district sharing. *Efforts could also be directed at collecting and disseminating valuable experiences of other states in order to learn from their experiences as well.*

### **State Project Office**

A state project office set-up under UP EFAPB for implementation of the UP BEP had been expanded to meet the requirements of DPEP-II. The SPO headed by SPD is responsible for the day to day management, administration, implementation and monitoring of the project.

Under DPEP-III, the state proposes to strengthen and restructure SPO with additional staff, equipment etc. Alongwith others, the proposal has been made for distance education co-ordinator, senior professionals in civil works, alternative schooling, girls education, quality improvement, media and documentation, research and evaluation, IED and community mobilization. These posts are other than those existing under DPEP-II. The requirement for this staff is rationalised by the need for necessary academic support to the districts and programme in implementation as well as to ensure monitoring and supervision for time bound implementation and quality control.

**Training has been proposed for SPO staff in their respective areas of specialisation by NSDART and SIEMAT. This strategy has been incorporated in the first year plan and will be taken up in the subsequent years according to the need felt, as informed by SPO.**

#### **Divisional Project Office**

In the field of basic education, the assistant director of education is the representative of the basic education directorate at the district level. There are 19 divisions in UP. Considering the mass coverage of districts under DPEP-II and III, the state has proposed a DPEP monitoring unit at the divisional level. This will act as a level between the State Project office and the DPO for the purpose of monitoring, supervision and co-ordination of the DPEP activities. There are 19 such units proposed. Each divisional office will consist of one deputy project director alongwith support staff. The SPO has clarified that this will be in the form of strengthening the existing divisional office.

The DPD will be responsible for monitoring, supervision and coordination of the implementation of DPEP activities in the districts. He/she will also attend DIET ARG meetings and monitor quality improvement programmes implemented by DIETs/BRC/NPRC. **While the establishment of Divisional Project offices seems to be an appropriate step to ensure rigorous monitoring of the programme, the**

**mission is of the view that the staff may be specifically trained in the processes of educational renewal and must not be saddled with the routine duties of the office.**

### **District Institute Of Education And Training**

The role of DIETs is crucial in planning and managing programme delivery in order to improve the quality and expand the access to primary education. The functions of DIET relate to

- training and orientation of teachers, instructors, supervisors, VECs, resource persons,
- academic and resource support to the elementary and adult education in the district.
- action research and experimentation to deal with specific problems of the district in achieving the objectives in the area of elementary and adult education.

All 38 project districts except six newly constituted districts have DIETs. In the six newly constituted districts, the activities related to DIETs will be undertaken by the DIETs of the neighbouring districts.

Under DPEP-III, DIETs will be responsible for the training of in-service teachers in the district. DIET staff will be trained as master trainers of the in-service teachers training programme. They will, in turn train resource persons who will conduct training at block level. In addition, new teachers will be given bridge courses and para teachers will also be trained by DIETs. DIETs will also provide technical support to BRCs and NPRCs, training to ECCE workers, AS instructors, obtain regular feedback on training, be involved with material development, conduct action research on locally relevant educational issues, data analyses and study problems of special groups in the district for target interventions.

In order to ensure co-ordination between DIETs and the educational administrative framework in the district an academic resource group consisting of teachers, BRCC, NPRCCs, experts etc. has been proposed in each of the districts.



Given the enormous task under DPEP, it has been proposed to strengthen DIETs by provision of equipments, books, infrastructure and for carrying out assigned activities.

The mission is of the view that the activities, functions of DIET in the district plans in general, must be elaborated upon.

It has been noted that although many DIETs have substantial staff but still some of the DIETs like Kanpur Dehat, are more or less non functional due to lack of staff, building and infrastructure. **There is an urgent need to recruit the faculty and staff in DIETs to make them fully functional in order to undertake its responsibility efficiently. The state agreed with this view in the final wrap up and intends to fill up all lecturer posts at the earliest. In this regard, the mission endorses the state policy of inducting four primary school teachers in the DIET faculty and training them in new pedagogy which is a critical aspect in this area.**

The mission feels that it is extremely important to ensure that DIETs are involved in all the project activities right from the beginning. The mission recognises and appreciates the effort of the state in this direction. **However since most of the DIET faculty involved in project activities comes from secondary education system, it must be ensured that they are given field based orientation and training in aspects related to primary education. Regular faculty programmes for DIET faculty in SCERT are also being planned for this purpose.**

As part of the capacity building exercise for DIET faculty, the lab area has been limited to 10-12 km radius on administrative grounds. **The mission is of the view that implementation of lab-area concept at the DIETs limited to 12 kms. radius violates the spirit of action research, particularly in hard pockets within the district. Therefore, the lab-area may be defined in terms of selected different geographical or social areas for experimentation. The suggestion was agreed upon in the state level wrap-up.**

## **Block Resource Centre/Nyaya Panchayat Resource Centre**

This concept is not new for UP as such structures have already been established under UP-BEP and are activity functioning. BRCs have been recognised as structures for providing both academic and supervision support to primary schools NPRCs. Each BRC will also provide guidance and technical support to NPRCs and handle monitoring and evaluation of NPRCs. NPRCs have been envisaged as structures providing support to primary schools. These have been set up in 20 districts of UP BEP and are proposed to be established in all 38 DPEP-III districts. It has also been proposed to establish a NPRC by adding an additional room in the central school (Sankul Vidyalaya). Besides training, NPRC will also act as a forum for sharing of experiences by teachers amongst themselves, resource support to teachers, for preparation of TLM and TLA and evaluation and monitoring.

In light of the above responsibilities, the identification and training of BRC/NPRC coordinators needs to be undertaken carefully and urgently.

**The mission is of the view that the academic support system through BRC/NPRC needs to be energised for their early operationalisation. In DPEP districts, the state intends to strengthen these extensively through SCERT and DIETs. Cognizant of its importance the state agreed to take up this activity on a priority basis.** Considering the responsibility of supervision of schools as a major activity at the block level, the state has proposed a strategy of empowering the block project officer with additional support in terms of conveyance to promote their mobility.

### **3.5.0 Civil Works**

U.P. has the rich experience of completing civil work across 12 BEP districts already. The civil works proposed in 38 districts mainly consists of :

- New Schools Building
- Additional classrooms
- Construction of ECCE rooms
- Reconstruction of schools with dilapidated buildings

- Construction of BRCs
- Construction of NPRCs
- Construction of toilets
- Major/minor repairs
- Arrangement of drinking water facility

New schools will be opened in habitations with no schools, which qualify as per state norms and buildingless schools. Locations will be identified on the basis of micro-planning during first year of the project period.

All single room schools will be converted to two room schools. In addition where student strength is higher, additional room has been provided for.

Emphasis will be given on providing toilets to all schools which are without toilets.

Construction activities proposed in the first year (six months) of the project should be planned carefully.

Activities during this period will be, site finalization, preparation of designs and estimates. Training of Engineers, orientation to the construction and repair manual and training of VEC members.

All civil works are proposed to be completed by the end of third year of the project.

At state level DPEP civil works interventions consists of SIEMAT and SCERT DPEP cell expansion.

The strength of civil works plan are :

- The experience gained through UPBEP and DPEP-II implementation.
- Well defined convergence parameters.
- Community participation in the process.

The issues confronting the districts are :

- Inadequate existing infrastructure leading to overcrowding.

- Dilapidated state of existing infrastructure in absence of a well defined civil works repairs and maintenance system.
- Requirement of additional infrastructure, in dispersed population areas especially in hill districts.
- Need for appropriate design of structure in hill districts especially in snowbound region.
- Site selection criteria for hilly terrain.
- Inadequate infrastructure facilities at DIETs & SIEMAT level.

### **3.5.01 Planning**

The state and district plans reflect the infrastructure needs and proposals for DPEP-III interventions. At district level 24% ceiling of the total project cost for civil works, has been by and large followed. Two districts viz. Jalaun, and Gazipur at 26.86% and 24.24% of the total cost respectively, have civil works component higher than the DPEP norm.

**It is recommended that the civil works cost for the two district (Jalaun, and Gazipur) may be brought within 24% ceiling.**

The costing of civil works as part of strengthening of SIEMAT is 63 lakhs. while under state component the civil work cost works out to 22 lakhs.

Details of state and districts civil works costs are as per Table 3.5.1.

Comments on component wise planning aspects of DPEP III civil works are as follows :

#### **SIEMAT**

The state plans to augment its infrastructure facilities at SIEMAT to take the additional load of DPEP-III as also as a long term plan to raise this institute to regional level institute.

## **SCERT**

SCERT DPEP cell expansion proposal was scrutinised.

**The state was requested to incorporate the minor corrections viz. Shifting furniture items like table, chair, carpet etc. from civil works head. The same has been modified.**

## **DIETs**

DIETs play an important role in the capacity building process under DPEP interventions and are thus, crucial to the success of these intervention. The state has planned for a number of training programmes at DIETs with this objective.

No civil works are proposed to be undertaken at DIETs.

It was observed during district visit that the existing DIET infrastructure was badly in need of proper maintenance and repairs and suffered from inadequate water supply. It is understood from subsequent discussions with other districts teams that this is a common issue across most of the districts and needs urgent attention.

**It is therefore recommended that state should look into improving and augmenting the DIETs infrastructure, wherever required, to create an environment more conducive to learning, while retaining the 24% ceiling on civil works of the district as per DPEP norms. If due to non-availability of funds this is not possible, GOI may be requested for grant of more funds for this purpose.**

## **BRC's**

BRC's would be opened in all the blocks of 35 districts. In Azamgarh district construction of 22 BRCs is proposed for 21 blocks. In Gautam Budh Nagar and Faizabad districts, there would be 4 and 8 BRCs for 4.5 and 9 blocks respectively.

The total number of BRC's is 426. Average unit cost is Rs. 8,00,000.00. The BRC design prepared for DPEP-II are proposed to be followed in DPEP-III.

Construction of BRCs will be taken up through national shopping. Construction management and supervision is being arranged at state level through consultancy assignment.

During discussion at state level it emerged that under DPEP-II, construction management and supervision is being provided through a state government undertaking (UP Jal Nigam).

The fee payable to the agency has been mentioned as 9% of the cost of BRC.

**In few districts this is nowhere documented that the same system of construction management and supervision will be adopted. The cost of consultancy was also not taken into account either in district plans or state budget. This aspect of consultancy arrangement may be clarified in the document and provision of consultancy may be made.**

This aspect has been looked into by state and provision for consultancy has been made in each district budget.

### **New Primary Schools**

State is putting the experience gained in DPEP-II to good use by picking up the school designs prototype developed in DPEP-II for implementation in phase-III as well. For hill region, the state proposes to adopt the designs developed under UPBEP for Pauri Garhwal region. This approach would certainly speed up the process of implementation.

However, it must be kept in mind that snow bound or difficult to access regions in hill districts would impose their own design requirements.

**Hence, it is recommended that the state should develop the designs keeping in view local specificity of these areas. Further, resource mapping exercise should be conducted before design development work is started for these areas.**

Another area of concern is the site selection criteria in hilly region. Standard guidelines of DPEP like availability of one acre of land etc. can not be followed for these regions. Additional factors like proximity to water supply, land slides free zone etc. need to be included in these consideration.

**Hence, it is recommended that the districts should carry out site selection keeping these additional, local specific factors in mind. State should help in formulating these norms.**

### **ECCE Centres**

Construction of ECCE centres close to school have been proposed in 8 districts to enable girl child attend school instead of sibling care responsibility at home. While the strategy is beyond question, the number of ECCE rooms proposed seem arbitrary and without any base data.

**It is recommended that number of ECCE room proposed in a district should be based on detailed microplanning and school mapping exercise.**

### **Toilets**

Lack of proper toilet facilities is one of the major constraint in the enrollment/retention of girl child. It is also a factor in generally unhygienic conditions in the school.

During the district visit, it was observed by all the three teams that even where toilets had been provided, they were non functional due to lack of water.

**It was suggested that the drain water from the hand pump should be allowed to drain into the toilets, by locating water platform at a higher level-a system devised in Bihar DPEP.**

Care should be taken, however, to keep the bore pipe of hand pump at least 20 mts. away from the toilet soak pit to avoid contamination of ground water source with the leachates from soak pit.

### **Drinking Water Supply**

The system of water supply i.e., installing mark II hand pumps, proposed in the plan, shall not work in most of the hill areas.

**It is recommended that State should plan for alternative sources of water supply in hill areas.**

In certain pockets of hill areas, acute shortage of drinking water exists due to considerable distance from the nearest source of water. Under UPBEP, children in such areas were provided water bottles for carrying water while coming to school. However, this does not solve the need of water for toilets. A suggestion made by one of the district team was to go in for water harvesting.

**It is suggested that state should study the feasibility of this option as the topography of hills permits a collection tank at a higher elevation on the ground, enabling gravity flow of the stored water.**

**It is recommended that the water supply for all civil works should be made available before start of construction work so that there is no paucity of water at the time of execution of these works.**

### **Repairs and Maintenance**

As per PIP a total of 9167 existing schools are in need of repairs. A lump sum amount of Rs 20,000/- per school has been kept for the purpose, as average cost.

**Detailed survey and inspection should be taken up required before finalisation of actual expenses especially in case of major repairs.**



A repair manual for minor repairs had been prepared under UPBEP and is in the process of being updated. While all districts plans propose to start this activity in the first year itself, not a single district has included it in their Implementation Plan for the first year. (Taken as Oct. 99 to Sept. 2000 in district plans).

**It is suggested that the part of the Civil Works, especially minor repairs, where VECs could take independent decision based on repair manual, should be taken up at the earliest.**

This would quickly get VECs into construction mode, familiarising them with various aspects of civil work viz. procurement, supervision etc., with minimum initial input. The experience and confidence thus gained by the VECs would stand them in good stead once major works start.

Moreover, as repairs require lesser time to complete, they act as effective visible indicators of DPEP interventions.

### **3.5.02 Designs**

Under DPEP-II, cost effective technology process of preparing innovative designs for primary school building is going on. Five designs have been identified based on outcomes of various state experiments. Based on these designs construction is underway, in DPEP II.

Drawings and Models of these designs were on display a SPO. It was heartening to note that all the design alternatives had duly incorporated the IED interventions in them. However, except for two designs, the other proposals were silent on the class room seating arrangements for multigrade teaching.

This factor may be looked into.

As mentioned earlier, new designs need to be developed for snow bound and difficult to access areas in hilly regions.

The total civil works cost works out to 176.83 crore in all 38 district which is 22.3% of total project cost.

Unit costs have been worked out on the basis of prevailing market prices.

### **3.5.03 Convergence**

It is observed that only 40% of school construction/additional classrooms / NPRC is being charged to DPEP and the balance is being provided through other schemes like JRY. Only the BRC cost of Rs. 8 lakhs is being funded fully through DPEP fund.

### **3.5.04 Construction Manual**

Construction manual part I was ready and part II was complete for one Design Alternative.

It was found during discussions with state team that the prototypes proposed under DPEP II are at various stages at construction, and roofing was yet to be taken up in all cases.

It is suggested that experience gained and lessons learnt during hands on experience of prototype construction should be reflected in the manual.

**It is recommended that construction manuals for all design alternatives should be made ready before start of project work.**

### **3.5.05 Implementation**

At the village level all constructions are given to VECs, who are to be trained for the purpose. Technical manuals are in the process of finalisation.

Technical guidance/supervision is being arranged separately in each district at district and block level, by appointing AE & JEs.

Since, all construction activity by the District is proposed to be taken up through VECs, VEC training is a crucial factor in the success of Civil Works component of DPEP.

It is proposed by the state to train them at the start at execution of works in district on the various civil works aspects.

**VEC training** should include maintenance of toilets as well since this is one facility that is routinely neglected and slowly becomes unusable due to lack of maintenance.

### **3.5.07 Civil Works Management Co-ordination**

Total project co-ordination for UP BEP and DPEP-II civil works is being carried out by two persons team at State level.

Under DPEP-III work responsibility of co-ordination of SIEMAT, SPO, and 426 BRCs would be on SPO team. It is felt that the manpower available to undertake additional workload of DPEP-III is insufficient. The state plan proposal indicates additional posts of civil works senior professionals. However the no. of additional posts and tentative date of appointment is not indicated.

**It is suggested that provision of engaging professional consultants may be made as and when required.**

## **SECTION 4 : MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND MIS**

The programme in 38 expansion districts to be covered under DPEP-III, in Uttar Pradesh will be managed by U.P. Education For All Project Board (UPEFAPB), the society which is managing the U.P. Basic Education Project (UPBEP) and DPEP-II districts in the state. The UPEFA Project Board established in May 1993 under Societies Registration Act is responsible for guidance and coordination of overall project implementation, allocate funds to approved programmes, maintain project accounts, coordinate procurement and monitor the progress of implementation of programme in the state.

The Project Board comprises of a General Council which is the apex authority of the project and provides overall policy guidelines and direction for the implementation of project activities. The second important body is the 'Executive Committee' which has all administrative, financial and executive authority to achieve the objectives of the project, including the power to create posts and make appointments. The 'General Council' and the 'Executive Committee' are headed the Chief Minister and the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh respectively. The State Project Director, who has overall responsibility of implementation of the project is the Member-Secretary of both these bodies.

Apart from the above mentioned bodies, 6 committees have been formed at the state level to facilitate decision-making and expedite the executive of various activities to ensure proper and speedy implementation of the project. These committees having specific responsibility are Finance Committee, Programme Committee, Policy Research Advisory Committee, MIS Committee, Training Task Force and Curriculum Review Panel.

It may be mentioned here that the existing UPEFA Project Board management structure including all the above mentioned committees which are responsible for the implementation of U.P. Basic Education Project and DPEP-II will take the responsibility of DPEP-III also in the state.

## **State Project Office (S.P.O.)**

The State Project Office set up under UPEFA Project Board for implementation of U.P. Basic Education Project and expands to meet the DPEP-II requirements will further be expanded to meet the requirements of DPEP-III also in the state. Since S.P.O. will be responsible for implementation of programme (DPEP) in 38 additional districts the state has proposed to strengthen and restructure the State Project Office with additional staff and equipments.

The staffing pattern in the State Project Office under UPBEP, DPEP-II and the proposed staff for DPEP-III is presented in Annexure table 5. The staffing pattern shows that there are 77 positions sanctioned under UPBEP and 43 positions under DPEP-II in the State Project Office. For DPEP-III it has been proposed to create 70 positions which may not be in addition to 77 positions of UPBEP but will substitute them after March 2000 when the U.P. Basic Education Project comes to an end. The number of positions, as proposed in the state component plan, in S.P.O. after March 2000 will be 43 + 70 i.e. 113. Out of these positions 70 positions will be funded from DPEP-III while rest 43 will continue under the DPEP-II funding. The details of the positions are given in Annexure table 4.5.

The proposal for staffing under DPEP-III as mentioned in the State Component Plan, has taken into consideration, the experience of existing staffing, the indicative staffing pattern of DPEP as communicated by GOI and the minimum staff requirements for an expanded programme.

**The proposal for staffing in DPEP-III seems to have a departure from the GOI suggestive staffing pattern. However, keeping in view that programme is to be implemented in additional 38 districts, Mission feels that such departure may be allowed as the staffing proposed under DPEP-III is justified. It has further been justified because the positions proposed will be substituting the sanctioned posts of UPBEP rather than any net addition to it.**

As given in the State Component Plan these 70 positions proposed under DPEP-III will be filled up in a phased manner. As per plan out of 70 positions 25 are proposed

to be filled up in 1999, another 43 positions are proposed to be filled up in 2000 while rest 2 positions namely Administrative Officer and Distance Education Co-ordinator will be filled up in 2002. These two have been taken in 2002 because one person on each of these positions is already in place under DPEP-II funding. The details of filling up the respective positions in various years are presented in Annexure table 4.6. It is with a view that S.P.O. staffing will persist with certain posts of UPBEP till March 2000 and fill up the commensurate DPEP-III posts only thereafter.

Mission appreciates that the plan for filling up the positions, proposed under DPEP-III, has been taken in a phased manner depending up the necessity of the positions as and when those are needed in S.P.O.

For strengthening the State Project Office in terms of equipments it has been proposed to procure hardware and software for EMIS/PMIS monitoring and documentation. It includes procurement of 4 computers with accessories, 1 laptop, 1 heavy duty laser printer, computer software and 2 Air Conditioners. These additional equipments are proposed in view of the increased workload of handling 77 districts in the state. Apart from equipping MIS cell the proposal for equipping S.P.O. includes procurement of 2 type writers, 1 photocopier, 1 LCD projector, 1 TV and VCR, 2 vehicles (one for Additional SPD and one for common pool) and some furniture.

### **Divisional Project Office**

The state is divided into 19 administrative divisions and on an average each division has jurisdiction over 4 to 5 districts. In the field of basic education Assistant Director of Basic Education is the incharge of the division. He coordinates the activities of districts under his jurisdiction, reviews the progress of implementation of various schemes and is also responsible for inter-departmental coordination at the division level.

Since after inception of DPEP-III the State Project Office will have the responsibility of monitoring and co-ordinating the implementation of programme in 77 out of total 83 districts in the state, it has been proposed in the State Component Plan to establish divisional project office at all the divisional headquarters of the state. This office will

not only coordinate the DPEP activities of districts but will also strengthen the office of A.D. (Basic) so as to ensure full involvement of this office in DPEP as well as help in routine administrative activities of this office. This divisional office of DPEP is to be headed by A.D. (Basic) and it is proposed to have a staff of 5 more persons. These are: Deputy Project Director (DPEP), Steno, Clerk-cum-Computer Operator, Driver and a Peon-cum-Messengers. For making the Divisional Office functional it has been proposed to provide office equipments such as Computer, Fax machine, photocopier, furniture, materials and one vehicle to each of the 19 Divisional Offices.

The Divisional Project Office will monitor, supervise and coordinate the implementation of DPEP activities in the districts that come under the jurisdiction of the division. The State Project Office will, as mentioned in the state component plan, delegate adequate administrative functions to the Dy. Project Director (DPÉP).

The responsibilities proposed to be assigned to the Dy. Project Director (DPEP) include : (1) Monitoring of project districts in jurisdiction (2) Supervisory field visits, (3) Ensuring PMIS and Project Indicator Reports on monthly basis to SPO (4) Monitoring Progress of civil works (5) Timely and quality control over EMIS data collection and analysis (6) Attend the DPEC meetings of project districts (7) Attend S.P.O. meeting (8) Regular monitoring of DIETs in their jurisdiction, activation of DIETs capacities for project purposes (9) Attend DIET Academic Resource Group meetings and monitor quality improvement programmes being implemented by DIETs.BRCs/NPRC's (10) Monitoring and quality checks on distribution of incentives grants given by the project (11) Monitor micro-planning and VEC participation in school management in project districts and (12) Provide administrative support to DPO through local problem solving, ensuring coordination of DPO with DIETs, interacting with District Magistrates and Divisional Commissioners for administrative support to the project and net working with other government departments, Universities, NGOs etc. for convergence and resource support.

Mission is of the view that the proposal of setting up of Divisional Offices is justified keeping in view the number of districts to be covered and the diversity in

geographical condition of the state. However, in this regard Mission has the following suggestions.

- **Utmost care needs to be taken in selecting/recruiting the person on the position of Dy. Project Director. It is therefore suggested that person having experience in administration of primary education may be selected for the job.**
- **Keeping in view the responsibility assigned to the Divisional Project Office the capacity building of not only Dy. Project Director but also of A.D. (Basic) is very important. It is therefore suggested that training/orientation of these key officials of Divisional Project office should be ensured.**
- **It should be ensured that authority alongwith responsibility is delegated to the Divisional Project Offices in real sense so as to ensure that these offices do not act only as Post office to take information from districts project offices to pass them on to the state project office.**
- **It should be ensured that Divisional Project Office may not become only administrative controller of the District Project Office but they should provide academic leadership to not only D.P.O. but also to the DIETs coming under their jurisdiction.**

#### **District Project Office (D.P.O.)**

At the district level the implementation of DPEP will be supervised and monitored by District Education Project Committee (DPEC). The committee will be headed by the District Magistrate (D.M.) while Chief Development Officers (C.D.O.) will be its vice chairman. The Basic Shiksha Adhikari (BSA) of the district will be its member-Secretary. The committee will be represented by NGOs, women social workers, DIET Principal, member of local bodies. All district level key officials will also be its member.

The District Project Office (DPO) will be responsible for implementation of the programme in the district as also for the preparation of annual work plan and budget. This office will be headed by Basic Shiksha Adhikari who will be designated as District Project Officer. The DPO will function under the direct supervision of



DM/CDO. In addition to District Project Officer, the Dy. Basic Shiksha Adhikaris (2-3 in each district) will be designated as Dy. Project Officer so as to make them responsible for overall monitoring of project activities in their respective geographical jurisdiction which are sub-division of the district.

Mission appreciates that at the district level co-ordination between existing educational administration and newly created project management structure is ensured by designating the BSA and Dy. BSA as District Project Officer and Dy. Project Officers respectively.

The D.P.O. is proposed to have 5 programme coordinators including one programme coordinator (IED), one Asstt. Finance and Accounts officer, one Asstt. Engineer, one computer operator, one Accountant, one Asstt Accountant, one steno, one typist, Driver and 3 peons. In addition to these one Junior Engineer per block for the blocks having more than 10 works is accounted. In the blocks where there are less than 10 works one Junior Engineer for 2 blocks will be taken. Thus each district will workout the requirement and the number of Junior Engineers will be accordingly recruited.

### **Block Project Office**

At the block level Block Education Advisory Committee (BEAC) is proposed to be constituted under the chairmanship of elected Block Pramukh. The committee will have wide representation of stakeholders of the locality. The Asstt. Basic Shiksha Adhikari (ABSA) who is a block level education officer will be its member secretary.

In large districts of Uttar Pradesh the experience of UPBEP and DPEP-II, as mentioned in the state component plan, has established the need for strengthening the block level office for primary education so that more decentralised monitoring and relevant/timely support can be made available to the schools, clusters and BRCs as well as for more effective feed back systems. It has therefore been proposed to make the ABSA specifically responsible for these sets of project activities. The ABSA has therefore been designated as ex-officio Block Project Officer. Since ABSA has no office room at the block headquarter it has been proposed that BRC building will have a small office accommodation for ABSA and he will be given grant for office stationary TA/DA and will also be provided a motor cycle.

Mission appreciates that the experiences of UPBEP and DPEP-II have been taken into consideration while taking decisions for DPEP-III. It is further appreciable like that coordination at the block level between existing educational management structure and newly created structure is ensured.

The Block Resource Centres proposed to be established under DPEP will have a staff of one coordinator, two assistant coordinators and a peon-cum-chowkidar.

### **Villages Education Committee**

At the grassroot level the management of primary education is to be entrusted to V.E.C. In Uttar Pradesh VECs have already been given the responsibility of construction of school building and that of management and supervision of local primary school. Recent government orders have vested VECs with substantial authority in day-to-day school management, extending to monitoring of teachers, attendance and performance etc.

Ensuring proper implementation of the programme (DPEP) at the grassroot level the responsibility is envisaged to be taken by VEC. This includes construction of school buildings including repairs and maintenance, funds for which will be deposited in a bank account jointly operated by Gram Pradhan and local Head master who are chairman and member secretary of the VEC respectively. Even purchase of material for schools as well as for ECCE and Alternative Schools in the village will be the responsibility of VECs. The school grants and TLM grants are also given to the schools and teachers through VECs only. The Village Education Committee in this way is the lowest level management structure to implement the programme at the village level.

### **Management Information System (MIS)**

Efficient Management Information System (MIS) is a condition for effective monitoring and implementation of the programme. The MIS is perhaps the most neglected but important component of both the State and District plans. Though a

significant amount is budgeted to MIS, only a limited information is presented in the State Component Plan. The information with respect of MIS is repetitive in nature across all the 38 districts.

During the discussions with the District Core Planning Teams, the Mission observed that the members of the Teams are not aware of the details of the activities which are to be initiated during the project period, more specifically in the first year of the project. The districts have proposed to acquire computer softwares and hardwares and other equipments, printing of formats etc. in the first year of the project i.e. October 1999- March 2000.

All the 38 expansion districts have proposed a post of Computer Operator. In addition, a post of Systems Analyst and four Computer Operators are also proposed at the State level which will be created/filled-up after the UPBEP is over in March 2000. **The State Project Office should ensure that the computer software and hardwares are procured at the earliest.** In response to Identification Mission recommendations, the state has prepared a bidding document (draft) for the supply of computers and related items. However, the same is not inclusive of the hardwares that are proposed for SPO. The SPD during the wrap-up agreed to incorporate the same in the revised documents.

The staff of the DPO will be trained in use of DISE and PMIS softwares at the State level. Assistant Basic Siksha Adhikari at the block level will be playing an important role in MIS related activities, as reliable and timely collection of data can be ensured only through him. However, MIS training to ABSA has not been proposed in the district plans. The districts should also ensure that the DIET faculty is involved in MIS related activities, especially in analysis and use of data.

During the discussions at the SPO, the Director Basic Education, Government of Uttar Pradesh mentioned that for better administrative management and project administration, the State envisages developing a data bank with the DPEP assistance. It was also mentioned that the data collected through the DISE under the DPEP would be analyzed at the Basic Siksha Parishad level. However, no details are presented in the State Component Plan. The State should present the details of the scheme about

how it will be operationalised. An amount of Rs.36.10 lakh is proposed for strengthening of the Basic Siksha Parishad but the break-up of amount proposed is not presented in the document.

The SIEMAT has also envisaged taking up analysis of EMIS data in a big way for which an amount of Rs.25.0 lakh over the total project period is proposed in the State Component Plan. **An amount of Rs. 5 lakh is allocated in the first year of the project i.e. October 1999 to March 2000. However details are not given about how data will be analysed, what would be the focus of the analysis, will the remaining seven uncovered districts be included in the analysis, what would be the mode of dissemination of information analysed, with whom and when the analysed data will be shared and what would be the frequency of analysis. The state should present the details of how the DISE data was analysed under the DPEP II and at what level.** For the purpose of data analysis, the SIEMAT has proposed a post of Sr. Systems Analyst and four Computer Operators.

The State Project Office also budgeted an amount of Rs. 73.20 lakh, which is inclusive of Rs. 25 lakh it allocated to SIEMAT for EMIS data analysis. The SPO proposed to acquire four computers at the rate of Rs. 2 lakh each. The SIEMAT has also proposed four computers at the rate of Rs.90 thousand each. Both the SPO and SIEMAT envisage obtaining the hardware's in the first year of the project. **The Mission noticed a wide difference between the costs of computers of two proposals. The State, as well as, the SIEMAT may re-look in to the proposals and present the configuration of hardwares in their revised documents.**

The State has presented budgeted break-up of activities, which it envisages to take-up with respect of EMIS. A few activities that have been proposed are in continuation of the activities taken up under DPEP II and have no financial implications. Preparation of EMIS/PMIS formats is one such activity for which an amount of Rs. 6.0 lakh is proposed. Similarly, for adoption of EMIS and PMIS packages, an amount of Rs. 4.0 lakh is proposed. The State has proposed in a big way to upgrade the existing systems for which an amount of Rs. 9.0 lakh is proposed. This is more than that the amount proposed for acquiring new hardwares. The State should present the details of the hardware that need upgradation along with the upgraded configuration. An amount of

Rs. 11.0 lakh is proposed for consultancy, the State should present details of this proposal in the revised document.

The State should ensure that the activities of Basic Siksha Parishad, SIEMAT and SPO concerning MIS data analysis are not overlapping and there is no administrative problems in effective implementation of the activities that are proposed in the plan document.

The state should spell out plans for six uncovered districts concerning MIS without which the aggregate data at the state level may not be generated.

## SECTION 5: PROJECT COSTS AND PROCUREMENT

5.1: The section on Project Cost and Procurement is written on the basis of revised cost tables handed over to Ed.CIL, New Delhi. The Cost Tables of District Plans and State Component Plan were revised based on the suggestions made by the Mission members during the discussion with District Teams, State Project Office, Basic Shiksha Parishad, SIEMAT, SCERT, and Mahila Samakhya. As a result of the revision, the budgets of some components have changed. The revised total project cost of all the districts and state component plan put together has increased by Rs. 370.55 lakhs.

5.2: The total project cost of 38 districts and State component plan are of the order of Rs. 84935.92 lakhs for the five year period from October 1999 to September 2004. Out of this the districts' budget is Rs. 79523.10 (93.6%) and the state component proposed a budget of Rs. 5412.82 lakhs (6.4%). Table 1 presents districtwise revised project costs and state component budget. For comparison the population figures are also given in the Table.

5.3: All the district plans proposed the budget which is within the limit of Rs. 40 crores. Infact, the budgets of many districts are far below the limit. Three districts have a budget exceeding Rs. 30 crores (Jaunpur – Rs. 31.58 crores, Agra – Rs. 31.49 crores and Azamgarh – Rs. 33.81 crores). Six districts (Sultanpur, Mirzapur, Bijnor, Bulandshahar, Muzaffarnagar and Ballia) have budgets between Rs. 25 and Rs. 30 crores. Nine districts have a budget between Rs. 20 and Rs. 25 crores (Unnao, Kanpur, Raibarelli, Fatehpur, Ambedkar Nagar, Etah, Mau, Padranua and Ghajipur). There are 12 districts having budget between Rs. 15 and Rs. 20 crores (Hamirpur, Farrukhabad, Faizabad, Haridwar, Tehri, Jhansi, Jalaun, Ghazibad, Meerut, Mathura, Kannoji and Mainpuri). The other ten districts have budget below Rs. 15 crores. The two districts of Bageshwar and Champawat have budgets Rs. 898.45 lakhs and Rs. 846.68 lakhs only. The proposed budgets are in tune with the size of the population in many districts. The big districts have proposed more budget than the small districts. However, some districts proposed disproportionately more than their share in population. Some other districts have budgets less than their population share. As the inter district variations in population size are substantial, we can observe large

differences in the district project costs. When compared to districts of UPDPEP-II and DPEP of other states the proposed budgets are less in per capita terms.

5.4: In table 2 the data on Civil Works and management costs are presented for all the districts. The figures given in the revised plans under civil works component suggest that civil works budget is within the ceiling limits in all the districts except two. It exceeded 24% in the districts of Jalaun (26.86%) and Ghazipur (24.25%). In most of the districts the civil works budgets is in the range of 20-24% of the total project cost. In the districts of Goutham Budh Nagar, Ghazibad, Muzaffar Nagar, Sultanpur and Unnao the civil works budget is less than 20%.

5.5: Management cost is 4.3 percent of the total project cost and is within the prescribed norms of 6%.

5.6: In table 5.3 the data on objective-wise distribution of total project costs for 38 districts and state component are presented. The table reveals that on an average about 16.5% of the overall cost is for access, 21.4% for retention, 30.9% for quality and the rest 30% towards capacity building. However, there are large inter-district variations in the percentage budgets allocated for each objective. While 4 districts (Kanpur Dehat, Uttar Kashi, Mau and Ballia) have allocated more than 20% for access, 4 districts (Mathura, Meerut, Haridwar, and Sultanpur) have allocated less than 10% for the same objective.

5.7: Retention received much attention in the districts of Haridwar (31.28%), Champawat (26.82%) and Ghaziabad (27.64%). The districts like Bageshwar (13.67%), Etah (14.49%) have allocated very small amount for the purpose of retention.

5.8: The objective of quality improvement received more attention than access and retention in many districts. More than one-third of the budget is allocated for this purpose in the districts of Sultanpur (33.60%), Jaunpur (34.33%), Mirzapur (33.19%), Etah (33.12%), Muzaffar Nagar (36.49%), Haridwar (33.76%), Jhansi (34.63%), Jalaun (33.56%), Meerut (35.25%), Agra (34.16%), Mathura (35.84%) and Mahoba (35.30%). There are very few districts (only 4) with a budget of less than 25% and there is no district with a budget of less than 20% towards quality improvement.

5.9: Capacity building also received priority in the budgets of many districts. Four districts (Unnao, Sultanpur, Raibareli, and Azamgarh) have allocated more than 40% of the budget for capacity building. Except Mahoba all the districts have allocated more than 25% of the budget for capacity building.

5.10: All the costs have been divided into investment (non-recurring) and recurring costs. Table 5.4 presents the district-wise investment and recurring costs. From the Table it may be noted that there are large inter-district variations in both the investment and recurrent costs.

5.11: In all the districts investment costs occupy a major share in the total project cost. On an average about 63% of the district budget is non-recurring in nature and the rest 37% is recurring component. This is in tune with the DPEP guidelines of keeping recurring liability at lower levels.

5.12: The district-wise comparison of investment cost suggest that the districts of Agra (70.83%) Unnao (73.64%) and Uttar Kashi (73.64%) have allocated more than seventy percent for investment purpose. In majority of the districts (25) the investment costs ranged between 60 to 70%. In no district investments costs are less than 50%.

5.13: There are also large inter-district variations in the recurring costs, ranging from 26% in Uttar Kashi to 44% in Kannauj. In nine districts recurring costs exceeded 40% and in two districts (Agra and Uttar Kashi) it is less than 30%. As the required details of the revised State Component Plan are not available, investment and recurrent costs have not been calculated.

5.14: A rough estimation of recurring costs in the final year of the project period (2003-2004) is made. The recurring costs are of the order of Rs. 112.79 crores approximately. This excludes the last year recurring costs of state component plan.

### **Costing in State Component Plan**

5.15: The cost estimates proposed in the state component plan were discussed with SPO, SCERT, SIET, SIEMAT, Basic Shiksha Parishad and Mahila Samakhya. The state component plan has a revised budget of Rs. 5412.82 lakhs. The same amount has



been proposed in the original budget as well. However, some changes have been made in the revised budget of some components.

5.16: The SPO has proposed a budget of Rs. 3298.77 lakhs in the revised plan, an increase of Rs. 552.01 lakhs, over the original budget. This is mainly due to the re-appropriation of the cost of training at SIEMAT level in the SPO budget instead of SIEMAT budget. The objective-wise classification of SPO budget shows that access received about 4.0 percent, and retention received 15%. The share of quality improvement and capacity building in the SPO budget is 5.0% and 76%, respectively.

5.17: Under access activities related to only Alternative Schooling are included in the budget of SPO. The important activities under retention are Awareness Building, VEC Training, School Improvement, ECCE & Girls Education, Special Education and Minorities Issues. For Quality Improvement, the main activities proposed in SPO budget include Dissemination of Baseline Assessment Data, Workshops, Multi-grade Teaching, Creation of an "Activity Bank" and preparation of Teaching Aids. Strengthening of SPO and establishment of divisional project offices and Training of State / District level functionaries through SIEMAT are the main components, under capacity building.

5.18: The total project cost of SCERT is Rs. 849.45 lakhs. In DPEP-II also there is a budget to the extent of Rs. 586.14 lakhs under the SCERT head. Since the budget of SCERT is quite substantial in DPEP-III which is in addition to DPEP-II budget already approved, each activity along with unit costs needs close scrutiny. It appears that some activities like development of Training material are costed twice both in DPEP-II and DPEP-III. The mission suggests that the activities already costed in DPEP-II should be avoided in DPEP-III.

5.19: SIEMAT budget under DPEP-III is of the order of Rs. 298.99 lakhs. In addition to this, SIEMAT would get Rs. 472.60 lakhs through SPO to carryout training (Rs. 287.6 lakhs) and Research (Rs. 185 lakhs) activities. This is in addition to the approved budget of Rs. 165.5 lakhs in DPEP-II including Rs. 50 lakhs towards salary and expenses. Since there is a ceiling of Rs. 300 lakhs the budget in DPEP-III should be restricted to Rs. 250 lakhs (Rs. 300 lakhs – Rs. 50 lakhs). Therefore, the Mission suggests that SIEMAT should revise the amount such that budget does not exceed

Rs. 250 lakhs. The Mission suggest that excess amount of Rs. 50 lakhs may be transferred to SPO/districts' budgets.

5.20: Mahila Samakhya proposed a revised budget of Rs. 474.67 lakhs the details of which are not available. As per the original proposal. Mahila Samakhya proposed to undertake activities in seven districts with a focus on one block in each districts. Accordingly the budget proposed was Rs. 197 lakhs. The Mission members discussed with SPO and Mahila Samakhya about details of the budget. It had been discussed that the budget to be below Rs. 200 lakhs. Mission is of the view that the break-up of the costs should be incorporated.

5.21: SIET has proposed a budget for Rs. 94.6 lakhs under distance education. The main activities for which budget has been prepared include material development, Replication and dissemination of materials and workshops and seminars. During the discussion, SIET has justified the proposed budget. In DPEP-II, SIET has an approved budget of Rs. 14 lakhs for training and equipment. However, the details and unit costs of each activity are not provided in the plan. It appears that there is duplication in DPEP-II and DPEP-III with respect to teacher training. Therefore, the Mission suggests that the detailed costing should be done by SIET while avoiding the replication.

### **Unit Cost**

5.22: State Component Plan and some district plans have given the unit costs of important components/activities. Unit costs of some items are implicit in the budgets. No details of the unit costs are provided in the budget of some districts. However, during our discussion SPO and district teams have provided the details of unit costs. The mission suggest that each district plan and state component should give more details on unit costs than available from the original plans.

5.23: The unit costs, of many components have been standardised across the districts. Based on the experience in UPBEP and DPEP II, the unit costs have been proposed in DPEP III. The units costs have been worked out on the basis of market prices. The details of unit costs of important components/activities have been given in Table 5.5.

5.24: It is proposed to construct a primary school building with two rooms and verandah at the cost of Rs. 191 thousands. The state is confident constructing good quality school building with this unit cost. The unit cost of additional room is Rs. 70 thousands. The unit costs of BRC and NPRC buildings are Rs. 8 lakhs and Rs. 70 thousands respectively. It is proposed to make use of JRY funds in the completion of civil works to the extent of 60% and hence only 40% of the cost of above works is to be met from DPEP funds. Costs of such activities have been calculated accordingly.

5.25: ICDS and EGS have both recurring and non-recurring components and hence, they are given separately. Based on per person per day requirement, the unit costs of teacher and VEC trainings are decided. While the salaries are the average figures, the honorarium is consolidated. The unit cost of Training activities at SIEMAT appears to be high.

### **Procurement**

5.26: A number of activities in the project involve procurement of civil works, services, materials, vehicles, equipment, furniture, books, TLMS and various other types of items and services. Purchase and procurement of equipment, materials and vehicles would be made in accordance with the guidelines provided by Funding Agencies. In pursuance of the IDA guidelines and norms, the state has already held trainings on procurement procedures. Each district has proposed a procurement plan. State component plan also provided the details on procurement procedures at the state level.

### **Financial Sustainability**

5.27: The study on "Financing of Basic Education in Uttar Pradesh" has examined the sustainability of district based Basic/Primary Education after the completion of the project period. UP Basic Education Project was launched in twelve districts in 1993-94 and would come to an end in 1999-2000. The total project outlay for UPBEP is Rs. 728.38 crores for Phase-I (1993-2000) and Rs. 320.38 crores for phase-II (1997-2000). Till 31.3.99, 83.9% of BEP-I and 35.1% of BEP-II funds have been utilised.

5.28: In addition to BEP, the UP has also launched DPEP in 15 districts during 1997 and would come to an end in 2002. The total approved outlay for the project is

Rs. 567.55 crores to be utilised (during the period October 1997 – December 2002). Till 31.3.99 only 19.4% of outlay has been utilised. The utilisation rate, thus, appears to be less in DPEP when compared to BEP.

5.29: The full benefits of BEP and DPEP would accrue only if State Government sustain the liabilities incurring from such investments/activities undertaken during BEP and DPEP. Sustainability of such investments/activities would mean additional burden on the State Exchequer. The State Government's capacity depends upon the economic and financial position. The findings of Study on Financing of Basic Education has suggested that the UP Government has the capacity to bear the burden.

5.30: The UPBEP recurring liabilities are likely to be of the order of Rs. 216.80 crores from the next year (April 2000). The salary component is very high in BEP as 86% of liabilities are on account of teachers salaries alone. It was informed that Education Budget of UP Government for the year 2000-2001 would incorporate this additional burden.

5.31: The DPEP-II liabilities have been estimated to be of the order of Rs. 69.80 crores from January 2003. As in the case of BEP, teachers salaries account for the largest share as about two-third of the liabilities are on account of this component.

5.32: Unlike in BEP and DPEP-II, the liabilities would be less in DPEP-III. This is clear from the annual liabilities emanating from the four additional DPEP-II districts. The annual liability on account of these three districts is estimated to be only Rs. 9.45 crores out of total project cost of Rs. 62 crores. This low liability is mainly due to salary component of teachers which account for about 37.1% of total liability.

5.33: The perspective plans of 38 new districts under DPEP-III have not yet been finalised. However, the preliminary analysis suggest that recurring costs are low and hence annual liability at the end of the project would be about Rs. 110 crores.

5.34: The relatively lower average liability in case of DPEP, as compared to BEP, is largely due to the very design and guidelines. The upper ceiling of Rs. 40 crores, 24% ceiling on civil works and an indirect ceiling on teachers' salaries in DPEP have kept the recurring liability of the lower level. The teacher's salaries are costed at much lower than the average salary of regular teacher.

5.35: The overall liability (due to BEP and DPEP) on State Government would be 0.14% of State Domestic Product and 0.43% of Total Revenue Expenditure of GOUP. As percentage of total expenditure on Education, the additional burden on account of BEP and DPEP would be about 2.27% in the year 2004-2005. That is an additional 3.6% of total expenditure on Basic Education is required to sustain the project.

5.36: Though the liability appears to be negligible in terms of SDP and total revenue expenditure, the overburdened state government may find even this difficult unless guarded. The state budget has been showing a deficit on revenue account in the last one decade and about 30% of revenue expenditure is going as interest payments. In addition, there is a pressure from other departments to increase the budgets. Unless appropriate steps are taken even this seemingly small liability may become a burden on already overburdened state.

### **Main Observations / Suggestions**

- The ceiling of Rs. 40 crores is strictly adhered to by all the district plans.
- Though the district share in the total project cost is in tune with the population share in many districts, some have received disproportionately more share and some others less share in the total project cost when compared to their share in population.
- The revised total project cost has been of the order of Rs. 84935.92 lakhs. an increase of Rs. 271 lakhs over the original project cost. However, there is no change in the project cost of state component plan.
- The revised budget of Mahila Samakhya is Rs. 474.67 lakhs. The details of the revised budget should be included in the revised plan. While preparing the detailed budget, the unit costs in the blocks with Mahila Samakhya activities should be taken into account.
- SIEMAT received a budget of Rs. 50 lakhs in DPEP-II for its strengthening. Hence, the Mission suggests to reduce the SIEMAT budget to Rs. 2.5 crores only. The balance can be transferred to SPO/district budgets.
- The unit cost of training at SIEMAT is Rs. 4000 per person per week, which appears to be very high. The Mission suggests that training costs should be on par with training cost at state level Training Institutions like SIRD, ATI and SCERT.
- The details of unit costs of all the activities should be presented in the revised plans.

**Table 5.5: Unit Costs of Main Activities / Interventions**

(Rs. in thousands)

Sl. No.	Unit	Unit cost	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Primary School Building	191	To be shared between DPEP and JRY in the ratio of 40 : 60
2.	Additional Classroom	70	-do-
3.	BRC Building	800	-do-
4.	NPRC Building	70	-do-
5.	Repair old school building	20	On an average
6.	Toilets	10.0	Per school
7.	Hand Pumb	22.0	-do-
8.	ICDS centre	6,375 6,500	Recurring expend. per month towards honorarium of A.W. (Rs. 250) and Assistant (Rs. Non-recurring towards toys, equipments, contingency
9.	EGS	0.600 1.750	Recurring exp. To pay towards honorarium non-recurring (Rs. 750 text book and Rs. 1000 maintenance)
10.	Teachers' Training	0.09	Per person per day
11.	VEC Training	0.03	-do-
12.	Training of state level functionaries by SIEMAT	4.00	Per person per week
13.	School Grant	2.00	Per primary school
14.	Teacher Grant	0.50	Per teacher
15.	BRC Coordinator	6.00	Per month salary
16.	BRC Asstt. Coordination	4.50	-do-
17.	BRC Chowikdar	3.5	-do-
18.	NPRC Co-ordinator	5.5	-do-
19.	Assistant Engineer	10.00	Honorarium per month
20.	Junor Engineer	7.0	-do-
21.	Para Teacher	1.450	-do-
22.	Alternative School Instructor	0.6	-do-
23.	Supervisor	1.0	-do-
24.	SIEMAT	29899.0	For the entire project period
25.	SCERT	84945.0	-do-
26.	SIET	9460.00	-do-
27.	Mahila Samakhya	47467.00	-do-
28.	Basic Shiksha Parishad – Finance wing	3607.0	-do-
29.	Basic Shiksha Parishad – State Textbook wing	39207.00	-do-

**Table 5.1 : Total Project Cost and Population**

S.No.	Districts	Total project cost		Population	
		Amount (Rs in lakhs)	% of Project Cost	No. of persons in lakhs	% of Population
1	Agra	3149.33	3.96	27.51	4.44
2	Ambedkar Nagar	2063.61	2.59	16.04	2.59
3	Azamgarh	3380.72	4.25	31.54	5.09
4	Baghpat	1477.14	1.86	10.30	1.66
5	Ballia	2656.06	3.34	22.62	3.65
6	Bageshwar	898.45	1.13	2.22	0.36
7	Bijnor	2576.21	3.24	24.36	3.93
8	Buland Shahar	2803.60	3.53	28.49	4.60
9	Champawat	846.68	1.06	1.65	0.27
10	Etah	2409.01	3.03	18.69	3.02
11	Faizabad	1982.22	2.49	13.74	2.22
12	Farrukhabad	1873.64	2.36	12.47	2.01
13	Fatehpur	2439.69	3.07	18.99	3.07
14	Gautam Buddha Nagar	1155.29	1.45	9.20	1.49
15	Ghazibad	1919.09	2.41	25.88	4.18
16	Ghazipur	2460.17	3.09	24.16	3.90
17	Hamirpur	1546.48	1.94	8.84	1.43
18	Haridwar	1660.76	2.09	11.24	1.81
19	Jalaun	1873.43	2.36	12.19	1.97
20	Jaunpur	3158.41	3.97	32.14	5.19
21	Jhansi	1717.60	2.16	8.63	1.39
22	Kannauj	1714.11	2.16	10.40	1.68
23	Kanpur (dehat)	2346.08	2.95	13.03	2.10
24	Mahoba	1496.75	1.88	5.82	0.94
25	Mainpuri	1806.87	2.27	13.17	2.13
26	Mathura	1880.46	2.36	16.77	2.71
27	Mau	2026.25	2.55	14.46	2.33
28	Meerut	1882.82	2.37	13.29	2.15
29	Mirzapur	2525.81	3.18	16.57	2.67
30	Muzaffar Nagar	2677.38	3.37	28.43	4.59
31	Padrauna	2424.65	3.05	22.35	3.61
32	Pithoragarh	1264.19	1.59	3.80	0.61
33	Pratapgarh	2602.59	3.27	22.10	3.57
34	Raibareli	2465.81	3.10	23.23	3.75
35	Sultanpur	2924.55	3.68	25.59	4.13
36	Tehri	1833.69	2.31	5.20	0.84
37	Unnao	2389.56	3.00	22.00	3.55
38	Uttar Kashi	1213.94	1.53	2.39	0.39
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79523.10</b>	<b>93.60</b>	<b>619.50</b>	<b>100.00</b>
	State Interventions	5412.82	6.47	-	-
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>84935.92</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Table 5.2 : Civil Works and Management Cost**

(in lacs)

S.No	Districts	Civil Works	As % of Project Cost	Mgt. Cost	As % of Project Cost	Other Programes	As % of Project Cost	Total Project Cost	
1	Agra	698.47	22.18	91.68	2.91	2359.18	74.89	100	3149.33
2	Ambedkar Nagar	491.08	23.80	93.18	4.52	1479.35	71.71	100	2063.61
3	Azamgarh	781.86	23.13	92.63	2.74	2506.23	74.14	100	3380.72
4	Baghpat	299.30	20.26	88.64	6.00	1089.20	69.62	100	1477.14
5	Ballia	636.79	23.97	93.99	3.54	1925.28	72.48	100	2656.06
6	Bageshwar	210.51	23.43	79.34	8.83	608.60	67.73	100	898.45
7	Bijnor	613.52	23.81	83.98	3.26	1878.71	72.92	100	2576.21
8	Buland Shahar	597.92	21.33	84.94	3.03	2120.74	75.64	100	2803.60
9	Champawat	199.31	23.54	79.06	9.34	568.31	66.21	100	846.68
10	Etah	500.03	20.76	92.26	3.83	1816.72	75.41	100	2409.01
11	Faizabad	444.85	22.44	94.35	4.76	1443.02	72.80	100	1982.22
12	Farrukhabad	446.02	23.80	87.87	4.69	1339.75	71.50	100	1873.64
13	Fatehpur	539.78	22.12	90.41	3.71	1809.50	74.14	100	2439.69
14	Gautam Buddha Nagar	211.95	18.35	83.70	7.24	859.64	73.62	100	1155.29
15	Ghazibad	377.12	19.65	92.72	4.83	1449.25	75.53	100	1919.09
16	Ghazipur	596.50	24.25	93.48	3.80	1770.19	71.96	100	2460.17
17	Hamirpur	346.89	22.43	83.04	5.37	1116.55	72.20	100	1546.48
18	Haridwar	371.25	22.35	85.86	5.17	1203.65	72.48	100	1660.76
19	Jalaun	503.14	26.86	92.58	4.94	1277.71	69.77	100	1873.43
20	Jaunpur	663.50	21.01	92.35	2.92	2402.56	76.06	100	3158.41
21	Jhansi	406.73	23.68	84.33	4.91	1226.54	71.40	100	1717.60
22	Kannauj	381.40	22.25	83.46	4.87	1249.25	73.94	100	1714.11
23	Kanpur (dehat)	551.47	23.51	90.20	3.84	1704.41	72.68	100	2346.08
24	Mahoba	293.78	19.63	92.49	6.18	1110.48	74.94	100	1496.75
25	Mainpuri	427.03	23.63	90.69	5.02	1289.15	71.68	100	1806.87
26	Mathura	434.68	23.12	91.95	4.89	1353.83	71.99	100	1880.46
27	Mau	443.33	21.88	91.66	4.52	1491.26	71.86	100	2026.25
28	Meerut	407.36	21.64	90.94	4.83	1384.52	76.51	100	1882.82
29	Mirzapur	582.75	23.07	90.93	3.60	1852.13	73.33	100	2525.81
30	Muzaffar Nagar	514.64	19.22	85.81	3.20	2076.93	77.60	100	2677.38
31	Padrauna	564.45	23.28	92.38	3.81	1767.82	72.91	100	2424.65
32	Pithoragarh	286.49	22.66	86.43	6.84	891.27	69.97	100	1264.19
33	Pratapgarh	599.19	23.02	84.84	3.26	1918.56	73.71	100	2602.59
34	Raibareli	576.53	23.38	91.09	3.69	1798.19	72.44	100	2465.81
35	Sultanpur	570.90	19.52	90.64	3.10	2263.01	76.37	100	2924.55
36	Tehri	416.00	22.69	89.48	4.88	1328.21	72.43	100	1833.69
37	Unnao	462.08	19.34	91.28	3.82	1836.20	76.84	100	2389.56
38	Uttar Kashi	284.30	23.42	86.55	7.13	843.09	69.45	100	1213.94
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17732.90</b>	<b>22.30</b>	<b>3381.21</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>58408.99</b>	<b>73.45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79523.10</b>
	State Intervention								5412.82
	<b>Grand Total</b>								<b>84935.92</b>



Table 5.3 : Objective-wise Project Cost

(Percentage)

S.No	Districts	Access	Retention	Quality	Capacity Building	Total project cost	
		1	2	3	4	5	Amount Rs. in lakhs
1	Agra	18.21	19.61	34.16	28.02	100	3149.33
2	Ambedkar Nagar	18.54	20.59	28.62	32.26	100	2063.61
3	Azamgarh	16.50	15.71	24.96	42.84	100	3380.72
4	Baghpat	16.22	22.73	28.15	32.90	100	1477.14
5	Ballia	20.98	16.77	29.69	32.57	100	2656.06
6	Beheshwar	19.91	13.67	29.13	37.30	100	898.45
7	Bijnor	15.59	24.00	31.20	29.21	100	2576.21
8	Buland Shahar	14.87	23.89	29.36	31.88	100	2803.60
9	Champawat	15.62	26.82	21.33	36.24	100	846.68
10	Etah	15.40	14.49	33.12	36.99	100	2409.01
11	Faizabad	18.67	17.46	32.14	31.73	100	1982.22
12	Farrukhabad	15.29	22.43	31.78	30.50	100	1873.64
13	Fatehpur	16.09	21.76	27.86	34.28	100	2439.69
14	Gautam Buddha	17.74	21.59	28.87	31.79	100	1155.29
15	Ghazibad	14.17	27.64	28.79	29.41	100	1919.09
16	Ghazipur	17.20	17.70	25.12	39.98	100	2460.17
17	Hamirpur	19.58	20.32	28.25	31.86	100	1546.48
18	Haridwar	7.71	31.28	33.76	27.25	100	1660.76
19	Jalaun	11.19	23.19	33.56	32.06	100	1873.43
20	Jaunpur	12.13	17.22	34.33	36.32	100	3158.41
21	Jhansi	13.66	23.13	34.63	28.58	100	1717.60
22	Kannauj	14.17	24.67	29.18	31.98	100	1714.11
23	Kanpur (dehat)	23.53	15.85	27.47	33.15	100	2346.08
24	Mahoba	16.57	23.24	35.30	24.89	100	1496.75
25	Mainpuri	16.43	20.45	31.60	31.52	100	1806.87
26	Mathura	9.37	24.21	35.84	30.59	100	1880.46
27	Mau	20.72	20.12	29.36	29.79	100	2026.25
28	Meerut	9.80	18.94	35.25	36.00	100	1882.82
29	Mirzapur	15.20	24.77	33.19	26.84	100	2525.81
30	Muzaffar Nagar	13.15	20.75	36.49	29.61	100	2677.38
31	Padrauna	14.22	19.47	31.42	34.89	100	2424.65
32	Pithoragarh	15.67	18.86	27.35	38.11	100	1264.19
33	Pratapgarh	15.42	22.73	26.68	35.58	100	2602.59
34	Raibareli	10.50	19.93	25.08	44.50	100	2465.81
35	Sultanpur	6.55	19.59	33.60	40.25	100	2924.55
36	Tehri	19.96	15.22	28.83	35.99	100	1833.69
37	Unnao	10.64	17.56	29.63	42.17	100	2389.56
38	Uttar Kashi	22.48	17.94	22.78	36.80	100	1213.94
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16.48</b>	<b>21.39</b>	<b>30.86</b>	<b>30.13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79523.10</b>
	State Intervention	2.22	9.26	2.87	85.64	100	5412.82
	<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>84935.92</b>

Table 5.4 : Investment and Recurring Cost

(Percentage)

S.No.	Districts	Investment Cost as % of Total Project Cost	Recurring Cost as % of Total Project Cost	Total Project Cost (Rs. in lakhs)	
1	Agra	70.83	29.17	100	3149.33
2	Ambedkar Nagar	60.64	39.36	100	2063.61
3	Azamgarh	59.40	40.60	100	3380.72
4	Baghpat	59.84	40.16	100	1477.14
5	Ballia	60.10	38.90	100	2656.06
6	Beheshwar	66.64	33.35	100	898.45
7	Bijnor	67.22	32.78	100	2576.21
8	Buland Shahar	61.50	38.50	100	2803.60
9	Champawat	59.85	40.15	100	846.68
10	Etah	64.12	35.88	100	2409.01
11	Faizabad	62.10	37.90	100	1982.22
12	Farrukhabad	67.28	32.72	100	1873.64
13	Fatehpur	59.67	40.33	100	2439.69
14	Gautam Buddha Nagar	59.46	40.44	100	1155.29
15	Ghazibad	57.76	42.24	100	1919.09
16	Ghazipur	57.57	42.43	100	2460.17
17	Hamirpur	60.58	39.42	100	1546.48
18	Haridwar	62.64	37.36	100	1660.76
19	Jalaun	67.32	32.68	100	1873.43
20	Jaunpur	63.84	36.16	100	3158.41
21	Jhansi	66.01	33.99	100	1717.60
22	Kannauj	56.24	43.76	100	1714.11
23	Kanpur (dehat)	61.11	38.88	100	2346.08
24	Mahoba	66.27	33.73	100	1496.75
25	Mainpuri	64.96	35.04	100	1806.87
26	Mathura	66.68	33.32	100	1880.46
27	Mau	60.36	39.44	100	2026.25
28	Meerut	62.66	37.34	100	1882.82
29	Mirzapur	64.70	35.30	100	2525.81
30	Muzaffar Nagar	63.62	36.38	100	2677.38
31	Padrauna	63.84	35.25	100	2424.65
32	Pithoragarh	63.62	36.68	100	1264.19
33	Pratapgarh	57.49	42.50	100	2602.59
34	Raibareli	58.75	41.25	100	2465.81
35	Sultanpur	66.23	33.77	100	2924.55
36	Tehri	61.94	38.06	100	1833.69
37	Unnao	56.82	43.18	100	2389.56
38	Uttar Kashi	73.64	26.36	100	1213.94
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62.51</b>	<b>37.49</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79523.10</b>
	State Interventions				<b>5412.82</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>84935.92</b>

## **SECTION 6 : FIRST YEAR ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET**

The first year of the proposed programme of these 38 districts of DPEP-III in UP is last six months of financial year 1999-2000. It is expected to start in the month of October 1999 and so first financial year will have six months only ending in the March 2000. All the district plans have been prepared and budgeted accordingly.

### **District Plans**

The activities proposed by the districts during this period are mainly as under :

- It is being proposed to operationalise the District Project Office by recruiting the manpower, purchasing equipment, furniture, fixture and vehicle.
- It is being proposed that DIETs will be strengthened by acquiring the required equipment, vehicle, staff etc.
- Setting up of MIS cell is being proposed with provision of procurement of equipment, manpower, training of MIS personnel as well as other districts/block functionaries for PMIS and EMIS.
- It is being proposed that District Education Project Committee will be constituted at district level for the planning & implementation of the programme.
- It is being proposed that at Block level, Block Project Advisory Committee will be constituted in all blocks of all the districts.
- Various activities are proposed for awareness building campaign using publicity, extension and mass communication.
- Starting at village level, microplanning & school mapping exercise are being proposed including survey, seminar and workshops.
- Training for elected women G.P./M.G., MTA/PTA, VECs has been proposed. NGOs are also being included in these trainings.
- 20 districts out of 38 have planned for civil works also during first year itself. These include mainly repairs of existing schools, drinking water facilities, toilets, additional classrooms. However, few districts have included in first year new

schools and BRCs also. Mission feels that these civil works may not materialise during the first 6 months period hence it may be reviewed.

- 8 districts have proposed less than 3% of total project cost during this period. 15 district have proposed between 3% - 5% of project cost, while 15 districts have proposed more than 5% of total project cost.

## **Cost**

Table 6.1 presents district wise total project cost, first year project cost and percentage of first year cost to the total project cost for all 38 districts and state component plan.

As given in the table out of total project cost of Rs. 84660.02 lakhs, an amount of Rs. 4689.71 lakh has been proposed for the first year which is about 5.54% of the total cost.

Various districts have proposed varying percentages of their total project cost during first year. Bijnore has proposed (1.04%) the lowest percentage while Gautam Budh Nagar has proposed the highest proportion (9.61%) to be spent in the first financial year.

State Component under DPEP-III has been proposed as 5412.82 lakhs for the full project period of 5 years. The proposal for first year 1999-2000 are 1141.11 lakhs.

## **State Component**

The main activities proposed are as under:

- under the access the main activities are planning/review meetings, research/evaluation, seminars and dissemination workshops and grants to NGOs.
- Activities planned under retention are awareness building, state and regional level meetings, development of publicity materials, VEC training modules, training strategies, school improvement module and activities connected with ECCE/girls education, minority and special education issues.

- Under the quality improvement programme the activities planned during 1st year are dissemination of BAS data, visioning workshops, academic issues workshop, preparation of teaching aids and development of multigrade teaching module.
- Under capacity building priority has been given to strengthening of State Project Office, division level project offices, setting of MIS cell and training in PMIS/EMIS, administrative and financial monitoring, training of state/district functionaries in planning and management and conducting research at state level involving SIEMAT and SCERT.
- The various state level organisations, SCERT, SIET, SIEMAT, Mahila Samakhya, Basic Shiksha Parishad are to be strengthened by providing them a financial layout of Rs. 579.25 lakh during 1st year.

It has been clarified by the SPO that budget proposals are for 12 months for the first year, irrespective of whenever the project starts.

**Table 6.1 Total Project Cost and First year (1999-2000) Cost**

*(Cost in lakhs)*

Sl.	Districts	Total cost	Year I cost	% of total	Civil Work Year I	Remarks
1	Unnao	2389.56	65.985	2.76	-	
2	Kanpur Dehat	2349.08	56.972	2.42	10.00	Repairs/Addl. Classrooms
3	Sultanpur	2924.18	116.0955	3.97	-	
4	Raibareli	2422.70	116.77	4.74	26.80	Repair/Toilet Add. classrooms
5	Pratapgarh	2602.60	88.57	3.4	40.00	Repair/Toilet Add. classrooms
6	Hamirpur	1546.48	86.78	5.61	22.60	Repair/Add. classrooms
7	Jaunpur	3158.42	196.05	6.21	20.00	Repairs
8	Mirzapur	2525.81	139.94	5.54	30.00	Repairs/Toilets
9	Fatehpur	2437.01	45.91	1.82	-	-
10	Farrukhabad	1873.64	99.21	5.29	26.60	Repair/Toilet/Addl. CR
11	Faizabad	1982.22	147.32	7.43	-	-
12	Ambedkar Ngr.	2065.21	101.04	4.9	-	-
13	Etah	2409.01	65.12	2.70	-	-
14	Bizanore	2576.22	26.91	1.04	4.0	Repairs
15	Bulandsair	2803.60	71.39	2.55	-	-
16	Muzaffar Ngr.	2681.58	85.27	3.18	-	-
17	Haridwar	1660.76	89.33	5.38	16.0	Toilet/drinking water
18	Tehri	1833.69	80.57	4.39	10.0	Repairs
19	Bageshwar	894.46	30.04	3.34	-	-
20	Pithoragarh	1241.88	45.50	3.60	-	-
21	Champawat	848.70	38.16	4.5	-	-
22	Uttarkashi	1212.95	46.48	3.83	-	-
23	Jhansi	1717.61	148.22	8.63	112.32	Repairs/toilets new schools additional CR BRC
24	Jalaun	1969.93	22.07	1.18		
25	Ghaziabad	1919.80	131.25	6.84	27.6	Repairs/additional CR
26	Gautam Budh Nagar	1155.29	111.09	9.61	40.8	Repairs/additional CR
27	Merrut	1882.82	97.68	5.19	48.0	6 BRC
28	Baghpat	1277.14	46.79	3.66	-	-
29	Agra	3149.34	170.67	5.43	-	-
30	Mathura	1880.46	81.50	4.33	-	-
31	Khushi Nagar	2424.65	147.83	6.08	100.56	New schools additional CR/ECCE rooms
32	Mau	1901.69	95.16	4.70	33.0	
33	Azamgarh	3380.74	91.47	2.71	10.0	Repairs
34	Ballia	2656.86	128.57	4.9	-	-
35	Gazipur	2460.17	159.54	6.49	20.0	Repairs/ECCE rooms
36	Kannauj	1706.81	114.77	6.70	37.89	Repairs/drinking water/toilet additional classrooms BRC NPRC reconstruction of schools
37	Mahoba	1496.69	57.04	3.81	5.0	Repairs
38	Mainpuri	1827.44	105.54	5.83	23.64	additional classrooms repairs
39	State component	5412.82	1141.11	21.08		class
	<b>Total</b>	<b>84660.02</b>	<b>4689.7125</b>	<b>5.54</b>	<b>346.49</b>	

## **SECTION 7 : BENEFITS AND RISKS**

The District Primary Education Programme aims at achieving the goal of Universalisation of Primary Education (UPE) in the districts where it is launched. The funding for this programme is in addition to the funds provided by state government in the district and budget allocation of the state is to be maintained in real terms. The Programme is expected to move the districts forward towards the goal of UPE. The benefits of the programme vis-à-vis the state in general and the district in particular will be based on the extent of the success of the programme in the district. These are given as below.

### **Benefits**

- The launch of DPEP in the remaining 38 districts of UP will ensure that the entire state would move forward to the universalisation of primary education in the state.
- There will be substantial increase in enrolment and retention of children at primary level in the DPEP districts. The project will provide 2769 additional schools and 12771 classroom.
- With the increase in enrolment and retention among all categories of children namely SC, ST, girls, minorities, there will be reduction in all types of disparities viz. gender disparities, social disparities and spatial disparities. This will ensure equity in education to a greater extent.
- Success of DPEP in the district will generate demand for upper primary education and contribute towards achieving the goal of UEE. It will ultimately lead to more demand for secondary education.
- The successful implementation of the programme will ensure capacity building at state, district, block, cluster and village level which may be a permanent asset for the state to manage the education system in a better way in future.
- By creating / strengthening resource institutions in planning and management of primary education like SCERT, SIEMAT, DIET etc. better management of schools will be ensured.
- Academic monitoring and supervision of primary schools is ensured by creating and sustaining the BRCs and NPRCs.

- Community participation in planning and management of primary education by activation and training of VEC, PTA, MTA etc. will ensure sustainability of efforts to improve the system.
- The quality of education at primary level will be improved as a result of regular and recurrent in-service training of teachers and follow-up undertaken by DIET, BRCs, NPRCs.
- The experience of state in the development of training design and materials as well as development of textbooks and supplementary books under UPBEP and DPEP form a strong asset to tackle the issues of quality in DPEP-III.
- Establishment of SIEMAT in the state which is now a Regional Resource Centre in the area of educational planning and management for Hindi speaking states, brings an advantage to UPDPEP in terms of intensive sharing of inter-state experiences.

### **Risks**

- A number of interventions can be implemented only if support of other departments and structures are ensured. If the requisite convergence does not materialise as expected, there is a risk that planned targets may not be achieved.
- For successful implementation of DPEP, it is important to establish decentralised structures and process. If these do not happen in time, the quality of implementation may suffer adversely.
- Pre-occupation with procedures and the rule-bound approach of experts, trainers and local level managers may result in regimentation. This should be guarded against.
- The project is based on the assumption that requisite systemic reforms at various levels would be initiated and carried through concerned efforts are required in this direction and any let up in this regard would jeopardise project implementation..



## **SECTION 8: REPORT ON ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS OF I.D.A. IDENTIFICATION MISSION**

Para 4.1

### **Recommendations**

Strengthening of S.P.O. during project preparation

- Appointment of an IAS/PCS officer and three to four consultants on a short-term basis.

### **Action Taken**

GOUP has appointed an Additional Project Director.

### **Remarks**

Consultants have been shortlisted & the appointment of 2 consultants has already been made and other 2 posts will be filled up when required.

Para 4.2

### **Recommendations**

Procedure to be developed and refined for planning methodology to establish State and District investment proposals.

To carry out the following studies :

(i) District Baseline Assessment Study

(ii) District Social Assessment Study

(iii) Compilation of complementary information to the existing educational financial study undertaken by GOUP in 1996.

### **Action Taken**

Training of District core planning teams completed in SIEMAT in December 1998.

BAS for 38 districts commissioned has been completed and shared on 29-30 May 1999.

SAS commissioned for sample 5 districts - Pithoragarh, Muzaffar Nagar, Mahoba, Unnao, Ambedkar Nagar has been completed and draft reports are available.

Completed & included in finance study.

### **Remarks**

The State has documented the findings of SAS in the plan. Since the district plans were formulated in mid-March, the findings and sharing of SAS is not reflected in the plans. Therefore the district teams need to document the major findings of SAS and its implications in their district plan along with the criteria of the sharing workshops. The SPD during the wrap-up agreed that the revised plans will contain the same and will be submitted to IDA Mission, during their State visit.

Para 4.3

### **Recommendations**

Training of State and District planning teams and inclusion of visioning and conceptual framework workshops during training process.

**Action Taken**

Training Module now includes the visioning and conceptual framework workshops. Training of district planning teams has been organised at NSDART and SIEMAT. Four training programmes for DPEP III districts for perspective plans were all completed by 12 January 1999 at SIEMAT, Allahabad with assistance from NSDART, Mussoorie.

**Remarks**

The district plans contain details of the constitution of Core Planning Teams and the training imparted to them. Action taken has been well documented in the state plan.

Para 4.4

**Recommendations**

- Preparation of District Investment Proposals
- Documentation of participatory process to be maintained at district level.

**Action Taken**

District Planning teams have been trained and their capacities have been built up for preparation of perspective plans and AWP&B. Participatory processes have been documented in each district investment proposal.

**Remarks**

Planning Process adopted is fairly participative in nature and is documented well in the district plans. The problems, areas of concern and possible interventions based on FGD is well documented.

Para 4.5

**Recommendations**

- Educational Statistics - (Mission will review during pre-appraisal)
- (i) child population 5 year age group (6-11)
  - (ii) enrolment in grades I-V disaggregated by gender, SC, ST and any other special group for each of past 5 years.
  - (iii) drop-out and retention rates when taken available for each group.
  - (iv) Literacy rates.
  - (v) Teachers by gender, SC & ST.
  - (vi) Sanctioned teacher positions as well as vacant teacher posts.
  - (vii) enrolment in private recognised and when available, also for non-recognised schools for each of past 5 years.
  - (viii) enrolment in non-formal and alternative school centres.
  - (ix) vacancies in DIETs in project districts.

**Action Taken**

Data has been included in District Plans.

**Remarks**

Good amount of data is presented in district plans but coverage varies from district to district. Enrolment data is generally not presented for

five years. During wrap-up SPD agreed that the process of data analysis and interpretation would be refined when EMIS is introduced.

Para 4.6 (a) **Recommendations**

New Interventions

(i) Inclusion of cost-effective interventions viz. para-teachers, double shift and any other method.

(ii) Provision of book banks for all poor children other than for girls, SC and ST students.

**Action Taken**

1. GOUP has launched Shiksha Mitra (para teacher) & EGS scheme.

2. Provision for double shifting & provision for book banks has been made.

**Remarks**

This has been fully complied with.

Para 4.6 (b) **Recommendations**

Utilization of BRCs may be assessed during project preparation to determine the number to be established under the proposed project.

**Action Taken**

Districts have made this assessment in UPDPEP III proposals.

**Remarks**

On the basis of the experience in UPBEP districts the matter was discussed at length and decision was taken that it was necessary to establish one BRC in each block.

Para 4.7 **Recommendations**

The Mission recommends that an evaluation between single and double shift schools and of the use of para-teachers be conducted before being taken to scale.

**Action Taken**

The State Plan has incorporated 3 models for double-shifting which is to be organised on pilot basis. Provision for an evaluation has been made.

**Remarks**

It is too early to evaluate the scheme. However, this would be done at the appropriate stage of implementation.

Para 4.8 **Recommendations**

Preparation of State Investment proposal

- objectives, strategy, components, convergence, strengthening SPOs  
EMIS/PMIS

**Action Taken**

After discussion with SCERT, SIEMAT, SIET & Director Basic Education were held the State Investment Plan prepared.

Para 4.9 (a)

**Recommendations**

SRG should be further strengthened.

- extending representation of the SRG membership to a broad base.

**Action Taken**

SRG has been made broad based by including persons from Universities and academicians.

**Remarks**

SRG has a pool of 1200 persons drawn from divergent background and capabilities. The state intends to replenish this pool regularly with the requisite expertise.

Para 4.9 (b)

**Recommendations**

The current pedagogical renewal plan be attached to the PIP:

**Action Taken**

The pedagogical plan has been attached to the State Investment proposal.

Para 4.10

**Recommendations**

Strengthening of State and District apex institutions - strengthening of SIEMAT, SCERT, SIE and DIETs.

(i) DIETs staff recruitment process

(ii) Support to facilitate DIETs making more effective use of their field laboratory areas.

**Action Taken**

Components have been included in State Plan.

**Remarks**

Specific comments related to this issue may be referred to in the section on capacity building.

Para 4.11

**Recommendations**

BAS : Current TOR need to be reviewed in light of a series of observations discussed with the SPO

**Action Taken**

TORs were finalized by GOI & NCERT and the same were adopted.

**Remarks**

The preliminary tables of BASs are available. For detailed comments, see Section 2 on Planning Process.

Para 4.15

**Recommendations**

Bank would require at pre-appraisal stage the following :

- (i) draft reports of SAS preliminary
- (ii) evidence of sharing preliminary findings of SAS with State and District planning teams.

**Action Taken**

Draft SAS findings are available and the same have been shared with the respective 38 districts on 12.3.98, 16.3.99, 18.3.99, 19.3.99 and 20.3.99.

**Remarks**

SAS reports are available and the findings are documented in the State Component Plan. The district plans need to incorporate major findings and details of sharing workshops. During the wrap-up at Delhi, the SPD agreed that it will be incorporated in the revised plans which are to be submitted to IDA mission.

Para 4.16

**Recommendations**

State Financial information

- (i) Existing finance study to be updated during project preparation.
- (ii) A detailed analysis to be made of the recurrent liabilities emerging at project completion.
- (iii) A draft of analysis would be reviewed by the mission during pre-appraisal.

**Action Taken**

Finance study is complete and the report is available on all these aspects.

**Remarks**

The revised (updated) finance study has been completed. The required details are given in the report.

Para 4.17

**Recommendations**

Preliminary analysis of the unit cost implications of introducing cost effective interventions to be made available during pre-appraisal.

**Action Taken**

Finance study includes this.

**Remarks**

Finance study analyses the unit cost implications of the cost effectiveness of para teachers and double shift.

Para 4.18

**Recommendations**

Civil Works :

To be made available during pre-appraisal

- (i) the sketch floor-plan for the type of facilities envisioned for the project.

(ii) technical supervision mechanisms

**Action Taken**

This has been prepared and included in the State plan. Executive committee's approval has been taken for new technical supervision mechanism.

**Remarks**

The plan put in place for UPDPEP II would be followed.

Para 4.20

**Recommendations**

Financial Management

Loan Administration Change Initiative (LACI) compliant Finance Management System

(a) Development of computerised FM system

(b) Appointment of CFO at SPO

(c) Recruitment of other accounting personnel

(d) Appointment of Auditors

(e) Procurement of computers

**Action Taken**

LACI as prepared in Rajasthan and approved by GOI is being replicated in UPDPEP III.

(a) not required in view of the above.

(b&c) Posts have been created and selection process is on .

(d) Auditors have been appointed.

(e) Draft bid documents for procurement of computers are placed in State Investment proposal.

**Remarks**

These were milestones for appraisal but they have essentially been complied with.

Para 4.21

**Recommendations**

LACI's Pre-appraisal bench marks :

(i) evidence of appointment of the consultancy firm for designing of the Financial Management System

(ii) finalization of job responsibilities of the firm or CFO

(iii) provision of job responsibilities of key accounting professional at districts.

(iv) draft bid documents for purchase of computers and software's.

**Action Taken**

(I) N.A.

(ii) & (iii) Job charts of CFO at State Level & Accounting Professionals at districts have been included in the State Plan.

(iv) Has been included in the State Plan.

Para 4.25

**Recommendations**

Project Indicators :

Inclusion of indicators for project interventions.

Classified by project component (access, quality, retention and capacity building).

These will be reviewed by the mission during pre-appraisal and appraisal stages.

**Action Taken**

Have been incorporated in PIP.

**Remarks**

Outcome indicators have been identified. EMIS and PMIS is currently under review at the national level. State will adopt the revised versions as and when available.

Para 4.26

**Recommendations**

Project Implementation Plan (PIP)

\* The PIP will clearly specify the concrete steps for first year activities.

\* The PIP should be flexible.

\* First draft of PIP required for pre-appraisal.

**Action Taken**

PIP has been prepared and made available.

Para 5 & 5.1

**Recommendations**

Project Preparation Schedule

The following documents required to be ready for pre-appraisal.

1. State investment proposal including strengthening of SPO.

2. District investment proposal.

3. PIP

4. Project Monitoring indicators.

5. First draft of SAS and its sharing.

6. Financial informations :-

\* Finance study-updated

\* Detailed analysis of recurrent liabilities emerging from all the projects at project completion.

\* Preliminary analysis of the unit cost implications of introducing cost-effective measures.

**Action Taken**

1, 2 & 3. District plans, State plan and PIP have been prepared and made available.

4. Project Monitoring Indicators included in PIP.

5. SAS draft available and sharing has taken place.

6. Updated report is ready and made available.

**Remarks**

The finance study provides the required details.

Para 5.1(a)

**Recommendations**

- 7. Civil Works requirements
- \* Sketch floor-plan for proposed facilities.
- \* technical supervision mechanism.

**Action Taken**

Have been prepared and included in the State Plan.  
Approval of EC has been taken for technical supervision mechanism.

Para 5.1 (b)

**Recommendations**

- 8. LACI's pre-appraisal benchmarks
- 9. Procurement plan
- 10. Standard bidding documents.
- 11. National pre-appraisal report
- 12. Levels of disbursements of Bank financed Primary education credits.

**Action Taken**

- 8. Completed as indicated in 4.20 & 4.21 above.
- 9. Included in State Investment proposal.
- 10. Computer bidding documents in State Plan.
- 11. This will be given by the GOI.
- 12. To be made available by GOI.

**Remarks**

The computer bidding document did not include hardwares proposed for SPO. The SPD during the wrap-up informed that it has now been incorporated.

In general it is seen that the milestones indicated in the Aide-Memoire of the Identification Mission have been adhered to by the State and ensured by the time of Pre-appraisal.



## SECTION 9 : RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### PLANNING PROCESS

- The district plan of Kannauj needs to present more detailed information on number of meetings held alongwith venue and number of participants.
- The name of blocks where the micro planning exercises will be undertaken in the first *year* have not yet been identified. The districts should include this information in the AWP&B for the first year.
- The districts may like to present the number of villages in each of its blocks, as the same would help them to properly conduct micro planning exercises.
- The district and state teams should ensure that (a) each table presented should have its number, clear title, year for which the information is presented, unit (if required) and complete source of information; (b) the figures referred in the text should match with the corresponding tables; (c) the consistencies of data presented should be maintained throughout the document; and (d) the data presented in the State plan should match with the figures presented in the district plans.
- The Mission recommends that, so far as possible, the district teams ensure that the block-wise information is presented in their revised plan proposals.
- The district teams should document major findings of the SAS and its implications in their district plans.
- The Mission recommends that the timings of the subsequent survey concerning BAS may be synchronized for the purposes ensuring the comparability of these results.

### ACCESS

- The mission appreciates efforts at rationalisation of teachers which will be done in order to bridge the differences in TPR among regions. In rationalising teacher appointments/posts, the mission raised the possibility that teachers already catering to a number of students are shifted to another school, adversely affecting children in that school. The SPO stated that the state already has certain broad

criteria in this regard which will be followed. It was agreed that provision be made for regular monitoring.

- The mission appreciates the advances made in this regard. It also notes that while the working of the shiksha ghar has been evaluated, other AS models have not been evaluated as these have been operational for only a year in DPEP-II. There is provision for evaluation of the working of AS models in both DPEP-II & DPEP-III. It is recommended that the results of the evaluation will be taken into account while operationalising subsequent AS centers.
- The state may consider the establishment and strengthening of pre-school education for minority (muslim) children, especially with the maqtabas / madarasas selected under DPEP.

## **RETENTION**

- It is suggested that advocacy campaigns should be launched to prepare community for effective implementation of the strategy.
- The mission observed that 'health check-up and referral' under ICDS happens to be very weak and therefore requires to be streamlined urgently.
- It is suggested that interface between Mahila Samakhya districts and non-MS districts should be established through experience sharing workshops, exposure visits etc.
- It is suggested that monitoring mechanism for timely and regular distribution of textbooks should be established, as the task is stupendous in the light
- The Mission suggests that the State IED cell may focus upon utilisation of the provisions for (i) pre-school education and (ii) itinerant teacher model, both under the centrally sponsored IED scheme and (iii) establishment of IED lab/resource unit at DIET as per MHRD Guidelines for DIETs.
- SCERT / SRG may design appropriate and effective strategies for self-study by students of classes III, IV and V for a period of three hours at a stretch daily before model II of alternative schooling is implemented.

## QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING

- The Mission suggests that some ethnographic studies/participative observations are conducted on classroom processes in selected/identified multigrade and large-class settings to analyse what really happens there. This will help in planning realistic strategies for classroom transaction and teacher-training programmes in years 2 and 3.
- The mission notes that SCERT and SIEMAT are the two nodal agencies undertaking a major part of the DPEP trainings . It is important that they network and establish linkages to evolve more comprehensive understanding of their respective tasks.
- While the establishment of Divisional Project offices seems to be an appropriate step to ensure rigorous monitoring of the programme, the mission is of the view that the staff may be specifically trained in the processes of educational renewal and must not be saddled with the routine duties of the office.
- Appreciating the move to induct four members of DIET faculty from primary schools, it may be ensured that field based orientation and training in aspects related to primary education is adequately provided for faculty drawn from secondary education in the programmes conducted by SCERT.
- The mission is of the view that implementation of lab-area concept at the DIETs limited to 12 kms. radius violates the spirit of action research, particularly in hard pockets within the district. Therefore, the lab-area may be defined in terms of selected different geographical or social areas for experimentation. The suggestion was agreed upon in the state level wrap-up.
- The mission is of the view that the academic support system through BRC/NPRC needs to be energised for their early operationalisation. In DPEP districts, the state intends to strengthen these extensively through SCERT and DIETs. Cognizant of its importance the state agreed to take up it on a priority basis.
- In the light of decentralisation of primary education to Panchayati Raj institutions, Panchayat members at the three levels (village, khand and zilla) should be given orientation and training on planning and management of primary education.

## **CIVIL WORKS**

- The civil works cost for the two district (Jalaun, and Gazipur) may be brought within 24% ceiling.
- The water supply for all civil works should be made available before start of construction work so that there is no paucity of water at the time of execution of these works.
- It is suggested that Civil Works, especially minor repairs, where VECs could take independent decision based on repair manual, should be taken up at the earliest.
- Construction manuals for all design alternatives should be made ready before start of project work (one design alternative manual is ready) as recommended during identification.

## **MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE & MIS**

- Utmost care needs to be taken in selecting/recruiting the person to the position of Dy. Project Director. It is therefore suggested that persons having experience in administration of primary education may be selected for the job.
- Keeping in view the responsibility assigned to the Dy. Project Director, their capacity building is very important. It is therefore suggested that training/orientation of these key officials of Divisional Project office should be ensured.
- It should be ensured that authority alongwith responsibility is delegated to the Divisional Project Offices in real sense so as to ensure that these offices do not act only as Post office to take information from district project offices to pass them on to the state project office.
- The State Project Office should ensure that the computer softwares and hardwares are procured at the earliest.
- An amount of Rs. 5 lakh is allocated to SIEMAT in the first year of the project MIS for data analysis. The state should present details of how data will be analysed, what would be the focus of the analysis, will the remaining seven uncovered districts be included in the analysis, what would be the mode of dissemination of information analysed, with whom and when the analysed data will be shared and what would be the frequency of analysis. During the wrap-up,

the SPD agreed that the SIEMAT will work out the details.

- The State should ensure that training is imparted to both the state and district level project functionaries concerning MIS data uses on continuing basis. They should also be exposed to planning techniques in general and projections and forecasting of educational data in general.
- The Mission noticed a wide difference between the costs of computers of two proposals presented by SPO and SIEMAT. The State, as well as, the SIEMAT may re-look in to the proposals and present the configuration of hardwares in their revised documents.
- The State should present the details of the hardware that need upgradation along with the upgraded configuration. An amount of Rs. 11.0 lakh is proposed for consultancy, the State should present the details of this proposal in the revised document.
- The State should ensure that the activities of Basic Siksha Parishad, SIEMAT and SPO concerning MIS data analysis are not overlapping and there is no administrative problems in effective implementation of different activities.

## PROJECT COST AND PROCUREMENT

- The revised budget of Mahila Samakhya is Rs. 474.67 lakhs. The details of the revised budget needs to be incorporated in the revised plan. While preparing the detailed budget, the unit costs in the blocks with Mahila Samakhya activities should be taken into account.
- SIEMAT received a budget of Rs. 50 lakhs in DPEP-II for its strengthening. Hence, the Mission suggests reduction of the SIEMAT budget to Rs. 2.5 crores only. The balance can be transferred to SPO/district budgets.
- The unit cost of training at SIEMAT is Rs. 4000 per person per week, which appears to be very high. The Mission suggests that training costs should be on par with training cost at state level Training Institutions like SIRD, ATI & SCERT. This matter needs to be resolved in the EC of SIEMAT.
- The revised plans should give the details of the unit cost of different activities.

LIBRARY & DOCUMENTATION UNIT  
National Institute of Educational  
Planning and Administration,  
17 B, Sri Aurobindo Marg,  
New Delhi-110016

D-10375  
H-11-89

# **ANNEXURES**

Table 1.1 : Basic Indicators of the Districts (1997-98)

No	Districts	Area (Sq. Km)	No. of Blocks	No. of Nyay Panchayats	No. of Gram sabhas	No. of inhabited Villages
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Unnao	4586.0	16	173	953	1687
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	3135.0	11	102	622	1032
3	Sultanpur	4436.0	22	256	2168	2495
4	Raibareli	4603.0	21	179	1333	1737
5	Pratapgarh	3717.0	16	171	1105	2185
6	Hamirpur	7166.0	7	61	394	647
7	Jaunpur	3602.6	21	218	1517	3269
8	Mirzapur	4952.5	12	106	763	1772
9	Fatehpur	4152.0	13	132	786	1352
10	Farrukhabad	4274.0	7	87	511	881
11	Faizabad	2015.0	9	112	592	995
12	Ambedkar Nagar	2496.0	9	110	791	1652
13	Etah	4446.0	15	149	902	1507
14	Bijnor	4938.0	11	131	947	2132
15	Buland Shahar	5208.0	15	147	1058	1365
16	Muzaffar Nagar	4049.0	14	112	886	886
17	Haridwar	1994.0	6	46	359	503
18	Tehri	4421.0	9	76	764	1778
19	Bageshwar	2286.0	5	33	338	859
20	Pithoragarh	7243.0	8	64	651	2189
21	Champawat	1613.0	4	23	238	630
22	Uttar Kashi	8016.0	6	36	373	686
23	Jhansi	5118.9	8	65	444	760
24	Jalaun	4569.9	9	81	564	942
25	Ghaziabad	2590.0	8	74	457	704
26	Gautam Buddha Nagar	1456.0	4	40	334	399
27	Meerut	3911.0	11	93	*	615
28	Baghpat	1028.3	6	46	287	369
29	Agra	4027.0	15	114	636	904
30	Mathura	3361.5	10	89	717	871
31	Padrauna	2873.5	14	140	944	1576
32	Mau	1727.8	9	92	620	1472
33	Azamgarh	4234.0	21	280	1628	3721
34	Ballia	2992.7	17	163	820	1791
35	Ghazipur	3607.0	16	193	1047	2583
36	Kannauj	2071.0	7	81	441	689
37	Mahoba	2161.0	4	37	299	415
38	Mainpuri	2759.0	9	80	647	826

**Table 1.2 : Demographic Indicators of the Districts (1991)**

S.No.	Districts	Population (in lakh)			% Population of SC	Density (Per sq. Km)	Sex Ratio
		Total	Male	Female			
1	Unnao	22.00	11.74	10.26	28.54	480	873
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	13.03	7.00	5.93	24.34	416	836
3	Sultanpur	25.59	13.23	12.36	22.35	577	934
4	Raibareli	23.23	12.03	11.20	29.85	505	931
5	Pratapgarh	22.10	11.12	10.98	21.50	595	987
6	Hamirpur	8.84	4.81	4.03	23.80	216	839
7	Jaunpur	32.14	16.12	16.02	22.40	879	993
8	Mirzapur	16.57	8.80	7.77	27.82	336	884
9	Fatehpur	18.99	10.09	8.90	24.72	457	882
10	Farrukhabad	12.47	6.81	5.66	16.36	571	879
11	Faizabad	13.74	7.23	6.51	20.58	545	900
12	Ambedkar Nagar	16.04	8.26	7.78	24.06	643	942
13	Etah	18.69	10.30	8.39	18.01	419	815
14	Bijnor	24.36	12.93	11.43	20.70	409	881
15	Buland Shahr	28.49	15.35	13.14	23.20	534	856
16	Muzaffar Nagar	28.43	15.29	13.14	15.70	541	852
17	Haridwar	11.24	6.09	5.15	21.61	564	846
18	Tehri	5.20	2.56	2.64	13.95	126	1031
19	Bageshwar	2.22	1.08	1.14	24.61	98	1065
20	Pithoragarh	3.80	1.89	1.91	22.55	141	986
21	Champawat	1.65	0.83	0.82	15.08	163	1036
22	Uttar Kashi	2.39	1.24	1.15	22.77	30	927
23	Jhansi	8.63	4.66	3.97	28.10	181	852
24	Jalaun	12.19	6.67	5.52	27.31	267	827
25	Ghaziabad	25.88	14.34	11.54	19.04	1044	832
26	Gautam Buddha Nagar	9.20	4.80	4.40	12.50	631	917
27	Meerut	13.29	7.21	6.08	21.60	822	852
28	Baghpat	10.30	5.60	4.70	12.23	1002	832
29	Agra	27.51	15.02	12.49	23.19	683	832
30	Mathura	16.77	9.23	7.54	19.97	514	817
31	Padrauna	22.35	11.52	10.83	16.19	789	940
32	Mau	14.46	7.32	7.13	21.10	837	974
33	Azamgarh	31.54	15.71	15.82	25.61	744	1006
34	Ballia	22.62	11.99	10.63	14.70	714	851
35	Ghazipur	24.16	12.34	11.82	21.04	716	957
36	Kannauj	10.40	5.72	4.68	19.40	475	818
37	Mahoba	5.82	3.15	2.67	26.60	153	847
38	Mainpuri	13.17	7.18	5.99	19.30	477	834



**Table 1.3 : Literacy Rates of the Districts (1991, 7+Pop.)**

S.No	Districts	Literacy Rates (%)		
		Total	Male	Female
1	Unnao	31.30	42.10	18.90
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	50.90	63.46	36.29
3	Sultanpur	38.70	55.30	20.80
4	Raibareli	37.80	53.30	21.01
5	Pratapgarh	40.40	60.30	20.50
6	Hamirpur	41.70	57.90	22.10
7	Jaunpur	42.20	62.20	22.30
8	Mirzapur	39.68	54.75	22.32
9	Fatehpur	44.60	59.80	27.20
10	Farrukhabad	38.95	49.77	25.92
11	Faizabad	40.02	55.90	22.60
12	Ambedkar Nagar	30.38	47.26	16.63
13	Etah	40.20	54.10	22.90
14	Bijnor	40.53	52.56	26.47
15	Buland Shahr	44.71	61.96	24.30
16	Muzaffar Nagar	44.00	56.63	29.12
17	Haridwar	48.35	59.51	34.93
18	Tehri	48.38	73.10	26.41
19	Bageshwar	44.70	67.20	32.79
20	Pithoragarh	59.29	79.38	38.30
21	Champawat	41.60	60.20	22.30
22	Uttar Kashi	47.20	68.70	23.60
23	Jhansi	51.60	66.80	33.80
24	Jalaun	50.70	66.20	31.60
25	Ghaziabad	55.20	68.60	38.80
26	Gautam Buddha Nagar	51.00	69.73	29.03
27	Meerut	51.30	64.50	35.60
28	Baghpat	51.30	64.50	35.60
29	Agra	38.50	50.43	24.17
30	Mathura	47.30	64.00	29.70
31	Padrauna	32.30	49.50	13.90
32	Mau	43.00	48.90	23.60
33	Azamgarh	39.20	56.10	22.70
34	Ballia	43.90	60.80	26.10
35	Ghazipur	43.20	61.40	24.30
36	Kannauj	38.50	49.60	25.50
37	Mahoba	36.50	51.00	19.10
38	Mainpuri	50.21	64.26	33.05

Table 1.4 : Basic Indicators of the Districts (1998-99)

S.No.	Districts	No. of Parishadiya Schools	No. of Unserved areas	Teacher-pupil ratio	GER % (1998-99)			Drop-out % (1994-95 to 98-99)		
					Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls
1	Unnao	1632	115	1:72	83.00	81.00	85.00	47.21	45.77	49.16
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	1070	125	1:68	90.29	85.40	96.40	31.25	35.00	27.50
3	Sultanpur	2047	37	1:72	88.00	87.00	91.00	50.00	49.00	51.00
4	Raibareli	1438	185	1:63	94.10	93.73	94.56	56.04	54.84	57.62
5	Pratapgarh	1431	78	1:63	90.80	95.20	86.30	33.30	36.20	29.50
6	Hamirpur	668	44	1:56	82.73	82.48	83.06	26.20	20.13	35.15
7	Jaunpur	1835	87	1:76	91.29	97.08	85.46	37.26	32.99	42.32
8	Mirzapur	1152	61	1:75	80.10	83.30	77.20	23.20	22.10	24.30
9	Fatehpur	1331	109	1:69	88.41	88.34	88.48	38.63	35.14	43.20
10	Farrukhabad	865	66	1:53	89.80	92.30	89.70	37.24	36.00	39.00
11	Faizabad	776	83	1:71	85.00	89.00	80.00	57.00	52.00	63.00
12	Ambedkar Nagar	976	85	1:70	85.00	75.00	85.00	56.64	52.00	63.00
13	Etah	1763	109	1:59	86.57	87.88	85.08	57.00	54.00	61.50
14	Bijnor	1401	108	1:61	71.85	81.39	60.82	47.21	45.77	49.16
15	Buland Shahr	1241	124	1:58	70.67	74.72	65.86	52.12	48.84	53.08
16	Muzaffar Nagar	1179	63	1:54	69.79	80.24	57.52	48.84	50.46	48.25
17	Haridwar	496	23	1:73	87.19	88.42	85.67	48.50	51.70	43.50
18	Tehri	1174	122	1:36	90.63	92.49	88.70	45.16	42.26	47.12
19	Bageshwar	493	52	1:29	78.00	80.00	76.00	50.05	50.11	49.98
20	Pithoragarh	1031	344	1:28	104.90	110.00	99.00	21.05	25.90	23.60
21	Champawat	413	183	1:27	101.10	98.30	103.90	18.88	15.08	22.69
22	Uttar Kashi	609	179	1:26	70.22	74.12	66.32	22.48	23.55	21.41
23	Jhansi	909	84	1:54	92.00	91.50	93.70	27.80	24.50	32.40
24	Jalaun	1043	45	1:50	90.10	91.30	88.40	28.30	26.80	30.30
25	Ghaziabad	669	18	1:49	76.69	80.79	71.84	38.33	31.86	46.02
26	Gautam Buddha Nagar	388	21	1:50	92.40	93.90	90.20	51.00	49.00	55.00
27	Meerut	806	26	1:51	86.21	89.53	82.35	55.79	54.39	57.24
28	Baghpat	481	7	1:39	85.51	89.87	80.47	59.51	58.45	60.87
29	Agra	1399	160	1:60	94.00	98.00	90.00	58.00	53.00	61.00
30	Mathura	1027	56	1:53	94.50	95.60	96.70	43.30	40.07	47.25
31	Padrauna	1305	47	1:91	80.85	80.95	80.75	34.80	34.40	33.60
32	Mau	835	69	1:57	70.50	74.41	63.15	47.80	39.50	60.50
33	Azamgarh	1614	126	1:70	78.34	80.60	76.10	49.10	61.50	32.90
34	Ballia	1341	341	1:62	80.00	89.00	71.00	65.00	61.00	72.00
35	Ghazipur	1250	154	1:61	64.90	71.40	66.60	36.00	35.00	37.00
36	Kannauj	743	60	1:72	93.10	95.60	90.40	28.50	25.80	31.60
37	Mahoba	501	39	1:52	85.05	89.14	79.54	35.86	33.73	38.00
38	Mainpuri	1106	72	1:60	79.25	81.83	76.03	51.50	53.90	48.50

	Additional class rooms			New Schools			Schools Reconstruction			Toilets			Drinking Water			School Repair			ECCE Centre			Alternative Schools			
	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	Req	DPEP	Gap	
Unnao	377	377	0	115	41	74	162	93	69	1005	400	605	458	162	296	11	11	0	250					77	
Kanpur Dehat	786	486	300	125	125	0	49	49	0	822	822	0	439	225	214	198	150	48	35					250	
Sultanpur	245	245	0	37	37	0	199	136	63	1455	500	955	1139	300	839	556	500	56	30					100	
Raebareli	686	250	436	185	50	135	69	69	0	600	600	0	292	235	57	429	429	0	200					235	
Pratapgarh	396	375	21	78	78	0	116	116	0	516	510	6	105	105	0	480	480	0	110					250	
Hamirpur	522	400	122	44	44	0	112	89	23	575	400	175	50	30	20	68	68	0	100					225	
Jaunpur	1024	424	600	87	87	0	120	120	0	1291	324	967	665	100	565	516	516	0	100					150	
Mirzapur	573	573	0	61	61	0	99	99	0	955	955	0	65	65	0	323	323	0	250					200	
Fatehpur	482	173	309	109	109	0	177	177	0	727	537	190	280	209	71	156	156	0	100					400	
Farukhabad	691	350	341	66	66	0	110	110	0	300	300	0	344	250	94	143	143	0	70	70	0			100	
Faizabad	556	556	0	83	83	0	46	46	0	550	550	0	83	83	0	110	116	-6	100					100	
Ambedkar Nagar	556	556	0	85	85	0	87	87	0	773	500	273	195	120	75	125	125	0	300					170	
Etah	584	300	284	109	109	0	215	120	95	1433	380	1053	260	100	160	168	118	50	100					150	
Bijnor	430	430	0	187	108	79	167	167	0	482	482	0	206	77	129	444	444	0	50					100	
Buland Shahar	379	379	0	124	124	0	91	91	0	875	767	108	158	124	34	312	312	0	100					100	
Muzaffar Nagar	427	427	0	63	63	0	52	52	0	898	520	378	63	63	0	350	350	0	100	100	0			220	
Hardwar	275	275	0	14	14	0	35	39	-4	425	425	0	152	152	0	425	429	-4	125	125	0			40	
Tehri	67	67	0	122	122	0	122	90	32	1130	200	930	1093	200	893	390	390	0	200					237	
Bageshwar	108	108	0	52	52	0	37	27	10	493	150	343	501	150	351	178	0	178	125	81	44			76	
Pithoragarh	160	59	101	38	38	0	55	55	0	825	600	225	409	250	159	193	60	133	104					139	
Champawat	102	102	0	28	28	0	33	20	13	200	200	0	200	200	0	200	200	0	116					82	
Uttar Kashi	20	20	0	96	96	0	12	9	3	612	400	212	602	400	202	63	62	1	65					150	
Jhansi	287	287	0	84	60	24	287	113	174	500	2750	-2250	100	100	0	213	200	13	100					60	
Jalaun	350	350	0	45	45	0	67	67	0	634	634	0	325	325	0	450	450	0	175					70	
Ghaziabad	345	345	0	18	18	0	56	56	0	588	588	0	43	43	0	215	215	0	100	100	0			330	
Gautam Budh Nagar	283	283	0	21		21	33	33	0	293	291	2	62	60	2	110	110	0	125					150	
Meerut	485	250	235	26	26	0	140	100	40	643	525	118	48	48	0	200	0	200	200					125	
Baghpat	480	480	0	7	7	0	80	60	20	440	300	140	22	22	0	140	90	50	150					130	
Agra	445	445	0	160	160	0	58	58	0	1057	1057	0	235	235	0	980	490	490	175					235	
Mathura	179	179	0	56	56	0	104	104	0	747	747	0	95	95	0	197	197	0	80	80	0			40	
Kushi Nagar	650	400	250	82	82	0	170	150	20	671	400	271	496	200	296	280	200	80	175					101	
Mau	400	400	0	69	69	0	138	100	38	73	73	0	78	78	0	745	400	345	50					350	
Azamgarh	586	550	36	126	126	0	211	150	61	530	304	226	388	220	168	209	209	0	250	150	100			400	
Ballia	620	400	220	175	175	0	104	104	0	250	200	50	366	300	66	370	220	150	125					166	
Gazipur	601	200	401	154	154	0	150	100	50	500	500	0	240	180	60	199	199	0	125	125	0			150	
Kannauj	272	272	0	60	60	0	51	51	0	617	610	7	238	238	0	42	42	0	70					100	
Mahoba	165	165	0	39	39	0	87	87	0	466	466	0	39	39	0	213	213	0	40					200	
Mainpuri	356	333	23	72	72	0	57	57	0	895	400	495	72	49	23	650	550	100	270					111	
Total	15950	12271	3679	3102	2769	333	3958	3251	707	25846	20367	5479	10606	5832	4774	11051	9167	1884	4940	831	4109			6269	

Note : As pointed out by the SPO, the gaps after DPEP provisions would be met through departmental funds and/or convergence with other departments.

DISTRICTS COMPONENTS

S.No.	Districts	Add. Class Room	New School	School Recon.	Toilets	Drinking Water	School Repair	BRC	NPRC	ECCE Room	Total Cost Civil Work	Civit Work %	Total Project Cost
	Unit Cost	0.28	0.764	0.764	0.1	0.22	0.2	8	0.28	0.28			
1	Unnao	377	41	93	400	162	11	16	174		462.08	19.34	2389.56
2	Kanpur (dehat)	486	125	49	822	225	150	11	108		551.48	23.51	2346.08
3	Sultanpur	245	37	136	500	300	500	22	187		570.9	19.52	2924.55
4	Raibareli	250	50	69	600	235	429	21	179		576.54	23.38	2465.81
5	Pratapgarh	375	78	116	510	105	480	16	171		599.19	23.02	2602.59
6	Hamirpur	400	44	89	400	30	68	7	61		346.89	22.43	1546.48
7	Jaunpur	424	87	120	324	100	516	21	218		663.51	21.01	3158.41
8	Mirzapur	573	61	99	955	65	323	12	106		582.76	23.07	2525.81
9	Fatehpur	173	109	177	537	209	156	13	132		539.78	22.12	2439.69
10	Farrukhabad	350	66	110	300	250	143	7	87	70	446.02	23.80	1873.64
11	Faizabad	556	83	46	550	83	116	8	112		444.86	22.44	1982.22
12	Ambedkar Nagar	556	85	87	500	120	125	9	110		491.08	23.80	2063.61
13	Etah	300	109	120	380	100	118	15	149		500.03	20.76	2409.01
14	Bijnor	430	108	167	482	77	444	11	131		613.52	23.81	2576.21
15	Buland Shahar	379	124	91	767	124	312	15	147		597.92	21.33	2803.60
16	Muzaffar Nagar	427	63	52	520	63	350	14	112	100	514.64	19.22	2677.38
17	Haridwar	275	14	39	425	152	429	6	46	125	371.2	22.35	1660.76
18	Tehri	67	122	90	200	200	390	9	76		416.04	22.69	1833.69
19	Baqeshwar	108	52	27	150	150	0	5	33	81	210.51	23.43	898.45
20	Pithoragarh	59	38	55	600	250	60	8	64		286.49	22.66	1264.19
21	Champawat	102	28	20	200	200	200	4	23		199.31	23.54	846.68
22	Uttar Kashi	20	96	9	400	400	62	6	36		284.3	23.42	1213.94
23	Jhansi	287	60	113	500	100	200	8	65		406.73	23.68	1717.60
24	Jalaun	350	45	67	634	325	450	9	81		503.14	26.86	1873.43
25	Ghaziabad	345	18	56	588	43	215	8	74	100	377.12	19.65	1919.09
26	Gautam Buddha Nagar	283	0	33	291	60	110	4	40		211.95	18.35	1155.29
27	Meerut	250	26	100	525	48	0	12	93		407.36	21.64	1882.82
28	Baghpat	480	7	60	300	22	90	6	46		299.3	20.26	1477.14
29	Agra	445	160	58	1057	235	490	15	114		698.47	22.18	3149.33
30	Mathura	179	56	104	747	95	197	10	89	80	434.68	23.12	1880.46
31	Padrauna	400	82	150	400	200	200	14	140		564.45	23.28	2424.65
32	Mau	400	69	100	73	78	400	9	92		443.38	21.88	2026.25
33	Azamgarh	550	126	150	304	220	209	22	280	150	781.86	23.13	3380.72
34	Ballia	400	175	104	200	300	220	17	163		636.79	23.97	2656.06
35	Ghazipur	200	154	100	500	180	199	16	193	125	596.5	24.25	2460.17
36	Kannauj	272	60	51	610	238	42	7	81		381.4	22.25	1714.11
37	Mahoba	165	39	87	466	39	213	4	37		293.78	19.63	1496.75
38	Mainpuri	333	72	57	400	49	550	9	80		427.03	23.63	1806.87
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12271</b>	<b>2769</b>	<b>3251</b>	<b>18117</b>	<b>5832</b>	<b>9167</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>4130</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>17732.99</b>	<b>22.30</b>	<b>79523.10</b>

STATE COMPONENT

1	DPEP cell in SCERT building										12.0		
2	SIEMAT expansion										63.0		
3	MIS										10.0		
	<b>Total</b>										<b>85.0</b>		
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>										<b>17818.0</b>		

**Table 4.1**  
**SPO Staffing Pattern, Present and Proposed**

S.No.	Post	No. of Existing Posts		Proposal	Total Posts after March 2000
		UP BEP	DPEP II	For DPEP III	
1.	State Project Director	1	-	1	1
2.	Additional State Project Director	-	1	1	2
3.	Additional Director (BEP / DPEP II)	1	1	1	2
4.	Chief Finance & Account Officer	-	-	1	1
5.	Senior Professional	7*	3**	7***	10
6.	Assistant Director	1	-	-	-
7.	Senior Finance & Accounts Officer	1	1	1	2
8.	Professionals	7	5	7	12
9.	Purchase Officer (Store)	-	-	1	1
10.	System Analyst	1	-	1	1
11.	Distance Education Coordinator	-	1	1	2
12.	Administrative Officer	1	1	1	2
13.	Computer Programmer	1	1	1	2
14.	Accounts Officer	1	-	1	1
15.	Asst. Accounts Officer	1	1	1	2
16.	Office Superintendent	-	1	1	2
17.	Senior Accountant	-	1	1	2
18.	Computer Operator	4	3	4	7
19.	Steno	13	6	7	13
20.	Accountant	2	2	2	4
21.	Auditor	-	1	1	2
22.	Junior Auditor	-	-	2	2
23.	Senior Clerk	-	2	6	8
24.	Asst. Clerk	11	2	3	5
25.	Cashier	-	-	1	1
26.	Driver	6	2	6	8
27.	Daftari	1	-	-	-
28.	Peon (Peon-cum-Messenger)	17	8	8	16
29.	Watchman	-	-	2	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>113</b>

\* (Planning and Monitoring / Formal Education / Non Formal Education / Training / Finance and Accounts / Civil Works / Research and Evaluation).

\*\* (Planning and Monitoring / Programme / Establishment).

\*\*\* (Civil Works, Alternative Schooling, Girls Education, Quality Improvement Media & Documentation, Research & Evaluation, Integrated Education & Community Mobilization).

**Table 4.2**  
**Proposed Phasing in Filling up of SPO Positions**

S.No.	Post / Designation	No's	1999	2000	2002
1.	State Project Director	1		*	
2.	Additional Project Director	1	*		
3.	Additional Director DPEP III	1		*	
4.	Chief Finance & Account Officer	1	*		
5.	Senior Professional	7		*	
6.	Senior Finance & Accounts Officer	1		*	
7.	Professionals	7		*	
8.	Purchase Officer	1	*		
9.	System Analyst	1	*		
10.	Administrative Officer	1			*
11.	Computer Programmer	1	*		
12.	Accounts Officer	1	*		
13.	Asst. Accounts Officer	1	*		
14.	Office Superintendent	1	*		
15.	Senior Accountant	1	*		
16.	Computer Operator	4	*		
17.	Steno	7		*	
18.	Accountant	2	*		
19.	Auditor	1	*		
20.	Junior Auditor	2	*		
21.	Senior Clerk	6	*		
22.	Asst. Clerk	3		*	
23.	Cashier	1	*		
24.	Driver	6		*	
25.	Peon	8		*	
26.	Watchman	2		*	
27.	Distance Education Coordinator	1			* *
	<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>2</b>

## DISTRICT VISITS

### FAIZABAD

A team comprising of Dr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi, Ms. Suman Sachdeva and Mr. A.P. Sharma visited district Faizabad on May 27<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup>, 1999.

In the morning session, the team had a meeting with the District Magistrate, the district planning team headed by the Basic Shiksha Adhikari and key officials from Departments of Health, DRDA, ICDS, Mahila Samakhya etc. The presentation by the Basic Shiksha Adhikari and the discussion held with the DM gave the present scenario of the district and helped to realise their strategy in dealing with the specific problems and issues of the district vis-à-vis education.

This was followed by the visit to the 'Block Tarun' where a meeting with 8-10 village education committees had been organised. This group consisted of about 50-60 community members. Significant issues came up in the discussion wherein the community members expressed their opinion about the problems of their villages in general and about education in particular, especially with respect to the general population, special focus groups, teachers, schools, role of panchayats and VECs etc.

In the afternoon session a visit to DIET was undertaken. Besides the discussion with the DIET faculty, the district plan was also discussed in detail with the planning team, whereby clarifications were sought and discrepancies pointed out. Decisions about incorporation of certain additions and deletions in the plan were also taken.

The next day, i.e. May 28, 1999, an ICDS centre situated in the village Dabha Simar (Masodha block) was visited. Discussions were held with the instructor and helper of the centre. The district visit concluded with the visit to a primary school which was closed for the vacations. However, perception about the building was drawn.

The significant issues emerging from the entire visit are given below :

- Community participation/awareness in the district is encouraging. The community has taken part in many activities related to primary education.
- The total literacy campaign which is successful has contributed to generate demand for primary education.
- The NGOs and other active groups who were deeply involved in TLC are also proposed to be involved in the DPEP in the area of environment building.
- The gender disparities in literacy as well as enrolment is quite high in the district.
- District still has problem of access as there are 83 unserved habitations for which new schools have been proposed.
- The teacher pupil ratio is quite high in the district and generally the classes are over crowded. In some schools it is 1 : 90 and above.
- About 70 villages in 3 blocks are affected by floods for 2-3 months and the teaching learning is disrupted during that period. It is proposed that the problem will be addressed by appointing para teachers.
- The dearth of infrastructure facilities like toilets and electricity is evident in the district.
- Private schools have been opened in even rural areas (including many unrecognised schools) which have drawn children from Government schools (i.e. Parishadya Schools).
- The coverage of ICDS does not seem to be much as in quite big villages only one or two ICDS centres are working and there is a restriction of enrolling at the most 40 children in these centres.
- The functioning of ICDS does not seem to be satisfactory which has also been recognized in the district plan and observed during district visit.
- It was observed that there is no input towards health and hygiene awareness among the children in ICDS centre.
- The convergence seems to have been thought of well and a few departments like ICDS, Health and DRDA etc. were involved even during district plan preparation.



- The VECs are constituted throughout the district and women are given proper representation but their participation in VEC activities are yet to be ensured in the district, in general.
- There is a general perception that VECs are expected to undertake many responsibilities which are all new for them and that the VECs will be over burdened as a result of this. Thus, the trainings proposed for VEC members in the district plan (i.e.. 3 days) in a year does not seem to be not enough.
- There is a need for VECs training immediately after the programme is launched but in Faizabad no VEC training has been proposed in the first year.
- The villagers seem to be enthusiastic about participating in the activities of primary education and they are well aware about the problems related to education at the grassroot level.
- The maintenance of DIET building is found to be very poor. The water supply is inadequate and basic facilities like toilet are not functioning properly due to lack of water supply.
- There is a need to gear up DIET for undertaking the activities proposed under DPEP. The capacity building of DIET faculty is very important in this context.

## **RAIBARELI**

A team of three members of the mission namely Dr. A.C. Mehta, Dr. Manjari Gopal and Dr. I.D. Gupta, visited Rae Bareli on 27-28th May, 1999. The team was accompanied by Ms. Kalpana Awasthi and Shri D.B. Sharma from the S.P.O.

### **The Visit**

The visit started on 27.5.1999 with an ICDS Anganwadi Kendra at Madhupuri village where 7 ladies including 'mahila pradhan' along with her husband and 2 adolescent girls had assembled besides the Anganwadi Worker and 17 of the 40 children enrolled. The Anganwadi Worker shared her problems as well as the experiences.

At noon, the team had a meeting with VEC, Hansapur village where 100 - odd people of all sorts - male and female, young and old, educated and illiterates had assembled. The assembly was lively, to even call immediately the SC nominee when the issue of stipend - disbursement was raised by a SC woman. The discussion covered the entire spectrum of primary and pre-primary education scenario.

The afternoon session provided for two meetings, first with the ABSAs of the district and later with the members of District Planning Core Team constituted for the DPEP. The ABSAs shared their experiences across the blocks in the district. Specific experience of the Eicher Project in 62 schools of Harchandpur Block was appreciated.

Discussion with district core team continued till 8.00 p.m., when the core team members shared their experiences in preparing district plan. It was observed from their presentations that the knowledge and data available at the block level is much deeper and comprehensive than that presented in the district plan document suggesting the need for better utilisation of the data generated.

The meeting on the second day, i.e. 28.5.1999 was planned at DIET, Rae Bareilly. The meeting, presided by District Magistrate, was attended by around 30 participants, including DIET faculty, BSA/ABSAs, NGOs, ICDS Officers, Health & Medical Officers, PRO and teachers from Eicher Project (Harchandpur). Presentations were made on multigrade teaching, IED and Joyful Learning by the DIET faculty, Panchayati Raj Project on Sanitation Hygiene by DPRO, role of NGOs by Ms. S. Hussain of Academy for Educational Development (Lucknow), Sh. U. Singh, Teacher (Eicher Project), ICDS by the concerned officer, community participation by Mr. Mathur and School Health Programme by Dr. Mishra, Dy. CMO.

**The Mission observations regarding different schemes are briefly summarised below:**

- the delivery system, both for nutritive meal and learning materials in ICDS, needs to be strengthened. ICDS centre Madhupuri had not received any set/kit of toys etc., and did not have nutritive meal for a week.

- health check up and referral services in ICDS centres are virtually non-existent.
- attendance of children in ICDS centres was found to vary large; it ranged, for example, between 25 and 40 in February and between 8 and 26 in March.
- VECs are expected to play a key-role at the grassroots level in improvement of educational provisions and qualities. The discussions with the members of VEC, Hansapur served to highlight the need for intensive, recurrent training/orientation which will be required for VECs to undertake the challenging role.
- procedures for disbursement of stipends to children require to be made effective; several members of the community registered complaints.
- DIET is expressively involved in promotion of joyful learning and is appreciative of its role of developing local-specific supplementary curriculum - materials on local history culture geography and dialect. Appropriate planning and costing require to be made especially for the CMDE and ET branches from the 2nd / 3rd years of DPEP.
- The lab. area of the DIET has been restricted to 12 kms., whereas the role demands that the lab-area be defined in terms of disadvantaged, difficult target pockets in the district, irrespective of distance.
- DIET is prepared to undertake its role in IED, as defined in the MHRD guidelines for DIETs. SCERT needs to establish and strengthen IED lab - cum - Resource Unit at the DIET.
- Eicher Experiment in Harchandpur Block has generated enthusiasm among the teachers who suggest that provisions for regular academic competitions within and among schools be made to encourage student participation and quality in education.
- A large scale project, worth Rs. 200 crore has been approved for Rai Bareli district to cater universal sanitation and hygiene. The main focus of the project, in its phase I, shall be on mobilisation and awareness. Three NGOs have been identified to work in 19 blocks. The mission suggests that community mobilisation in general and the construction plus maintenance of toilets in schools in particular, in DPEP may be interwoven with the said project.
- Infrastructural inadequacies were evident from the observation of the Hansapur primary school which comprises two rooms only with corridors and verandah.

Current enrolment figures were given as 369 students with seven primary teachers. The mission members were concerned to note that on a regular school day, the possible presence of all or most of the assigned teachers with above 50% attendance would be difficult to manage in such a set up.

- There are five 'Montessori schools' running in the neighbouring areas also. This shows the increased demand for 'quality' education, but it also highlights the possible incidence of double enrolment also (many children are registered at the government schools for the stipends and/or scholarships and the mid-day meal supplements of 3 kgs of wheat).
- The DIET at Raibarely is staffed with a Principal, Vice-Principal, and Senior Lecturer and 15 Lecturers and has adequate infrastructure for the regular training / programmes it conducts.

### **Convergence with Government Department and Programmes**

- The district team, under the Chairmanship of the DM is working to ensure convergence of other developmental programmes of different governmental departments with the DPEP. The Mission strongly recommends regular meetings particularly at the initial stages of programme planning and implementation to initiate and strengthen the awareness of the problems and issues faced in spreading primary education in general and DPEP in particular.

### **SULTANPUR**

A four member team comprising of Dr. A.K. Singh, Mr. Harshavardhan, Dr. B. Shiva Reddy and Mr. C. Sadhu visited Sultanpur district and held discussions with D.M., C.D.O. and district planning team members i.e. Basic Shiksha Adhikari (BSA), Assistant Basic Shiksha Adhikari (ABSA), DIET faculty members. Within the district, the members also visited DIET and four village primary schools located in different blocks. At the village primary schools, the members held discussions with Gram Pradhans, teachers, other VEC members and functionaries of ICDS, NFE and women's groups. The members are appreciative of the efforts put in by the district planning team in

planning process and preparation of perspective plan documents. However, there are certain issues which the team finds worth highlighting and expects these to be addressed to by the district planning team/the concerned authorities.

- Consistency of data use in plan proposal: The plan has taken educational data (such as enrolment, retention) from different sources. The data quoted in the document varies from one page to another. There is need to maintain consistency in terms of data use in plan preparation.
- High Teacher People Ratio (TPR): Teacher Pupil Ratio of primary schools in Sultanpur district is 1:72. The range varies from 1:62 in Dhanpalganj block to 1:122 in Shukul Bazar block. There are 5 blocks with T.P.R. more than 1:85. Besides rational deployment of teachers, there is need of fresh recruitment of teachers to ease out the situation. There are 1407 vacant posts against the sanctioned strength. The mission recommended that these must be filled during pre-project period itself.
- Teacher Transfer: Certain schools in the district have suffered due to recent teacher transfer. The policy of giving two teachers to one school has affected some of the schools. Out of the four schools visited, three schools suffered from the problem of inadequate teachers due to vacant transfers.
- Infrastructure Gap: The district, as described in the plan, has sizeable infrastructure requirements especially in terms of building, drink water, toilet and repairs, which are partially addressed through DPEP funds. There is need to fill up the gap through coordination with other departments.  
It is observed that toilet and drinking water facilities are not available in 1455 and 1139 schools respectively, out of 2069 existing schools. These should be taken up on priority basis.
- Irregular Supply of Incentives: From discussion with children and parents, it comes out that stipends/scholarship provided to the SC/ST and minorities children through social welfare department is irregular. Very often they get it at the end of year, which hardly goes into school related expenses, such as buying books and

other stationers. The supply of 3 kg grain under the mid-day meal scheme is not regular either. Besides, the supply of raw nutrition materials to the ICDS functionaries are also delayed. The mission members think that the procurement and distribution of these incentives need to be more effective. At the state level, it was pointed out that the distribution of incentives to the disadvantaged groups is getting computerised which would streamline the distribution. The convergence should be taken up among the district level officials.

- Double Shift: Regarding double shifts, a strategy being introduced under DPEP, villagers and teachers had mixed reactions. While some people approved the idea to ensure teachers availability in each class and more effective classroom transaction, some members pointed out that afternoon class will not be effective especially for girls and younger children. Therefore it is suggested that feasibility issue should be looked into greater details and during implementation, it should be a priority area of research.
- Operationalisation of DIET: In comparison to other DPEP - II districts, staffing position at DIET Sultanpur is better. Although out of 25 sanctioned posts, 18 have been filled up, it does not have adequate number of senior faculty persons.
- In the perspective plan, the write up on strengthening DIET does not match with the budgeted activities. Priority should be worked out for more relevant activities.
- The planning team was advised to study and reflect the findings of baseline assessment study in the revised plan.

## ITINERARY

May 255, 1999 (A.N.)	Departure to Lucknow
May 266, 1999	Meeting at SPO : Presentation and Discussion on State Component Plan
May 277 & 28, 1999	Visit to District (Faizabad, Raibareli and Sultanpur)
<b>District Visit Itinerary : Faizabad</b>	
May 277, 1999 (6.00 A. M.)	Departure from Lucknow
8:30 A.M.	Arrival at Faizabad
9:30 A.M.	Meeting with District Magistrate and other District Level Officials and Presentation by BSA.
11:30 A.M.	Visit to Tarun Block : Meeting with Village Panchayat, VEC and Community Members and discussion.
14:30 P.M.	Visit to DIET Marodha, Faizabad : Discussion with District Planning team on Faizabad District Plan at DIET
May 228, 1999, 9:30 A.M.	Visit to ECCE Centre at Dabha Semar in Masodha Block
11:30 A.M.	Departure from Faizabad
14:00	Arrival at Lucknow
<b>District visit Itinerary : Sultanpur</b>	
May 227, 1999 (7:00A.M.)	Departure from Lucknow
10:30A.M.	Arrival at Sultanpur
11:00A.M.	Meeting with CDO and District Planning Team
3:00P.M.	Meeting with DIET Principal and faculty
4:00P.M.	Visit to Primary schools, Dagupur and Bhain Block Dulupur. Meeting with BDO, ABSA, Village Panchayat members, teachers and parents.
May 228, 1999 (9:00A.M.)	Visit to primary schools, Indaria Thakurganj block shukul banzan and Kamrauli block jagdishpur. Meeting with school teachers, ICDS functionaries, VEC members, woman groups, village panchayat pradhan & members.
12:00A.M.	Departure from Sultanpur
2:30PP.M.	Arrival at Lucknow
<b>District Visit Itinerary : Raibareli</b>	
May 27, 1999 (8:00 A.M.)	Departure from Lucknow
10:00 A.M.	Arrival in Raibareli
11:30A.M.	Visit to ICDS centre at Madhupuri village
12:30 P.M.	Discussion with VEC and community, Hausapur
4:00PP.M.	Discussion with ABSAs, at Raibareli
6:00PP.M.	Discussion with DPEP Planning Core Team, Raibareli
May 28, 1999 (9:00A.M.)	Meeting organised at DIET, Raibareli under the chairmanship of DM, Raibareli.
12:30P.M.	Departure from Raibareli
2:15PP.M.	Arrival in Lucknow
May 28, 1999 (A.N.)	Meeting at SPO : Presentation and Discussion with Directors, Basic Education, SCERT, SIEMAT, M.S. and SIET.
May 29 & 30, 1999	Meeting with District Planning Teams at SPO : Discussion on District Plans.
May 31, 1999 (F.N.)	Wrap-up Meeting at SPO with Principal Secretary (Education), Government of Uttar Pradesh and key state Level Officials and SPO officials.
(After Noon)	Departure to Delhi.

NIEPA DC



D10375

LIBRARY & DOCUMENTATION

National Institute of Educational Planning  
New Delhi

Date: 11-11-99  
D-10375