

**No.F. 1-84/2009-Sch.1**  
Government of India  
Ministry of Human Resource Development  
Department of School Education & Literacy  
School-1 Section  
\*\*\*\*\*

Dated 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2010

To

The Secretaries, In-charge of Secondary Education of Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Puducherry.

Sub: - Fourth meeting of Project Approval Board (PAB) for Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) chaired by Secretary (SE&L) to consider proposal from Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh., Meghalaya and Puducherry held on 25.2.2010.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith minutes of the Fourth meeting of PAB for RMSA held on 25.02.2010 to consider proposals received from Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Puducherry for information and necessary action at your end.

Yours faithfully,

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

Encl: - as above

Copy to:-

1. Sr. PPS to Secretary (SE&L)
2. PS to AS & FA
3. PPS to JS(SE)
4. The Vice-Chancellor, NUEPA, New Delhi.
5. Director, NCERT, New Delhi.
6. Ministry of Minority Affairs, CGO complex, New Delhi.



**Minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Project Approval Board (PAB)  
held on 25.2.2010 to consider the  
proposals of State/UT Governments under  
Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA)**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Sub: Minutes of the fourth meeting of the Project Approval Board (PAB) to consider proposals under Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan held on 25.2.2010.**

The fourth meeting of the Project Approval Board for Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan to consider annual plan proposals of Bihar, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh and Puducherry was held on 25.2.2010 under the chairmanship of Smt. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, School Education and Literacy, Government of India. A list of participants is appended.

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

**3. Bihar**

3.1 Principal Secretary (Education), Government of Bihar, presented the Annual Plan proposal of the State Government for 2009-10. The GER at secondary stage in Bihar in 2007-08 was 29.80%, The transition rate from elementary to secondary education was however quite high around 95%. While the perspective plan was yet to be finalised, the State Government has set the following tentative targets:

<u>GER</u>	<u>Year</u>
35%	2010
42%	2012
64%	2017
100% (universalization )	2025

3.2 JS(SE) suggested that the State Government needed to have a re-look at the targets and perhaps try to achieve universalisation by 2020. Principal Secretary (Education), Bihar stated that since enrolment at secondary stage cannot exceed number of class-VIII graduates, the target setting was done keeping in view the trend in class-VIII enrolment.

3.3 JS(SE) pointed out that following the enactment of RTE Act, all children in the relevant age group would have to be enrolled in class-I within the roll out period allowed in the Act. If this is done, within a period of eight years, NER at elementary level would automatically approach 100%, and given the high transition rate from elementary to secondary stage, it would be possible for the State Government to achieve universalisation at secondary stage within ten years. Secretary (SE&L) advised the State Government to keep in view the suggestions while finalizing the perspective plan for RMSA, even though there is a 3 year roll-out period for RTE Act to become fully operational.

3.4 It was mentioned in the appraisal note that about 20% of the sanctioned posts of teachers were lying vacant in the State. Principal Secretary, Government of Bihar stated that action has been initiated in this regard and 7000 posts of teachers were likely to be filled up soon. It was also pointed out that PTR in certain districts was unusually high as per the statistics provided. Principal Secretary, Bihar stated that this was apparently because of erroneous data, and the these figures would be rechecked.

3.5 Under the current year's Annual Plan, the State Government has requested for upgradation of 1698 upper primary schools and setting up of 200 new secondary schools. Principal Secretary, Government of Bihar stated that these schools were selected based on three well defined criteria,

- (i) No high school being available within 5 kilometers of proposed new/upgraded school,
- (ii) Availability of adequate enrolment,
- (iii) Availability of at least 1.5 acres of land in case of upgraded schools.

3.6 PAB felt that considering the low enrolment ratio at secondary stage in Bihar, there was little doubt that the State Government would be requiring a large number of new schools. However, in the absence of a proper school mapping exercise, the PAB recommended upgradation of 350 schools in the first year. The State Government would have to furnish this list based on priority to the Ministry.

3.7 The State Government had proposed strengthening of 750 out of the 2938 existing Government schools. It was pointed out by the Appraisal Team that no additional classrooms was proposed, nor were the school level details provided. The PAB advised the State Government to take up all requirements of a set of schools simultaneously, and not to take up components in bits and pieces. The State Government was, therefore, advised to work out the requirements based on complete school improvement plans and bring the same before PAB next year.

3.8 Annual school grant @ Rs 0.40 lakh was recommended for 2938 existing government secondary schools. Minor repair grant @ Rs 0.25 lakh was sanctioned for the same 2938 schools.

3.9 As regards in-service training of teachers, the Principal Secretary, Govt. of Bihar conveyed the readiness of State government to train a large number of teachers, particularly during the ensuing summer vacation. Since there is little likelihood of next year's Annual Plan being approved by that time, the State Government requested for approval for imparting in-service training to 5000 teachers as part of current year's Annual Plan. PAB approved in-service training of 5,000 teachers as part of Annual Plan of 2009-10. These teachers would be imparted the training during the summer vacation.

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

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

- (i) A list of 350 new secondary schools to be upgraded from the upper primary level;
- (ii) Provision in the State budget to meet State share;
- (iii) Bond, Resolution, authorization letter in the prescribed format.

#### **4. Arunachal Pradesh**

4.1 Secretary and Commissioner (School Education), Government of Arunachal Pradesh presented the proposal for Annual Plan 2009-10. GER at secondary stage in Arunachal Pradesh in 2008-09 was 61.4%, and at higher secondary stage 38.34%. The total enrolment in secondary classes (IX, X) was 40,359 in 2008-09, 70% of the students being tribals. The State government is yet to formulate the perspective plan and set medium and long term targets under RMSA.

4.2 The State government has proposed to strengthen all 186 government secondary schools and have projected the requirements district wise. While the district level requirements have been worked out, the additionalities have not been assessed school wise. The PAB therefore advised the State government to assess school-wise requirement through a school improvement plan and bring the same before PAB for consideration next year. JS(SE) also stated that whatever number of schools are taken up, all required improvement as per State norms should be covered at one go. All existing government secondary schools should also be covered within the next two years, so that all such schools would have requisite facilities as per State norms in place by the end of 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.

4.3 The proposal for major repair of 186 existing schools was not recommended as school level requirements were not assessed. The State government was advised to come back with the proposal next year.

4.4 Annual School grant @ Rs 0.40 lakh per school was recommended for 186 existing government schools including 104 secondary schools and 82 higher secondary schools with secondary classes.

4.5 It was mentioned by the State government in the presentation that 74 of the 186 schools were having RCC type buildings. The remaining schools are having "Assam type" buildings. As per the framework of implementation of RMSA, minor repair grant is admissible for schools having their own buildings. Secretary (School Education), stated that the "Assam type" buildings also have a fairly long life span and are meant for permanent use. Principal Secretary (Education), Government of

Meghalaya also supported him. PAB therefore recommended minor repair grant for all 186 existing government secondary schools.

4.6 As regards in-service training of teachers, Secretary (Education), Arunachal Pradesh stated that training will be provided by using the infrastructure of 11 DIETs in the State. Considering the time left in the current financial year, the PAB recommended in-service training of 500 teachers.

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

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

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

## **5. Meghalaya**

5.1 Principal Secretary (Education), Government of Meghalaya presented the Annual Plan proposal of the State. It was stated that GER for secondary stage in the State was 26.47% in 2007, which is targeted to be increased to 50% by 2011-12. At the current rate of growth in enrolment (9.2% per annum), enrolment in secondary classes will increase by more than 2700 students by 2011. As against this, to achieve a GER of 50%, enrolment will have to increase by around 50000 by 2011-12. The long term target is to achieve a GER of 80% by 2017-18.

5.2 It was pointed out that as per SES 2006-07, GER at secondary stage in Meghalaya was already 50.62%, but this has been reported as 26.47% in SEMIS 2007-08. Such wide discrepancy in the indicator needs to be reconciled. Prof. Biswal of NUEPA stated that the SEMIS data appeared more realistic as this was also broadly in line with NSS data, which also projected a GER of around 30%. Therefore, it makes sense to carry out the planning exercise based on SEMIS data.

5.3 There are only 20 existing government secondary schools in Meghalaya, and the State Government proposed to strengthen all of them by providing additional infrastructure as indicated below:

<b><u>Component</u></b>	<b><u>Number proposed</u></b>
Additional class room	20
Science Lab	14
Computer room	5
Art/ craft/ culture room	20
Library	15
Separate toilet blocks & drinking water facility	15
Principal's room	2
Girl's activity room	15

5.4 As school level details were provided, the PAB recommended the above facilities excluding the Principal room and Girls activity room, which were not permissible for funding in existing schools under the scheme.

5.5 Annual school grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh for 20 existing schools was recommended. Minor repair grant for the same 20 schools was also recommended @ Rs.0.25 lakh per school.

5.6 The State Government had proposed in-service training for only 200 teachers. Considering the small number of teachers proposed, the PAB recommended the same.

5.7 Regarding the proposal to set up residential quarters for teachers, the State Government was advised to re-submit the proposal next year after identifying the locations. They were also advised to plan the quarters in clusters if possible so that teachers of more than one school could stay there.

5.8 A statement of components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Meghalaya is at **Annexure – III.**

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

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

## **6. Puducherry**

6.1 Project Director, RMSA, Government of Puducherry presented the Annual Plan proposal of the Union Territory Administration. The GER at secondary stage is already 96% and, therefore, the objective of the UT Administration is to achieve NER of 100% in secondary education by 2017 and 100% retention by 2020. The Project Director stated that although 100% GER has almost been achieved, the UT would need considerable support as population in the secondary school going age group is projected to increase over the next few years.

6.2 The UT Administration has proposed to strengthen all existing 118 government secondary schools, and a requirement of 167 additional classrooms was projected. The appraisal team pointed out that these classrooms were proposed in 33 schools, 14 of which were already having 4 or more classrooms. In certain cases, large no. of classrooms ranging between 4 and 12, were requested in schools already having 4 classrooms or more. This might lead to situation with some of the schools having upto 20 classrooms in secondary classes.

6.3 Prof. Biswal of NUEPA stated that projection for additional classrooms should be based on enrolment and student classroom ratio. Any arbitrary projection would lead to unviable position. PAB therefore advised the UT Administration to re-assess the requirement of additional classrooms and resubmit the proposal along with all shortfalls required to be filled up as per UT norms. Secretary (SE &L) stated that If this was done within couple of days, the proposal could be incorporated in the minutes.

6.4 In pursuance to the above, the UT Administration has submitted a revised proposal in respect of 24 schools, in which 16 additional class rooms, along with full complement of laboratories, lab equipment, library, computer room, Art/craft/culture

room and separate toilet blocks for boys and girls, have been proposed. This revised proposal of the UT Administration was found to be in order and was recommended.

6.5 Annual school grant @ Rs.0.40 lakh for 118 existing schools was recommended. Minor repair grant for the same 118 schools was also recommended @ Rs.0.25 lakh per school.

6.6 The UT administration had proposed in-service training for only 852 teachers. Considering the small number of teachers, the PAB recommended the same

6.7 A statement of components recommended by PAB for implementation as part of annual plan 2009-10 in Puducherry is at **Annexure – IV.**

6.8 The UT Administration is required to submit the following for release of Central share with respect to components recommended:

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

**7. General Issues:** The following general issues were also discussed in the PAB meeting:

### **7.1. Preparation of perspective plans - Target setting and model building**

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

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

7.1.2 It has also been observed that many of the State Governments are coming out with targets and growth projections which are not realistic. It is important to realize that number of students completing class VIII constitutes the upper limit in

secondary enrollment. Unlike elementary level, it is not realistic at secondary stage to bring 'out of school' children within the regular schooling straightway.

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

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

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

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

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

## **7.2. Preparation of Annual plans**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **7.5. Curricular, examination and school governance reform**

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

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

## **7.6. Teachers' recruitment and training**

7.6.1 It is observed that untrained and unqualified teachers were being recruited by some of the States even at secondary level. PAB felt that this practice must stop. Under RMSA scheme, Central government would be financing 75% of the salary of regular teachers posts newly sanctioned under the scheme and this should provide a very good opportunity to the State Education Departments to convince their Finance Departments regarding the need to recruit good quality trained teachers for secondary schools.

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

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

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

7.6.5 Necessary infrastructure need to be identified or developed by the States to enable annual in-service training of all secondary teachers.

**7.7. Data collection under SEMIS (Secondary Education Management Information System) for 2009-10:** Since data collection under SEMIS is required

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

**7.8. Budget provision for State share:** All State/UT governments are advised to ensure adequate provision in their budget to meet the applicable state/UT share and indicate the same alongwith the annual plan proposal. Unless it is done, it would delay release of central share.

**7.9. Submission of bond, resolution etc.:** Delay in the submission of these documents or mistakes in their preparations have been delaying release of fund. Prescribed formats, a specimen copy complete in all respect and some frequent mistakes in its preparation are available on the website of MHRD. All State/UT governments were requested to accord due importance to preparation and timely submission of these documents. From the next years, these documents should be sent with the annual plan proposal itself.

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

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

## Appendix

**Subject: Fourth Meeting of Project Approval Board (PAB) to consider Annual Work Plan and Budget, 2009-10 of RMSA and Meeting of GIAC on 25.2.2010.**

### List of Participants

1. Smt. Anshu Vaish, Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi In the Chair
2. Shri S.C. Khuntia, Joint Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
3. Shri K. Satish Nambudiripad, Director, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
4. Shri Bhaskar Dasgupta, Under Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
5. Shri Sanjay Kumar, DO (IFD), Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi

### **NCERT**

6. Smt Sushma Jaireth, DWS, NCERT

### **NUEPA**

7. Dr. K. Biswal, Associate Professor, NUEPA, New Delhi

### **Ministry of Minority Affairs**

8. Dr Pardeep Kumar, R.O., Ministry of Minority Affairs, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi

**Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh**

9. Shri Hage Khoda, Secretary & Convener  
(Education), Government of Arunachal Pradesh
10. Shri Tapang Taloh, Director of School  
Education, Government of Arunachal Pradesh

**Govt. of Puducherry**

11. Shri Parthaswamy. R, State Project Director,  
Government of Puducherry
12. Shri A.V.V.S. Sastry, Coordinator, RMSA,  
Government of Puducherry

**Govt. of Meghalaya**

13. Shri P.S. Thangkhiew, Principal Secretary  
Education Department, Government of  
Meghalaya
14. Shri W. Khyllipo, Director, Higher and Technical  
Education, Government of Meghalaya
15. Shri G. Barman, Member, Planning Team,  
Government of Meghalaya

**Govt. of Bihar**

16. Shri A.K. Singh, Principal Secretary,  
Government of Bihar
17. Shri Ajit Kumar, Deputy Director, Secondary  
Education, Government of Bihar

\*\*\*\*\*

**Annexure - I**

**Proposals approved by PAB for Bihar under Annual Plan for 2009-10**

Rs. In lakh

<b>Component</b>	<b>Physical</b>	<b>Unit cost</b>	<b>Total amount approved</b>
<b>Non-recurring/ Civil component</b>			
<b>New/ upgraded schools</b>	350	58.12	20342.00
<b>Strengthening of existing schools</b>	0		0.00
Classrooms	0	5.63	0.00
Science lab	0	6.10	0.00
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	0	5.00	0.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	0	5.00	0.00
Library	0	7.00	0.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	0	1.50	0.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
<b>Total (Civil work)</b>			<b>20342.00</b>
<b>Recurring/ other than civil work</b>			
Annual School grant	2938	0.4	1175.20
Minor repair grant	2938	0.25	734.50
In service training of teachers	5000	0.01	50.00
Teachers for new schools			0.00
<b>Total (other than Civil work)</b>			<b>1959.70</b>
<b>Total (Civil plus other than civil work)</b>			<b>22301.70</b>
<b>Share of Civil work</b>			<b>91.21</b>
MMER @ 1.5%			334.53
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>22636.23</b>
<b>Central share</b>			<b>16977.17</b>

**Annexure - II**

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

Rs. In lakh

<b>Component</b>	<b>Physical</b>	<b>Unit cost</b>	<b>Total amount approved</b>
<b>Non-recurring/ Civil component</b>			
<b>New/ upgraded schools</b>	0	58.12	0.00
<b>Strengthening of existing schools</b>	0		0.00
Classrooms	0	5.63	0.00
Science lab	0	6.10	0.00
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	0	5.00	0.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	0	5.00	0.00
Library	0	7.00	0.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	0	1.50	0.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
Residential quarter for teachers	0	6.00	0.00
<b>Total (Civil work)</b>			<b>0.00</b>
<b>Recurring/ other than civil work</b>			
Annual School grant	186	0.4	74.40
Minor repair grant	186	0.25	46.50
In service training of teachers	500	0.01	5.00
Teachers for new schools	0		0.00
<b>Total (other than Civil work)</b>			<b>125.90</b>
<b>Total (Civil plus other than civil work)</b>			<b>125.90</b>
<b>Share of Civil work</b>			<b>0.00</b>
MMER @ 1.5%			1.89
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>127.79</b>
<b>Central share</b>			<b>115.01</b>

**Annexure - III**

**Proposals approved by PAB for Meghalaya under Annual Plan for 2009-10**

Rs. In lakh			
<b>Component</b>	<b>Physical</b>	<b>Unit cost</b>	<b>Total amount approved</b>
<b>Non-recurring/ Civil component</b>			
<b>New/ upgraded schools</b>	0	58.12	0.00
<b>Strengthening of existing schools</b>	20		450.50
Classrooms	20	5.63	112.60
Science lab	14	6.10	85.40
Lab Equipment	0	1.00	0.00
Computer room	5	5.00	25.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	20	5.00	100.00
Library	15	7.00	105.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	15	1.50	22.50
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
<b>Total (Civil work)</b>			<b>450.50</b>
<b>Recurring/ other than civil work</b>			
Annual School grant	20	0.4	8.00
Minor repair grant	20	0.25	5.00
In service training of teachers	200	0.01	2.00
Teachers for new schools			0.00
<b>Total (other than Civil work)</b>			<b>15.00</b>
<b>Total (Civil plus other than civil work)</b>			<b>465.50</b>
<b>Share of Civil work</b>			<b>96.78</b>
MMER @ 1.5%			6.98
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>472.48</b>
<b>Central share</b>			<b>425.23</b>

**Annexure - IV**

**Proposals approved by PAB for Puducherry under Annual Plan for 2009-10**

			Rs. In lakh
<b>Component</b>	<b>Physical</b>	<b>Unit cost</b>	<b>Total amount approved</b>
<b>Non-recurring/ Civil component</b>			
<b>New/ upgraded schools</b>	0	58.12	0.00
<b>Strengthening of existing schools</b>	24		704.48
Classrooms	16	5.63	90.08
Science lab	24	6.10	146.40
Lab Equipment	24	1.00	24.00
Computer room	24	5.00	120.00
Art/Craft/Culture room	24	5.00	120.00
Library	24	7.00	168.00
Separate toilet Block & drinking water facilities	24	1.50	36.00
Major repair	0	1.00	0.00
<b>Total (Civil work)</b>			<b>704.48</b>
<b>Recurring/ other than civil work</b>			
Annual School grant	118	0.4	47.20
Minor repair grant	118	0.25	29.50
In service training of teachers	852	0.01	8.52
Teachers for new schools			0.00
<b>Total (other than Civil work)</b>			<b>85.22</b>
<b>Total (Civil plus other than civil work)</b>			<b>789.70</b>
<b>Share of Civil work</b>			<b>89.21</b>
MMER @ 1.5%			11.85
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>801.55</b>
<b>Central share</b>			<b>601.16</b>