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Main Report

1. Background

Following the recommendations of New Education Policy of 1986 and Programme of Action, 1992 the Government of India has initiated different schemes to support children of secondary and higher secondary schools at different points in time. The IEDSS (formerly IEDC), Girls’ Hostel, Vocational Education and ICT@schools schemes were started with the overall objective of providing accessible, and relevant secondary education of good quality in India. The recent addition to these schemes was RMSA, started in 2009 in partnership with State Government and Local Self Government. RMSA aims to provide quality secondary education to all children in the 14 to 18 age group by 2020 (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1: Introduction of schemes for secondary education in India**

The MHRD has decided to integrate these five schemes and has asked RMSA-TCA to develop a “how to guide” for this integration. First of all it is important to have a common understanding of what is meant by “integration” within this context. Figure 2 shows a scale of possible integration.

**Figure 2: A scale of integration**

The current situation is represented by the first picture on the scale, whereby the Department of Secondary Education coordinates the five schemes, but they operate independently. Possible scenarios for the other degrees of integration are described below.
**Scenario 2**  *Different elements come together but remain unchanged*

In this situation, the five schemes would fit together without losing their individual identities. Therefore norms and funding shares would remain the same and the schemes would continue to be managed by separate units. Under this scenario, a common planning, budgeting and appraisal framework could be produced which amalgamates the five schemes under the RMSA AWP&B. This will require some level of cooperation and coordination amongst different bodies which manage different schemes at the state and district levels once a year.

**Scenario 3**  *Different elements come together and some changes occur*

Under scenario 3, more effective coordination and cooperation will be needed as the separate units work more closely together not only at the planning and budgeting stage but also in the implementation of activities. This would mean for example that the content of capacity building programmes could be coordinated and therefore more effective and civil works implementation would follow common procedures. Some of the norms across the schemes would be rationalised as a result.

**Scenario 4**  *Different elements converge into a single body for a common goal*

Under a fully integrated scenario, a single unit with a common objective would plan, budget and implement the activities of the five schemes. This would mean that all activities would be integrated with commonalities of objective, content and process. Resources would be pooled together in a state and district with priorities being agreed through decentralised planning. In this scenario, therefore, targets would be reached quicker and more economically, making it the most effective choice.

Table 1 sets out a matrix of the possibilities of implementing these four scenarios. Each of scenarios 2 – 4 is feasible and would ensure, to varying degrees, a more effective use of resources.

This report attempts to analyse the current objectives, coverage, institutional and management arrangements, planning integration and financial norms of the five schemes and gives suggestions for achieving effective integration. This has been done with Scenario 4 – full integration – in mind. This will support the MHRD’s decision to integrate the five schemes under the umbrella of RMSA to have a common platform for improving secondary education through a more comprehensive and accountable system with streamlined management.

Once a decision has been made at the central level on which degree of integration is most feasible, then a more detailed “how to guide” for the integration at state, district and school levels can be prepared.
# Table 1: Matrix of possible scenarios of integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Level of integration</th>
<th>Management arrangements</th>
<th>Planning &amp; budgeting</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Advantages / Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | None                 | Completely separate with no cooperation / coordination required | Done separately without reference to each other | Carried out independently | Separate MMER and funding. Norms and funding shares remain the same. | + Each scheme is sure of distinct attention and funding  
- Less effective as no overall objective. Targets will take longer to achieve and will cost more. |
| 2        | Partial              | Separate management arrangements, but some cooperation / coordination required | Planning and budgeting done separately and amalgamated in one AWP&B | Carried out independently, only coming together at the time of AWP&B preparation, submission and appraisal | Separate MMER and funding. Norms and funding shares remain the same. | + the annual planning, budgeting and appraisal mechanism will take up less time  
- there is likely to be some unintended cooperation and coordination at the state and district levels if joint working on AWP&B becomes as increasing effectiveness  
- there will be no saving in costs or improvements to processes since neither will have changed. Therefore overall effectiveness is unlikely to change. |
| 3        | Substantial          | Separate management arrangements but mechanisms in place for regular cooperation / coordination | Joint planning which is amalgamated into a single AWP&B | Some joint implementation taking place eg on capacity building, civil works, AWP&B preparation, submission and appraisal | Separate MMER and funding. Funding shares remain the same. Norms rationalised. | + no institutional changes required  
+ more effective use of resources through joint planning for implementation  
- each scheme is sure of distinct attention and funding  
- high levels of coordination and cooperation of different management units in a bureaucratic system are difficult to develop and sustain |
| 4        | Full                 | Integrated with five schemes being run by a single unit | Planning and budgeting done jointly through a single integrated AWP&B | Carried out through one unit working towards a single set of objectives. | Share MMER and funding. Norms and funding shares integrated (not necessarily standardised) | + Levels of coordination and cooperation required are less as work is done by a single unit.  
+ Single set of combined objectives and funding ensures more efficient and economic implementation = targets reached sooner and cost less  
- As priorities will be decentralised, some schemes may see less priority given to them initially |
2. Challenges and possible way forward

2.1. Objectives of the schemes
The first step towards integration is to ensure there is a common objective for the five schemes. The RMSA vision for secondary education is to make good quality education available, accessible and affordable to all young persons in the age group of 14-18 years. Through mapping the guiding principles and objectives of RMSA against the other four schemes it can be seen that they all contribute towards the overall objectives of RMSA. The next step would be to combine these into a single set of objectives. Currently RMSA focusses mainly on access, equity and quality. However, the primary aim of the schemes for ICT and vocational education – to improve the relevance of education - will also need to be represented in the unified RMSA objectives.

2.2. Target group and coverage
Based on the Government of India’s vision for secondary education, a scheme with the widest possible scope is needed to ensure there is “good quality education available, accessible and affordable to all young persons in the age group of 14-18 years”. The five schemes have helped to target interventions at specific grade and age level within this broad age group (see Table 2).

Table 2 Target groups and coverage of five schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX and X</td>
<td>XI and XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Hostel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an agreement that RMSA will be extended to cover grades XI and XII and government-aided schools (which are already covered by the other schemes). This extension will be necessary to achieve universalization of education for 14-18 year olds. There is presently a gap in the scope of coverage under the five schemes.

- A large population of children may not receive the full benefits of the integrated scheme.
In some states a large proportion of secondary and higher secondary schools are government-aided (e.g. West Bengal, UP, Gujarat etc.) and limited extension of the benefits of RMSA to such schools is a right step towards providing quality, relevant education to children in these schools. However, the burden on parent and/or community is more in government aided schools and that dissuades poor and marginalised children in these states from continuing their education beyond elementary level. It is imperative then that the state governments upgrade the existing government elementary schools to secondary and higher

---

1 As per GoI’s press release in May 2013 ‘all benefits of RMSA would extend to aided secondary school excluding infrastructure support/core areas’
secondary level under the ambit of RMSA to provide quality secondary education to all children of 14-18 age group.

- *Are the current interventions targeted at the most needy and marginalised groups?*
  
  For example, VE is currently targeted at grades XI and XII, but children who drop out from grades IX and X are more likely to join the informal employment sector, whereas children who complete grade XII are more likely to further their education. The question to be asked is which of these groups would most benefit from VE?

A strategy therefore needs to be developed which will set out the target groups and coverage of an integrated RMSA over the next 3-5 years.

### 2.3. Institutional & management arrangements

#### 2.3.1. Management Structure

The five schemes are being managed by different units in the Education Department both at the centre and at the state level. To improve the effectiveness and accountability of the management of these schemes under an integrated model, it is therefore suggested that all programme management, reporting systems, funding flows and implementation should be combined in the same unit responsible for RMSA at the central, state and district levels. As a result, the management structure in those units will have to be changed including ensuring sufficient staffing levels, capacity of staff and resources at all levels.

#### 2.3.2. MMER Adequacy

MMER for each scheme is currently based on a percentage of the approved annual budget, with different ratios for each scheme. It has been seen that in states where approved budgets are low, the MMER is insufficient to fully fund state and district offices to carry out support and monitoring activities. Efforts have been made to resolve this by increasing the MMER of RMSA to up to 5% in states where this is an issue. In addition, a formula could be agreed upon to ensure that the right number of staff are available in each district and state and adequate resources are available for district level activities (see Table 3 as an example).

#### Table 3 An example of a formula for funding MMER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bihar</th>
<th>Manipur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of secondary schools</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government secondary schools</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of government schools per district</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State RMSA office staffing and management costs</td>
<td>Rs $X^2$</td>
<td>Rs $X^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District RMSA office staffing and management costs</td>
<td>Per district&lt;br&gt;Rs $Y^2$&lt;br&gt;Rs 38Y</td>
<td>Rs $Y^2$&lt;br&gt;Rs 9Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Fixed amount required to ensure the state office has sufficient manpower and infrastructure – will be the same for every state

3 Unit cost per district of the amount required to ensure a district office has sufficient manpower and infrastructure - total amount will vary for each state depending on the number of districts
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2.3.3. Integration of curriculum (Course content)

To fully maximise the benefits of integration, it is suggested that the course content of the IEDSS, ICT, VE and RMSA schemes be harmonised to create an inclusive programme with a universal design for learning. For example, the aim of ICT@Schools is “to provide opportunities to secondary stage students to mainly build their capacity on ICT skills and make them learn through computer aided learning process”. While the first aim is straight forward to achieve, achieving “computer aided learning” requires the integration of other subjects’ course content with the innovative and creative use of ICT. Similarly, to have a truly inclusive learning environment for all children means that the concept of IEDSS should be mainstreamed across all subject areas by using Universal Design principles of curriculum and pedagogy.

2.4. Integrated planning

2.4.1. Needs based planning

The planning under an integrated RMSA has to be needs based to ensure that different schemes and components within them get sufficient focus, funds and intervention to meet the specific requirement of districts and states. For example in districts/states where the number of children with special needs is more, the share of funds allocated to IEDSS should be increased.

Also, planning needs to be done to achieve objectives and there could be freedom/choice given in deciding the options based on the context of the district and state that help to meet the objective. For example in states where the enrolment of girls is low there should be the option of either providing for transport or construction/up-gradation of girls’ hostels in order to increase access: and if the state decides on hostels, the share of funds allocated for that should be increased.

2.4.2. Centre / State Sharing Formula

Table 4 shows the sharing pattern between centre and state for different schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Centre:State Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSA</td>
<td>75:25, 90:10 for NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>75:25, 90:10 for NE States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS</td>
<td>100% GOI support with the provision that State govt to provide for scholarship of Rs. 600 per disabled child per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>100% assistance except for infrastructure facility for new VE school and existing VE school (75:25), salary of staff for new and existing VS and induction training (90:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Hostel</td>
<td>90:10 for all States/ UTs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Unit rate per school – will vary for each state depending on the number of schools*
This may not reflect the requirements of states which may vary due to huge differences in socio-economic conditions, financial capacity and support provided by the state governments.

In order to determine the optimum sharing pattern actual analysis of the budgets and allocation needs to be done for states. It is expected that the share of the centre in the combined/integrated budget for the current year would be more than 75% as schemes other than RMSA and ICT@Schools have more central share (e.g. GH-90:10; IEDSS-100% centre). Figure 2 gives an illustrative example.

**Figure 2: Sharing pattern analysis for two states**

### Maharashtra 2013-14 (figures in lacs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSA</td>
<td>19,042</td>
<td>14,282</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS</td>
<td>10,147</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT@Schools</td>
<td>99,056</td>
<td>74,292</td>
<td>24,764</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Hostel</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,29,989</td>
<td>97,665</td>
<td>32,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Actual Sharing</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bihar 2013-14 (figures in lacs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSA</td>
<td>39,723</td>
<td>29,792</td>
<td>9,931</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT@Schools</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>12,361</td>
<td>9,271</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Hostel</td>
<td>41,495</td>
<td>37,346</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>99,750</td>
<td>81,037</td>
<td>18,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Actual Sharing</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen the shares differ for the two states but that is reflective of the needs of the states – Bihar has more government schools under RMSA and needs more Girls’ Hostels to improve access and equity and Mahasrashtra either needs or has mechanisms in place to utilise the funds for ICT for schools to improve relevance.

After determining the current share, planning for the next year could be done on the basis of needs of states as explained above and an optimum sharing pattern could be arrived at. Though there is an implication that there would be different sharing pattern for different states for the integrated RMSA scheme, this would be reflective of the requirements of the states. The centre’s share could be capped at an appropriate level after analysis of states (for example at 80% for other states and 90% for NE states).
2.4.3. Integration of Formats and Guidelines

Operational guidelines for the five schemes will need to be reviewed and combined. Over the last year, states have been using separate costing sheets for the five schemes to develop a single AWP&B which was reviewed in a joint PAB meeting. Although the structure of the AWP&B already contains a combined chapter on “Action Programmes for Focus Groups”, there will be a need to revise the format of the AWP&B costing sheets to set out an integrated framework for planning and budgeting for the four additional schemes under RMSA and supporting guidelines. An example of an integrated costing sheet is included in Table 5. Here, items under the other four schemes have been combined under the relevant objective/section of the RMSA costing sheet (highlighted in grey).

Table 5 An example of an integrated costing sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Definition of unit</th>
<th>Proposal for 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improving Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Strengthening existing schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Additional Classroom</td>
<td>No. of ACR</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2a</td>
<td>Integrated Science Lab</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2b</td>
<td>Lab equipment</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3a</td>
<td>Computer Room</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3b</td>
<td>ICT Equipment</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Art and Craft room</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Toilet block</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Water facility</td>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Head Master Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>VE Workshop/ Laboratory</td>
<td>No. of WL</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improving Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Strengthening existing schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Girls’ Activity Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Girls’ Hostel - Construction</td>
<td>No. of GH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>JEDSS Resource Room</td>
<td>No. of RR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been discussed above, once decisions have been made about the funding share under an integrated scheme, formula can be inserted into the costing model to ensure each item is correctly calculated.

2.5. Financial Norms

2.5.1. Staffing:
**Teachers:** All existing schools have sanctioned posts, vacancies against which will need to be filled and paid for by the state. All additional posts created as a result of upgrading existing schools and creating new schools and introducing VE or IEDSS will be paid for by RMSA.

**Teacher Salaries:** Currently there are different norms for teachers’ salaries under each scheme. In order to attract better teachers, it is recommended that RMSA subject teachers, ICT teachers, IEDSS resource teachers and VE teachers start at the minimum salaries equal to regular state teacher salaries and indexed to CPI (Consumer Price Index) because of differences in state salaries. Current strategies aimed at improving equitable opportunities for students should be continued, such as giving additional incentives to teachers beyond their salaries. Two examples of these are:

- IEDSS teachers receive additional allowance of Rs400 per month following training
- GH Warden receives her standard minimum state salary plus Rs3,000 pm additional allowance and free accommodation.

**Non-teaching Staff:** Under current RMSA norms, every RMSA school should have the following non-teaching staff:

- Lab attendant
- Office assistant / dufftary

Following integration of all four schemes with RMSA, every RMSA school could have the following additional non-teaching staff:

- Security personnel\(^5\)
- Accountant / clerk\(^6\)
- Librarian\(^7\)
- Cleaner\(^8\)

Schools with VE need an additional lab attendant and schools with a GH also need:

- Security based in the hostel
- Cooks

It is suggested that in schools with enrolment over 200 students, additional personnel may be recruited:

- office assistant / dufftary
- accountant / clerk

As with teaching staff, all existing schools have sanctioned non-teaching posts, vacancies against which will need to be filled and paid for by the state. All additional posts created as a result of upgrading existing schools and creating new schools will be paid for by RMSA.

---

\(^5\) formerly under VE Scheme
\(^6\) formerly under VE Scheme
\(^7\) RMSA provides laboratories and lab attendants. However, RMSA provides libraries but does not provide librarians. If RMSA is providing a library, a librarian should also be provided under RMSA. This should be included in the RMSA norms.
\(^8\) not formerly included under any scheme
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Non-teaching Staff Salaries: Currently there are different norms for non-teaching staff’s salaries under each scheme. It is suggested that salaries equal to regular state non-teacher salaries and indexed to CPI (Consumer Price Index) are introduced for:

- Lab attendant
- Librarian
- Security personnel / Chowkidar
- Office assistant / dufftary
- Accountant / clerk
- Cleaner
- Head Cook and assistant

Some states might need to develop salary norms for these posts based on clear rationale.

2.5.2. Community involvement:

It is suggested that SMDCs should be involved in planning and monitoring of all components for greater accountability and integration.

2.5.3. Capacity building:

It is suggested that the current financial norms for capacity building be reviewed to assess whether they are sufficient to achieve the objectives of the capacity building programmes.

Community training: Currently SMDC members receive 2 days training a year under RMSA and other forms of training under VE and ICT. It is suggested that all SMDC members receive 5 days training a year for more effective implementation and monitoring of all 5 schemes. It is also suggested that the training should be needs based, so for example if girls’ education is a particular issue, one out of the five days of training would focus on this.

In-service teacher training and induction training: Currently the in-service training and induction norms are different for ICT and VE (see Table 6). There is no implication of having different rates if there is a clear rationale behind it. For example, if ICT and VE training requires the use of equipment and other resources, then this is likely to cost more.

Table 6 Capacity building norms for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>No of days in-service</th>
<th>No of days induction</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rs300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS</td>
<td>no number of days specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rs400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rs892 / Rs 431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.4. Direct school funding:

There are currently two sources of recurrent funds received by schools on an annual basis under RMSA – those for minor repairs and school grants. Each of the other four schemes also has a form of direct funding of schools. The first step would be to combine the recurrent funds of the five...
schemes, based on the facilities available in the school as currently there are some duplications in funding. For example, electricity and water costs are included across the five schemes.

Secondly, the integrated recurrent funds should be clearly divided into two categories:

- funds for minor repairs and
- running costs.

Minor repairs include maintenance of buildings, painting and electrical repairs. The school running costs would include purchasing materials for teaching and learning and repairing equipment used for as science, ICT, IEDSS and VE. Table 7 shows the amounts each school would receive for each facility they have under this rationalised system using the current financial norms.

**Table 7 Integrated school funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities available in school</th>
<th>Minor repair grant</th>
<th>Running costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSA facilities</td>
<td>Rs 25,000</td>
<td>Rs 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 1.3 Lk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDSS facilities</td>
<td>No additional grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE facilities</td>
<td>Rs 25,000</td>
<td>Rs 5.05 Lk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excludes seed money)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Hostel</td>
<td>Rs 40,000</td>
<td>Rs 3.19 Lk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.5.5. Facilities:**

**Decision making:** RMSA guidelines specify preference for upgrading schools and introducing residential schools. In areas with hilly, difficult or remote terrain the decision of whether to build a new school or strengthen a central school with increased provision will be critical to the universalization of secondary education. To illustrate this, a district could decide that the provision of VE education would be shared across different schools with transportation provided for students, or they could have one VE hub in the district or cluster. Likewise, a district may decide to have fewer, larger schools and provide transportation or boarding facilities. In a decentralised system, these decisions should be taken at the district level and should be based on a robust planning process which takes into account cultural norms and other contextual issues and financial implications.

**Provision of Facilities:** Taking the suggestions above into account, it is the objective that many schools will ultimately have a computer room, VE and resource room for IEDSS. All schools also need drinking water and toilets. It is suggested that decisions about provisioning of school facilities should be taken based on existing facilities and need taking the following into consideration:

- Number of classrooms and labs should be adequate for both subject classes and VE classes based on number of VE skills being offered and student population.
- Number of office rooms needed should be based on total number of teaching staff in the school including subject teachers, computer teachers, IEDSS resource teachers and VE teachers besides principal and classrooms.
- Each school to have one generator set for all subjects including ICT & VE. This will determine the capacity of the generator to be provided. Norms to be agreed for this.
• Computer room norms to continue using RMSA and ICT@school norms.
  o If schools already have fully equipped Computer room, no additional ICT facilities should be added under VE.
  o If schools don’t have a computer room, additional ICT facilities should be added under RMSA/ICT@schools and NOT under VE
• Decisions over the provision of drinking water in schools with a girls’ hostel need to take into consideration the capacity of the water facilities and the enrolment in the girls’ hostel. The norm should then be based on the number of girls and the number of staff to one well/hand pump or the daily capacity in gallons of the water source.

2.5.6. Civil works:

Civil works: The following are suggestions for integration of civil works under the 5 schemes:

• RMSA currently uses the State Schedule of Rates (SoR) or CPWD rate for all civil works (whichever is lower). It is suggested that the State Schedule of Rates (SoR) be applied across all the five schemes as otherwise in states where the CPWD rates are lower, there might be quality concerns.
• All school buildings/ facilities under the five schemes should have barrier free access and toilets with wheelchair access.
• Out of the total budget, there is a ceiling of 50% for civil works. Under integration, it is suggested that this ceiling includes new school buildings, strengthening of existing schools, VE construction, girls’ hostel construction and IEDSS construction.
• Drinking water norms for RMSA and GH are different. It is suggested that this be standardised under either the Total Sanitation Campaign norms or State Drinking Water Department Rates.

Major repairs: Again, costs for major repairs should be based on actual estimates approved by state competent authority using State Schedule of Rates (SoR) for all civil works as otherwise in states where the CPWD is lower, there might be quality concerns. Major repairs are only to be applied to buildings over 10 years old. It is suggested that under an integrated system this can include major repairs on any school structure using the current RMSA norms, including GH, IEDSS resource room, VE labs, etc. provided the structure is over 10 years old.
• Up to Rs 4Lk per school for 2 section school
• Up to Rs 2Lk per school for 1 section school
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3. Way forward

It is suggested that the following steps be taken to integrate the five schemes. The timeline for the completion of these steps will be critical to the success of the implementation. Therefore considering the annual planning and budgeting cycle of RMSA, it is suggested that a realistic timeframe would be for these steps to be implemented prior to the commencement of the 2015/16 planning cycle ie by September, 2014.

1. Agree on the degree of integration desired
2. Agree a common set of objectives for the integrated scheme
3. Agree on the target group of the integrated scheme and the expansion to grade XII
4. Agree on which types of school the integrated scheme will cover.
5. Implement the required institutional changes needed to integrate the five schemes
   a) Management structure
   b) MMER adequacy
   c) Integration of course content for students and teacher development prorgammes
6. Integrated planning
   a) Needs based planning
   b) Centre / state sharing formula
   c) Integration of formats and guidelines
7. Agree on integrated financial norms
8. Develop a “How to Manual” as a ready reckoner for the users at different levels of the system
9. Develop and provide training for state and district level officers on the revised guidelines

As was mentioned in the introduction of this report, the level of integration required will determine the next steps to be taken. If the MHRD decides to follow Scenario 2 or 3 (partial integration), then some of these suggested steps (such as the institutional changes) might be of different nature. What will be important will be that a common understanding of “integration” is decided, shared, owned and used at all levels.