

TWELFTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE
ON
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
(2006-2008)**

SIXTY SECOND REPORT

(Presented on 15th July, 2008)



SECRETARIAT OF THE KERALA LEGISLATURE
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
2008

TWELFTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE
ON
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
(2006-2008)**

SIXTY SECOND REPORT

On

**Paragraphs relating to General Education Department, contained in the
Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the years
ended 31st March 1994, 31st March 1995, 31st March 1997,
31st March 1998, 31st March 1999, 31st March 2000,
31st March 2002 and 31st March 2003 (Civil)**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Composition of the Committee ..	v
Introduction ..	vii
Report ..	1
Appendices :	
I. Summary of Main Conclusions/Recommendations ..	33
II. Notes furnished by the Government ..	42

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (2006-2008)

Chairman :

Shri Aryadan Muhammed

Members :

Shri C. T. Ahammed Ali

” Alphons Kannanthanam

” P. Jayarajan

” K. M. Mani

” K. P. Mohanan

” C. K. P. Padmanabhan

” M. Prakashan Master

” Thiruvanchoor Radhakrishnan

” N. Rajan

” A. K. Saseendran

Legislature Secretariat :

DR. N. K. Jayakumar, Secretary

Smt. D. Kumari Girija, Deputy Secretary

Smt. A. Achamma, Under Secretary

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Public Accounts, having been authorised by the Committee to present this Report on their behalf present the Sixty Second Report on paragraph relating to General Education Department contained in the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the years ended 31st March 1994 No. 2 (Civil), 31st March 1995 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1997 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1998 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1999 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 2000 (Civil), 31st March 2002 (Civil) and 31st March 2003 (Civil).

The Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the years ended 31st March 1994 No. 2 (Civil), 31st March 1995 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1997 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1998 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 1999 No. 3 (Civil), 31st March 2000 (Civil), 31st March 2002 (Civil), 31st March 2003 (Civil) were laid on the table of the House on 31-3-1995, 19-3-1996, 23-4-1998, 13-4-1999, 31-3-2000, 2-7-2001, 8-7-2003 and 28-6-2004 respectively.

The Committee considered and finalised this report at the meeting held on 7th July 2008.

The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them by the Accountant General in the examination of the Audit Reports.

Thiruvananthapuram,
15th July, 2008.

ARYADAN MUHAMMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

REPORT

GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Improvement of science education in schools

Introduction

The scheme "Improvement of science education in schools" was launched by Government of India in 1987-88 as a follow up to the National Policy on Education, 1986. The components of the scheme formulated with the objective of improving the quality of science education and promoting scientific temper among school students were :

- (i) Provision of science kits to upper primary schools ;
- (ii) Upgradation and strengthening of science laboratories in secondary and higher secondary schools;
- (iii) Library assistance to secondary and higher secondary schools;
- (iv) Setting up of District Resource Centres for Science Education (DRECSE) ;
- (v) Training of science and mathematics teachers ;
- (vi) Assistance to voluntary organisations for undertaking innovative projects in science education.

All the Government and Government aided upper primary, secondary and higher secondary schools were to be covered by the scheme in a phased manner. Implementation of the scheme commenced in the State during 1988-90 with 100 *per cent* Central Assistance.

Organisational set-up

The Director of Public Instruction (DPI) under the General Education Department of State Government was the implementing authority of the scheme who was assisted by the State Institute of Education, Thiruvananthapuram. Two State Government Undertakings, viz., M/s. Kerala Small Industries Development Corporation Limited (SIDCO) and M/s. Kerala State Co-operative Consumer Federation (KSCCF) were entrusted with the procurement and supply of materials and equipment under the scheme as the department did not have sufficient staff and infrastructure for this purpose.

Audit coverage

A review of the implementation of the scheme in the State was conducted during January to April 1994 with reference to the records in the Government Secretariat, Directorate of Public Instruction, State Institute of Education, 93 high schools, 89 upper primary schools and the offices of SIDCO and KSCCF.

Highlights

- * Rupees 9 lakhs released by Government of India for imparting training and setting up of DRECSE were advanced to purchasing agents (SIDCO and KSCCF) for procurement and supply of materials to schools.
- * Supply of integrated science kits and science books for phase III of the scheme approved by Government of India in December 1990 was not made as of March 1994.
- * Rupees 13.26 lakhs were paid as service charges to purchasing agents, though no such expenditure was envisaged in the scheme.
- * The cost of materials and equipment supplied was overcharged by the purchasing agents by Rs. 2.95 lakhs.
- * An amount of Rs. 58.95 lakhs paid as advance to purchasing agents up to March 1991 remained unadjusted as of March 1994.
- * Integrated science kits supplied to 46 schools had shortage of items ranging from 1 to 62. However, payment was made to the suppliers at the full rate and no action was initiated to make good the shortage.
- * The list of equipment to be supplied in Phase 1 for upgradation of laboratories in high schools was prepared without ascertaining the actual requirements resulting in supply of items already available in some cases.
- * Laboratory equipment valued at Rs. 21.90 lakhs received at a storing centre during November 1992 to July 1993 were not distributed to the selected schools as of March 1994.
- * No training programme was conducted for upper primary school teachers, high school teachers and orientation programme for key persons even though Government of India approved 62 programmes for upper primary school teachers, 58 for high school teachers, and

three orientation programmes one each for Key Persons, Resource Persons and for preparation of guidelines and instructional materials.

- * The monthly progress reports to the State Government by the Director of Public Instruction and the quarterly progress reports to the Government of India by the State Government required to be sent as part of evaluation of the scheme, were not sent and an evaluation of the scheme was not conducted.

Central assistance, budget provision and expenditure

(i) The details of central assistance received, provision made in the State budget and the expenditure incurred during the years 1988-89 to 1992-93 were as below :

<i>Year</i>	<i>Central assistance Received</i>	<i>Budget provision</i>	<i>Expenditure incurred</i>
<i>(Rupees in lakhs)</i>			
1988-89	200.92	..	200.91
1989-90	199.43	500	199.43
1990-91	152.72	500	153.15
1991-92	..	550	0.78
1992-93	..	50	..
Total	553.07	1600	554.27

The budget provision made on a lumpsum basis had no relation to the proposals sent to Government of India for approval.

(ii) The Central assistance of Rs. 553.07 lakhs was to be utilised for purchase of materials (Rs. 544.07 lakhs), imparting training (Rs. 7.00 lakh) and setting up of DRECSE (Rs. 2.00 lakhs). The detailed rates of Central assistance were Rs. 1200 (I phase) and Rs. 1000 (II & III phases) for provision of science kits to upper and primary schools, Rs. 20,000 (I phase) and Rs. 25,000 (II and III phases) for upgradation of science laboratories in secondary and higher secondary schools and Rs. 10,000 (I phase) and Rs. 15,000 (II and III phases) for supply of library books to secondary and higher secondary schools. Though imparting training and setting up of DRECSE was to be executed departmentally, the entire amount was advanced to the purchasing agents (SIDCO/KSCCF) for supply of materials.

Submission of proposals and approval by Government of India

There were 2805 upper primary schools, and 2314 high schools in the State as of March 1988. The State Government submitted proposals to Government of India for implementing the scheme in all upper primary/high schools in 3 phases in 1987-88, 1989-90 and 1990-91 against which approval of Government of India was received for implementing the scheme in 2699 upper primary schools and 1418 high schools during the above years, releasing a Central assistance of Rs. 553.07 lakhs as shown below :

Phase	Date of approval by Government of India	No. of schools to be covered		No. of training programmes approved	No. of DRECSE to be set up	Amount released (Rs. in lakhs)
		Upper primary school	High School			
I	25 March 1988	1203	615	40	Nil	200.92
II	27 September 1989	1062	450	40	Nil	199.43
III	18 December 1990	434	353	43	2	152.72
Total		2699	1418	123	2	553.07

Proposals to implement the scheme in 109¹⁵ upper primary schools and 356 high schools sent to Government of India in 1991-92 had not been approved (March 1994) and in respect of 520¹⁵ high schools, proposals were yet to be sent. The State Government had not considered the implementation of the scheme (March 1994) in 82 higher secondary schools functioning in the State (31 from 1990-91 and 51 from 1991-92).

Delay in procurement and supply of materials and equipment

(i) Procurement and supply of integrated science kits, science books and laboratory equipment were entrusted to the purchasing agents (SIDCO and KSCCF) on payment of service charges by the DPI on the ground that there was no adequate staff for effecting large scale purchases to be made under the various schemes and amounts as shown below were advanced to them during

¹⁵ Difference in number with reference to the position as of March 1988 was due to subsequent addition/abolition of schools.

1988-89, 1989-90 and 1990-91, without specifying any time limit for the completion of the supply.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Amount advanced (Rupees in lakhs)</i>		<i>Total</i>
		<i>SIDCO</i>	<i>KSCCF</i>	
1988-89	I	137.05	63.86	200.91
1989-90	II	159.54	39.89	199.43
1990-91	III	122.18	30.54	152.72
	Total	418.77	134.29	553.06

KSCCF could complete the supply of integrated science kits and science books for Phase II (1989-90) during 1992-93 only. Similarly SIDCO completed the supply of laboratory equipments for Phase II (1990-91) only in March 1994.

(ii) The list of items to be included in the integrated science kits to be supplied to the schools for phase III of the scheme approved by Government of India in December 1990 was given to KSCCF only in May 1992 though advance (Rs. 30.54 lakhs) for the purchase had already been given to them (March 1991). The tenders for the supply received by KSCCF were not accepted by the State Institute of Education as the samples given by the suppliers were of poor quality. Fresh tenders were obtained by KSCCF and submitted to the State Institute of Education in April 1993. Even though a supplier was selected and the Director of Public Instruction was requested in August 1993 to issue purchase order, no further action was taken in this regard (March 1994).

(iii) The list of science books to be supplied to the high schools during the III phase was approved by the State Government only in March 1993 and the Director of Public Instruction was directed to purchase them directly from the publishers without involving the purchasing agents even though funds required for the purchase of the books were paid to them as early as in March 1991. Though the Director of Public Instruction invited quotations in November 1993 and placed supply orders (December 1993), the supplies were not completed as of March 1994.

Overcharging of cost of materials and equipment supplied to schools

(i) As per the terms of agreement with the purchasing agents, service charge at the rate of 3 *per cent* of the cost of materials supplied was to be paid to them. Service charge of Rs. 13.26 lakhs on the supplies costing Rs. 442.11 lakhs made up to March 1994 had been adjusted against the advance. As the Government of India scheme did not envisage payment of service charges, incurring of Rs. 13.26 lakhs from the Central Government grant was irregular.

(ii) As against Rs. 544.07 lakhs released by Government of India for the supply of materials and equipment to the schools, the cost of supplies made by the purchasing agents as of March 1994 was Rs. 442.11 lakhs only which itself was overcharged by Rs. 2.95 lakhs as shown below:

(a) The purchasing agents had made deduction of Rs. 2.59 lakhs from the bills of the suppliers towards penalty for belated supply. As these agents were engaged on the payment of service charges at the rate of 3 *per cent* of cost of materials, the actual cost i.e., the net amount paid to suppliers after deducting the penalty was to be treated as the cost of materials. But the original cost of materials was, however, shown as expenditure.

(b) SIDCO had recovered from a supplier on its failure to supply the materials as per agreement, Rs. 0.36 lakh being the additional expenditure incurred for making alternative supply. But this amount was not deducted when working out the actual cost of the materials supplied.

Delay in adjustment of advance paid to purchasing agents

The advances paid to purchasing agents, cost of supplies as reported by the agents and balance of advance pending with them for the 3 phases were as follows:

<i>Phase</i>	<i>SIDCO</i>			<i>KSCCF</i>		
	<i>Advance paid</i>	<i>Cost of supplies made</i>	<i>Balance fund available</i>	<i>Advance paid</i>	<i>Cost of supplies made</i>	<i>Balance fund available</i>
	<i>(Rupees in lakhs)</i>					
I	137.05 (-) 14.28*	103.47	19.30	63.86 (-) 14.28*	76.19	1.95
II	159.54	133.78	25.76	39.89	37.73	2.16
III	122.18	90.94	31.24	30.54	Nil	30.54
Total	404.49	328.19	76.30	148.57	113.92	34.65

* Amount transferred from SIDCO to KSCCF.

After adjusting amounts of Rs. 28.40 lakhs and Rs. 23.60 lakhs refunded by SIDCO and KSCCF to the department in March 1994, balance of advance pending with SIDCO and KSCCF was Rs. 47.90 lakhs and Rs. 11.05 lakhs respectively.

Defects in selection and supply of materials

(a) Integrated science kits

(i) Integrated science kits supplied to upper primary schools during the I and II phases were to contain 98 items and 124 items respectively of materials and equipment costing Rs. 1188 and Rs. 1583 respectively. Kits were supplied at the storing centres and payments were made to the suppliers by KSCCF at the approved rate based on the number of kits acknowledged by the storing centres. Out of 89 upper primary schools test-checked, in 46 schools the kits received had shortage of items ranging from 1 to 62. The non-receipt of items were not reported to KSCCF or to the Director of Public Instruction for appropriate action. As the cost of individual items of kits was not specified, the payment made in respect of items not supplied, could not be assessed.

(ii) Nine integrated science kits costing Rs. 0.14 lakh received at the storing centres during May 1992 to December 1992 (II Phase) were not distributed to the selected schools as in respect of 6 kits the list of schools/distribution order was not received in the storing centre from the State Institute of Education, in respect of 2 kits the schools to which kits were ordered to be supplied were not functioning and in respect of one kit the school authorities did not turn up to receive the kit ordered to be supplied to it.

(b) Laboratory equipment

(i) Laboratory equipment were to be supplied to high schools for the upgradation of the existing laboratories to the optimum level. The list of items to be supplied were to be selected after ascertaining the items which were lacking, through a survey, with reference to the list of equipment required for high schools prepared by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) or the State Board of Secondary Education. The State Institute of Education conducted a survey in February 1989 to ascertain the items of equipment to be supplied. However, the list of laboratory equipment to be supplied during the I phase had already been given to the purchasing agents in August 1988. This would indicate that the list of items to be supplied during the phase was prepared without ascertaining the actual requirement in the schools.

A test check revealed that in six schools audio visual equipment like overhead projector, public address system and tape recorder valued at Rs. 0.32 lakh were supplied though the Headmasters of these schools had reported during the survey that these items were already available in the schools.

(ii) Laboratory equipment were to be supplied to the schools with reference to the standard lists developed by NCERT or the State Board of Secondary Education. As syllabus of NCERT standard was introduced in the schools in the State and as no standard list of equipment was developed by the State Board of Secondary Education, the items of laboratory equipment selected for supply should have been with reference to the NCERT list. However, out of equipment costing Rs. 24,246 per school selected for the I phase and Rs. 26,005 selected for the II phase, items costing Rs. 16,025 and Rs. 16,384 respectively were audio-visual equipment which were not included in the NCERT list. Several other items like electric stove, electric iron, immersion heater, telescope, compound microscope, electric kit, X-ray tube-demonstrator type and petrol gas burner not included in the NCERT list were also supplied to the schools. The reason for selection of such items called for from the department was not received (March 1994).

(iii) Eight items of laboratory equipment like astronomical telescope (5 numbers), terrestrial telescope (5 numbers), automatic slide projector (2 numbers) etc., electric stove (16 numbers) valued at Rs. 0.18 lakh supplied at three storing centres during the first and second phases were not distributed to the selected schools. Similarly, the entire lot of equipment valued at Rs. 21.90 lakhs received at a storing centre (Teachers' Training Institute, Chittoor) during November 1992 to July 1993 (III phase) to be distributed among 85 High Schools were not distributed as of March 1994. Reason for non-distribution was not furnished.

(iv) The maximum amount admissible for 353 high schools at the rate of Rs. 25,000 per school amounting to Rs. 88.25 lakhs was released by Government of India during the III phase. However, laboratory equipment costing Rs. 90.94 lakhs were procured during this phase resulting in excess expenditure of Rs. 2.69 lakhs.

Setting up of District Resource Centres for Science Education (DRECSE)

The scheme envisaged the setting up of the DRECSE for training of science and mathematics teachers and taking up other activities for promotion of science education. A suitable college of teachers education was to be selected to be developed as DRECSE with Central assistance of Rs. 1 lakh each. The State Government's proposals to set up DRECSE under I phase (5 numbers) and

II phase (6 numbers) in selected High Schools were not approved by Government of India. Even though Government of India approved the setting up of 2 DRECSE in the III phase and released Rs. 2 lakhs for the purpose they were not set up as of March 1994.

Training of science and mathematics teachers

Government of India approved the conducting of 62 training programmes for upper primary school teachers, 58 programmes for High school teachers and one programme each for orientation of key persons, orientation for Resource Persons and for preparation of guidelines and instructional materials during the three phases and released Rs. 6.99 lakhs. None of the training programmes for upper primary school teachers and high school teachers and the orientation programme for key persons were conducted. Reasons for not conducting the programmes called for from the department were awaited (March 1994). A programme for preparation of guidelines and instructional materials was conducted in March 1991 incurring a total expenditure of Rs. 0.38 lakh out of which Rs. 0.16 lakh was incurred for expenses not covered by the norms prescribed by the Government of India. A resource persons' training programme was conducted during September 1993 incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.12 lakh out of which Rs. 0.11 lakh was not covered by Government of India norms.

Evaluation and monitoring

The State Government was to conduct a summative evaluation of the scheme to ensure that the intended benefits were obtained. As part of the evaluation, the State Government was to send quarterly progress reports to Government of India in the prescribed format and the Director of Public Instruction was to send monthly progress reports to the State Government. But, no progress reports were submitted either by the Director of Public Instruction or by the State Government and no evaluation of the scheme was conducted.

The points mentioned above were referred to Government in August 1994 ; reply has not been received (October 1994).

[Paragraph 3.10 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1994, No. 2 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II in this Report.

1. In the audit para, the details of central assistance received, provisions made in the State budget and the expenditure incurred during the years 1988-89

to 1992-93 were elaborated. The Committee observed that the central assistance provided declined continuously and the budget provision and central assistance did while the budget provisions was high, the central assistance was comparatively low. The Committee wanted to know the reason for this. The witness stated that always the budget provision would be inflated so as to get a higher corresponding assistance from the Centre. But the Central allotment to the State would always be lesser than that provided in the budget and hence lesser expenditure. The Committee pointed out that in all cases, it was seen that the budget provision was made on a lumpsum basis without ascertaining the quantum of assistance that could be expected from Government of India and proposals would be sent accordingly. The Committee opined that the implementation of most of the central schemes were like this. The proposal was forwarded to Government of India by the State Government without any planning and adequate home work. The lumpsum provision was fixed without exploring the possibilities and the extent of the central assistance that could be tapped. The Committee opined that the approach towards the centralised schemes should be changed so as to enable the State Government departments to get the maximum assistance from the Government of India.

2. When asked whether proposal for Central assistance to the Schools were sent by the department within the time limit prescribed by Government of India, the Secretary (General Education) answered that the proposal was sent later and the full amount was sanctioned by Government of India. In fact the State Department got a greater amount.

3. The Committee asked why the department had placed orders on KSCCF and SIDCO without specifying time limit for the delivery of the materials demanded. The Secretary answered that in the case of Kerala State Consumer Co-operative Federation (KSCCF) as the samples were of poor quality, fresh tenders were invited and hence the delay. She admitted that there was a delay of 15 months on the part of the department in giving indent to KSCCF and SIDCO for the list of materials to be supplied. The Committee desired to be furnished with the details regarding the date of supply of the materials and the Secretary assured to furnish the details.

4. From the audit observation the Committee could find that in the scheme for supplying materials and equipments to schools, the department failed to recover from the purchasing agents the amount of service charge which was not envisaged in the GOI scheme and also the penalty towards the belated supply which was charged and deducted by the purchasing agents from the bills of the suppliers. In the reply, it was stated that steps were being taken to recover the amount from the purchasing agents. The Committee commented that 15 years had since lapsed and still the action had not been completed.

5. The Committee enquired whether the balance amount of Rs. 47.90 lakh to be realised from SIDCO and Rs. 11.05 lakhs from KSCCF had been realised. The Secretary disclosed that the amount had not been realised so far. She assured that steps would be taken to finalise the accounts by adjusting the advances soon after completing the audit in SIDCO. The DPI supplemented that the whole account would be settled within one month. The Committee was aggrieved to find that even after the lapse of 10 years the Department had not gone any further from where they were and this shows the casual attitude of the Department in handling public money.

6. The witness admitted that the records relating to the distribution of the nine integrated science kits costing Rs.14,000 were not available. Since the science kits contained many items and no checking was done on receipt any shortage in items was not detected and even if detected there was delay in reporting the matter. In the written reply, it was informed that the department had taken rectification measures and decentralised the purchasing system. Regarding the supply of laboratory equipment also, the available records did not throw light on the details. The Committee opined that the department supplied the materials to schools without conducting a survey for ascertaining the requirements in schools in advance. If such a survey had been made prior to the purchase, many irregularities and lapses could have been avoided.

7. The Secretary, General Education, deposed that actually six Resource centres were proposed but sanction was accorded for starting two centres only – Thrissur Government Girls High School and Palakkad Government Boys High School and Rs. 2 lakhs was allotted for this purpose. Funds had to be recouped from SIDCO and KSCCF. The Committee could find that neither the fund had been recouped nor the centres started. The Committee opined that there was no effective system for evaluation and monitoring of such schemes. The Secretary, General Education Department stated that for centrally sponsored schemes review was being conducted every three months.

Conclusion/Recommendation

8. Improvement of Science education in schools is a fully Centrally Sponsored Scheme with all the funds provided by the centre. The duty of the State is only to implement the scheme in a phased manner in all the Government and Government aided upper primary, secondary and higher secondary schools. Even though implementation of the scheme was started in 1988-89 with 100% Central assistance, it reached no where even after the

lapse of 5 to 7 years. The department is also complaining of poor budgetary provision for projects. The Committee may be informed of the total fund received under this programme by the State Government, the amount so far utilized, and the total time allowed for the completion of the scheme, the reason for the non implementation of the scheme and the present status of the programme.

9. The Committee observes that the State allocation of Budget provision for the implementation of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme – Improvement of Science Education in schools – in the State were not in consonance with central assistance received from GOI. While State Budget provision showed a high allocation, the corresponding central assistance for the programme showed a marginal figure which resulted in less expenditure. The Committee finds that this mismatch happened due to the fact that State Budget provisions are made on a lumpsum basis without ascertaining the possibility of central assistance from GOI for the scheme. Hence, the Committee recommends that the approach towards the centralised scheme should be changed so as to enable the State Department to get the maximum assistance of GOL. The Committee also notices that the Department diverted a fund of Rs. 6.99 lakhs earmarked for imparting training and Rs. 2 lakhs for setting up of DRESCE, for the purchase of materials. The Committee notes that this is against the rules envisaged in the scheme. Hence, the Committee strongly recommends to furnish all the details regarding purchase of materials including the reason for the diversion of funds, without delay.

10. The Committee would like to know, whether the proposal for Central assistance to all the High Schools were sent by the Department within the time limit prescribed by Government of India. The total fund released under this scheme by the GOI and the total fund so far utilized should also be furnished to the Committee.

11. In the case of procurement and supply of materials and equipments, there was unreasonable delay of 15 months in handing over the list of items to be supplied by the firm, though an advance amount of Rs. 30.54 lakh was paid to the firm much earlier. The Committee strongly condemns such irresponsible attitude of the department and like to know the reason for the inordinate delay in handing over the list. There was lapse on the part of the department in placing orders without specifying time limit for the supply. The reason for the delay in supply of material by KSCCF and SIDCO and non finalisation of purchase orders should be submitted to the Committee. Since no time limit was fixed for the completion of supply, the Committee desires to know when the supply was completed.

12. The Central Government Scheme did not envisage payment of service charges to the suppliers of materials and equipment to schools from the schemes fund. But the Department had given Rs. 13.26 lakhs to the purchasing agents as service charges though the same was not allowed in the scheme. Moreover, the purchasing agents had charged a penalty of Rs. 2.59 lakh and realised the same from the suppliers on account of belated supply of materials. That amount had to be deducted from the cost of the materials, but the same was not done in this case. Instead, the amount was included in the expenditure and claimed service charge also. The Committee finds that the action is irregular and hence the entire amount should have been recovered from them. But it is deplorable to note that the amount had not been recovered from them even after the lapse of 15 years. Therefore, the Committee wants to be furnished with the details why the amount was not recovered from the purchasing agents and what the present position of the case is.

13. The Committee would like to be informed whether the balance amount to be realised from SIDCO as well as from KSCCF had since been obtained or not.

14. The Committee acknowledges many irregularities committed in the distribution of materials under the scheme. The Committee finds that these irregularities occurred mainly due to the fact that the Department placed orders for the materials to be supplied without conducting a survey for ascertaining the requirements of each school in advance. The supply of science kits to schools was neither checked nor a proper register maintained in this respect. Hence the Committee suggests that a need based approach has to be adopted in such cases.

15. No institutional set up is available to explore the scientific calibre of school students under the present system of education. The labs in schools are not sufficiently equipped to test even the basic principles of Science. The District Resource Centre for Science Education (DRECSE) envisaged for training of science and maths teachers and also for taking up other activities for promotion to science education was a good step in this direction. But the Department could not implement the scheme in the State as envisaged. Though two centres were selected and an amount of Rs. 2 lakh was allotted for the purpose, the scheme could not be materialised. This is most unfortunate. The Committee recommends that the Department should effectively evaluate and monitor the implementation of such Centrally Sponsored Schemes so that the Central aid is fruitfully utilised.

16. Training programme can apprise the teachers of the minute details of the positions of Science and Mathematics which they can deliver to students in a more digestable way. The Committee would like to be informed of the reason for not conducting training programme for upper primary and high school teachers even though there was sufficient funds to meet all the expenses. The Committee would also like to be informed of the details of fund utilisation earmarked for the training programme for upper primary school teachers and high school teachers.

17. The success of every new programme depends on its proper evaluation and monitoring at each stage of its implementation. The DPI and the State Government failed to do it. There was wilfull omission and sheer negligence on the part of the DPI in implementing the programmnes and policies of the Government. Proper monitoring and evaluation only can rectify the lacunas and defects arising during the course of its implementation. By understanding this, the defects can be cured in its future implementation. The officer-in-charge of planning in the office of the DPI should be asked to submit the reason for not conducting proper evaluation and monitoring.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Avoidable excess expenditure on purchase of microscopes

The Director of Higher Secondary Education invited tenders (December 1991) for purchase of laboratory equipment and chemicals for use in laboratories in Higher Secondary Schools for the year 1991-92. These included supply of 132 monocular microscopes. Three firms quoted for this item as follows :

1. Firm 'A'	:	Rs. 875
2. Firm 'B'	:	Rs. 1,600
3. Firm 'C' (Four rates)		
(i) Rolex make microscope without built-in light arrangement	:	Rs. 2,950
(ii) Rolex make with built-in light arrangement	:	Rs. 3,350
(iii) Getner make without built-in light arrangement	:	Rs. 5,850
(iv) Getner make with built-in light arrangement	:	Rs. 6,150

While firms 'A' and 'B' had submitted samples for verification, firm 'C' had submitted samples only in respect of 'Rolex make with built-in light arrangement' at the rate of Rs. 3,350.

As per the directions of Government, the Director, State Institute of Education was required to constitute a Technical Committee with science experts for verification of the samples produced by the tenderers and to furnish verification report with their recommendations. Accordingly, the samples received were verified by the Technical Committee. The Departmental Purchase Committee (DPC) agreed with the Technical Committee Report that the offers for which tenderers had supplied samples should alone be considered.

The Technical Committee did not accept the samples submitted by firms 'A' and 'B' on the ground that the samples presented did not agree with the specifications and the image received was not clear. The Committee recommended the Getner microscope quoted by firm 'C' at the rate of Rs. 5,850. The DPC in its meeting held on 22nd October 1992 accepted the recommendations of Technical Committee. Government accepted the recommendations of the DPC and accorded sanction in November 1992 for the purchase. Accordingly, the Director of Higher Secondary Education placed supply orders for the purchase of 132 Getner make microscopes at the rate of Rs. 5,850 on firm 'C' in January 1993. The firm completed the supply in March 1993.

The following points were noticed in audit :

(i) Rolex microscope costing Rs. 3,350 per unit, for which alone sample was produced by firm 'C', satisfied all the tender specifications, it also had built-in light arrangement. But the Committee recommended purchase of 'Getner make' microscopes at the rate of Rs. 5,850, which did not contain built-in light arrangement. The recommendation of the DPC to purchase this item was also against its own decision that offers for which the tenderers had supplied samples alone should be considered.

(ii) Further, the decision to purchase 'Getner make' microscope at Rs. 5,850 per unit, without mentioning any reason to reject 'Rolex make' microscope, which satisfied the tender specifications and cost of Rs. 3,350 only per unit, was unjustifiable. This resulted in avoidable excess expenditure of Rs. 3.30 lakhs.

The department stated in March 1995 that though the supply of sample of 'Rolex microscope' alone had been recorded, the Committee had verified the 'Getner make' also. The argument of the department is not tenable as the minutes of the Technical Committee meeting reveals that the Committee had verified only one sample with built in light arrangement of firm 'C' and the

'Getner make' at Rs. 5,850 per unit recommended by the Committee did not have built-in light arrangement. While the Committee had specifically rejected the samples produced by firm 'A' and firm 'B', it did not make any reference to the sample 'Rolex make with built-in light arrangement at Rs. 3,350 per unit' produced by firm 'C'. In the absence of any reason for rejection of this brand the recommendation to purchase another brand at a higher cost was not justifiable.

The matter was referred to Government in March 1995 reply has not been received (September 1995).

[Paragraph 3.8 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31 March, 1995 No. 3 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

18. The Committee observed that both the DPC and the Technical Committee acted contradictory to their own earlier decision not to accept the offer of the firms which have not submitted the sample (Microscope) along with the offer. Also, the quality was not ensured. The reply furnished by the Department was unsatisfactory and hence not acceptable. However since the matter related to a purchase done 15 years back, the Committee decided not to pursue it any further.

19. The Committee enquired about the procedure being adopted in purchases since then. The witness DPI, informed that centralised purchase system had been stopped and in its place, local purchase Committee involving Panchayats had been set up. To ensure quality, quotation from standard companies only were being entertained.

Conclusion/Recommendation

20. The Committee is not at all satisfied by the reply given by the witness. However, the Committee decides not to pursue further since a long period had elapsed after the said deal.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Blocking of Government funds due to purchase of paper in excess of requirement

The scheme 'Total Literacy Campaign' was being implemented in the State through Kerala Saksharatha Samithi (KSS), a registered society with Chief Minister as Chairman. In October 1993, KSS decided to purchase 100 tonnes of

white paper for printing of books for neo-literates. Though necessary formalities for the purchase were completed by 29th March 1994, supply order was placed only on 9th May 1994 due to delay in getting the approval of the Secretary of KSS. The delay resulted in extra payment of Rs. 1.20 lakh due to enhancement of excise duty with effect from 1st April 1994.

Out of 100.70 tonnes of paper procured, 39.83 tonnes were issued to the printing presses between July 1994 and October 1994 and the remaining 60.87 tonnes of paper valued at Rs. 14.70 lakh was still unutilised. The godown rent paid for stocking the unutilised paper for the period from October 1994 to March 1997 amounted to Rs. 2.52 lakh. The rent payable for the period from April 1997 to October 1997 was Rs. 0.49 lakh.

Further, 17.37 tonnes of paper valued at Rs. 4.15 lakh issued for printing was remaining unutilised in the presses. Though the press had in October 1995 requested to lift the unused paper, no action had been taken by KSS (July 1997).

Thus purchase of paper in excess of actual requirement resulted in blocking of funds to the tune of Rs. 18.85 lakh for the last 3 years and avoidable extra expenditure of Rs. 3.01 lakh on account of rent of godown. The loss of interest on the blocked capital at the borrowing rate of 11 per cent for the period from October 1994 to October 1997 worked out to Rs. 6.39 lakh.

KSS stated (July 1997) that action was being taken to dispose of the unutilised paper.

The matter was referred to Government in September 1997; reply had not been received (October 1997).

[Paragraph 7.10—contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1997, No. 3 (Civil)].

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

21. The Secretary, General Education, admitted that there was under utilisation of white paper purchased for the scheme “Total Literacy Campaign” in the State since the programme was at the introductory stage. For stocking this unused paper a godown was taken on rent. As the programme “Continuing education” was being continued, the unused paper, had been utilised fully for printing materials for the programme. The Committee asked the witness to furnish the details of the utilisation of the 100 tonnes of paper purchased for the Literacy programme.

Conclusion/Recommendation

22. The Committee is surprised to note that when the education department trailing heavily in short of money even to meet the printing of text books of school children, the Department had purchased 100 tonnes of paper in excess under the scheme 'Total Literacy Campaign' without looking into the actual requirement. The concerned officer should be asked to explain the reason for purchasing 100 tonnes of paper in lump and what prevented him from purchasing paper according to requirement. Knowing that paper is a perishable thing and it is difficult to store 100 tonnes of paper in lump, the department is compelled to store in a rental godown which resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 3.01 lakh (2.52 + 0.49) by way of rent. The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation of the Department on the issue. Hence, the Committee may be informed of the quantity of paper used, that remaining unutilised, the total number of books printed using those paper and the number of books so far distributed. The Committee would also like to know, how the department is going to use the remaining quantity of paper and the details regarding it.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Non-deployment of protected teachers

The strength of teaching and non-teaching staff of aided schools is fixed every year on the basis of strength of students. The rules do not provide for retention of staff in any school in excess of sanctioned strength, in case, consequent on fall in pupil strength, certain categories of teachers were rendered surplus, they were allowed to continue in their schools as 'protected' teachers till they are absorbed elsewhere.

Government issued (April and May 1988) orders to deploy the 'protected' teachers against open vacancies in Government and aided schools. Observing that maintenance of protected teachers was a heavy burden on exchequer, Committee on Public Accounts (PAC) recommended in July 1993 that all the protected teachers should be absorbed in the future vacancies. Despite these recommendations and Government Orders, the retention of protected teachers continued.

Audit (January and November 1997) revealed that the number of teachers retained in aided schools during 1993-96 was 433 on an average, while nearly 3000 vacancies in Government schools existed on average during the above years. Information relating to 1996-97 and 1997-98 had not been furnished to Audit (July 1998).

Assuming the minimum staff strength of protected teachers as 400 (actuals for 1995-96), non-deployment of protected teachers resulted in unfruitful expenditure of Rs. 1.26 crore per annum (approximately) during 1993-94 to 1995-96.

The matter was referred to Government in June 1998; reply had not been received (October 1998).

[Paragraph 7.6—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1998 No. 3 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Avoidable expenditure on payment of salary to protected teachers

Non-deployment of protected teachers against arising vacancies resulted in avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore to State exchequer

Kerala Education Rules (Rules) provide for fixation of staff strength of teaching and non teaching staff in aided schools on the basis of strength of students annually. The rules do not provide for retention of staff in excess of the sanctioned strength.

Government, by issue of executive orders from time to time, allowed the teachers rendered surplus on account of staff fixation/division fall to continue in the respective schools as 'protected' and to absorb such protected teachers in vacancies arising on retirement or otherwise in the same institution or in institutions under the same management or to deploy in Government Schools against existing/arising vacancies. Government also ordered in September 1999 that all aided school teachers who were in service as on 14th July 1997 were eligible for protection by retaining them in the respective schools.

Mention was made in paragraph 7.6 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1998 (Civil) about the unnecessary retention of protected teachers when vacancies existed in Government schools. A further scrutiny conducted revealed that the number of protected teachers retained in the same schools under special orders and remained undeployed during 1998-02 ranged between 1177 and 4180. During

the same period, 14728 teachers were newly recruited in Government schools. The details are as under :—

Year	Number of protected teachers retained in same schools/ undeployed				Number of teachers recruited		
	HSA*	PDT#	Spl®	Total	HSA	PDT	Total
1998-99	115	503	559	1177	2169	3917	6086
1999-00	362	1352	667	2381	1306	1658	2964
2000-01	460	1872	735	3067	1394	1907	3301
2001-02	741	2374	1065	4180	1125	1252	2377

Thus, the failure of the Government to deploy the protected teachers against the vacancies arisen, instead of resorting to recruitment, resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore (approx) during 1998-2002 towards payment of salary of newly recruited teachers.

Government stated (September 2003) that they had taken all possible steps to deploy the maximum number of protected teachers by 30th June 2002 and that the number of protected teachers awaiting redeployment at the end of the last year was only 800. The department arrived at the number of 800 excluding those granted exemption from redeployment on account of physical disabilities, relationship with jawans, etc. Despite the recommendation of the PAC in July 1993 that all protected teachers should be redeployed in future vacancies, the situation is still alarming.

[Audit Paragraph 4.4.1—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 2003 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

23. The witness deposed that only 398 protected teachers remained to be redeployed. She added that all regular vacancies in Government Schools could not be filled up by re-deploying protected teachers as this would affect the employment prospects of the candidates selected by the Public Service Commission. The Hon'ble High Court in many cases had passed orders in their

* HSA – High School Assistant

PDT – Primary Division Teachers

® Spl. – Specialist Teachers

judgement against posting of protected teachers in the existing vacancies in Government schools. The Committee desired to get a copy of the judgement so that the Committee could get a clear picture of the issue. The Secretary disclosed that a decision had been taken to appoint these protected teachers as full time librarians after giving them sufficient training in major High Schools, under the scheme of "School Library Movements". The DPI apprised the difficulties faced by the Department in the case of 1065 protected specialised teachers who could not be redeployed elsewhere.

Conclusion/Recommendation

24. **The issue of protection of teachers in aided schools in the State appears to be a 'conundrum', facing the educational front in Kerala for the past few decades. The Committee observes that even though there is clear Government Order and the Committee's earlier recommendation that all the protected teachers are to be redeployed against the arising vacancies in the Government schools, a large number of teachers were unnecessarily retained in the State resulting in unfruitful expenditure. The Committee also notices that the number of protected teachers ranged between 1177 and 4180 in aided schools where as the number of newly recruited teachers in Government Schools were 14,728. Thus the non-implementation of the Government Order/ Committee's earlier recommendation has resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore towards the payment of salary to newly recruited teachers. However, the Committee earnestly endorses the view expressed by the Government that the redeployment of the protected teachers would adversely affect the prospects of the candidates selected by the Public Service Commission. The Committee expresses the opinion that this is a sensitive problem largely involving the fulfillment of a social responsibility on the part of the Government and hence in order to have a more clear picture of the issue, the Committee desires to be furnished with the details of court judgements on all cases relating to redeployment of protected teachers in the State.**

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Misappropriation of Government money

A primary school headmaster fraudulently withdrew Rs. 2.53 lakh from treasury during April 1994 to August 1998

Scrutiny (September 1998) of the accounts of Government Lower Primary School, Ambalavayal in Wayanad district revealed that the Headmaster of the

school, withdrew fraudulently Rs. 2,52,654 through 50 salary bills from sub treasury, Sultan Bathery (April 1994 to August 1998) and misappropriated the amount. His modus operandi included drawing salary for non-existent staff, erasing and over-writing office copies of salary bills, showing incorrect totals in the office copies of bills and acquittance rolls, tampering acquittance rolls after disbursement of salary by changing the amounts actually disbursed etc. Though the school was last inspected by the Assistant Educational Officer in January 1998, the fraudulent drawals were not detected. Scrutiny revealed that there was no accountant in the school and the Headmaster was himself handling the cash and making disbursement.

On this being pointed out (September 1998) by Audit, the Deputy Director of Education, Wayanad conducted (September 1998) a preliminary inquiry and found that the headmaster was guilty of misappropriating Government money and placed him under suspension. The delinquent official remitted the entire amount in October 1998 in the said sub treasury.

Government in an interim reply stated (September 1999) that the Deputy Director of Education, Wayanad had been directed to initiate disciplinary action against the headmaster and punishment was also imposed on the Assistant Educational Officer. Final reply of Government is awaited (October 1999).

[Audit Paragraph 3.7—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1999, No. 3 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

25. The Committee observed that the delinquent officer was suspended twice and on both the occasions he had been reinstated consequent on the direction of the court to review the suspension. The Committee wanted to be apprised of the details of the case. The witness stated that when the fraudulence was detected the Headmaster was placed under suspension by the Government. Aggrieved by this he filed an O.P. in the High Court against the order of the Government. Consequent on the direction of the court to review the suspension the D.D. gave direction to reinstate him. Meanwhile the Vigilance Department had filed case against the officer and hence they requested the Department to place the officer under suspension. Even before the Vigilance direction, Government had over ruled the DD's order and suspended the Headmaster. Again the Officer filed an O.P. in the High Court and subsequently he was reinstated in 2002 on the direction of the Court. The Committee did not

agree with this argument. From the reply, the Committee found that the court directed the Government only to review the suspension and not to reinstate the delinquent officer. The Committee opined that the Government had misinterpreted the judgement and had availed the opportunity to reinstate the accused.

26. When asked whether any action had been taken against the A.E.O. who failed to detect the misappropriation at the time of his inspection in the school in 1998, the witness replied in the negative. The Committee asked about the effectiveness of the system in the department to detect such misappropriation. The witness deposed that the staff strength in the department was inadequate to attend all the transactions/accounts in all the Government and aided schools and hence priority would be given to retirement cases. Training programme for the Headmasters had been revamped giving special emphasis to accounting, Book Keeping etc. so as to enable them to get adequate knowledge in the provisions of the various rules and codes. The DPI stated that training programme for the clerical staff had also been intensified. Also, computerisation of PF accounts was over and that of other accountings was in progress.

Conclusion/Recommendation

27. **In this case the Committee noticed that, even though the court directed to review the order of suspension of the Head Master, the Deputy Director (DD) wilfully misinterpreted it and reinstated the Head Master in service. The Head Master had admitted his crime and remitted the entire amount in October 1998. Therefore the Committee wants more details of the case from the Deputy Director who had taken a decision in favour of the Headmaster by interpreting the court judgement of reviewing the suspension order but not anything specifically said in the judgement to reinstate him in service. Action should also be taken against the AEO who had failed to detect the misappropriation at the time of his inspection in the school.**

28. **In majority of schools there is scarcity of non-teaching staff for maintaining the establishment files, expenditure, accounts etc. The Head Masters are forced to discharge these functions without having sufficient training. Headmaster should be given sufficient training in Accounts before they assume charge. The Committee suggests to speed up the computerisation in the department and to strengthen the Internal Audit Wing so as to reduce the level of corruption going on in the department. The Committee also desires to get the details of the Headmaster's latest reinstatement in service.**

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

*Nugatory expenditure on staff***No TTC course was conducted during 1996-97 to 1997-98 and the staff in 21 Teachers Training Institutes had no work**

Director of Public Instructions (DPI) issued notifications inviting applications for admission to the two-year Teachers Training Certificate (TTC) course. No such notification was issued for the courses during 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98. Candidates admitted during 1994-95 completed the course in June 1996 and the next admission was made only in August 1998. There was no recorded reason for not conducting the course during the said period.

There are 24 Teachers Training Institutions (TTIs) under the Government. As no course was conducted during 1996-97 and 1997-98, 136 staff during 1996-97 and 102 during 1997-98 in 21* TTIs had no work to do and only 34 staff were redeployed during 1996-97 and another 33 during 1997-98. The idle wages paid to the staff for the two academic years 1996-97 and 1997-98 worked out to Rs. 1.12 crore. Secretary, General Education Department furnished no reasons for the discontinuance of the courses despite repeated requests.

The matter was reported to Government in December 1998; reply has not been received (October 1999).

[Audit Paragraph 3.8—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1999, No.3 (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

29. The Committee was informed that a large number of OPs and Writ Appeals were filed before the High Court regarding the question of selection and admission of students in the TTIs run by minorities and Government had to wait for the judgements so as to make necessary modifications in the notification and hence stopped admission to the course during 1996-97 and 1997-98. The Secretary contended that the services of staff of TTIs were used for training programmes. As there were the 2nd year classes during 1995-96 their services were utilised partially. There was a policy decision that these teachers should not be retrenched or deployed elsewhere due to any division fall. The Committee could find that along with the minority institutions, the admissions to 63 other schools were also stopped during this period. When asked about the reasons for this, the Secretary replied that admission to the schools were made

* Details in respect of GTTI, Palakkad not received and in GTTIs Chalai and Munnar no separate staff for TTI.

from a common list prepared at the district level irrespective of the administrative nature of the institutions. The Committee was not satisfied with this reply and hence directed the Secretary to forward a detailed reply explaining the reasons for not allowing the Government institutions and other non-minority institution to carry out admission to TTC courses during the years 1996-97 and 1997-98.

Conclusion/Recommendation

30. The Committee does not agree with the Government stand for not issuing the notification, for admission in TTIs in the State for the period from 1995-96 to 1997-98 since all litigations and counter appeals are exclusively related to admission in the institutions run by minority community. This does not affect admission in Government run and non-minority TTIs. The reason adduced by the witness that admissions to all TTIs in the state are made from a common list prepared at the district level irrespective of the administrative nature of the institution is also not acceptable to the Committee. The Committee desires to be furnished with a detailed reply explaining the reasons for not allowing the Government and non-minority institutions in the State to carry out admission to Teachers Training Courses during 1995-96 to 1997-98.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Schools without minimum strength

142 Schools which were functioning without minimum strength created a liability of Rs. 3.67 crore annually

Kerala Educational Rules (KER) provide that the minimum effective strength of students in each class should be 25. The Director of Public Instruction (DPI) was to consider withdrawal of recognition in cases where the minimum effective strength was less than 25 only after ensuring alternative educational facilities in the locality. It was seen that number of Government/aided primary schools functioning in the state without minimum strength increased from 1265 in 1995-96 to 1937 in 1998-99.

Though KER envisaged that the DPI was to accord permission for continuance of such schools on the merits of the case, and on the condition that they would increase the strength to required level, Government issued sanction for continuation of such schools through a general order, without examining the merits in each case. Scrutiny revealed that 142 schools were functioning with a strength ranged from 0 to 74 during the period from 1995-96 to 1998-99. The average expenditure per student per annum incurred by these 142 schools during 1995-99 was Rs. 4825, Rs. 5457, Rs. 6398 and Rs. 8233. Of the 142 schools, 57 had been functioning without minimum strength for more

751/2008.

than 10 years. There was no student in Government L.P. School (LPS), Shanghumugham (under AEO, Thiruvananthapuram North) during 1998-99 but the school had a Headmaster and a part time employee. Idle wage of Rs. 1.68 lakh was spent during 1998-99 . Though the DPI recommended to the Government to merge these 142 schools with inadequate strength with other schools, the proposal was not accepted by the Government. As the Staff strength prescribed for a school is one Headmaster and three teachers for an LP School, these 142 primary schools created a minimum financial liability of Rs. 3.67 crore per annum.

The matter was referred to Government in July 2000 ; reply has not been received (November 2000).

[Audit Paragraph 3.11—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 2000, (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

31. The Committee was informed that the DPI after conducting a scientific study on the schools having inadequate strength and possibility of transferring the students to nearby school had submitted a list of 105 Government and aided schools to be closed down. But due to various reasons viz. Court order, local pressure etc., only 48 such schools were decided to be closed down and 53 were retained. The Secretary deposed that the Government had taken a decision to lower the minimum effective strength of students required in schools situated in inaccessible/difficult areas to avoid the difficulties of the students.

Conclusion/Recommendation

32. Even though Government has a duty to provide education to children studying in schools without minimum strength also, unproductive establishment expenditure of Rs. 3.67 crores per annum can't be taken for granted. The Committee thinks it fit to explore the possibility of merging two schools without minimum strength to one or admitting the students to the nearby schools of the locality.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Avoidable expenditure on appointment of language teachers

Irregular appointment of Malayalam Language Teachers in aided schools in violation of rules lead to avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 crore

Rules for fixation of strength of teachers in departmental and aided schools are laid down in Chapter XIII of Kerala Education Rules (Rules). Audit scrutiny

revealed irregular sanction of posts of Malayalam Teachers in aided schools in contravention of the Rules resulting in avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 crore as detailed below :

Rules provided for sanctioning of posts of teachers in languages other than regional language on the basis of total effective strength of pupils studying a particular language in all divisions of standard in a school. Posts of language teachers in Malayalam were sanctioned by District Educational Officers in regions of Kerala where other languages like Arabic, Urdu or Sanskrit were taught as first language instead of Malayalam.

On this being pointed out in audit, Government admitted (July 2000) that the provision in the rule was not in conformity with the intention of rule makers and informed that amendment to the rule was under consideration. Government also ordered (September 2000) that no post of High School Assistant (Malayalam) be sanctioned from the year 2000-01 reckoning the number of students learning Arabic, Urdu, Sanskrit etc. as first language.

Scrutiny of records for the period 1997-2002 revealed that by interpreting the rule, not in conformity with the intention of the rule makers. 200 to 233 posts were operated in aided schools alone in three educational districts of Kozhikode, Malappuram and Tirur over and above the normal strength of Malayalam language teachers. This resulted in avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 core. Amendment to KERs, as agreed to by Government, had not been made as of December 2002.

The matter was referred to Government in May 2002; reply has not been received (December 2002).

[Audit Paragraph 7.5—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 2002, (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

33. The Secretary (General Education) stated that Government had issued necessary amendment to the Rules in KER so that the calculation of periods for sanctioning post of teachers for regional language could be made on the effective strength of pupils studying that language in all the divisions of each standard in a school. Earlier Staff fixation was done based on the total number of students in a school which had resulted in excess teachers in regional language. By the issuance of the G.O. (Ms.) 237/2000/GE. dated 15-7-2000 the difficulty in interpretation of the Rules had been removed. She informed the Committee that the excess teachers who had the eligibility of protection were being redeployed.

Conclusion/Recommendation

34. No comments.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Fixation of staff strength on bogus admission

Injudicious sanctioning of excess posts of teaching and non-teaching staff in a Government aided school.

Kerala Education Rules (KERs) provided for fixation of strength of teaching staff in each school by Educational Officer, once a year, after finalising the effective strength of the pupils as on 6th working day from the re-opening date in June and fixing the number of divisions (sections). KERs also empowered the Government to constitute Super Check Cell to inspect schools, to verify the strength of pupils, call for records from Headmasters/Managers/Educational Officers and to send detailed report to the Director of Public Instruction (DPI) for appropriate action.

District Educational Officer (DEO), Mavelikkara fixed (July 2000) staff strength of an aided High School, MSM High School, Kayamkulam for the academic year 2000-01 sanctioning 41 divisions. The Super Check Cell inspected the school thrice on 30th November 2000, 13th February 2001 and 26th February 2001 and found that there were bogus admissions and that 342 pupils enlisted in the roll were not actually studying there. Based on the report of the Super Check Officer, DPI conducted detailed enquiry and re-fixed the number of divisions as 33 based on the total effective strength. He ordered (September 2001) abolishing of 8 posts of High School Assistants/Upper Primary School Assistants, and one post each of Lower Grade Hindi Teacher, Lower Divisions Clerk and one full time Menial and to convert full time post of Urdu teacher as part-time. He also ordered to recover the loss sustained by the Government on account of salary etc., from the Headmaster and District Educational Officer jointly.

Scrutiny revealed that 342 pupils were admitted to High School from the academic year 1995-96 on the basis of transfer certificates obtained from a Lower Primary School under the same management. This amounted to fraud on the exchequer. Bogus admissions for arriving at the effective strength resulted in sanctioning 21 divisions and 21 posts in excess during the academic years 1995-96 to 1999-2000. Extra expenditure incurred for pay and allowances on the irregular posts amounted to Rs. 11.88 lakh at the minimum of the scale of pay of the posts, for the five academic years from 1995-96 to 1999-2000 and Rs. 7.20 lakh for the academic year 2000-01. Thus failure on the part of the educational officer in exercising the powers vested on him judiciously resulted in sanctioning of posts in excess involving extra liability to the tune of Rs.19.08 lakh.

The matter was referred to Government in June 2000, reply has not been received (December 2002).

[Audit Paragraph 7.6—contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 2002, (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

35. The Secretary (General Education) apprised that based on the report of the Super Check Cell, the DPI had ordered to recover Rs. 19.08 lakh from the Headmaster and DEO jointly who were responsible for the loss of Rs. 19.08 lakh sustained to Government on account of salaries and other allowances paid to the excess staff. Meanwhile, the Deputy Director had revised the earlier proceedings and fixed the liability at Rs. 13 lakhs and made seven officers responsible for the loss instead of two as fixed earlier. In 2004 they represented to Government and they were given two-three chances to hear in person. But nobody turned up. Some of them had retired from service and their DCRG had been withheld. In the case of those who had received their DCRG, steps were being initiated to recover the amount by R.R. proceedings. Subsequently, in 2005 they had filed writ petition in the Court which was pending. The witnesses could not offer a convincing reply as to why the Headmaster was not suspended and why no action was taken against the manager for such a serious fraud. The Committee opined that this was not a case of negligence but a very lenient attitude of the Government towards the deliberate fraud committed by the culprits. Hence the Committee suggested that the Headmaster should be suspended forthwith and criminal proceedings should be initiated against the manager of the school. Both of them should be awarded with proper punishment. The Committee was of strong opinion that such criminal actions could be controlled, if the delinquents are suitably punished. The Committee also added that KER should be suitably amended, if necessary. The Committee also suggested that a provision should be introduced, to the effect that in case of appeals filed against orders of recovery of loss to Government, the applicant should deposit 15% of the amount ordered for recovery while submitting application to the Appellate Authorities.

Conclusion/Recommendation

36. **In the case of fixation of staff strength in an aided school under the jurisdiction of Mavelikkara DEO, the DPI personally conducted a detailed enquiry based on the report of the super check cell and ordered to recover Rs.19.08 lakhs from the Headmaster and DEO jointly who were responsible for the loss sustained to Government. Overriding this order, the DD conducted a**

further enquiry and refixed the responsibility of Rs. 13 lakhs against seven officers of whom majority were on the verge of retirement.

37. The Committee thinks that since a sufficiently serious mode of proceedings was conducted at the higher level the intervention of DD in the matter again was prefixing, most unwarranted, and ridiculous. Refixing the responsibility on persons who were on the verge of retirement in fact reduced the chance to recover the loss sustained to Government. The further interference of DD on the matter evokes an element of suspicion of collusion between the DD, DEO and the Headmaster. The Committee is of the opinion that the Department ought to have suspended the Headmaster with immediate effect when the fraud was noticed.

38. Since the matter is with the court, the Committee would like to know the present status of the case, and what departmental action was taken by the DPI against the Head Master and the concerned officers who had connived in this fraud. The Committee recommends to initiate criminal proceedings against the Manager who was responsible for bogus admission. The Committee directs to present the case well before the court, after cleaning the defects. Also the department should think of fixing a norm such that, for permitting an appeal to the higher authority, the delinquent officer should remit 1/3rd of the assessed amount. Such a norm can be a warning to other habitual corrupt officers and the chance of escaping by influencing higher officers can be avoided. Even though, every person has a right to be heard, majority of the officers are misutilizing this right and drag the case upto their retirement and escape from the liability and departmental action.

39. Necessary amendments should be made in the KER such that responsibility for bogus admissions and increased staff strength should also be fixed on the Manager. Both the Manager and Headmaster should be made jointly liable in such cases.

AUDIT PARAGRAPH

Non-recovery of amounts due from Universities

Rs. 5.72 crore due from Universities towards reimbursement of leave salary paid to school teachers for invigilation in University examinations during 1986-99 not collected so far.

Based on the recommendation of Inter-University Consultative Committee (January 1985) Government ordered (March 1985 and July 1985) that school teachers who were appointed as invigilators for the conduct of University examinations would be entitled to Earned Leave as per provisions of Kerala

Service Rules and that the expenditure would be borne by the concerned Universities. The Director of Public Instructions (DPI) was responsible to get the actual expenditure incurred on this account by Government reimbursed from the Universities. According to information received from DPI, Rs. 5.72 crore was due from three Universities* towards expenditure incurred by Government on account of payment made to teachers appointed as invigilators by these Universities during 1986-99. But no action was taken by DPI till November 1997 to prefer a claim for the amounts due to the Government from the Universities.

Amounts due for the period from 1999 to 2002 are yet to be assessed by the DPI for want of details from subordinate offices. The abnormal delay in claiming the amounts due to Government is likely to render them irrecoverable on account of accumulation.

The matter was referred to Government in January 2003; reply has not been received (December 2003).

[Audit Paragraph 4.6.2—Contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31 March 2003, (Civil)]

Government notes on the above audit paragraph is included in Appendix II of this Report.

40. The Secretary, General Education informed that Government had ordered the recovery of a total amount of Rs. 5,71,83,012 due from the three Universities towards reimbursement of leave salary benefit paid to the school teachers for invigilation duty done by them in University examinations during the period 1986-99 from the non-plan grant to the concerned Universities. On a query regarding the reason for the delay of 19 years in claiming the reimbursement, she disclosed that eventhough the Universities were reminded several times, they did not remit the amount and finally Government had taken the decision to recover the amount in 60 instalments. Recovery steps had been started from April 2005 onwards.

41. The Committee pointed out the negligence on the part of the department in assessing the amounts due from the Universities from 1999 to 2002. The DPI assured that the matter would be attended to immediately.

Conclusion/Recommendation

42. The Committee is of the opinion that there was sheer negligence on the part of the department in not taking proper official action to recover the amount due from universities. The delay of 19 years in taking action is clear dereliction of duty.

* Kerala University : Rs.1.04 crore; Mahatma Gandhi University: Rs. 0.96 crore; Calicut University:Rs.3.72 crore

43. The Committee is informed that even though the Universities were reminded several times, they did not remit the amount and finally the Government had started to recover the amount in 60 instalments from April 2005. Therefore, the Committee desires to know the present position of the case. The Committee also wants to know the details of the negligence on the part of the department in assessing the amounts due from the Universities from 1999-2002. The Committee recommends that urgent steps should be initiated to recover the dues from Universities without any further delay.

Thiruvananthapuram,
15th July, 2008.

ARYADAN MUAMMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

APPENDIX I

Summary of Main Conclusions/Recommendations

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Department Concerned</i>	<i>Conclusions/ Recommendations</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	8	General Education	Improvement of Science education in schools is a fully Centrally Sponsored Scheme with all the funds provided by the centre. The duty of the State is only to implement the scheme in a phased manner in all the Government and Government aided upper primary, secondary and higher secondary schools. Eventhough implementation of the scheme was started in 1988-89 with 100% Central assistance, it reached no where even after the lapse of 5 to 7 years. The department is also complaining of poor budgetary provision for projects. The Committee may be informed of the total fund received under this programme by the State Government, the amount so far utilized, the total time allowed for the completion of the scheme, the reason for the non implementation of the scheme and the present status of the programme.
2	9	„	The Committee observes that the State allocation of Budget provision for the implementation of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme–Improvement of Science Education in schools – in the State were not in consonance with central assistance received from GOI. While State Budget provision showed a high allocation, the corresponding central assistance for the programme showed a marginal figure which resulted in less expenditure. The Committee finds that this mismatch happened due to the fact that State Budget provisions are made on a lumpsum basis without ascertaining the possibility of central assistance from GOI for the scheme. Hence, the Committee recommends that the approach towards the centralised scheme should be changed so as to enable the State

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			<p>Department to get the maximum assistance of GOI. The Committee also notices that the Department diverted a fund of Rs. 6.99 lakh earmarked for imparting training and Rs. 2 lakhs for setting up of DRESCE, for the purchase of materials. The Committee notes that this is against the rules envisaged in the scheme. Hence, the Committee strongly recommends to furnish all the details regarding purchase of materials including the reason for the diversion of funds, without delay.</p>
3	10	General Education	<p>The Committee would like to know, whether the proposal for Central assistance to all the High Schools were sent by the Department within the time limit prescribed by Government of India. The total fund released under this scheme by GOI and the total fund so far utilized should also be furnished to the Committee.</p>
4	11	„	<p>In the case of procurement & supply of materials and equipments, there was unreasonable delay of 15 months in handing over the list of items to be supplied by the firm, though an advance amount of Rs.30.54 lakh was paid to the firm much earlier. The Committee strongly condemns such irresponsible attitude of the department and likes to know the reason for the inordinate delay in handing over the list. There was lapse on the part of the department in placing orders without specifying time limit for the supply. The reason for the delay in supply of material by KSCCF and SIDCO and non finalisation of purchase orders should be submitted to the Committee. Since no time limit was fixed for the completion of supply, the Committee desires to know when the supply was completed.</p>
5	12	„	<p>The Central Government Scheme did not envisage payment of service charges to the suppliers of materials and equipment to schools from the schemes fund. But the Department had given Rs. 13.26 lakhs to</p>

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			the purchasing agents as service charges though the same was not allowed in the scheme. Moreover, the purchasing agents had charged a penalty of Rs. 2.59 lakh and realised the same from the suppliers on account of belated supply of materials. That amount had to be deducted from the cost of the materials, but the same was not done in this case. Instead, the amount was included in the expenditure and claimed service charge also. The Committee finds that the action is irregular and hence the entire amount should have been recovered from them. But it is deplorable to note that the amount had not been recovered from them even after the lapse of 15 years. Therefore, the Committee wants to be furnished with the details why the amount was not recovered from the purchasing agents and what the present position of the case is.
6	13	General Education	The Committee would like to be informed whether the balance amount to be realised from SIDCO as well as from KSCCF had since been obtained or not.
7	14	„	The Committee observes many irregularities committed in the distribution of materials under the scheme. The Committee finds that these irregularities occurred mainly due to the fact that the Department placed orders for the materials to be supplied without conducting a survey for ascertaining the requirements of each school in advance. The supply of science kits to schools was neither checked nor a proper registers maintained in this respect. Hence, the Committee suggests that a need based approach has to be adopted in such cases.
8	15	„	No institutional set up is available to explore the scientific calibre of school students under the present system of education. The labs in schools are not sufficiently equipped to test even the basic principles of Science. The District Resource Centre for Science Education (DRECSE) envisaged for training of science and maths teachers and also for taking up other

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			activities for promotion of science education was a good step in this direction. But the Department could not implement the scheme in the State as envisaged. Though two centres were selected and an amount of Rs. 2 lakh was allotted for the purpose, the scheme could not be materialised. This is most unfortunate. The Committee recommends that the Department should effectively evaluate and monitor the implementation of such Centrally Sponsored Schemes so that the Central aid is fruitfully utilised.
9	16	General Education	Training programme can apprise the teachers of the minute details of the positions of Science and Mathematics which they can deliver to students in a more digestible way. The Committee would like to be informed of the reason for not conducting training programme for upper primary and high school teachers even though there was sufficient funds to meet all the expenses. The Committee would also like to be informed of the details of fund utilisation earmarked for the training programme for upper primary school teachers and high school teachers.
10	17	„	The success of every new programme depends on its proper evaluation and monitoring at each stage of its implementation. The DPI and the State Government failed to do it. There was wilfull omission and sheer negligence on the part of the DPI in implementing the programmes and policies of the Government. Proper monitoring and evaluation only can rectify the lacunas and defects arising during the course of its implementation. By understanding this, the defects can be cured in its future implementation. The officer in charge of planning in the office of the DPI should be asked to submit the reason for not conducting proper evaluation and monitoring.
11	20	„	The Committee is not at all satisfied by the reply given by the witness. However, the Committee decides not to pursue further since a long period had elapsed after the said deal.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12	22	General Education	<p>The Committee is surprised to note that when the education department trailing heavily in short of money even to meet the printing of text books of school children, the Department had purchased 100 tonnes of paper in excess under the scheme 'Total Literacy Campaign' without looking into the actual requirement. The concerned officer should be asked to explain the reason for purchasing 100 tonnes of paper in lump and what prevented him from purchasing paper according to requirement. Knowing that paper is a perishable thing and it is difficult to store 100 tonnes of paper in lump, the department is compelled to store it in a rental godown which resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs.3.01 lakh (2.52 + 0.49) by way of rent. The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation of the Department on the issue. Hence, the Committee may be informed of the quantity of paper used; that remaining unutilised, the total number of books printed using those paper and the number of books so far distributed. The Committee would also like to know, how the department is going to use the remaining quantity of paper and the details regarding it.</p>
13	24	„	<p>The issue of protection of teachers in aided schools in the State appears to be a 'conundrum', facing the educational front in Kerala for the past few decades. The Committee observes that eventhough there is clear Government Order and the Committee's earlier recommendation that all the protected teachers are to be redeployed against the arising vacancies in the Government schools, a large number of teachers are unnecessarily retained in the State resulting in unfruitful expenditure. The Committee also notices that the number of protected teachers ranged between 1177 and 4180 in aided schools where as the number of newly recruited teachers in Government Schools were 14,728. Thus the non-implementation of the Government Order/Committee's earlier recommendation</p>

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			has resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore towards the payment of salary to newly recruited teachers. However, the Committee earnestly endorses the view expressed by the Government that the redeployment of the protected teachers would adversely affect the prospects of the candidates selected by the Public Service Commission. The Committee expresses the opinion that this is a sensitive problem largely involving the fulfillment of a social responsibility on the part of the Government and hence in order to have a more clear picture of the issue, the Committee desires to be furnished with the details of court judgements on all cases relating to redeployment of protected teachers in the State.
14	27	General Education	In this case the Committee noticed that, eventhough the court directed to review the order of suspension of the Head Master, the Deputy Director (DD) wilfully misinterpreted it and reinstated the Head Master in service. The Head Master had admitted his crime and remitted the entire amount in October 1998. Therefore the Committee wants more details of the case from the Deputy Director who had taken a decision in favour of the Headmaster by interpreting the court judgement of reviewing the suspension order but not anything specifically said in the judgement to reinstate him in service. Action should also be taken against the AEO who had failed to detect the misappropriation at the time of his inspection in the school.
15	28	„	In majority of schools there is scarcity of non-teaching staff for maintaining the establishment files, expenditure, accounts etc. The Head Masters are forced to discharge these functions without having sufficient training. Headmaster should be given sufficient training in Accounts before they assume charge. The Committee suggests to speed up the computerisation in the department and to strengthen the Internal Audit Wing so as to reduce the level of

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			corruption going on in the department. The Committee also desires to get the details of the Head Master's latest reinstatement in service.
16	30	General Education	The Committee does not agree with the Government stand for not issuing the notification for admission in TTIs in the State for the period from 1995-96 to 1997-98 since all litigations and counter appeals are exclusively related to admission in the institutions run by minority community. This does not affect admission in Government run and non-minority TTIs. The reason adduced by the witness that admissions to all TTIs in the state are made from a common list prepared at the district level irrespective of the administrative nature of the institution is also not acceptable to the Committee. The Committee desires to be furnished with a detailed reply explaining the reasons for not allowing the Government and non-minority institutions in the State to carry out admission to Teachers Training Courses during 1995-96 to 1997-98.
17	32	„	Eventhough Government has a duty to provide education to children studying in schools without minimum strength also, unproductive establishment expenditure of Rs. 3.67 crores per annum can't be taken for granted. The Committee thinks it fit to explore the possibility of merging two schools without minimum strength to one or admitting the students to the nearby schools of the locality.
18	36	„	In the case of fixation of staff strength in an aided school under the jurisdiction of Mavelikkara DEO, the DPI personally conducted a detailed enquiry based on the report of the Super check cell and ordered to recover Rs. 19.08 lakh from the Headmaster and DEO jointly who were responsible for the loss sustained to Government. Overriding this order, the DD conducted a further enquiry and refixed the responsibility of Rs. 13 lakhs against seven officers of whom majority were on the verge of retirement.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19	37	General Education	The Committee thinks that since a sufficiently serious mode of proceedings was conducted at the higher level the intervention of DD in the matter again was prefixing, most unwarranted, and ridiculous. Refixing their responsibility on persons who were on the verge of retirement in fact reduced the chance to recover the loss sustained to Government. The further interference of DD on the matter evokes an element of suspicion of collusion between the DD, DEO and the Headmaster. The Committee is of the opinion that the Department ought to have suspended the Headmaster with immediate effect when the fraud was noticed.
20	38	„	Since the matter is with the court, the Committee would like to know the present status of the case, and what departmental action was taken by the DPI against the Head Master and the concerned officers who had connived in this fraud. The Committee recommends to initiate criminal proceedings against the Manager who was responsible for bogus admission. The Committee directs to present the case well before the court, after clearing the defects. Also the department should think of fixing a norm such that, for permitting an appeal to the higher authority, the delinquent officer should remit $\frac{1}{3}$ of the assessed amount. Such a norm can be a warning to other habitual corrupt officers and the chance of escaping by influencing higher officers can be avoided. Even though, every person has a right to be heard, majority of the officers are misutilizing this right and drag the case upto their retirement and escape from the liability and departmental action.
21	39	„	Necessary amendments should be made in the KER such that responsibility for bogus admissions and increased staff strength should also be fixed on the Manager. Both the Manager and Headmaster should be made jointly liable in such cases.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22	42	General Education	The Committee is of the opinion that there was sheer negligence on the part of the department in taking proper official action to recover the amount due from universities. The delay of 19 years in taking action is clear dereliction of duty.
23	43	„	The Committee is informed that even though the Universities were reminded several times, they did not remit the amount and finally the Government had started to recover the amount in 60 instalments from April 2005. Therefore, the Committee desires to know the present position of the case. The Committee also wants to know the details of the negligence in the part of the department in assessing the amounts due from the Universities from 1999-2002. The Committee recommends that urgent steps should be initiated to recover the dues from Universities without any further delay.

APPENDIX II

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL FOR THE YEAR 1993-1994

Centrally Sponsored Scheme—Improvement of Science Education in Schools RMT Statement on Para 3.10

<i>Para in Audit Report</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
(1)	(2)

3.10.5 Central assistance, budget provision and expenditure

(i) The details of Central assistance received, provisions made in the State budget and the expenditure incurred during the years 1988-89 to 1992-93 were as below :

<i>Year</i>	<i>Central Assistance received</i>	<i>Budget provision (Rupees in lakhs)</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>
1988-89	200.92	..	200.91
1989-90	199.43	500	199.43
1990-91	152.72	500	153.15
1991-92	..	550	0.78
1992-93	..	50	..
Total	553.07	1600	554.27

(i) The budget provision could not be fully utilized for meeting the expenditure of the scheme, as the budget provisions were much higher than the actual requirement. Amount in the budget was utilized based on the actual release of Government of India grant. This is the reason for variation between the budget provision and expenditure.

42

The Budget provision made on a lumpsum basis had no relation to the proposals sent to Government of India for approval.

(ii) The Central assistance of Rs. 553.07 lakhs was to be utilized for purchase of materials (Rs. 544.07 lakhs) imparting training (Rs. 7.00 lakhs) and setting up of DRECSE (Rs. 2.00 lakhs). The detailed rates of Central assistance were Rs. 1200 (I phase) and Rs. 1600 (II and III phases) for provision of science kits to upper primary schools, Rs. 20,000 (I phase) and Rs. 25,000 (II and III phases) for upgradation of science laboratories in secondary and higher secondary schools and Rs. 10,000 (I phase) and Rs. 15,000 (II and III phase) for supply of library books to secondary and higher secondary schools. Though imparting training and setting up of DRECSE was to be executed departmentally, the entire amount was advanced to the purchasing agents (SIDCO/KSCCF) for supply of materials.

(ii) The full amount was advanced to the above Government agencies on the strength of the G.O. (Rt.) 633/90/GEDN. dated, 1-3-1990. The balance amount of Rs. 30,00,000 which was available with SIDCO/KSCCF had been refunded to the Department in due course. Steps are being taken by the Department to settle the dues pending with the agencies.

3.10.6. Submission of proposals and approval by Government of India

There were 2805 upper primary schools, and 2314 high schools in the State as of March 1988. The State Government submitted proposals to Government of India for implementing the scheme in all upper primary/high schools in 3 phases in 1987-88, 1989-90 and 1990-91 against which approval of Government of India was received for implementing the scheme in 2699 upper primary

It may be noted that the financial assistance was obtained for the Improvement of Science Education in UP and High Schools in the 1st phase. Subsequently proposal was submitted to Government of India for the upgradation of laboratories/libraries in Higher Secondary

Phase	Date of approval by Govt. India	(1)		No. of training programmes approved	No. of DRECSE to be set up	Amount released (Rs. in lakhs)
		Upper primary school	High school			
I	25 March 88	1203	615	40	Nil	200.92
II	27 September 89	1062	450	40	Nil	199.43
III	18 December 90	434	353	43	2	152.72
Total		2699	1418	123	2	553.07

schools and 1418 high schools during the above years, releasing a Central assistance of Rs. 553.07 lakhs as shown below :

schools. An amount of Rs. 575.136 lakhs was sanctioned by MHRD and the same was distributed directly to the selected Government Higher Secondary Schools for effective utilization. In 1998-99 Rs. 216 lakhs and in 1999-2000 Rs. 399.92 lakhs received as assistance from Government of India, was fully utilized, and Utilization Certificate had already been furnished.

Proposals to implement the scheme in 109 upper primary schools and 356 high schools sent to Government of Indian in 1991-92 had not been approved (March 1994) and in respect of 520 High Schools, proposals were yet to be sent. The State Government had not considered the implementation of the scheme (March 1994) in 82 high secondary schools functioning in the State (31 from 1990-91 and 51 from 1991-92)

3.10.7 Delay in procurement and supply of materials and equipment

(i) Procurement and supply of integrated science kits, science books and laboratory equipment were intrusted to the purchasing

(i), (ii) & (iii)

The delay in the procurement and the supply

agents (SIDCO and KSCCF) on payment of service charges by the DPI on the ground that there was no adequate staff for effecting large scale purchases to be made under the various schemes and amounts as shown below were advanced to them during 1988-89, 1989-90 and 1990-91, without specifying any time limit for the completion of the supply.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Amount advanced (Rupees in lakhs)</i>		
		<i>SIDCO</i>	<i>KSCCF</i>	<i>Total</i>
1988-89	I	137.05	63.86	200.91
1989-90	II	159.54	39.89	199.43
1990-91	III	122.18	30.54	152.72
Total		418.77	134.29	553.06

KSCCF could complete the supply of integrated science kits and science books for Phase II (1989-90) during 1992-93 only. Similarly SIDCO completed the supply of laboratory equipments for Phase III (1990-91) only March 1994.

(ii) The list of items to be included in the integrated science kits to be supplied to the schools for Phase III of the scheme approved by Government of India in December 1990 and was given to KSCCF only in May 1992 though advance (Rs. 30.54 lakhs) for the purchase had already been given to them

of the items occurred purely on administrative grounds. The observation of the Audit has been taken into account and no outside agencies have since been involved in the procurement/supply of items for which sanction has been obtained from the Government of India, MHRD.

(1)

(2)

(March 1991). The tenders for the supply received by KSCCF were not accepted by the State Institute of Education as the samples given by the suppliers were of poor quality. Fresh tenders were obtained by KSCCF and submitted to the State Institute of Education in April 1993. Even though a supplier was selected and the Director of Public Instruction was requested in August 1993 to issue purchase order, no further action was taken in this regard (March 1994).

(iii) The list of science books to be supplied to the high schools during the III phase was approved by the State Government only in March 1993 and the Director of Public Instruction was directed to purchase them directly from the publishers without involving the purchasing agents even though funds required for the purchase of the books were paid to them as early as in March 1991. Though the Director of Public Instruction invited quotations in November 1993 and placed supply orders (December 1993), the supplies were not completed as of March 1994.

3.10.10. Defects in selection and supply of material

(a) Integrated science kits

(a) Integrated science kits supplied to upper primary schools during the I and II phases were to contain 98 items and 124 items respectively of materials and equipment costing Rs. 1188 and Rs. 1583 respectively. Kits were supplied at the storing centres and payments were made to the supplies by KSCCF at the approved

There was lack of co-ordination in the prompt supply of the items procured for the beneficiary schools. Hence some items were found short in some schools when cross-checked by Audit. On the basis of the audit

rate based on the number of kits acknowledged by the storing centres. Out of 89 upper primary schools test checked, in 46 schools the kits received had shortage of items ranging from 1 to 62. The non-receipt of items were not reported to KSCCF or to the Director of Public Instruction for appropriate action. As the cost of individual items of kits was not specified, the payment made in respect of items not supplied, could not be assessed.

(ii) Nine integrated science kits costing Rs. 0.14 lakhs received at the storing centres during May 1992 to December 1992 (II phase) were not distributed to the selected schools as in respect of 6 kits. The list of schools/distribution order was not received in the storing centre from the State Institute of Education, in respect of 2 kits the schools to which kits were ordered to be supplied were not functioning and in respect of one kit the school authorities did not turn up to receive the kit ordered to be supplied to it.

(b) Laboratory equipment

(i) Laboratory equipment were to be supplied to high schools for the upgradation of the existing laboratories to the optimum level. The list of items to be supplied were be selected after ascertaining the items which were lacking through a survey, with reference to the list of equipment required for high schools prepared by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) or the State board of Secondary Education. The State Institute of education conducted a survey in February

observation, in this matter, the very system itself was decentralized by the Department and further allotment was made to the Deputy Directors of Education with direction to procure quality items in the concerned schools only with the involvement of the PTA and Local Self Government body.

(i) The observation made is correct. In the survey, the HMs of the 6 schools under reference are reported to have stated the availability of the equipments in their schools. The outside agency, which was not aware of the fact had supplied the items in the schools again. Steps have been taken to avoid such duplication in supply of laboratory items.

(1)

(2)

1989 to ascertain the items of equipment to be supplied. However, the list of laboratory equipment to be supplied during the I phase had already been given to the purchasing agents in August 1988. This would indicate that the list of items to be supplied during the phase was prepared without ascertaining the actual requirement in the schools.

A test-check revealed that in 6 schools audio visual equipment like overhead projector, public address system and tape-recorder valued Rs. 0.32 lakhs were supplied though the Headmasters of these schools had reported during the survey that these items were already available in the schools.

(ii) Laboratory equipment were to be supplied to the schools with reference to the standards lists developed by NCERT or the State Board of Secondary Education. As syllabus of NCERT standard was introduced in the schools in the State and as no standard list of equipment was developed by the State Board of Secondary Education, the items of laboratory equipment selected for supply should have been with reference to the NCERT list. However, out of equipment costing Rs. 24,246 per school selected for the I phase and Rs. 26,005 per school selected for the II phase, items costing Rs. 16,025 and Rs. 16,384 respectively were audio-visual equipment, which were not included in the NCERT list. Several other items like electric stove, electric iron, immersion heater,

(ii) The list of lab equipments published by Government of India, MHRD in 1988 does not include audio-visual equipments and other inevitable equipments for effective Science teaching. Therefore based on advice of educational experts the equipment pointed out in the audit Para were also included in the list to facilitate effective science teaching.

telescope, compound microscope, electric kit, X-ray tube-demonstrator type and petrol gas burner not included in the NCERT list were also supplied to the schools. The reason for selection of such items called for from the department was not received (March 1994).

(iii) Eight items of laboratory equipment like astronomical telescope (5 numbers), terrestrial telescope (5 numbers), automatic slide project (2 numbers) etc., electric stove (16 numbers) valued at Rs. 0.18 lakh supplied at three storing centres during the first and second phases were not distributed to the selected schools. Similarly, the entire lot of equipment valued at Rs. 21.90 lakhs received at a storing centre (Teachers' Training Institute, Chittoor) during November 1992 to July 1993 (III phase) to be distributed among 85 High Schools are not distributed as of March 1994. Reason for non-distribution was not furnished.

(iv) The maximum amount admissible for 353 high schools at the rate of Rs. 25,000 per school amounting to Rs. 88.25 lakhs was released by Government of India during the III phase. However, laboratory equipment costing Rs. 90.94 lakhs were procured during this phase resulting in excess expenditure of Rs. 2.69 lakhs.

3.10.12 Training of Science and Mathematics Teachers

Government of India approved the conducting 62 training programmes for upper primary school teachers, 58 programmes for

(iii) & (iv) The available records on the purchase do not throw light on this fact. However, earnest efforts are being taken by the Department of Public Instruction to collect the details in this regard.

(1)

(2)

high school teachers and one programme each for orientation of key persons, orientation for Resource persons and for preparation of guidelines and instructional materials during the three phases and released Rs. 6.99 lakhs. None of the training programmes for upper primary school teachers and high school teachers and the orientation programme for key persons were conducted. Reasons for not conducting the programmes called for from the department were awaited (March 1994). A programme for preparation guidelines and instructional materials was conducted in March 1991 incurring a total expenditure of Rs. 0.38 lakh out of which Rs. 0.16 lakh was incurred for expenses not covered by the norms prescribed by the Government of India. A resource persons' training programme was conducted during September 1993 incurring expenditure out of Rs. 0.12 lakh out of which Rs. 0.11 lakh was not covered by Government of India norms.

was not covered by the norms prescribed by the Government of India. However, stringent measures have since been taken to expend the amount released by the Government of India strictly, based on their guidelines.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF
KERALA FOR THE YEAR END ON 31-3-1995 NO. 3 (CIVIL)—REMEDIAL MEASURES TAKEN STATEMENT

<i>Sl. Para No. No.</i>	<i>Audit Para</i>	<i>Remedial measures taken</i>
(1) (2)	(3)	(4)
1 3.8	<p><i>Avoidable excess expenditure on purchase of Microscope :</i></p> <p>The Director of Higher Secondary Education invited tenders (December 1991) for purchase of laboratory equipment and chemicals for use in laboratories in higher Secondary Schools for the year 1991-92. These included supply of 132 monocular microscopes. Three firms quoted for this item as follows :—</p> <p>1. Firm 'A' : Rs. 875</p> <p>2. Firm 'B' : Rs. 1,600</p> <p>3. Firm 'C' (Four rates) :</p> <p>(i) rolex make microscope without Built-in light arrangement : Rs. 2,950</p> <p>(ii) Rolex make with built-in light arrangement : 3,350</p> <p>(iii) Getner make without built-in light arrangement : Rs. 5,850</p> <p>(iv) Getner make with built-in light arrangement : Rs. 6,150</p>	<p>This issue relates to 1992. The Technical Committee constituted for the verification of the sample microscopes furnished by the Companies had recommended Getner Microscope for Rs. 5,850 each as the Committee was aware of the plus points of this make of Microscopes. The DPC also accepted the report of Technical Committee and recommended to purchase 'Getner brand microscope for Rs. 5,850 each'. Accordingly Government sanctioned the purchase. Since the purchase is approved by the Technical Committee and DPC, further action in the matter may be dropped.</p>

(1) (2)

(3)

(4)

While firms 'A' and 'B' had submitted samples for verification, firm 'C' had submitted samples only in respect of 'Rolex make with built-in light arrangement at the rate of Rs. 3,350.

As per the directions of Government, the Director, State Institute of Education was required to constitute a Technical Committee with science experts for verification of the samples produced by the tenderers and to furnish verification report with their recommendations. Accordingly, the samples received were verified by the Technical Committee. The Departmental Purchase Committee (DPC) agreed with the Technical Committee Report that the offers for which tenders had supplied samples should alone be considered.

The Technical Committee did not accept the samples submitted by firms 'A' and 'B' on the ground that the samples presented did not agree with the specification and the image received was not clear. The Committee recommended the Getner microscope quoted by firm 'C' at the rate of Rs. 5,850. The DPC in its meeting held on 22nd October 1992 accepted the recommendations of Technical Committee. Government accepted the recommendations of the DPC and accorded sanction in November 1992 for the purchase. Accordingly the Director of Higher Secondary Education placed supply orders for the purchase of 132 Getner make microscope at the rate of Rs. 5,850 on firm 'C' in January 1993. The firm completed the supply in March 1993.

The following points were noticed in audit :

- (i) Rolex microscope costing Rs. 3,350 per unit, for which alone sample was produced by firm 'C' satisfied all the tender specifications; it also had built-in light arrangement. But the Committee recommended purchase of 'Getner make' microscope at the rate of Rs. 5,850, which did not contain built-in light arrangement. The recommendation of the DPC to purchase this item was also against its own decision that offers for which the tenderers had supplied samples alone should be considered.
- (ii) Further, the decision to purchase 'Getner make' microscope at Rs. 5,850 per unit, without mentioning any reason to reject 'Rolex make' microscope, which satisfied the tender specifications and cost of Rs. 3,350 only per unit was unjustifiable. This resulted in avoidable excess expenditure of Rs. 3.30 lakhs.

The department stated in March 1995 that though the supply of sample of 'Rolex microscope' alone had been recorded, the Committee had verified the 'Getner make' also. The argument of the department is not tenable as the minutes of the Technical Committee meeting reveals that the committee had verified only one sample with built in light arrangement of firm 'C' and the 'Getner make' at Rs. 5,850 per unit recommended by the committee did not have

(1) (2)

(3)

(4)

built-in light arrangement. While the Committee had specifically rejected the samples produced by firm 'A' and firm 'B', it did not make any reference to the sample 'Rolex make with built-in light arrangement at Rs. 3,350 per unit' produced by firm 'C'. In the absence of any reason for rejection of this brand, recommendation to purchase another brand at a higher cost was not justifiable.

The matter was referred to Government in March 1995, reply has not been received (September 1995).

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
GENERAL EDUCATION (N) DEPARTMENT

**Statement of Action taken on the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended
31st March 1997 No. 3 (Civil)**

<i>Reco- mmen- dation No.</i>	<i>Para No. in the report</i>	<i>Department concerned</i>	<i>Extract of recommndations</i>	<i>Remarks of Government</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	7.10	General Education (N) Department	The Scheme 'Total Literacy Campain' was being implemented in the Sate through the Kerala Saksharatha Samithi (KSS), a registered society with the Chief Minister as Chairman. In October 1993, Kerala Saksharatha Samithi decided to purchase 100 tonnes of white paper for printing of books for neo-literates. Though necessary formalities for the purchase were completed by 29th March 1994, supply order was placed only on 9th May 1994 due to delay in getting the approval of secretary of K.S.S. The delay resulted in extra payment of Rs. 1.20 lakhs due to enhancement of excise duty with effect from 1st April 1994.	It is true that 100.696 tonnes of paper was purchase by the Saksharatha Samithi with the intention of printing books for the neo-literates. However during 1994-95 Kerala was in the Post-Literacy phase which did not generate the required momentum. Consequently the demand for new-literate reading/ learning material was much below the expected level. It was there fore decided to go slow in book production as that would have led to accumulation of stock of printed books. Thus the paper was kept unutilised and the godown rent had to be paid.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			<p>Out of 100.70 tonnes of paper procured 39.83 tonnes were issued to the Printing Presses between July 1994 and October 1994 and the remaining 60.87 tonnes of paper valued at Rs. 14.70 lakhs were still unutilised. The godown rent paid for stocking the unutilised paper for the period from October 1994 to March 1997 amounted to Rs. 2.52 lakhs. The rent payable for the period from April 1997 to October 1997 was Rs. 0.49 lakhs.</p>	<p>However now that continuing Education Programme has been started in the State, steps have been taken to utilise the paper for the material production in connection with this programme.</p>
			<p>Further, 17.37 tonnes of paper valued at Rs. 4.15 lakhs issued for printing was remaining unutilised in the presses. Though the press had in October 1995 requested to lift the unused paper, no action had been taken by K.S.S. (July 1997).</p>	<p>However the delay had led to some loss, but the printing of books would have resulted in greater loss.</p>
			<p>Thus purchase of paper in excess of actual requirement resulted in blocking of funds to the tune of Rs. 16.85 lakhs for the last 3 years and avoidable extra expenditure of Rs. 3.01 lakhs on account of rent godown. The loss of interest on the blocked capital at the borrowing rate of 11 per cent for the period from October 1994 to October 1997 worked out to Rs. 6.39 lakh.</p>	

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
GENERAL EDUCATION (J) DEPARTMENT

Statement of action taken on the audit para 7.6 contained in the audit report of C& A.G. for the year ended 1996-97

<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Particulars of Audit Para</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
<p>Audit Para No. 7.6</p>	<p><i>Non- deployment of protected teachers</i></p> <p>The strength of teaching and non teaching staff of aided schools is fixed every year on the basis of strength of students. The rules do not provide for retention of staff in any school in excess of sanctioned strength. In case, consequent on fall in pupil strength, certain categories of teachers were rendered surplus they were allowed to continue in their schools as 'protected' teachers till they are absorbed elsewhere.</p> <p>Government issued (Aprill and May 1988) orders to deploy the 'protected' teachers against open vacancies in Government and aided schools. Observing that maintenance of protected teacher was a heavy burden on exchequer, committee on Public Accounts (PAC) recommmeded in July 1993 that all the protected teachers should be absorbed in the future</p>	<p>As per rule 12 of Chapter XXIII KERs, the fixation of staff strength in aided and Government schools should completed by the Educational Officer not later than 15th July every year or such other date as may be fixed by the Director from time to time for the purpose. Due to administrative reasons, the fixation of staff strength can be completed only be October or November. Though the rules do not provide for retention of staff in any school in excess of sanctioned stength, certain categories of teachers such as Urdu, Arabic, Sanscrit, Drawing, Music, Needle Work, Craft and Physical Education were allowed to continue in schools as protected.</p>

(1)	(2)	(3)
<p>vancancies. Despite these recommendations and Government orders, the retention of protected teachers continued.</p> <p>Audit (January and November 1997) revealed that the number of teachers retained in aided schools during 1993-96 was 433 on an average, while nearly 3000 vancancies in Government schools existed on average during the above years. Information relating to 1996-97 and 1997-98 had not been furnished to Audit (July 1998). Assuming the minimum staff strength of protected teachers as 400 (actuals for 1995-96), non-deployment of protected teachers resulted in unfruitful expenditure of Rs. 1.26 crore per annual (approximately) during 1993-94 to 1995-96.</p> <p>The matter was referred to Government in June 1998 reply had not been received (October 1998).</p>	<p>Since 1969, orders were issued as a policy of Government to protect the aided school teachers who were thrown out due to fall in divisions. Government have issued orders in G.O. (Ms.) 83/88/G.Edn. dated 18-4-1988 to deploy such protected teachers against open or arising vacancies in Government/aided schools subject to the condition that they will be absorbed against the next arising vancancies in their parent school. Subsequently, in order to avoid hardship to those who are already included in the current P.S.C. ranked lists orders were issued in G.O.(Ms.) 95/88/G.Edn. dated 12-5-1988 that the vacancies in such categories of posts will be reported to the P.S.C., so as to enable the P.S.C to advise candidates against vacancies reported to commission. Deployment or portected staff should not be prejudicial to the interest of such candidates (ie. those who are included in the current P.S.C.) randked lists which are likely to expire within a period of one year from the date of opening of schools. In the case of protected teachers under the categories of Urudu, Arabic, Music, Drawing, Needle Work, Craft sewing, Physical Education etc. they could not be deployed either in</p>	<p>58</p>

Government or in aided school for want of vacancies in these categories. After exploring the feasibility of their efficitive deployment in other suitable posts. Government have issued Orders in G.O.(P) 63/99/G.Edn. dated 16-3-1999 to provide necessary intensive training to undeployed protected specialist and language teachers of aided schools who possess the qualification S.S.L.C. so that on completion of training, they can be deployed on protection as P.D. teachers on Government schools. But, even now, the orders could not be implemented in the face of stiff resistance by various teachers organisations.

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
GENERAL EDUCATION (B) DEPARTMENT

Audit Para 3.7 Chapter III of Comptroller and Auditor General submitted to Public Accounts Committee Action Taken on Report for the year ended on 31-3-1999

<i>Para</i>	<i>Department</i>	<i>Relevant portion of the Report</i>	<i>Action taken report</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3.7 Chapter III year ended on 31-3-1999	General Education (B) Department	The Headmaster of Ambalavayal UPS Shri M. N. Sreedharan Achari's misappropriation of Rs. 2,52,654 from the Sulthanbathery Sub Treasury during the period of April 94 to August 98 and his subsequent remission of the said amount back to the treasury on 5-10-1998 after having been caught red handed.	Shri M. N. Sreedharan Achari, the Headmaster who committed serious financial misappropriation was suspended from service by the Deputy Director of Education, Wayanad and disciplinary action was taken against the concerned Assistant Educational Officer. The Accountant General (Audit) was duly informed of the action taken. Subsequently Shri M. N. Sreedharan Achari filed an OP No. 29697/99 in the Hon'ble High Court requesting to direct the Deputy Director of Education to review the suspension order. Based on the judgement of the said OP the Deputy Director of Education, Wayanad, revoked the suspension order of the Headmaster and he was reinstated vide proceedings No. A/441/99 dated, 28-1-2000. In the meantime the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Bureau

filed a case against Shri M. N. Sreedharan Achari, (case No. VC6/99/WYD) under Kerala Prevention of Corruption Act 1988, under section 13(1) (C) & (D) read with section 13(2) and sections 409, 468, 471 and 477A of the IPC. And the Vigilance Department vide its letter No. 8501/B1/99/Vig. dated, 27-1-2000 directed that Shri Achari be placed on suspension till completion of the enquiry. But prior to receipt of this instruction Shri Achari had been reinstated vide the proceedings of Deputy Director of Education Wayanad dated, 28-1-2000.

The proceedings of the Deputy Director of Education dated, 28-1-2000 issued without trying to realise the gravity of the irregularities conducted by the Headmaster and misinterpreting the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court, was revoked by the Government vide G.O.(P) No. 1892/2000/GE dated, 15-5-2000 and ordered that disciplinary action will be taken against Shri Achari by the Deputy Director of Education as per Kerala Service (Classification and Control Rule). A copy of the G.O. was served on Shri M. N. Sreedharan Achari and he was again placed on suspension after he handed over the charge of HM to the Senior Assistant. As Vigilance enquiries against Shri Achari in progressing other

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			<p>departmental procedures against him have been discontinued.</p> <p>However on the basis of the directions contained in judgement dated 3-9-2002 in OP No. 23889/2000 Government have examined the case and issued orders to reinstate Sri. M. N. Sreedharan Achari in to service again without prejudice to the Vigilance Proceedings pending against him as per G.O.(Rt.) 4563/02/GE dt. 23-12-2002. The Vigilance enquiry has been completed. Since it is decided to prosecute the accused Officer, the case has been chargesheeted (9 separate chargesheets) before the court of Enquiry Commissioner and Special Judge, Kozhikode on 13-3-2003.</p>

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General for the year 1998-99
Report No. 3 (Civil) Action taken on para No. 3.8—Nugatory Expenditure on Staff

<i>Audit Report</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
(1)	(2)
<p><i>3.8 Nugatory Expenditure on staff</i></p> <p>No TTC course was conducted during 1996-97 to 1997-98 and the staff in 21 Teachers Training Institutes had no work</p> <p>Director of Public Instruction (DPI) issued notifications inviting applications for admission for the two year Teachers Training Certificate (TTC) Course. No such notification was issued for the courses during 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98. Candidates admitted during 1994-95 completed the course in June 1996 and the next admission was made only in August 1998. There was no recorded reason for not conducting the course during the said period.</p> <p>There are 24 Teachers Training Institutions (TTIs) under the Government. As no course was conducted during 1996-97 and 1997-98, 136 staff during 1996-97 and 102 during 1997-98 in</p>	<p>The objection is about the non-functioning of TTIs during 1995-1996, 1996-1997 and 1997-98 and the payment of salary to the staff of TTIs during the above period. There are 101 TTIs in the state of which 38 are Government TTIs. The contention of the Accountant General is that there were no work for the staff due to the non-functioning of the Institutions. So the salary paid to them is termed as idle wages. The approximate amount paid as idle wages was about Rs. 4 crores.</p> <p>As per Rules in Chapter XXV of KER, Head of the Department has to issue notification for admissions to TTC subject to approval of the Government. A large number of OPs and Writ Appeals were filed before the High Court regarding the question of selection and admission of candidates in the TTIs, run by Minorities. Government had to wait to study the judgments in several OPs so as to make necessary modifications in the notifications accordingly.</p> <p>Therefore Government have ordered to pay salary to all staff even without deploying them. Non-issuance of notification was due to</p>

(1)	(2)
<p>21 TTIs had no work to do and only 34 staff were redeployed during 1996-97 and another 33 during 1997-98. The idle wages paid to the staff for the two academic years 1996-97 and 1997-98 worked out to Rs. 1.12 crore. Secretary, General Education department furnished no reasons for the discontinuance of the course despite repeated requests.</p>	<p>the specific reason stated above. In the uncertain circumstances it was not possible to order redeployment of teachers immediately. With regard to the point of idle wages it is a fact that there were no specific work assigned to the Teacher Educators and other staff due to the non-admission of teacher trainees. However during the academic year 1995-96 the 2nd year students were on the rolls and classes were conducted for them. During 1996-97 the issue regarding the norms for admissions was not settled and so the Director could not issue the notification. However in order to avoid continuance of such a situation, the Director had directed the Educational Officers to fix the staff strength observing the principles of deployment. But the direction could not be implemented fully for various reasons.</p>
<p>The matter was reported to Government in December 1998; reply has not been received (October 1999).</p>	
	<p>The retention of the Teacher Educators and the non-teaching staff of the TTIs occurred due to the policy decision that no teacher shall be retrenched or deployed consequent to the division fall in the staff fixation for 1996-97.</p>
	<p>During 1997-98 notification for admission to TTC was not issued and hence TTIs did not function as in the previous year. Meanwhile the Government have again decided to retain the surplus teachers for the current year also by revising the teacher-pupil ratio 1:40.</p>
	<p>The TTIs are separate establishments governed by Rule 9 of Chapter XXIII KER. Actually there is no provision anywhere in</p>

the statute to adjust the staff in accordance with the strength of students in TTIs by way of retrenchment or deployment as in the case of schools. A TTI is a unit having fixed number of students (teacher trainees) and staff. The admission to the TTI is to be made by way of a notification issued by the Director as per Rule 15 of Chapter XXV of KER. The very same rule specifies that there is no compulsion on the part of the Director to issue notification for admission every year. So it implies that the Director or Government for sufficient reasons may with old issuance of notification for TTI. In the instant case Notification was not issued for the reason that there was certain controversy with regard to the question of admission of candidates in Minority Community Institutions.

Even though the classes could not be conducted in TTIs for a few years due to the non-admission of teacher trainees, the TTIs were not ordered to be closed down. This was because the classes could start functioning at any time the controversy regarding admission would be over. In the above circumstance deployment and other work assignment to the TTI staff was not possible.

65

കാപ്ട്രോളർ ആന്റ് ആഡിറ്റർ ജനറലിന്റെ 2000 മാർച്ച് 31-ന് അവസാനിച്ച വർഷത്തെ റിപ്പോർട്ടിലെ കൂട്ടികളുടെ ഏറ്റവും കുറഞ്ഞ അംഗസംഖ്യപോലുമില്ലാത്ത സ്കൂളുകൾ സംബന്ധിച്ച് 3.11 നമ്പർ ഖണ്ഡികയിൻമേൽ സ്വീകരിച്ച പരിഹാര നടപടികളുടെ റിപ്പോർട്ട്

വിദ്യാർത്ഥികളുടെ അംഗസംഖ്യ കുറവാണെന്ന കാരണത്താൽ അനാദായകരമായി പ്രവർത്തിച്ചുവരുന്ന സ്കൂളുകളെ ഏകപക്ഷീയമായി അടച്ചുപൂട്ടുവാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല. അടച്ചുപൂട്ടുവാൻ തിരുമാനമെടുക്കുന്നതിനുമുൻപായി പ്രസ്തുത പ്രദേശത്തെ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസ ആവശ്യംകൂടി കണക്കിലെടുക്കേണ്ടതുണ്ട്. ആയതിനാൽ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടുവാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന സ്കൂളിലെ മൂന്ന് വർഷങ്ങളിലെ വിദ്യാർത്ഥികളുടെ എണ്ണത്തിലുണ്ടായ കുറവ്, ഏറ്റവും അടുത്ത സ്കൂളിൽ പ്രസ്തുത വിദ്യാർത്ഥികളെക്കൂടി പ്രവേശിപ്പിക്കുവാനുള്ള സാധ്യത, പ്രസ്തുത സ്കൂളിന്റെ സ്ഥലപരിമിതി തുടങ്ങിയ കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഒരു ശാസ്ത്രീയ പഠനം നടത്തി റിപ്പോർട്ട് നൽകുവാൻ പൊതുവിദ്യാഭ്യാസ ഡയറക്ടറോട് സർക്കാർ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടു. അപ്രകാരം സർക്കാർ സ്കൂളുകളും, എയിഡഡ് സ്കൂളുകളുമായി 105 സ്കൂളുകളുടെ ലിസ്റ്റ് അദ്ദേഹം സമർപ്പിച്ചു. 12-9-2001-ലെ ജി.ഒ.(എംഎസ്.) 270/01/പൊ.വി. 16-10-2001-ലെ ജി.ഒ.(എംഎസ്.) 308/01/പൊ.വി. എന്നീ ഉത്തരവുകൾ പ്രകാരം 51 105 സ്കൂളുകൾ 2001-02 വർഷത്തിൽ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടുവാൻ സർക്കാർ തിരുമാനിച്ചു. എന്നാൽ അധ്യാപക-രക്ഷാകർത്തൃ സംഘടനകളുടെയും മറ്റ് പ്രാദേശിക സംഘടനകളുടെയും അപേക്ഷ മാനിച്ച് തുടർന്നുള്ള വിശകലനത്തിൽ നേരത്തെ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടപ്പെട്ട 4 സ്കൂളുകൾക്ക് പുറമെ 48 സ്കൂളുകൾ മാത്രം 1-5-2002 മുതൽ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടിയാൽ മതിയെന്ന് 30-4-2002-ലെ ജി.ഒ.(എംഎസ്.) 88/02/ജി.ഇ. പ്രകാരം സർക്കാർ ഉത്തരവാകുകയും 53 സ്കൂളുകൾ തുടർന്നും പ്രവർത്തിക്കുവാൻ അനുമതി നൽകുകയും ചെയ്തു.

ഹൈക്കോടതി ഉത്തരവുകളുടെയും ചില സ്കൂൾ ഹെഡ്മാസ്റ്റർമാരുടെയും രക്ഷകർത്താക്കളുടെയും അഭ്യർത്ഥനകൾ മാനിച്ച് മൊത്തം അടച്ചു പൂട്ടുവാൻ തീരുമാനിച്ച 52 സ്കൂളുകളിൽ 5 എണ്ണംകൂടി തുടർന്നും പ്രവർത്തിക്കുവാൻ ജി.ഒ.(എംഎസ്.) 246/02/ജി.ഇ. പ്രകാരം സർക്കാർ ഉത്തരവായി.

അപ്രകാരം സംസ്ഥാനത്തെ അനാദായകരമായി പ്രവർത്തിച്ചുവന്ന 47 സ്കൂളുകൾ സർക്കാർ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടിയിട്ടുണ്ട്.

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

GENERAL EDUCATION—CLOSURE OF UNECONOMIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE—ORDERS
ISSUED

GENERAL EDUCATION (F) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (Ms.) No. 278/2001/G.Edn. *Thiruvananthapuram, dated 12th September 2001.*

Read :—Letter No. NS2/73301/98 dated 6-5-2000 from Director of Public
Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

ORDER

The issue of closure of uneconomic schools in the State has been engaging the attention of Government for some time. The number of uneconomic schools is mounting up year after year. The Public Accounts Committee (1996-98) in its first report have commented that maintaining uneconomic schools have become a serious drain on the exchequer. The Committee also recommended that Government should formulate a policy and lay down guidelines to determine cases deserving exemptions and also to conduct a detailed survey to ascertain the number of schools to be retained even without minimum strength. The Accountant General is also pressing for a policy decision in this regard.

Uneconomic schools cannot be closed down arbitrarily simply because of the fall in numerical strength. The educational need for the existence of the school has to be considered before closure. Considering all these facts, Director of Public Instruction was directed to furnish report after conducting a scientific survey to ascertain the number of schools to be retained, pupil strength during last three years, nearby schools having facility to accommodate the excess students, area of the school etc. Accordingly Director of Public Instruction has identified 104 schools (both Govt. and aided) and recommended for closure.

Government have examined the matter in detail and hereby accord sanction to close down the hundred and four uneconomic schools existing in the State (both Government and aided-list appended) at the end of the academic year 2001-02 and deploy the Teaching and Non-teaching staff in those schools in the existing/arising vacancies.

By order of the Governor,

K. K. VIJAYAKUMAR,

Principal Secretary to Government.

To

The Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

All Deputy Directors/District Educational Officers/Assistant Educational Officers (through D.P.I.).

The Accountant General A & E/Audit, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram.

All Sections of General Education Department General Administration (SC-Vide item No. 233 dated 5-9-2001).

The Stock File/Office Copy.

LIST OF UNECONOMIC SCHOOLS FOR CLOSURE

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of School</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Edn. District/Sub Dist.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Panchayat H.S.	Kazhuvur	Neyyattinkara
2	Kanjiramkulam Local Body	Perumkadavila	Neyyattinkara
3	LPGS Thirupuram (Govt. Mal.)	Thirupuram	Neyyattinkara
4	LPGS Bharaniyam (Govt. Mal.)	Bharaniyam	Neyyattinkara
5	LMS LPS Boothancode (Aided Mal.)	Venkulam near Nellicode	Neyyattinkara
6	GLPS, Valiyathura	Valiyathura	Thiruvananthapuram
7	UPS, Veli (Govt.)	Veli	Thiruvananthapuram
8	GUPS, Nanthancode	Nanthancode	Thiruvananthapuram
9	GLPS, Sanghummugham	Sanghummugham	Thiruvananthapuram
10	Govt. City VHS, PMG	PMG	Thiruvananthapuram
11	Govt. Tribal School, Chettiyampara	Chettiyampara	Thiruvananthapuram
12	Govt. Tribal School, Methotty	Methotty	Thiruvananthapuram
13	MTLPS, Perayam (Aided)	Perayam	Kollam
14	MTLPS, Perumpuzha (Aided)	Ambipoika	Kollam
15	Bothel LPS (Aided)	Vellimangalam	Kollam
16	MTLPS, Mukkoodu (Aided Mal.)	Mukkada	Kollam
17	St. Thomas LPGA, Kundara (Aided)	Pallimukku	Kollam
18	MGLPS, Koduvila (Govt.)	Koduvila	Kollam
19	Govt. UPS, Pazhayathoruva	Pazhayathoruva	Kottarakkara
20	Govt. SLPS, Aypalloor	Aypalloor	Kottarakkara
21	Govt. LPS, Poringalloor	Poringalloor	Punlur/Anchal

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22	MSC LPS, Nariyapuram (Aided)	Nariyapuram	Konni
23	LPGS Konni (Govt.)	Konni	Konni
24	MTLPS, Kanjeethikara (Aided)	Kanjeethikara	Thiruvalla
25	EALPS, Vengazha (Aided)	Vengazha, Ezhamattoor	Thiruvalla/ Nennikkulam
26	MDLPS, Madappara	Madappara	Thiruvalla/ Nennikkulam
27	Govt. SMPLPS, Ayroor	Ayroor	Thiruvalla/ Nennikkulam
28	Mueepadal CMPLPS, Alappuzha (Aided)	Alappuzha (Town)	Alappuzha
29	Sreepadam UPS, Alappuzha	Alappuzha Nr. Power House Bridge	Alappuzha
30	Govt. LPS, Kanjiramchira	Alappuzha	Alappuzha
31	CMSLPS, Kollad (Aided)	Kollad	Kottayam (East)
32	CMSLPS, Manganam	Puthossory Manganam	Kottayam (East)
33	CEMSLPS, Olessa	Olessa	Kottayam (West)
34	CMSLPS, Kompound	Kottayam	Kottayam (West)
35	Mohammedan UPS	Kottayam	Kottayam (West)
36	Kidangamparambu ALPS (Aided)	Alappuzha	Kottayam (West)
37	Govt. Model UPGS, Pala	Pala	Pala
38	Propose Estate Erumely (Aided)	Propose Estate	Kanjirappally
39	SKVLPS, Mannam (Aided)	Mannam Malayinduppale	Kanjirappally
40	CMSLPS, Melukerumettam	Melukerumettam	Kanjirappally
41	Govt. V.H.S. Thodupuazha	Thodupuazha	Thodupuazha

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
42	Govt. H.S. Kanjikuzhi	Kanjikuzhi	Thodupuazha
43	MKNMHS, Kumaramangalam	Kumaramangalam	Thodupuazha
44	Govt. G.H.S., Kaloor	Kaloor, Ernakulam	Ernakulam
45	Govt. B.H.S., Kaloor	Kaloor, Ernakulam	Ernakulam
46	MIHS, Ernakulam Fort Cochin	Ernakulam	Ernakulam
47	MULPS Fort Cochin (Aided)	Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
48	Govt. UPS, Amaravathy	Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
49	GLPS, Palayathode	Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
50	Govt. LPS, North	Calvathy Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
51	Govt. LPS, St. John Pattom	Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
52	AMAS, Kochangadi	Mattancherry	Ernakulam
53	NPLPS Moolamkuzhi	Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
54	St. Antonys LPS (Aided)	Sande Fort Cochin	Ernakulam
55	Govt. LPS, Near Thottakkad	Thottacattukara	Aluva
56	GLPS, North Kadungalloor	Near U.C.College	Aluva
57	St. Marys LPS, Aluva	Aluva Town	Aluva
58	Govt. Fishery LPS, Chandamangalam	Vadakkunpuram	Aluva/ North Paravoor
59	Govt. LPGS, Moothakunnam	Moothakunnam	Aluva/ North Paravoor
60	GLPS, Puthiyakavu	Puthiyakavu	Aluva/ North Paravoor
61	GLPS, Parayakad	Parayakad	Aluva/ North Paravoor
62	LPBS, Paravur (Govt.)	Kannakulangara	Aluva/ North Paravoor

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
63	GU.P.S., Kizhakkambalam	Kizhakkambalam	Aluva
64	GL.P.S., Kizhakkambalam	Kizhakkambalam	Aluva
65	Varikoli, JBS	Varikoli	Aluva Kolencheri
66	Aided LPS, Thaminimattom	Thaminimattom	Aluva Kolencheri
67	GL.P.S. (Govt.)	Karimgazha	Kothamangalam
68	MTLPS (Aided)	Keerampara	Kothamangalam
69	CMS LPS, (Aided)	Mala	Mala
70	SNUPS (Aided)	Annamanada	Mala
71	GNLPS	Muthuvattoor	Chavakkad
72	AMLPS (Aided)	Vazhapully	Chavakkad
73	AMLPS (Aided)	Pillakkad	Chavakkad
74	ALPS (Aided)	Thiruvencotam	Chavakkad
75	St. Joseph, LPS (Aided)	Kallur	Chavakkad
76	AMLPS (Aided)	Thozhiyur	Chavakkad
77	East ALPS (Aided)	Vylathur	Chavakkad
78	PMMLPS (Aided)	Puthenpally	Chavakkad
79	SNLPS (Aided)	Kottapady	Chavakkad
80	SVALPS (Aided)	Kappiyur	Chavakkad
81	AMLPS (Aided)	Vylathur	Chavakkad
82	St. Joseph, LPS (Aided)	Thamrayur	Chavakkad
83	AMLPS, (Aided) Kodyiammal	Vazhakkad Panchayat	Malappuram
84	AMLPS, Azhinhilam (Aided)	Vazhakkad Panchayat	Malappuram
85	Ottappilakkol, MLPS (Aided)	Azhiyur	Vadakara/Chambala
86	Kunnummal, MLPS (Aided)	Pathirapatta	Vadakara/Chambala

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
87	ALPS, Naduthodikka	Kondotty Town	Malappuram/ Kondotty
88	GUPS, Killiyanad	Killiyanad, Ashokapuram	Kozhikode City
89	GUPS, Nadukkavu West	West Nadukkavu	Kozhikode City
90	GLPS, Eranhipalam	Kozhikode	Kozhikode City
91	GLPS, Nagaram	Nagaram	Kozhikode City
92	Panniyankara Mulism ALPS (Aided)	Manari	Kozhikode City
93	Mamakkunnu West, LPS (Aided)	Mamakkunnu	Kannur South
94	Mundallur, RVLPS (Aided)	Mundallur	Kannur South
95	Mundallur West, LPS (Aided)	Mundallur	Kannur South
96	Thottada North, LPS (Aided)	Thottada	Kannur South
97	Adoor Central, LPS (Aided)	Adoor	Kannur South
98	Edakkal, LPS (Aided)	Edakkad	Kannur South
99	Mavilayi, LPS (Aided)	Mavilayi	Kannur
100	Erdangol Achuthavilasam, LPS (Aided)	Peralassery	Kannur
101	GLPS, Thavakkavu	Thavakkavu	Kannur (West)
102	GLPS of HS	Irinjalakuda	Irinjalakuda
103	Govt. BLPS, Kunnamkulam	Kunnamkulam	Kunnamkulam
104	Civil Station, ALPS (Aided)	Near Gandhi Ashram	Kozhikode
105	GMLPS Nellikode	Nellikode	Kozhikode

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

GENERAL EDUCATION—CLOSURE OF UNECONOMIC SCHOOLS—ERRATUM OF THE
GOVERNMENT ORDERS—ORDERS ISSUED

GENERAL EDUCATION (F) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (Ms.) No. 308/2001/G.Edn. *Dated, Thiruvananthapuram, 16th October 2001.*

Read :— 1. G. O. (Ms.) No. 278/2001/G.Edn. dated 12-9-2001.

2. Letter No. NS(2) 73301/98/DPI dated 10-10-2001 from the Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

ORDER

In the circumstances reported by the Director of Public Instruction in his letter read above Government are pleased to issue an erratum order in closing down the total number of schools as 105 instead of 104 re-assigning the serial number from 76 to 105 from A.M.L.P.S. (Aided), Thozhiyoor, Chavakkad Education District to G.P.L.P.S., Nellikode, Kozhikode, Education District.

The Government Order read above is stand modified to this extent.

By order of the Governor,

K. K. VIJAYAKUMAR,

Principal Secretary to Government.

To

The Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.
The Accountant General (A&E), Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram.
All sections of General Education Department.
The General Administration (SC) Department.
All D.Ds, D.E.Os and A.E.Os through D.P.I.
S.F/O.C.

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

GENERAL EDUCATION—CLOSURE OF UNECONOMIC SCHOOLS EXISTING IN THE STATE—
SANCTIONED—REVISED ORDERS ISSUED

GENERAL EDUCATION (F) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (Ms.) No. 88/2002/G.Edn. *Dated, Thiruvananthapuram, 30th April 2002.*

- Read :—*
1. G. O. (Ms.) No. 278/2001/G.Edn. dated 12-9-2001.
 2. G. O. (Ms.) No. 308/2001/G.Edn. dated 16-10-2001.
 3. G. O. (Rt.) No. 681/2002/G.Edn. dated 30-3-2002.
 4. Letter No. NS(2) 73301/G2/DPI. dated 10-4-2002 from the Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

ORDER

As per the Government Order read as first and second papers above Government have accorded sanction to discontinue 105 Nos. of uneconomic schools existing in the State at the end of the academic year 2001-2002. Accordingly these schools had to be closed down as on 31st March 2002. Later this cut of date was further extended upto 30th April 2002 as per Government Order read as third paper above. Out of the 105 schools ordered to be closed, 4 schools namely, GUPS, Nanthencode; GLPS, Sanghummugham; GUPS, Kiliyanand, Kozhikode, AMLPS, Vazhappilly, Thrissur had already been closed. Against the closing down of the remaining 10 schools, many representations were received from PTA's and other local organisations requesting frequently to exclude their schools from the list of closing of schools.

Considering certain aspects in such representations The Director of Public Instruction was requested to review the question of closing down of remaining 101 schools. The Director of Public Instruction has therefore forwarded a final list as per letter read as 4th paper above for closing of 48 schools during the end of this academic year 2001-2002.

Government have examined the matter in detail and are pleased to accord sanction to close down 48 schools as detailed in Annexure (A) out of the 105 schools ordered to be closed as per Government Orders read as 1st and 2nd

papers above with effect from 1-5-2002 in addition to the 4 schools already closed down.

Sanction is also accorded for the continuance of the remaining 53 schools which have been ordered to be closed down as per Government Orders 1st and 2nd read above.

By order of the Governor,

P. MARAPANDIYAN,
Secretary to Government.

To

The Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Accountant General (Audit), (A&E), Kerala.

All DDs/DEOs/AEOs through DPI.

All section of General Education Department.

The General Administration (SC) Department vide item No. 948 dated 29-4-2002.

S.F./O.C.

Copy to : Disposal leading to G.O.(Ms.) No. 278/2001/G.Edn. dated 12-9-2001, 808/2001/G.Edn. dated 16-10-2001 and G.O.(Rt.) No. 681/2002/G.Edn. dated 30-3-2002.

ANNEXURE A

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of school</i>	<i>District</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	M.T. Lower Primary School, Kanjettukara	Pathanamthitta
2	E.A. Lower Primary School, Vengazha	Pathanamthitta
3	G. B. High School, Kaloor	Ernakulam
4	M.U.L.P.S., Fort Kochi	Ernakulam
5	A.M.A.S., Kochangadi	Ernakulam
6	S.V.A.L.P.S., Kappiyoor	Thrissur
7	Edakkad Lower Primary School	Kannur
8	Government Lower Primary School, Elampalloor	Kollam
9	M.D. Lower Primary School, Medappara	Pathanamthitta
10	Government S.M.P.L.P.S., Ayiroor	Pathanamthitta
11	Sreepadam Upper Primary School, Alappuzha	Alappuzha
12	Government Lower Primary School, Kanjiramchira	Alappuzha
13	C.M.S. Lower Primary School, Kollat	Kottayam
14	C.M.S. Lower Primary School, Manganam	Kottayam
15	C.M.S. Lower Primary School, Koachanal	Kottayam
16	Government Model U.P.G.S.	Pala, Kottayam
17	Estate Erumeli Lower Primary School	Kottayam
18	S.K.V. Lower Primary School, Mannam	Kottayam
19	C.M.S. Lower Primary School, Melookkavumattam	Kottayam
20	Government G.H.S., Kaloor	Ernakulam
21	M.I.H.S. Ernakulam, Fort Kochi	Ernakulam
22	GL.P.S. Pathayathode, Kalvathi North	Ernakulam

(1)	(2)	(3)
23	Govt. L.P.S., Kalvathi North	Ernakulam
24	M.P.L.P.S., Moolamkuzhi	Ernakulam
25	Govt. L.P.S., Thottada North	Ernakulam
26	St. Mary's L.P.S., Aluva	Ernakulam
27	G.U.P.S., Kizhakkumbhagam	Ernakulam
28	Varikkodi J.B.S.	Ernakulam
29	C.M.S.L.P.S., Mala	Thrissur
30	S.N.U.P.S., Annamanada	Thrissur
31	GL.P.S., Muthuvathoor	Thrissur
32	St. Josephs L.P.S., Kalloor	Thrissur
33	P.M.M.L.P.S., Puthanapalli	Thrissur
34	St. Joseph's L.P.S., Thamarayoor	Thrissur
35	Ottappilakkadu, M.L.P.S.	Kozhikode
36	GL.P.S., Nadakkavu West	Kozhikode
37	GL.P.S., Elanjippalam	Kozhikode
38	GL.P.S., Nagaram	Kozhikode
39	A.M.L.P.S., Panniyankara	Kozhikode
40	Mamakkunnu West, L.P.S.	Kannur
41	Thottada North, L.P.S.	Kannur
42	Adoor Central, L.P.S.	Kannur
43	Kudungode Achuthavilas, L.P.S.	Kannur
44	GL.P.S., Thavakkara	Kannur
45	GL.P.S. of H.S. Irinjalakkuda	Thrissur
46	Govt. B.L.P.S., Kunnamkulam	Thrissur
47	Civil Station, A.U.P.S.	Kozhikode
48	G.GL.P.S., Nellikkode	Kozhikode

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

GENERAL EDUCATION—CLOSURE OF UNECONOMIC SCHOOLS—REVIVAL—SANCTIONED
ORDERS ISSUED

GENERAL EDUCATION (F) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (Ms.) No. 246/02/G.Edn. *Dated, Thiruvananthapuram, 12th August 2002.*

- Read :—* 1. G. O. (Ms.) No. 88/02/G.Edn. dated 30-4-2002.
2. Judgment dated 25-3-2002 in O.P.No. 3977/2002.
3. Letter No. NS2/733/98/DPI. dated 19-6-2002 from the Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

ORDER

The undermentioned 7 schools which were already ordered to be closed down, among other schools, as per the G.O. read as 1st paper above for want of sufficient number of students have been continuing during the current academic year.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of school with District</i>
1	C.M.S.L.P.School, Manganam, Kottayam
2	S.V.A.L.P.School, Kappiyoor, Thrissur
3	St.Mary's L.P.School, Aluva, Ernakulam
4	Edakkad L.P.School, Kannur
5	Thottada (North) L.P.School, Kannur
6	Adoor Central L.P.School, Kannur
7	Udungottu Achuthavilasom L.P.School, Kannur.

Of the above Schools the first two schools have been continuing on the strength of the orders of Hon'ble High Court and the remaining schools in anticipation of Government orders in view of the claim of the concerned Head Masters that the strength of students on the 6th working day is more than 50.

In the circumstances Government directed the Director of Public Instruction to issue instruction to the concerned Educational Officers to make surprise inspection of these schools and furnish report on the exact number of students. On the basis of the surprise inspection, Director of Public Instruction reported that the number of students in the following 5 schools are 50 or more during the current academic year and therefore he has recommended to accord sanction for the continuance of those schools. He has also requested to consider the remaining two schools as closed down with effect from 1-5-2002.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of schools with District</i>
1	C.M.S. L.P. School, Manganam, Kottayam
2	S.V.A. L.P. School, Kappiyoor, Thrissur
3	St.Mary's L.P.S., Aluva, Ernakulam
4	Thottada (North) L.P.S., Kannur
5	Udungottu Achuthavilasom L.P.S., Kannur.

Government have examined the matter in detail and are pleased to accord sanction for the revival of the following 5 Schools during the current academic year which were ordered to be closed down as per the G.O. read as 1st paper above.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of schools with District</i>
1	C.M.S. L.P. School, Manganam, Kottayam
2	S.V.A. L.P. School, Kappiyoor, Thrissur
3	St.Mary's L.P.S., Aluva, Ernakulam
4	Thottada (North) L.P.S., Kannur
5	Udungottu Achuthavilasom L.P.S., Kannur

The G.O. read as first paper above stands modified to the above extend.

By order of the Governor,

P. MARAPANDIYAN,
Secretary to Government.

To

The Director of Public Instruction, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Accountant General (Audit)/(A&E).

The Deputy Director of Education, Kottayam, Thrichur, Ernakulam, Kannur.

The Assistant Educational Officer concerned through D.P.I.

The Advocate General, Ernakulam (with C/L).

All Section of General Education Department.

The Stock File.

Copy to disposal leading to G.O.(Ms.) No. 88/2002/G.Edn. dated 30-4-2002.

Notes showing remedial measures taken on para 7 contained in the report of Comptroller and Auditor General for the year ended on 31-3-2000 (Civil)

<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Action taken</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7	Schools without minimum Strength 1937 Schools were functioning without minimum strength of students	Seventeen per cent of the total number of (Government Aided) private schools were functioning without minimum strength. K.E.R. provide that the minimum effective strength of student in each class should be 25. A school was to be deemed to have the minimum strength if the average effective strength per standard was not less than 25. The Director of Public Instruction, however was to consider the alternative educational facilities in the locality. Backwardness of the area etc. before the recognition was withdrawn in cases where the minimum effective strength was less than 25. The details of schools (Primary Wing) running without minimum strength are given in Annexure 2. It was noticed that the number of schools functioning without minimum strength kept on increasing during the period under review. Out of the total number of schools functioning without minimum strength, 58 per cent of the schools were in private sector and 87 per cent of the schools were L.P.S. According to K.E.R., functioning of such schools was subject to the approval of the Director of Public Instruction on condition that they would increase the strength to the minimum required level. It was, however seen that though the rules envisaged that the DPI would accord permission for continuance depending on the merits of the case, Government was	Some uneconomic Schools where the student strength is below 15 have already been closed down which included Government L.P.S. Shangummughom, G.L.P.S., Anathara, G.U.P.S. Nanthencode and U.P. section of City V.H.S.S., Thiruvananthapuram. Further steps were taken to close down two schools namely G. L. P. S., Mettupalayam in Palakkad District and St.Marys L.P.S., Engandiyoor in Thrissur District from the academic year 2000-01 onwards. But schools (Private/Government) are continuing still without minimum

issuing blanket sanction for the continued functioning of such schools through a general order, without even examining the merits in each case. Scrutiny revealed that 142 out of 233 schools from where the details were collected had strength ranging from 0 to 74 during the period 1995-96 to 1998-99 the details are as under.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of schools with strength of students</i>				<i>Total</i>
	<i>upto 20</i>	<i>21 to 40</i>	<i>41 to 60</i>	<i>61 to 74</i>	
1995-96	6	23	87	26	142
1996-97	7	34	85	16	142
1997-98	6	62	67	7	142
1998-99	8	52	79	3	142

strength. Government consider the matter of social necessity and educational backwardness of the area etc. to ascertain the uneconomic schools to be retained even without prescribed minimum strength. The proposal for closing down uneconomic schools in the State (File No. 23986/F1/2000/G.Edn.) is under examination of Government. Necessary instruction will be issued after taking a policy decision by Government in this regard.

83

Government was incurring annual expenditure of Rs. 50 crores on running schools without minimum strength

The average expenditure per student per annum incurred by these schools during these four years was Rs. 4825, Rs. 5457, Rs. 6398, and Rs. 8233 against the State average of Rs. 1676, Rs. 1907, Rs. 2545 and Rs. 2853 respectively. Expenditure for student in certain schools was very huge ranging upto Rs. 67,000 (Annexure 3) of the 142 schools, 57 had been functioning without minimum strength for the last 10 to 30 years. There was no student in Government L.P.S., Shanghumugham (under A.E.O., Thiruvananthapuram North) during 1998-99. But Rs. 1.68 lakh was spent on pay and allowances of the Headmaster and a P.T. employee who were idling. Had the 142 schools functioning without minimum strength been closed down

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		<p>according to the provisions of K.E.R., there would have been huge savings to the exchequer. This closure would not have caused any difficulty to the pupils because there were other schools including schools with less than minimum strength within a distance of 1 to 3 kms.</p>	
		<p>Considering the staff strength of 1 Headmater and 3 Teachers for an L.P. Schools, 1937 Primary Schools which were functioning without minimum strength (as of march 1999) created a minimum financial liability of Rs. 50 crore (Approx.) during 1999-2000 to the exchequer. Similar financial liability existed in earlier years also due to the functioning of such schools.</p>	

ANNEXURE II

Year-wise details of Schools without minimum strength*(Reference : Paragraph 7)*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Government sector</i>			<i>Aided sector</i>			<i>Grand total</i>
	<i>L.P.</i>	<i>U.P.</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>L.P.</i>	<i>U.P.</i>	<i>Total</i>	
1994-95	404	61	465	722	69	791	1256
1995-96	464	72	536	726	73	799	1355
1996-97	521	95	616	715	65	780	1396
1997-98	588	164	752	774	193	967	1710
1998-99	685	127	812	1000	125	1125	1937

ANNEXURE III

Details of Schools incurring huge expenditure per student*(Reference : Paragraph 7)*

<i>Name of School</i>	<i>Expenditure per student in Rs.</i>			
	<i>1995-96</i>	<i>1996-97</i>	<i>1997-98</i>	<i>1998-99</i>
U.P.S., Nanthencode	22000	29273	39000	67400
G.M.L.P.S., Ayroor	10176	12000	11667	19692
M.K.N.M.S.H.S., Kumaramangalam	10879	11683	9932	11754
Government U.P.S., Kannathoor	6233	8145	9180	11481
G.T.W.L.P.S., Madupathy	8000	5450	11737	10526
L.P.S., Thottada North	6733	7414	9654	14158
Govt. U.P.S., Kumaranallur	5948	7881	10278	19432
GL.P.S., Kalloorkadu	7741	11440	8517	10808
West A.M.L.P.S.	9032	13667	9333	8722

Remedial Action Taken Statement on the Report of Comptroller and Auditor General

I	(a)	Department	:	General Education (J) Dept.
	(b)	Subject/Title of the Review Paragraph	:	Avoidable expenditure on appointment of Language Teachers
	(c)	Paragraph Number	:	7.5
	(d)	Report Number and Year	:	2002 (Civil)
II	(a)	Date of receipt of the Draft Paragraph Review in the Department	:	20-6-2002
	(b)	Date of Department's Reply	:
III		Gist of Paragraph Review		

87

Irregular appointment of Malayalam language teachers in aided schools in violation of rules led to avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 crore

Rules for fixation of strength of teachers in departmental and aided schools are laid down in Chapter XXIII of Kerala Education Rules (Rules). Audit scrutiny revealed irregular sanction of posts of Malayalam teachers in aided schools in contravention of the Rules resulting in avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 crore as detailed below :

Rules provided for sanctioning of posts of teachers in languages other than regional language on the basis of total effective strength of pupils studying a particular language in all divisions in a standard in a school. Posts of language teachers in Malayalam were sanctioned by District Educational Officers in regions of Kerala where other languages like Arabic, Urdu of Sanskrit were taught as first language instead of Malayalam.

On this being pointed out in audit, Government admitted (July 2000) that the provision in the rule was not in conformity with the intention of rule makers and informed that amendment to the rule was under consideration.

Government also ordered (September 2000) that no post of High School Assistant (Malayalam) be sanctioned from the Year 2000-01 reckoning the number of students learning Arabic, Urdu, Sanskrit etc. as first language. Scrutiny of records for the period 1997-2002 revealed that by interpreting the rule, not in conformity with the intention of the rule makers, 200 to 233 posts were operated in aided schools alone in three educational districts of Kozhikode, Malappuram and Tirur over and above the normal strength of Malayalam language teachers. This resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 7.78 crore. Amendment of KERs, as agreed to by Government, had not been made as of December 2002.

The matter was referred to Government in May 2002; reply has not been received (December 2002).

- IV (a) Does the Department agree with the facts : Yes.
figures included in Paragraph ?
- (b) If not, please indicate the areas of disagreement : N.A.
and also attach copies of relevant documents
in support ?
- V (a) Does the Department agree with the Audit : Yes.
conclusion ?
- (b) If not, please indicate specific areas of : N.A.
disagreement with reasons for disagreement
and also attach of relevant documents,
where necessary ?

VI Remedial Action Taken

Based on the recommendation of A.G, Government issued G.O.(Ms.)237/2000/GE. dt. 15-7-2000 to the effect that no post of HSA(Mal.) will be sanctioned reckoning the numbers of pupils learning languages, viz. Arabic, Urdu, Sanskrit etc. For statutory validity of the same, necessary amendment has been made in KER, by inserting a new rule 6 J after 6 I of Chapter XXIII through G.O.(P) No. 92/2005/G.Edn. dtd. 19-3-2005 (SRO. No. 306/2005) published in Gazette Extraordinary No. 664 dtd. 30-3-2005.

GENERAL EDUCATION (J) DEPARTMENT

Statement of Action Taken on C&AG Report for the year ended 31-3-2003—Avoidable expenditure as payment of salary of protected teachers—Remedial measures on Audit Paragraph

<i>Reco- mmen- dation No.</i>	<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Depart- ment</i>	<i>Particulars of Recommendation</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4.41		Gen. Edn. Dept.	<p>Avoidable expenditure on payment of salary of protected teachers.</p> <p>Non-deployment of protected teachers against arising vacancies resulted in avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore to State exchequer.</p> <p>Kerala Education Rules (Rules) provide for fixation of staff strength of teaching and non teaching staff in aided schools on the basis of strength of students annually. The rules do not provide for retention of staff in excess of the sanctioned strength.</p> <p>Government by issue of executive orders from time to time, allowed the teachers rendered surplus on account of staff fixation/division fall to continue in the respective schools as 'protected' and to absorb such protected teachers in vacancies arising on retirement or otherwise in the same institution or in institutions under the same</p>	<p>As regards observation of C&AG in para No. 4.4.1 on the Report for the year ended 31-3-2003, it may be submitted that all possible steps have been taken to redeploy the protected teachers. At present only 398 teachers are to be deployed. It is also brought to notice that all regular vacancies in Govt. Schools cannot be filled up by re-deploying protected teachers as this will affect the employment prospects of the candidates selected by the K.P.S.C. The Hon'ble High Court in so many</p>

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

management or to deploy in Government Schools against existing/arising vacancies. Government also ordered in September 1999 that all aided school teachers who were in service as on 14th July 1997 were eligible for protection by retaining them in the respective schools.

Mention was made in paragraph 7.6 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March 1998 (Civil) about the unnecessary retention of protected teachers when vacancies existed in Government Schools. A further scrutiny conducted revealed that the number of protected teachers retained in the same schools under special orders and remained undeployed during 1998-2002 ranged between 1177 and 4180. During the same period, 14728 teachers were newly recruited in Government Schools. The details are as under :—

judgments has passed orders against the posting of protected teachers against existing vacancies in Govt. Schools. As such the Dept. was not in a position to redeploy protected teachers against vacancies in Govt.Schools and to avoid the expenditure to some extent as observed by the Audit. However, possible efforts are being taken to reduce the numbers of protected teachers. It may also be noted that protection benefits are not allowed to those teachers who entered service on or after 15-7-1997. In such a context it is presumed that the 398 protected teachers still remaining undeployed can however be deployed in the coming years, without much delay and without causing much additional financial burden to Government.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of protected teachers retained in same schools</i>				<i>Number of teachers recruited</i>		
	<i>HSA</i>	<i>PDT</i>	<i>Spl.</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>HSA</i>	<i>PDT</i>	<i>Total</i>
1998-99	115	503	559	1177	2169	3917	6086
1999-00	362	1352	667	2381	1306	1658	2964
2000-01	460	1872	735	3067	1394	1907	3301
2001-02	741	2374	1065	4180	1125	1252	2377

Thus, the failure of the Government to deploy the protected teachers against the vacancies arisen, instead of resorting to recruitment, resulted in an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 54.05 crore (approx) during 1998-2002 towards payment of salary of newly recruited teachers.

Government stated (September 2003) that they had taken all possible steps to deploy the maximum number of protected teachers by 30th June 2002 and that the number of protected teachers awaiting redeployment at the end of the last year was only 800. The department arrived at the number of 800 excluding those granted exemption from redeployment on account of physical disabilities, relationship with jawans, etc. Despite the recommendation of the PAC in July 1993 that all protected teachers should be redeployed in future vacancies, the situation is still alarming.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL (CIVIL) FOR YEAR ENDED BY 31-3-2003

ACTION TAKEN REPORT

GENERAL EDUCATION (G) DEPARTMENT

<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Report</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
4.6.2. Non-recovery of amount due from Universities	<p>Based on the recommendation of Inter-University Consultative Committee (January 1985) Government ordered (March 1985 and July 1985) that school teachers who were appointed as invigilators for the conduct of University examinations would be entitled to Earned Leave as per provision of Kerala Service Rules and that the expenditure would be borne by the concerned Universities. The Director of Public Instructions (DPI) was responsible to get the actual expenditure incurred on this account by Government reimbursed from the Universities. According to information received from DPI, Rs. 5.72 crore was due from three Universities towards expenditure incurred by Government on account of payment made to teachers appointed as invigilators by these Universities during 1986-99. But no action was taken by DPI till November 1997 to prefer a claim for the amount due to the Government from the Universities.</p> <p>Amount due for the period from 1999 to 2002 are yet to be assessed by the DPI for want of details from</p>	<p>Government have ordered to recover a total amount of Rs. 5,71,83,012 (Five Crore Seventy one lakhs Eighty three thousand and twelve only) due from the 3 Universities towards re-imburement of leave salary paid to the school teachers for invigilation in University examinations during 1986 to 1999, (Kerala University-Rs. 1,04,25,802, Calicut University-Rs. 3,71,40,228 and Mahatma Gandhi Univeristy-Rs. 96,16,892) from the non-plan grqnt to the concerned Universities form April 2005 onwards in 60 instalments vide G.O.(Ms.) No. 36/05/H.Edn. dated 8-4-2005. The recovery was started from April 2005.</p>

subordinate offices. The abnormal delay in claiming the amounts due to Government is likely to render them irrecoverable on account of accumulation.

The matter was referred to Government in January 2003, reply has not been received (December 2003).
