

## Minutes of AIE/EGS Review Meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2008

1. National Review Meeting of EGS/AIE coordinators was held on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2008 at SCOPE Building, CGO Complex, New Delhi.
2. The overall participation was from 27 States/UTs. The list of the participants is attached at Annexure I.
3. The data were received from 24 States, but only 21 States/UTs participated in person.
4. There were four states namely Bihar, Goa, Gujarat and Himanchal Pradesh, which had sent the information through e-mail but their State EGS/AIE coordinator did not attend the meeting. On the other hand EGS/ AIE coordinators for Karnataka and Mizoram, attended the meeting without providing any data either through mail or in hard copy.
5. Following are session wise minutes.

### Session I

Meeting started with welcome address by the TSG Consultant Mr. Adil Rasheed, followed by the introduction of participants.

Four main objectives of the review meetings that were share with the participants are given below:-

1. Progress Overview of 2007-08.
2. Achievement and failures in 2007-08.
3. Future plan of action for 2008-09.
4. Introduction of new formats of information for Quarterly Review Meetings.

### Session-II

Session II started with TSG consultants Ms. Papari Baruah (Sr. Consultant, TSG, North-East cell). Mr. Adil Rasheed and Ms. Kalpna Bhardwaj, Consultants, TSG, over viewing of the progress made in 2007-08. The progress overview was based on the data provided by the individual States. State wise overview of the progress under AIE in 2007-08 is given below.

Name of the State	Overview
1. Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coverage under AIE, excluding RBC was 42 per cent.</li><li>• Coverage under RBC was 50 per cent</li><li>• Out of the total children covered under AIE, 75 per cent were reported to have been mainstreamed.</li><li>• State could run only 52 EGS centres out of 66 sanctioned. The coverage of children was 66 per cent only.</li></ul>

- The data on EGS upgradation was found inconsistent and State was requested to provide corrected data as soon as possible.
  - State did not provide information on the number of recognised Madarsa/Maktab being supported under SSA.
2. Arunachal Pradesh
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 51per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 34 per cent. However, the State had reduced the target for RBC on its own from 10919 to 5146.
  - Out of the total children covered under AIE only 8 percent were mainstreamed.
  - The coverage of children under EGS was 78 per cent while 72 per cent EGS centres were made operational.
3. Assam
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was reported 90 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 100per cent.
  - Total children mainstreamed from AIE were 18 per cent only.
4. Bihar
- Coverage of children through direct enrolment in regular schools exceeded by 3.8 lakhs against the target number. (State had planned to enrol 5.73 lakh children directly in regular schools but at the end of year it enrolled 9.54 lakh children exceeded by 166 per cent)
  - Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 40 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 59 per cent only.
  - 50 per cent of the total children covered under AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
5. Chandigarh
- Coverage under AIE is 91per cent.
  - Mainstreaming from AIE centres to regular schools is Zero.
6. Chhattisgarh
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC is 66 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC is 57 per cent only.
  - 31per cent of the total children covered under AIE have been mainstreamed.

- The state coordinator clarified that complete data on mainstreamed children shall be available after 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2008.
  - Out of 427 recognised Madarsa/Maktab, the State supported 299 thereby covering 21466 children.
  - 48 unrecognised Madarsa/Maktab were also covered under AIE for 613 children.
7. Dadra & Nagar Haveli
- The UT could cover only 567 children through direct enrolment in regular schools.
  - The UT did not start any intervention under AIE.
8. Delhi
- State covered 10 thousand children through direct enrolment in regular schools.
  - The State could cover only 8 per cent children in RBC in 2007-08.
  - Data on mainstreamed or any other indicator was not provided by the State.
9. Goa
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 18 per cent.
  - There was Zero coverage in RBC.
  - Data on mainstreaming was not provided as children are mainstreamed in the month of April.
  - There was no representation in person from the State in the review meeting.
10. Gujarat
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 72 per cent.
  - 18 per cent coverage was reported under RBC.
  - 68 per cent of the total covered children were mainstreamed in regular schools.
  - There are 1050 recognised Madarsa/Maktab but State is not supporting any of them.
11. Haryana
- The coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 48 per cent.
  - State had planed to cover 5040 children under RBC but it did not start any RBC centres and reported Zero coverage.
  - 31 per cent children from AIE centres were mainstreamed in regular schools.

- 53 Madarsa/Maktab were supported under AIE covering 10625 children.
12. Himachal Pradesh
- The State covered more children through direct enrolment in regular schools than the targeted number. (Target for direct enrolment was 1359 but state actually enrolled 2187 children thus exceeding by 61 per cent)
  - The State covered almost 100 per cent targeted children under AIE.
  - 34 per cent children are reported to have been mainstreamed from AIE centres.
  - Coverage under EGS centres was 76 per cent only.
  - Financial expenditure under EGS was 46 per cent.
13. Jharkhand
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 41per cent.
  - State covered 20 per cent of the targeted children under RBC.
  - Data on mainstreaming was not provided by the State.
  - State has upgraded only 746 EGS out of the 851 targeted.
  - There are 188 recognised Madarsa/Maktab of which 95 Madarsa/Maktab were supported under SSA.
  - In addition 25 unrecognized Madarsa/Maktab were covered under AIE with 12711 children
14. Karnataka
- The State representative participated in the Review Meeting without any data. He did not bring hard copy of data nor it was sent through e-mail.
15. Madhya Pradesh
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 23 per cent.
  - Covered under RBC was 50 per cent.
  - There was inconsistency in the data pertaining to mainstreamed children. The State reported 152 per cent children being mainstreamed in regular schools. State shall provide corrected data as soon as possible.
16. Maharashtra
- Coverage of children through direct enrolment in regular schools was more than initially planned in 2007-08. State covered 31 thousand more children than it has planed.
  - (State had planned to enrol 38 thousand children directly in

regular schools but at the end of year it enrolled 70 thousand children thus exceeding by 83 per cent)

- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 62 per cent.
  - 62per cent of the targeted children were covered under RBC.
  - State did not provided data on mainstreamed children from AIE to regular schools.
17. Meghalaya
- State did not provide any information on coverage of children in under any interventions in AIE. State representative was asked to furnish the information as soon as possible.
18. Mizoram
- The State representative participated in the Review Meeting without any data. She brought no hard copy of data nor was it sent through e-mail.
19. Orissa
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 33 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 16per cent only.
  - 41 per cent of the total covered children have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
  - All the recognise Madarsa/Maktab (500) were supported under SSA.
20. Pondicherry
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 21 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 65per cent.
  - 61 per cent out of the total children covered in AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
21. Punjab
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 59 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 55 per cent.
  - 50per cent out of the total children covered in AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
22. Rajasthan
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 94 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 56per cent.
  - 71per cent out of the total children covered in AIE have

been mainstreamed in regular schools.

23. Tamil Nadu
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 84 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 68 per cent.
  - 7per cent out of the total children covered in AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
  - The complete data on mainstreamed children shall be provided later as complete data was not available.
24. Tripura
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC is 68per cent.
  - State had planed to cover 878 children under RBC but could not start any RBC centre, hence coverage under RBC was Zero.
  - Out of the total children covered under AIE was 37 per cent were mainstreamed in regular school.
25. Uttar Pradesh
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 98 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 76 per cent.
  - State did not provided data on children mainstreamed in regular schools.
26. Uttarakhand
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 40per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was 37 per cent.
  - 52 per cent out of the total children covered in AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
27. West Bengal
- Coverage under AIE excluding RBC was 37 per cent.
  - Coverage under RBC was very low at 4per cent only.
  - 25 per cent of the total children covered under AIE have been mainstreamed in regular schools.
28. **National**
- **53 per cent children were covered under AIE excluding RBC.**
  - **54 per cent children were covered under RBC.**
  - **Out of the total covered children under AIE, only 35 per cent children were mainstreamed in regular schools.**

### **Session-III**

States were divided into five groups and were asked to make presentations on major initiatives undertaken by them in 2007-08 to cover out of school children. The five groups were also asked to highlight the shortcomings and hindrances in achieving the objectives and to describe their action plan for 2008-09.

#### **Major Initiatives undertaken in 2007-08**

Following major initiatives were stated as undertaken by the State /UTs in year 2007-08.

- Inter Cluster culture meet
- CWSN meet (Out of School Children)
- Night Schools were opened for working children
- A Bridge course module 'Sargam' was developed and implemented in AIE centres
- Training of all volunteers of EGS/AIE centres was organized
- Software regarding child tracking system was developed and the process of data entry is on.
- NGO's guidelines revised and approved by GIAC.
- Revised norms of EGS/AIE were approved by GIAC and forwarded to districts for necessary followup.
- Worked out time schedule and detailed instructions were sent to the districts for identification of children, selection of volunteers and to make AIE centres operational.
- AIE Centres for special category children like migratory, scheduled tribes such as *Kabutara, Musfar, Sahariya* etc.
- Orientation programme for different functionaries like DIET/BSA/BRCC were organized.

**Some important initiatives undertaken by the states are given below:-**

#### **Chandigarh**

1. **Culture Meets and Celebration of Important Days:-** The UT organised cultural meets and celebrated important days to create an interest for continuation of education among children enrolled in AIE centres. The UT celebrated Van Mahotsava, Independence Day, Teacher's Day and Children's Day:
2. **Skill Development:-** Efforts were made to enhance and polish the skills and talent of children. Skill based training work-shops were held in all the schools. Children were taught Flower making, Pot Painting, Candle Making, Diya Making, Mehendi designing 3125 children participated in these work shops of skill development and the articles prepared were exhibited during Diwali Mela.

3. **Inter Cluster Cultural Meet:-** More than 1700 children participated in the “Fun and Frolic” programme organised on 21st and 22nd November, 2007. During this programme children competed in various sports and Cultural activities and won prizes.
4. Night Care centres, Contact centres, Half way Home were started to cover urban deprived, migratory and working children.
5. Preparation of child wise profile for out of school children for specific strategies.

### **Uttarakhand**

1. A new scheme called “PAHAL” was launched in U.S.Nagar & Dehradun in Public Private Partnership (PPP Mode) covering around 300 Out of School Children involving 7 Private schools.
2. Night school camps for the working children at Nainital.
3. A bridge course module “SARGAM” developed and implemented in AIEs

### **Punjab**

1. Training of all volunteers of EGS/AIE centres was organised.
2. All the requisite items provided to all EGS/AIE centres.
3. Nine EGS Centres upgraded into formal schools.
4. 36518 children were mainstreamed.
5. Software regarding child tracking system was developed and the process of data entry is on.

### **Uttar Pradesh**

1. NGO Guideline were revised and approved by GIAC, and the printed version was distributed to districts levels. Orientation programmes of personnel at district level and below were organised.
2. Revised norms for EGS/AIE/NRBC/RBC were approved by GIAC and communicated to the districts.
3. Worked out time scheduled and detailed instructions sent to the districts for identification, selection & operationalisation of centres.
4. AIE centres for children of special category, for instance migratory, schedule tribes such as *Kabutara*, *Musfar*, *Saharia* etc. were opened.
5. Orientation programme for different functionaries like DIET/BSA/DC/ BRCC/NGO were organised.

6. Orientation of district functionaries were organised regarding seasonal migration, mapping and dynamics of migration and identification of children belonging to seasonal migrant families.
7. A core group team was sent to Maharashtra and Gujarat to understand the initiatives for education of seasonal migrant children.
8. HHS survey was conducted in August in order to obtain accurate number of out of school children. Computerised Child wise profiling was done for tracking and preparing specific strategies.
9. Close linkage were developed with State Arbi Farsi Madarsa Board and the Labour Department.
10. Documentation process of the work experience is in process
11. Study of the NRBCs operationalised in 2006-07 was commission.

### **Plan of Action for 2008-09**

The plan of action for 2008-09 was presented by the following States only.

#### **Chandigarh**

1. Emphasis on health & hygiene.
2. Better arrangement for MDM.
3. Reading corners for the AIE
4. NRBCs for older age group children.
5. Skill courses for older age group.
6. Tracking of child labour and beggars
7. Rs 250/ will be given as incentive to every working child who would be mainstreamed in regular school.

#### **Uttarakhand**

1. Programme "PAHAL" to be extended to all urban areas.
2. Special incentives to PRIs, Village level health workers-"ASHA", NCC & NSS Students for bringing in out of school children.
3. Continuation of EGS in remotest areas, especially in "*khattas*" where van *Gujjars* live.
4. Physical verification of EGS and AIEs keeping in view the concept of Zero Based Budgeting
5. Involvement of NGOs especially for covering 'hard to reach children'.
6. Introduction of migratory card for migratory children.

## **Punjab**

1. Having identified 1.004 lakh Out of School Children (6-14) the State proposes to cover older children (8-14) through AIE/Bridge courses of different durations.
2. Thirty-one EGS to be upgraded. All EGS centres are to be closed with effect from 31.03.08.
3. Involvement of NGOs to run AIE Centres.

## **Uttar Pradesh**

1. Finalisation of unit cost for RBCs, approval and intimation- May
2. Finalisation of detail instructions and intimation to the districts- May.
3. Orientation programme of district functionaries BSA/DIET/DC/BRCC/NGOs- May-June.
4. Workshop on migratory children, finalisation and Action plan – May-June.
5. Preparatory exercises like training, honorarium and textbooks availability for the AIE/EGS centres proposed to run from July- June.
6. Finalisation of Policy of upgradation of EGS by May-June.
7. Regular field visits/monitoring/academic support to the operation centres.
8. Regular field visits by State officials/SRG/Quality coordinator (UNICEF).
9. Tracking of children to be mainstreamed in formal schools from AIEs/NRBC/RBCs.
10. Documentation of the centres to be made operational.

## **Major Issues Identified**

### **1. Problem of Access**

It was found during presentations that provision of access on institutional basis in many eligible habitations is still an issue. Some of the States are facing problems of access in a few eligible habitations as these are located in reserved or protected forest areas. For instance there are 300 eligible habitations in Orissa which are located in reserved forest areas. As a result the state education department is unable to open primary schools in these habitations despite these habitations being eligible for primary schools.

There are many other habitations that are not eligible for schools as per the existing state norms but a considerable number of children of targeted age group are available in these habitations. These habitations require a relaxation of norms to be eligible for a permanent schooling facilities (may be small/branch school). Till now only Chhattisgarh has relaxed its norms for opening schools in small and scattered habitations. As a result, these habitations are being covered

through AIE and consequently AIE centres in these habitations are reported to be running as EGS centres.

There is an urgent requirement for relaxation of School opening norms of the states to cover those in eligible habitations where considerable number of targeted children are available.

## **2. Double enrolment**

Double enrolment of children in regular schools along with NCLP schools was brought in the notice at the Review Meeting. It was reported by the coordinators that some of the NCLP schools have failed to attend their target group.

There are instances of children other than the child workers being enrolled in NCLP schools for the attraction of additional incentives provided only in NCLP schools for targeted working children.

## **3. Low coverage under AIE**

An analysis of the information provided by the States regarding coverage of out of school children under various intervention of AIE reveals that coverage under AIE has been extremely low. States have covered only 53 per cent children against the targeted number of children sanctioned in the PAB (2007-08).

On the other hand many children who required AIE interventions were directly enrolled in regular schools without providing any bridging inputs.

## **4. Low coverage in RBC**

Some of the States have reported very low coverage under RBCs. Such States are tabled below in Table no. – I

**Table no. - I**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>State Name</b>	<b>Coverage (in per cent)</b>
1.	Andhra Pradesh	44
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	34
3.	Bihar	59
4.	Chhattisgarh	57
5.	Haryana	0
6.	Jharkhand	19
7.	Madhya Pradesh	50

8.	Orissa	13
9.	Punjab	11
10.	Rajasthan	30
11.	Uttarakhand	39

## 5 Low Mainstreaming from AIE

Out of the total children covered under AIE, only 35per cent children could be mainstreamed in regular schools upto 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2008. The number of children mainstreamed from AIE centres into regular schools was extremely low.

## 6. More coverage through direct enrolment in regular schools

States have put great emphasis on covering children through direct enrolment in regular schools. The number of children covered through direct enrolment have exceeded than the actual numbers planned initially at the time of PAB in 2007-08. This could lead to a severe problem of increasing dropouts as no bridging interventions have been provided to the children and instead were directly enrolled in regular schools.

Following Table no II underlines some of the states which covered high number of children through direct enrolment in regular schools.

**Table no. - II**

Sl No.	Name of the State	Direct enrolment in regular schools		
		Planned	Covered	Exceeded by
1	Bihar	573096	954622	381526
2	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0	567	567
3	Delhi	0	10000	10000
4	Gujarat	32308	39807	7499
5	Haryana	0	70000	70000
6	Himachal Pradesh	1359	2187	828
7	Maharashtra	38387	70256	31869
8	Rajasthan	31517	115234	83717
9	Uttarakhand	2606	4870	2264
10	West Bengal	407280	645013	237733
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1086553</b>	<b>1912556</b>	<b>826003</b>

## Need for Orientation

An issue of concern that came up during the meeting was low progress in AIE interventions. The participants highlighted that the critical factor for the low progress in AIE was the approach of State Project Office (SPO). It was stated by them that most of the times, they have interacted with SPO officials, they were left unsatisfied by their

approach and attitude towards the AIE component of the programme. Some times the officials have shown utter negligence to the AIE component. The officials many a times don't have clear understanding about AIE component. Hence they are often very reluctant to sanction interventions under AIE. The officials are indifferent to realise that different categories of out of school children may require different types of interventions. The officials unburden themselves by instructing to cover all children through direct enrolment in regular schools.

All coordinators in the meeting were of the view that there is a need of intervention at the national level to orient the officials at the SPO level to the specific needs of AIE component.

Another important issue that emerged during the discussion was that participants perceived some kind of pressure on District Collectors to achieve enrolment targets for their districts, irrespective of the needs of the children. Thereby, the pressure of enrolment is passed down the bureaucratic line and the headmaster of a school lands up registering as much children as possible in regular school without assessing the needs of bridging of these children. This, also, is a verified fact by the figures that appeared in the Table no. I. This could lead to a severe problem of increasing drop out. Mid-day-meal also was sighted as another reason for over reporting from regular schools.

### **Household Survey in Urban areas**

A Major hindrance in implementing any intervention of AIE towards achieving the target of UEE, as reported by the coordinators, was the lack of data with regard to urban areas. Coordinators reported that it was extremely difficult to conduct any household survey in urban areas due to many unavoidable reasons such as lack of household data presence of slums, resettlement and unauthorised colonies, fluctuating population and lack of resources etc. It was also highlighted that there are many children who do not have any household at all and therefore can not be numbered through any household survey.

### **Expansion of the Unapproved Scheme**

Uttarakhand has reported to expand what was not approved by the PAB. In the PAB of 2008-09, Uttarakhand had proposed to cover 450 children by enrolling them in private schools and bearing their tuition fees under its scheme called *Pahal*. The only reason given by the state for this intervention was lack of primary school in some habitations in a radius of 1km. The state neither could identify these habitations without access nor the total number of eligible children in these habitations. The proposal of the state was not clear other aspects as well such as criterion for selecting children and schools, ensuring quality of education in these schools, and most importantly the sustainability of this initiative. The PAB could not find any evidence which could suggest that this was a need based intervention and, therefore, did not approve this proposal. Though PAB had not approved the proposal, the state is still planning to go ahead with this scheme in whole of the state.