

**MINUTES OF 3RD SUBMISSION ON INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISIONING IN SSA
CIVIL WORKS HELD ON 24TH SEPTEMBER, 2009 IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM
OF TSG, ED.CIL, NEW DELHI**

1. The 3rd meeting of submission on infrastructure provisioning in SSA civil works was held on 24th September, 2009 in the Conference Room of TSG, Ed.CIL, New Delhi.
2. List of Participants is given in **Annexure – I**.
3. Ms. Richa Sharma, Director, MHRD, welcomed all the members of the sub mission. All the members present confirmed that they had received the notice of the meeting and the detailed agenda notes, on time.
4. *Members felt that MHRD may consider broadening the scope of the sub mission, so that the sub mission can actively work as a resource group.* The membership of the sub mission could also be increased, to include, for e.g. (i) A representative from NDMA, to advise on both structural and non structural school safety issues (ii) A School sanitation and hygiene expert (iii) An expert who can advise on energy efficiency issues in schools (iv) An expert on universal building design/school access audit and more architects and engineers who have experience in working in the education sector . Inclusion of pedagogy and gender experts would also be useful, especially in the context of recommendations of the 10th SSA JRM on whole school planning. There could be more representatives from States, particularly where school infrastructure gaps are large.
5. Ways of engaging the sub mission members more meaningfully with the SSA school infrastructure agenda was discussed thereafter. MHRD could identify, in consultation with States, the specific areas in which resource support is needed. The sub mission members could then either travel to the States themselves (with MHRD/States' facilitation) , or advise MHRD regarding organizations/experts who could be contacted for the purpose. *In short, the Sub mission should be facilitated to play an active role, delivering specific outputs and sharing with MHRD, new and innovative ideas that would promote the building and transformation of public schools into child friendly and comfortable places that promote learning, and are attractive to children.* The sub mission reaffirmed the 10th SSA JRM recommendation that design of built spaces and outdoor spaces of a school should be viewed as intrinsically connected to the SSA goals of access, equity and quality.
6. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi made a presentation on 'Child friendly and inclusive whole school planning'. As per the recommendations of the 10th SSA JRM, MHRD will be developing guidelines on 'whole school planning', and Shri. Vajpeyi's presentation was intended to

familiarize the sub mission members with the concept and obtain their views on key ideas/themes that should be included in the proposed guidelines. A copy of the presentation is at **Annexure II**. The presentation covered (i) why whole school planning is needed (ii) guiding principles for whole school planning and (iii) how to go about whole school planning.

7. States have evolved different designs of schools and classrooms. This diversity is to be welcomed, as building designs need to respond to the requirements of different geo-climatic regions. *Members felt that it would be appropriate ,nevertheless, to undertake an analysis of all the existing school and classroom designs, state-wise.* The design analysis would be done on the basis of certain key parameters, both structural and non structural. Some suggested parameters were (i) whether the school design is a composite one, including an adequate number of classrooms, drinking water and sanitation facilities, kitchen shed for MDM etc. (ii) whether the design incorporates appropriate hazard resistant features(for e.g. against earthquakes, in States with regions falling in seismic zones IV and V) (iii) whether it is in accordance with the requirements of the National Building Code (for e.g., whether the size of a classroom is such that each child gets at least the minimum space specified in the code) , (iv) whether facilities within the school have been designed in view of the needs of the children(e.g., taps fitted at different heights for children of different heights) (v) whether school designs (including toilet designs) incorporate barrier free features , so that they are accessible to children with special needs (vi) whether there are provisions for adequate lighting and ventilation, and more than one entry and exit points in the classroom. Finally, as the 10th SSA JRM has recommended, the designs should also be analyzed to see if , or how they have responded to pedagogic/educational needs , as design of both indoor and outdoor spaces of the school can facilitate learning in many different ways. Ms. Richa Sharma, Director, MHRD mentioned that the ministry has collected designs of school buildings, ACR, toilets etc. from 23 states and these are available for analysis. *She requested the members to initiate at least a preliminary analysis of the designs. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi, Shri. Sandeep Kumar Jha and Shri. Devanshu Pandit mentioned that they will carryout the analysis and provide feedback to MHRD.* It was decided to give 3 state designs to each member. A copy of the designs was handed over to the members at the end of the meeting as per the details given below:

Sl.No.	Name	States
1.	Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi	Uttrakhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal
2.	Shri. Devanshu Pandit	Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan
3.	Shri. Sandeep Kumar Jha	Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Assam

8. Shri. Vajpeyi and Shri. Jha mentioned that an extensive design renewal exercise has been done in the DPEP States. Members felt would be worthwhile to examine if these designs are still being used or the States have reverted back to the conventional PWD designs that include 2-3 classrooms in a row and a rectangular verandah. *TSG (civil works unit) was entrusted to carry out this exercise, in respect of all States where DPEP was implemented.* Since the SSA framework specifically makes a reference to the child friendly designs developed under DPEP and encourages States to make use of the designs (altering it to the local context, as needed) , *TSG should also report how many non DPEP states are, in fact, using the school building designs developed under DPEP .*
9. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi shared with the sub mission members , some examples of the wealth of documentation done in the civil works area, during DPEP. *Members felt that the civil works unit of the TSG should function as the collective memory/repository /resource center for civil works under SSA and DPEP.* TSG should collect all the documentation done in this area, both at National and State level. If necessary, copies of some documents should be reprinted. A catalogue (of both print and video material) should be prepared and shared with the sub mission members and states. These may also be uploaded on the SSA website. No State should waste time in reinventing the wheel, simply because there is no central knowledge/ resource center , from where relevant documents can be accessed. The TSG ‘School Infrastructure Resource Center’ should also have all the relevant National Building Codes , relevant documentation from NDMA(pertaining to school safety; structural designs and retrofitting measures for schools) , from DDWS,GOI(reg., guidelines for TSC and NRDWP; school hygiene and sanitation) , the ECBC(Energy Conservation Building Code , which enunciates the energy efficiency aspects of building designs) , documentation on concepts and examples of Universal Building designs, Accessible buildings , Access audits, GRIHA(rating of green buildings), cost effective construction technologies etc. MHRD may consider a specific seminar for all Education Secretaries/SPDs of SSA to familiarize them with these ideas. The Resource center should also have lists of all schools of planning and architecture across the country, as well as other organizations and experts in different fields that are relevant to creation of school infrastructure and its augmentation. Finally, the resource

center must have a visual documentation of the large variety of elementary school buildings existing in different climatic regions of the country – in deserts, hilly areas, coastal areas, areas with high rainfall and snowfall , urban areas, etc.

10. The necessity of undertaking fresh documentation under SSA was discussed thereafter. Two examples of good DPEP documentation were seen by members (i) ‘Building Rural Primary Schools’ and (ii) ‘Child friendly elements for rural primary schools’. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi pointed out the importance of documenting not only the end products (i.e., good school buildings) but also the *processes* of design development, consultations with stakeholders etc. that have resulted in good designs and construction practices. *Members suggested that MHRD/TSG should identify best practices in States which could be documented. Some examples of possible areas are (i) Building urban elementary schools under SSA (ii) Indoor and outdoor school spaces as pedagogic resources – examples from select States under SSA (iii) Processes of school building design development under SSA (iv) Barrier free elementary school buildings (v) Building elementary schools through community participation , etc.*
11. The concept note and checklist developed for undertaking assessment of school environments was discussed thereafter. The environment management practices relate to different stages of planning and construction of school buildings and maintenance of facilities thereafter. Members gave specific suggestions for improving the checklist. *It was suggested that there should be separate checklists for the State level and the school level. TSG should prepare a modified checklist, incorporating members’ suggestions, and submit it to MHRD for consideration.*
12. Subsequently , the progress report for the quarter ending 30-6-09 was discussed. A copy of the State wise progress report, status on technical manpower availability, school mapping, third party evaluation, maintenance of asset register, environmental assessment etc. was circulated in the meeting. Director, MHRD mentioned that these were discussed in the recently held review meeting of state project engineers at Gandhinagar, Gujarat. It was emphasized that for quality improvement of SSA civil works , the states should have sufficient technical manpower, third party evaluation and school mapping to avoid haphazard construction activities within school premises. Members noted that some States like Gujarat, Maharashtra, Assam and Rajasthan have a strong civil works team under SSA, with a sufficient number of technically qualified staff on deputation or contract. The situation is different in other States. In some States like UP,CG etc. , the SSA civil works are undertaken by works departments of the State Governments. It is not clear how ideas regarding specific requirements of school buildings (child friendly design

of classrooms and facilities, outdoor and indoor spaces to be developed as learning resources, safety and hazard resistant features, barrier free access, whole school planning etc) are communicated to them, since these works departments do not participate in the quarterly workshops of civil works coordinators. *It was suggested that TSG should, in respect of each state, prepare a detailed status note incorporating, inter alia, existing organizational structure of civil works unit (from state to block level), sanctioned staff at each level and vacant positions. There should be a specific comment on whether the sanctioned staff strength and the existing system of execution of works is optimal in view of the State's civil works outlay, infrastructure gaps, requirements for monitoring and oversight by SSA, quality assurance and above all, infusion of new learnings and ideas about design innovations, whole school planning and building schools that are child friendly. The status notes may be examined by MHRD, to connect the progress and quality of civil works in each state, with its sanctioned staff strength and the existing system of execution of works. This could then form the basis for a dialogue with the States, for strengthening technical capacity at all levels for quality execution of SSA civil works.* Shri. S.C. Girotra, Chief Consultant mentioned that guidelines issued in 2002-03 by MHRD can also be examined. Fresh instructions can be issued in view of the current context, to advise States on 2-3 alternative models for efficient execution of SSA civil works.

13. Director (MHRD) drew the attention of members towards the schedule to the RTE Act, 2009, which specifies the minimum infrastructure requirements of all schools. Members welcomed the Act and noted that it is for the first time that ensuring basic infrastructure provisioning in schools has become a statutory requirement.
14. Director, MHRD mentioned that draft guidelines for building barrier free schools under SSA have been prepared by the IE unit and is enclosed with the agenda note. She requested the members to go through the guidelines and to suggest modifications/comments, by email. Members noted that the RTE Act requires barrier free access and indicative guidelines for incorporation of barrier free features in school buildings would be useful for States.
15. Shri. Amit Kumar Saha, Assistant Advisor (PHE) from DDWS mentioned that their department provides toilet and drinking water facilities to schools and they need the information on the coverage of schools by SSA. *Updated data, based on DISE 2008-09, will be provided to him by TSG, after MHRD authorization.*
16. Director (MHRD) thanked all the members for participating in the sub mission meeting and giving valuable suggestions.