

**FUNDING THE
RIGHT TO EDUCATION**

Submitted to

Centre for Civil Society

By

Shruti Ambast

Working Paper No 241

Summer Research Internship 2010

Centre for Civil Society

Abstract

This paper seeks to identify and provide a preliminary analysis on issues which arise in context of funding the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE). The Act, which has been enforced recently, requires an unprecedented sum of money, rough estimates of which are currently available. These estimates, when probed, were found to be lacking in several respects.

The sum of 1.71 lakh crores – stated as required expenditure to implement RTE over five years – seems to be insufficient when seen in the light of earlier estimates made in 2005. Also, some provisions of the act have not been accounted for.

Besides this, there is a need to investigate whether or not different states are justified in demanding more funds for RTE. At the same time it seems inevitable that the Centre will have to cover a higher proportion of the total required expenditure than it is presently stipulated to do under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan norms.

Several problems that have been observed in fund flows under the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan need to be addressed to ensure that they do not persist under RTE.

A slightly removed but related issue is that of the reimbursement to be given by the government to private unaided schools in exchange for their reserving

25% of seats for disadvantaged children free of cost. Some preliminary findings suggest that the amount of reimbursement determined by the government will be inadequate for private schools and, more importantly, that there is a need to work out a comprehensive mechanism to enforce this particular clause of the legislation.

Table of Contents

1. List of Abbreviations	6
2. Introduction	7
3. Right to Education Legislation.....	8
4. Overview of Education Expenditure in Context of RTE	9
4.1 The 6% Target	9
4.2 Present Allocations.....	11
4.3 Financial Estimations for Achieving UEE	11
5. Estimation of Financial Requirements for RTE, 2009.....	13
5.1 National-level and State-level Estimates	13
5.2 Teacher Salary.....	14
5.3 Analysis with Reference to CABE 2005	16
5.4 Entitlement to Children.....	19
6. Centre-State Fund Sharing.....	20
7. SSA Fund Flows and What Can Be Learnt From Them	22
8. Assessing Per-Child Expenditure in Context of RTE, Section 12	26
8.1 Private Schools' Per-Child Expenditure	27
8.2 Government's Per-Child Expenditure	28
8.3 Framing a Solution.....	29
9. Conclusion.....	30
10. References	31

Annexure I35

Annexure II.....38

1. List of Abbreviations

BRC: Block Resource Centre

CABE: Central Advisory Board of Education

CRC: Cluster Resource Centre

DIET: District Institute for Education and Training

MHRD: Ministry of Human Resource Development

NUEPA: National University for Educational Planning and Administration

PTR: Pupil Teacher Ratio

RTE: Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (as notified on 1 April 2010)

SSA: Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

UEE: Universalisation of Elementary Education

2. Introduction

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act(henceforth RTE) is finally in position to be implemented. As expected, there are many concerns about this process, not least of which are questions regarding funding for such a huge undertaking. There are various issues which arise in the above context which need to be analysed and, if not resolved, then at least brought to the notice of policymakers and all other actors involved in executing RTE. This paper seeks to address these very issues and provide a preliminary analysis of the same.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Firstly, it will take a brief look at government expenditure on education, focussing on the elusive 6% target. Then it will present insight into how estimates of financing legislation such as RTE are made and what are the problems that arise in doing so. This includes presentation of an overview of estimates that have been made over time, comparisons among them, gaps in the current estimates, and why they need to be filled. Next, it will review and analyse the altercation between the Centre and the states over the sharing of finances. It will then review the shortcomings in Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) funding, and how and why they need to be tackled under RTE. Additionally, it will address the issue of reimbursement to private unaided schools that arises under Section 12 of the RTE.

3. The Right to Education Legislation

“The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of the Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years.”¹

On 1 April 2010, the State finally undertook the endeavour described in the above statement, albeit with some tweaking of the target age-group. This date marked the enforcement of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE). The Right to Education was made a fundamental right in 2002, under Section 21A of the constitution, by way of the Constitution Act (Eighty-sixth Amendment). Between then and now, the legislation to implement the RTE has been drafted and redrafted several times, specifically in 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2008. The 2008 bill was taken forward, and approved, with minor changes, in 2009.²

¹ Article 45, Part IV, The Constitution of India (prior to the 86th Amendment Act)

² A comprehensive history of the RTE legislation is available at www.azimpremjifoundation.org/html/RtEOverview.htm, from where the information in the referred paragraph has been sourced

4. Overview of Education Expenditure in Context of RTE

4.1 The 6% Target

The National Policy on Education, 1986 stated the need to increase expenditure on education till it reaches 6% of GDP. This was reportedly based on the recommendations of the Kothari Commission (1964-66). Further on, the UPA government in its Common Minimum Programme (2004) pledged to achieve this target in a 'phased manner'. The latest set of statistics available from the Ministry of Human Resource Development show that the pledge is still far from fulfilled.

Table 1: Budgeted Expenditure on Education³

Year	Total Expenditure (in crores)	Education (in Rs)	Education Expenditure as % of GDP
2006-07	137383.99		3.64
2007-08	161419.92 (RE)*		3.74
2008-09	186498.58 (BE)**		3.78

A recent study⁴ by Pankaj Jain and Ravindra Dholakia demonstrates that even allocating 6% of GDP to the education sector will not suffice to achieve

³ GDP figures have been taken from National Accounts Statistics, Central Statistical Organisation. Education expenditure figures have been taken from Budgeted Expenditure on Education, Dept. of Higher Education, MHRD

* Revised Expenditure

** Budget Expenditure

Universilisation of Elementary Education (UEE) unless a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) model for setting up schools is taken up. The point they make is that excessive reliance on government schools, especially given the recommendations of the Sixth Central Pay Commission on teacher salaries, will render RTE unfeasible.

Failure to meet the 6% target has always been a major concern for educationists who have seen it as a lack of commitment to the education sector on the government's part. This is definitely a valid concern, especially in light of the findings cited above. However, it is important to ascertain if better and more efficient utilization of funds will negate the need to raise the proportion of expenditure on education. There is ample evidence of funds being under-utilised in case of the SSA. It has also been seen that many countries have achieved UEE by spending less than 6% of GDP, as mentioned in the Jain and Dholakia paper.

Thus, instead of just racing after the 6% target, a greater priority for the government should be to ensure 100% utilization of currently available funds in a timely and efficient manner.

⁴ The study was published in the Economic and Political Weekly, June 2009.

4.2 Present Allocations

The government intends to implement RTE through the SSA, according to various Ministry of Human Resources Development (MHRD) officials as well as the Anil Bordia Committee Report, April 2010.⁵ The Bordia Committee was formed to look into the details of incorporating the norms of RTE into the existing SSA structure. The following table presents a summary of the allocations which have been made in the current fiscal budget with respect to education.

Table 2: Allocations for 2010-2011

	Allocation (2010-2011) (in Rs crores)
Education	49,904
School Education and Literacy	33,214
SSA	15,000
Grants-in-aid for elementary education	24,068

Source: Union Budget 2010-11, 13th Finance Commission Report

The allocation to SSA implies that Rs 15,000 crores is available with the Centre to spend on RTE this year, pending revisions to the budget. As shown in Section 5, this falls short of what is required to implement the Act.

4.3 Financial Estimations for Achieving UEE

The following table shows the various estimates that have been made, over the years, for achieving UEE through a fundamental Right to Education.

⁵ Available on the SSA online portal (www.ssa.nic.in)

Table 3: Estimates for Achieving UEE

Authority/Source	Amount Required (Rs crores)	Average Requirement (Rs crores)	Annual (Rs)
Saikia Committee (1997)	40,000 for five years	8000	
Tapas Majumdar Committee (1999)	1,36,922 for ten years	13, 692.2	
93 rd Amendment Bill ⁶ (2001)	98,000 for ten years	9800	
CABE Committee Report* (2005)	3,21,196 to 4,36,459 for six years	53,533 to 72,743	
NUEPA* (2009)	1,71,780 for five years	34,356	

The Saikia Committee, a committee of state education ministers, had made only a rough estimate, taking a per-child expenditure of Rs 948 and multiplying it with the number of children in the age group 6-14. When the task was handed over to the Tapas Majumdar Committee, it was done in a much more thorough manner, resulting in a much higher estimate (Majumdar, 1999). A similar discrepancy can be observed between the 2001 and the 2005 estimates. It is clear that making estimates for a legislation as vast in scope as this involves a meticulous exercise.

⁶ This was the bill proposed to make the Right to Education a fundamental right. The estimate was provided in the financial memorandum accompanying the bill. Source: PRS Legislative Brief
 * Details of these two estimates are given in the following section.

5. Estimation of Financial Requirements for RTE, 2009

A team from the National University for Educational Planning and Administration has prepared a report titled 'Financial Implications of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009', dated December 2009. The figure they arrived at is Rs 171780 crores for over five years from 2010-11 to 2014-15, or about Rs 34356 crore per year. This is the estimated additional cost for implementing RTE, which is to form the basis of the government's budget allocation. It is over twice what has been allocated in the 2010-2011 Union Budget.

The estimates have been made in a rather roundabout way. They have used the projected child population and the stipulated Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR) of 30:1 to arrive at the number of additional teachers required. This number has then been used to estimate the number of additional classrooms and other infrastructure.

5.1 National-level and State-level Estimates

A basic problem with this estimate is that it does not tally with the total of the states' estimates. When estimates were made separately for each state and

totalled, the figure came to Rs 204609 crores for expenditure over five years, or about Rs 40922 crores per year. The following is the explanation for the mismatch as given in the report, supplied by a professor at the National University for Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) who was part of the team. While making the national estimates, the number of additional required teachers was aggregated in such a way that the number of excess and deficit teachers in different states could be cancelled out. This incorporates an assumption that an 'extra' teacher from one state can be deployed to fill the vacancy in another state. In reality, this would obviously not be viable. When the estimates were made separately for each state, the total number of additional teachers required turned out to be far more, resulting in a higher estimate. Accordingly, when the Act is put into practice, it will actually require at least Rs 204609 crores.

5.2 Teacher Salary

Another questionable premise in these estimates are the teacher salaries, which have been estimated as follows:

- Rs 8400 per month for all teachers at primary level, and 80% of the teachers at upper primary level

- Rs 11,200 per month for 20% of the teachers at upper primary level, who are Trained Graduate Teachers (TGTs)

According to the report, these levels have been arrived at based on the revised pay scales as per the Sixth Central Pay Commission (CPC) *and* with an assumption of a 40% rise in the salaries estimated in the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) report 2005 (Rs 6000 and Rs 8000 respectively, corresponding to the two levels given above). But judging by the numbers, the CABE estimates have just been increased by 40%.

It is also unclear whether these salaries comprise just the basic pay or the various allowances as well. According to one set of estimates made by R.C. Jain, the total pay for primary teachers inclusive of all allowances amounts to Rs 23,346, and that for a TGT amounts to Rs 25,287. According to the Dholakia and Jain study cited in section 4.1, the 6th CPC recommends Rs 13,042 for primary teachers and Rs 15,996 for secondary schools teachers. There seems to be ambiguity in the actual salaries that will be paid but, if any of these estimates are at all accurate, then there is a serious underestimation in the RTE budget. Teacher salary forms the largest component in the NUEPA estimates; if the salaries have been underestimated, the actual budget could be substantially higher.

The remaining problems in these estimates can be analysed by conducting a comparison with the CABE estimates, 2005.

5.3 Analysis with Reference to CABE 2005

In 2005, CABE was reconstituted to come up with a draft of the RTE bill. The draft prepared by them was accompanied by a financial estimate prepared by NUEPA. This bill was rejected by the central government on the grounds that it could not raise the kind of funds required by the bill. What the government then did was send a model bill to the states, who could then draft their own legislations.⁷ When NUEPA came up with a new set of estimates in 2009, there were questions as to why the amount had gone down.

The CABE estimates present an average annual expenditure of Rs 53,533 to 72,743 crores. As per NEUPA's 2009 estimates, this figure has fallen to Rs 34,356. A study of the two estimates reveals that there are several items which were accounted for in the 2005, but not in 2009. Given that the schedule of norms and standards for a school in both the June 2005 draft and the 2009 draft of the RTE bill is nearly the same, it needs to be examined why there is a mismatch.

⁷ The rejection of the 2005 draft of the bill is discussed at length in Vinod Raina's article 'Killing the Bill', published in Seminar.2006.

In the CAGE report, under Estimation of Financial Requirements, it has been stated:

‘Norms and unit costs have been worked out as per the current practice in states and provisions of the Right to Education Bill, 2005 and as per the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan’.

Therefore this report includes items such as kitchen facility for schools, and costs of establishing and running DIETS, CRCs and BRCs (teacher training institutions under SSA), while they are missing from the new estimates. When asked about this, the NUEPA professors who were involved in making the estimates replied that in the interim between the two estimates, these facilities and institutions have already been established to the extent that they need not be included again.

Furthermore, under school equipment and grants, items such as computers, utensils, grants to School Management Committees, and research grants are all missing from the new estimates, while they had been accounted for in 2005.

A complete comparison of the two estimates, in terms of the differences in unit costs, which also reflects the differences in norms, is attached in Annexure 1. A

study of this will reveal what may be called a 'cost-cutting' exercise, which has brought the estimated expenditure down.

The explanation given by the NUEPA professors for the reduction in total estimated expenditure is two-fold. Firstly, since 2005, the child population has been lower than what had been projected then. Secondly, between 2005 and 2009, more teachers have been recruited, which has brought down the number of additional teachers required. The following figures, taken from both reports confirm this:

Table 4: Comparison of Selected Statistics between the 2005 and 2009 Estimates

	2005	2009
Duration over which estimates have been made	2006-07 to 2011-12	2010-11 to 2014-15
Projected child population in the age-group 6-13, for the above duration (in crores)	22.57 to 24.89	18.69 to 18.24
Number of additional teachers required, for the above duration (in lakhs)	11.42 at a PTR of 35:1	10.33 at a PTR of 30:1

As per the above figures, it stands to reason that the cost would have come down.

5.4 Entitlement to Children

Under section 3(2) of the RTE act, it is stated that, 'no child shall be liable to pay any kind of fee or charges or expenses which may prevent him or her from pursuing and completing the elementary education...'

In the NUEPA report, this entitlement has been accounted for as such:

75% of the child population will receive free textbooks

50% of the child population will receive free uniforms

The remaining children are assumed to have been provided these by the states, or enrolled in private unaided schools. Transport facilities for children have not been accounted for at all, their variability across states being cited as the reason.

Interestingly, the CAFE report, which had done the same accounting as above, had stated that the financial estimates would have to be 'firmed up' as the entitlement covered only free textbooks and uniforms. The problem remains with the 2009 estimates.

A study by S. Chandrasekhar and Abhiroop Mukhopadhyay (2006) discusses in what ways the direct costs of education can deter children from going to school.

It also calculates the additional expenditure which the government will have to incur in making primary education free, over and above the existing subsidies. This study may be used as an indicator of the inadequacy of the provisions that have been made under this head.

On the whole, the NUEPA estimates may be used as a point of reference. But they definitely do not fully reflect the expenditure that will be incurred when RTE is put into practice.

6. Centre-State Fund Sharing

As per the SSA framework, the ratio in which the Centre and the states would share funds was to change from 85:15 during the IX five year plan to 75:25 during the X five year plan, for all the states. During the XI five year plan, it would be 65:35 in 2007-08 and 2008-09, 60:40 in 2009-2010, 55:45 in 2010-2011, and 50:50 thereafter. During this period, the fund-sharing pattern for the 8 North-eastern states would be 90:10, till the end of the programme.

If this pattern is to be followed for RTE, in the current year, the states will have to shell out 45% of the funds required for its implementation. This is clearly not agreeable at all to most states. The opinion of all the state education secretaries on the fund-sharing pattern has been tabulated in The Anil Bordia Committee

Report. Most states feel that the Centre should take on the entire burden; many feel that the ratio should be 90:10.

The CABE report had also stressed on the need for the financial liability to be borne almost entirely by the Centre.

Drawn from the Anil Bordia report, and other media reports, the following are the estimates presented by some of the states:

Bihar: Rs 20,000 crore (Outlook, May 2010)

Uttar Pradesh: Rs 18,500 crore - 4000 recurring*

Karnataka: Rs 16,165 crore*

Orissa: Rs 13,671 crore (Orissadiary.com, June 2010)

Kerala: Rs 10,000 crore (Daily Pioneer, April 2010)

* These figures have been taken from the Anil Bordia report.

As the methodology and timeframe for these estimates is not known, they cannot directly be compared to the NUEPA estimates. Anyhow, the amounts given by Orissa, Karnataka and Kerala are significantly more than the corresponding NUEPA estimates (4809, 4729 and 1618 – all in crores of rupees). On the other hand, the NUEPA estimates for Bihar and U.P. are more than their

own estimates. The NUEPA estimates for all the states are attached in the annexure.

One way to analyse whether or not the states' demands are justified is by looking at their utilisation capacities under SSA. For instance, a report by the Accountability Initiative (2010) shows that Bihar spent only 42% of the total available funds in 2008-09, while Madhya Pradesh spent 57%. It is worth investigating whether states could do better simply by utilising available funds more punctually and efficiently.

7. SSA Fund-Flows and What Can Be Learnt From Them

SSA is monitored by multiple stakeholders – the government, state universities, foreign agencies and civil society organisations. A reading of review reports by various agencies suggests some key common issues regarding the fund-flow mechanisms. Further insight into the issues was gained through discussions with a former consultant with the National Technical Support Group, SSA, now a PhD scholar at NUEPA.

Given that RTE is to be implemented through SSA, and that the fund-flow mechanisms are not going to be radically different, these problems are likely to persist and must be resolved if RTE is to be a success. The following are the

major reforms that have been identified as necessary to ensure smooth implementation of RTE:

1. Decentralised planning

While a bottom-up planning approach is stressed everywhere on paper, it does not seem to exist in practise. A policy brief by the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP 2007) states that the Annual Work Plans and Budget prepared by states are not accepted as they are. It makes the case for planning to be more demand-driven, based on need factors, both among and within states. The 11th Joint Review Mission Report also stresses on the same issue. It further states the need for all schools to make a School Development Plan, already mandated under RTE, which would be the basis for grants made to schools.

2. Flexibility in unit costs

In discussions with the TSG consultant, it was revealed that the costs of constructing a classroom may go up by two or three times the unit cost prescribed by the government, in areas with unsuitable terrain. This goes to show that fixing a national level per-head cost may impede progress towards

meeting the RTE norms and standards. The solution once again lies in a need-based, demand-driven approach to financial planning.

3. Utilisation capacity

Budget utilisation has improved over the years, but in 2009-2010, expenditure with respect to total availability of funds was still only 62%. While states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu have been able to utilise over 90% of their funds, West Bengal, Chattisgarh and Bihar are still lagging far behind (Joint Review Mechanism Report, 2010). This is another problem that needs to be tackled quickly. Fund-flows must be monitored throughout the year, at every level of implementation.

4. Capacity-building and technical expertise

The SSA cadre of workers mostly comprises of contractual workers (with the contract usually lasting for a year) who are unable to execute sustainable progress. There is also often a clash between the state and the SSA-specific administrative bodies. Now, under RTE, a permanent, consolidated structure needs to be created, with a clearly defined administrative hierarchy. Technical expertise also needs to be developed, so that the agents who will enforce

various provisions of the RTE are equipped to handle all the problems listed above.

8. Assessing Per-Child Expenditure in Context of RTE, Section 12

Under Section 12 of the RTE act, all private unaided schools are required to reserve 25% of their seat in the entry-level class for children belonging to the economically weaker and disadvantaged groups in the neighbourhood.

In exchange, the schools will be reimbursed an amount equal to the per-child expenditure of the state (or the actual amount charged to the child, whichever is less).

This clause has become a bone of contention between private schools and the government. As expected, most of the 'elite' schools in big cities are claiming that the reimbursement will be nowhere near enough to cover their per-child expenses. They will have to hike the fee for the remaining 75% students, in an instance of cross-subsidisation. This, in turn, has unleashed a stream of protests from parents who send their children to these schools. However, some ground-level work reveals even 'budget private schools'⁸ may be unable to have their expenses covered under this provision.

⁸ These are schools which are affordable to the relatively poorer sections of society.

8.1 Private Schools' Per-Child Expenditure

The following table details the estimates of per-child expenditure given by the principals of a few budget private schools in Delhi

Table 5: Per-Child Expenditure of Private Schools

School Name	Estimated Annual Per-Child Expenditure (in Rs)
J.G.M. Public School (unrecognized)	5000 – 10,000
Bharti Public School (unrecognized)	3500 – 4000
Vardhaman Public School (unrecognized)	1800
Atul Shiksha Sadan	15,000 – 20,000
Eminent Public School	15,000 – 20,000
Navgyan Jyoti School	45,00 – 7000

None of these schools had any official figures for the per-child expenditure; they have all given rough estimates. The estimates are reportedly inclusive of all expenses that the schools incur. All these schools cater to an average of approximately 200-400 students. They provide basic facilities of drinking water and toilets. While these are rough figures, they do give an idea of the kind of reimbursement such schools would require.

A pilot study conducted by Micro Credit Ratings International Ltd. (M-CRIL) in Hyderabad for 35 budget private schools reveals that their average annual operating expense per-child is Rs 2580.⁹

8.2 Government's Per-Child Expenditure

A senior official in the Elementary Education Bureau, MHRD, claims that there is no official figure available for the government's annual per-child expenditure. At the headquarters of the Delhi Directorate of Education (DoE), an official, off the top of his head, gave a figure of Rs 700-800. A meeting with the Deputy Director, Planning Branch, Delhi DoE was more revealing. He stated that firstly, the Delhi government was still in the process of constructing an estimate for the per-child expenditure, which had to be supplemented by information from the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD) Secondly, he said the government is not comfortable declaring an estimate. It feels that private schools whose expenditure is less than the government's (and the official claims there are many of them) will immediately hike their fees so as to get the benefit of reimbursement. The question remains why the government is still dithering over this, as the problem they have cited is bound to crop up anyway.

⁹ The findings of this study have not been published officially yet. The information was obtained at a Dialogue Seminar on School Ratings, organised by the School Choice Campaign, where M-CRIL made a presentation on the same.

There seems to be no available measure of exactly what cost the government will incur on reimbursement. While this may not be a problem this year, as most private schools are already done with their admissions process, it needs to be addressed at any rate.

A study on public financing of elementary education by A.N. Reddy, NUEPA, (2008) reveals that the government's annual per-child expenditure in 2004-05 was Rs 2827. This figure has been arrived at by dividing the total budgeted expenditure on elementary education by the number of children enrolled in government primary and upper primary schools. If a similar calculation is made with more recent data, a rough estimate will be available.

8.3 Framing a Solution

If the estimates obtained from the budget private schools are accurate, then it is unlikely that the reimbursement will cover the expenses for most of them.

A fair way must be devised to execute the reimbursement process. As of now, the RTE Act does not give any details regarding this process. While it does not seem fair to provide an inadequate reimbursement to the private schools and leave them to cope with the ramifications, it will be hard to ascertain the requirements for each school separately. Nevertheless, a mechanism must be

worked out to take into consideration the various facilities and infrastructure in the schools, as well as the quality of education they are providing, before estimating the reimbursement.

9. Conclusion

The staggering scope of the RTE legislation implies that its success is contingent on the degree of precision and detail in its implementation. It means that every rupee allocated has to be spent just right. This would require a much more concentrated effort towards financial planning.

Firstly, every provision entailed in the act has to be thoroughly accounted for, and budgetary allocation must be made accordingly. If the government is serious about achieving UEE in India, financial constraints can no longer be used as an excuse. The accounting must also be done in a manner that permits flexibility according to the needs of different schools and children. Secondly, the fund flows must be monitored at every level and the problems identified under SSA funding must be done away with, as discussed in section 7. Finally, resolution of issues such as reimbursement, on which there is no official word yet, must not be delayed any longer.

10. References

Annual Status of Education Report (Rural). 2009. Mumbai: Pratham Resource Centre.

Chandrasekhar S. and Abhiroop Mukhopadhyay. 2006, September. "Primary Education as a Fundamental Right, Cost Implications". *Economic and Political Weekly*. 41 (35): 3797-3804.

Constitution of India (prior to the 86th Amendment Act), Article 45, Part IV

Daily Pioneer. 2010. "Finance upsets RTE applecart". 12 April. Accessed on 11 June 2010 at www.dailypioneer.com/248609/Finance-upsets-RTE-applecart.html

Government of India. 2006. *Performance Audit Report on Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. Ministry of Human Resource Development*. Department of Elementary Education and Literacy. Accessed on 18 June 2010 at http://www.cag.gov.in/html/reports/civil/2006_15_peraud/contents.htm

Government of India. *Report of the Thirteenth Finance Commission (2010-2015)*. Ministry of Finance. Accessed on 25 May 2010 at <http://fincomindia.nic.in/ShowContentOne.aspx?id=28&Section=1>

Government of India. 2010. *Union Budget 2010-11*. New Delhi: Government of India.

Unknown Author. 2009. *Financial Implications of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act*,. National University for Educational Planning and Administration. December 2009.

India, Gazette of. 2009. *The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009*. Government Report, New Delhi: Government of India Press.

Jain, Pankaj S. and Ravindra H. Dholakia. 2009. "Feasibility of Implementation of Right to Education Act". *Economic and Political Weekly*. XLIV (25): 38-43. DATE

Kanungo, Dipti. 2010. "Orissa Education minister Pratap Jena meets Kapil Sibal, highlighted need of Rs.13,671 crores for implementation of RTE Act". *Orissa Diary*, 10 June. Accessed on 11 June 2010 at www.orissadiary.com/CurrentNews.asp?id=19015.

Kapur, Avani and Sruti Bandyopadhyay. 2010. *Accountability India Budget Briefs, Education Sector 2*, (1). Accessed on 21 May 2010 at <http://accountabilityindia.org/index.php?menu=1>

Mukherjee, Anit N. and Tapas K. Sen. 2007. *Universalising Elementary Education: An Assessment of the Role of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*. National Institute of Public Finance and Policy. Accessed on July 2 at www.nipfp.org.in/displaymore.php?idd=220&cid=156

National Common Minimum Programme of the Government of India. May 2004. New Delhi: Government of India. Accessed on 7 July 2010 at <http://pmindia.nic.in/cmp.pdf>

National Policy on Education, 1968. New Delhi: Government of India. Accessed on July 9 2010 at <http://www.ugc.ac.in/policy/policy.html>

.Outlook 2010 "RTE: States Want Centre to Foot Bulk of Expense".24 May Accessed on 11 June 2010 at www.news.outlookindia.com/item.aspx?679145.

Raina, Vinod. 2006. "Killing the Bill". *Seminar*, # 565, September. Accessed on 25 May 2010 at www.india-seminar.com/2006/565/565_vinod_raina.htm

Reddy, A.N. 2008. "Public Financing of Elementary Education in India". *Indian Journal of Social Development*. 8 (1): 19-36.

Central Advisory Board of Education. 2005. *Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Free and Compulsory Education Bill and*

Other Issues Related to Elementary Education, June. New Delhi: Government of India Accessed on 24 May 2010 at www.education.nic.in/cabe/Fcebill.pdf

Anil Bordia Committee. 2010. *RTE Report*, April. New Delhi: Government of India. Accessed on 26 May 2010 at www.ssa.nic.in/quality-of-education/rte-reporting-by-anil-bodia-committee

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan Framework Revised. 2008. Accessed on 26 May 2010 at http://ssa.nic.in/page_portletlinks?foldername=ssa-framework

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. 2010. *Eleventh Joint Review Mission & Mid-term Review*. 15-29 January. New Delhi: Government of India. Accessed on 27 June 2010 at <http://ssa.nic.in/monitoring/joint-review-mission-ssa-1/joint-review-mission-ssa>

Tapas Majumdar Committee. 1999. *Tapas Majumdar Committee Report*. New Delhi: Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development.

Vanka, Sarita. 2009. "Legislative Brief, The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Bill, 2008". *Parliamentary Research Service*. Accessed on 21 May 2010 at www.prsindia.org/uploads/media/1229341892/bill206_20090212206_Legislative_Brief_The_Right_to_Education_Bill_2008.pdf

Annexure I

Differences in Unit Costs in the 2005 and 2009 Estimates

COMPONENT	2005	2008
Civil Works and School Facilities		
1. Additional classroom	Rs 1.5 lakh	Rs 2 lakh
2. Office-cum-store-cum-head teacher's room	Rs 1.5 lakh	Rs 2 lakh
3. Drinking water facility	Rs 20,000	Rs 40,000
4. Toilet (including girl's toilet) facility	Rs 15,000	Rs 30,000
5. Upgradation of school buildings	Rs 3 lakh per school having no pucca building for construction of two classrooms	Rs 1 lakh per school having semi pucca building for upgradation Rs 5 lakh per school having kaccha or tent for upgradation
6. One-time grant to upgrade school facilities	Rs 20,000	Rs 50,000
7. Furniture and Equipment	Rs 10,000 per primary school and Rs 50,000 per UP school	Rs 10,000 for primary only, UP only, UP in high and higher secondary schools etc. Rs 25,000 for composite UP school Rs 50,000 for upgraded UP school
8. One time grant for library		Rs 5000 for primary schools Rs 7500 for UP schools Rs 6500 for primary

9. Annual grant for TLE		schools Rs 8500 for UP schools
10. Annual maintenance grant	Rs 10,000 per primary school and Rs 12,000 per UP school	Rs 10,000 per primary and UP school
<p>Note: The following grants, mentioned in the 2005 report, are not specified as norms in the 2009 report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Computers (Rs 30,000 per UP school) - Textbooks (Rs 1500 per primary school and Rs 500 per UP Schoolteacher) - Kitchen facility (Rs 15000 primary school) - Utensils (Rs 10000 per primary school) - Teaching-learning material and equipment in pre-school classes (Rs 5000 per class (one time grant)) - Grants for sports and co-curricular activities (Rs 500 per school per annum) - Grants to SMC (Rs 1500 per SMC per annum) - Monitoring, research and evaluation grant (Rs 1500 per school per annum) - Teacher grant (Rs 500 per teacher per annum) 		
Mainstreaming Out-of-school Children		
1. Residential courses	Rs 6800 per child per annum	Rs 10,000 per child per annum
2. Non-residential courses	Rs 3000 per child per annum	Rs 3000 per child per annum
Integrated Education for the Disabled		
1. Education of children with special needs in regular schools	Rs 2000 per child per annum	Rs 3000 per child per annum
2. Children with severe disability	Rs. 50,000 per child per annum (including	Rs 10,000 per child per annum (including teacher

	teacher cost)	cost)
Entitlements under 'Free Education'		
1. Free textbooks	Rs 300 per primary school student per annum; Rs 500 per UP school student per annum	Rs 150 per primary school student per annum; Rs 200 per UP school student per annum
2. Free uniforms	Rs 200 per child per annum	Rs 400 per child per annum
Additional Teachers		
1. Salary of non-graduate trained teacher	Rs 7965 per month with an increase of Rs 800 per annum (KVS pay scale) and Rs 6000 per month plus an increase of Rs.600 every year (state level)	Rs 8400 per month
2. Salary of graduate trained teacher		Rs 11,200 per month
3. Salary of part-time art, health, physical and work education instructor provided to UP schools	Rs 3000 per month	Rs 4200 per month
4. Salary of pre-school instructor	Rs 4000 per month	
Teacher Development		
<p>Note: The norms for provision of teacher training are different in both reports. The 2005 report makes no mention of training for untrained teachers. It does, however, specify norms for the working of BRCs, CRCs and DIETs (including costs of establishing new ones, salaries of staff, contingency grants and establishment of non-DIET teacher training institutions and distance education facilities), which are absent from the 2009 report.</p>		
1. Professional training for new and existing		Rs 20,000 per teacher per annum

untrained teachers		
2. In-service training for all teachers	60-day training for 20% of existing teachers - Rs 4200 per teacher per annum 20-day training for 80% of existing teachers - Rs 1400 per teacher per annum	Rs 1500 per teacher per annum
3. Induction training for newly appointed teachers	Rs 2100 per teacher per annum	Rs 3000 per teacher per annum
Management	6% of total recurring costs as management cost	4% of total recurring costs as management cost (includes expenses of SCPCR & SCA)
Note: The 2005 report specifies a lump sum of Rs 10 crore for meeting the expenditure of the National Elementary Education Commission		

Annexure II

NUEPA Estimates for State-wise Requirements for RTE Implementation over
2010-11 to 2014-15:

State	Amount (Rs in crores)
Andhra Pradesh	9856
Assam	5921
Bihar	39543
Chattisgarh	3812
Gujarat	6424
Haryana	3057
Himachal Pradesh	1069
Jammu and Kashmir	2303
Jharkhand	12170
Karnataka	4729
Kerala	1618
Madhya Pradesh	7698
Maharashtra	8270
Orissa	4809
Punjab	3647
Rajasthan	9020
Tamil Nadu	3825
Uttar Pradesh	54025
Uttaranchal	1360
West Bengal	16034
North Eastern States	3662
UTs and Small States	1758
All States	204609