

(b) to (d) The Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education has constituted a Review Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. Yashpal to review the role and functions of the All India Council for Technical Education as part of the reform process of higher education in the country.

Reduction in off-takes of foodgrains for Mid-Day Meal Scheme

2218. SHRI K.E. ISMAIL:

SHRI R.C. SINGH:

Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there has been a reduction in the off-take of foodgrains for Mid-Day Meal Scheme by various State Governments during 2008-09;

(b) if so, the details of the allotment and off-take, State-wise during the year;

(c) whether the new distribution system adopted by Government is the reason for failure of the State Governments to lift the quota on time and thereby lapsing the quota, resulting in children getting less food; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M.A.A. FATMI): (a) and (b) Against the annual allocation of 28.60 lakh MTs of foodgrains for the year 2008-09 under the scheme, lifting of foodgrains by the States/Uts for the first two quarters *i.e.* for the period from 1.4.2008 to 30.9.2008 is 10.40 lakh MTs. The total unspent balance of foodgrains available with States/UTs as on 1.4.2008 was 3.04 lakh MTs. The total foodgrains available with the States/UTs during first two quarters was 13.44 lakh MTs, which is 47% of the annual allocation. The statement of allocation, lifting and availability of food grains during 2008-09 (up to 30.9.2008) is given in statement (See below).

(c) and (d) Due to unilateral modification of the guidelines for the lifting of foodgrains by the Department of Food and Public Distribution, the off take of foodgrains from the FCI godown was affected adversely in the first two quarters. However, with mutual consultation, now the guidelines have been further revised by the Department of Food and Public Distribution to remove these difficulties. Also, the quantity lapsed in the first two quarters have been revalidated for lifting.

Statement

Allocation and Lifting of foodgrains 2008-09 during 1.4.2008 to 30.9.2008 (PY + U PY)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Opening	1st Qtr + 2nd Qtr		Total Availability	%	
		Balance as on 1.4.08	Allocation	Lifting		Annual Allocation 2008-09	Availability against annual
1	2	3	4	5	6=3+5	7	8=6/7 *100
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60578.311	37870.72	38179.00	98757.311	171474.82	58%

1	2	3	4	5	6=3+5	7	8=6/7*100
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	3961.10	1068.18	1068.18	4233.48	25%
3.	Assam	1460.32	60763.38	30996.49	32456.81	106737.65	30%
4.	Bihar	13497.87	152709.76	68496.34	81994.21	236481.5	35%
5.	Chhattisgarh	9169.39	56177.24	37289.68	46459.07	79354.28	59%
6.	Goa	322.95	1349.29	411.00	733.95	3474.03	21%
7.	Gujarat	3323.21	56012.72	34104.70	37427.91	98249.91	38%
8.	Haryana	13131.72	26124.84	11453.93	24585.65	45074.54	55%
9.	Himachal	469.75	10173.66	7581.19	8050.94	23833.21	34%
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	1269.4	15762.56	9724.26	10993.66	28810.02	38%
11.	Jharkhand	4708.88	62545.70	33690.80	38399.68	93517.5	41%
12.	Karnataka	167.22	72793.14	61991.50	62158.72	144705.26	43%
13.	Kerala	8311.459	32642.76	29265.77	37577.229	78020.67	48%
14.	Madhya Pradesh	25006.02	147241.98	135163.50	160169.52	216034.65	74%
15.	Maharashtra	15476.07	139144.28	72595.35	88071.42	309755.58	28%
16.	Manipur	427.12	4897.14	961.73	1388.85	7003.62	20%
17.	Meghalaya	1022.1	11042.56	11693.05	12715.15	9398.09	135%
18.	Mizoram	27.49	1686.32	1404.80	1432.29	3762.81	38%
19.	Nagaland	428.07	3352.02	4042.91	4470.98	4638.25	96%
20.	Orissa	8520.93	85013.56	42169.48	50690.41	104468.7	49%
21.	Punjab	4032.76	25394.41	16245.21	20277.97	57278.14	35%
22.	Rajasthan	44945.86	124563.88	71705.34	116651.2	135743.62	86%
23.	Sikkim	3.229	1664.16	1317.26	1320.489	2013.53	66%
24.	Tamil Nadu	869.341	65994.02	48780.20	49649.541	133261.16	37%
25.	Tripura	7162.358	7877.62	5252.00	12414.358	13045.3	95%
26.	Uttarakhand	1051.81	12634.76	6630.03	7681.84	26821.8	29%
27.	Uttar Pradesh	59370	261633.66	172238.32	231608.32	410403.07	56%
28.	West Bengal	18851.089	160785.82	78432.66	97283.7486	270021.52	36%
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	64.615	550.38	275.00	339.615	977.85	35%

1	2	3	4	5	6=3+5	7	8=6/7*100
30.	Chandigarh	125.3	1005.12	331.00	456.3	2124.42	21%
31.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	73.923	619.06	0.00	73.923	923.4	8%
32.	Daman and Diu	97.22	247.12	29.00	126.22	439.88	29%
33.	Delhi	0	18719.25	5880.80	5880.8	35798.19	16%
34.	Lakshadweep	183.58	130.36	0.00	183.58	240.6	76%
35.	Puducherry	0	915.70	666.00	666	2305.44	29%
Total		304149.36	1664000.02	1040066.48	1344215.84	2860426.49	47%

Report of NUEPA on primary education

†2219. SHRI RAJ MOHINDER SINGH MAJITHA:

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:

Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has taken note of the report on country's primary education system released by the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in 2006-07;

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that these schools have far too less number of teachers against recognized average student-teacher ratio; and

(c) if so, the established average of above student-teacher ratio, the average prevalence of this average in the country, the States where this average is higher than the country's average and whether this situation has led to fall in the standard of country's education?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M.A.A. FATMI): (a) to (c) National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) collects elementary school statistics annually through the District Information System (DISE) from all districts in the country.

Based on DISE data 2007-08 collected by NUEPA, the national average Pupil-Teacher Ratio at primary level is 37:1, Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have Pupil-Teacher Ratio more than 40:1

A multi-pronged approach has been adopted under SSA for improving the quality of education. The interventions include, *inter-alia*, strengthening of schools and improving the quality of education through improvement in school infrastructure, recruitment of additional teachers, annual school grants regular training of teachers, academic support to teachers, free textbooks to children and remedial classes for children from disadvantaged sections of society.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.