

**FIFTEENTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
(2023-2026)**

**FORTY NINTH REPORT**

(Presented on 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2024)



**SECRETARIAT OF THE KERALA LEGISLATURE  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM  
2024**

FIFTEENTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
(2023-2026)**

**FORTY NINTH REPORT**

**On**

**Paragraphs relating to General Education Department contained in the  
Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the  
years ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018  
(General and Social Sector)**

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Composition of the Committee ..	v
Introduction ..	vii
Report ..	1
Appendices:	
I. Summary of main Conclusions/Recommendations ..	16
II. Notes furnished by the Government ..	17

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

(2023-2026)

**Composition**

*Chairman :*

Shri Sunny Joseph.

*Members :*

Shri Manjalamkuzhi Ali

Shri M. V. Govindan Master

DR. K. T. Jaleel

Shri C. H. Kunhambu

Shri Mathew T. Thomas

Shri M. Rajagopalan

Shri P. S. Supal

Shri Thomas K. Thomas

Shri K. N. Unnikrishnan

Shri M. Vincent.

*Legislature Secretariat :*

DR. N. Krishna Kumar, Secretary

Shri Selvarajan P. S., Joint Secretary

Shri Jomy K. Joseph, Deputy Secretary

Smt. Beena O. M., 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 Forty Ninth Report on paragraphs relating to General Education Department contained in the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the years ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018 (General and Social Sector).

The Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the years ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018 (General and Social Sector) were laid on the Table of the House on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2016 and 12<sup>th</sup> February 2020 respectively.

The Committee considered and finalised this Report at the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2024.

The Committee place on records our appreciation of the assistance rendered to us by the Accountant General in the examination of the Audit Report.

Thiruvananthapuram  
26<sup>th</sup> June, 2024.

SUNNY JOSEPH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Public Accounts.*

## **REPORT**

### **GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

#### **4.1 Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madrasas**

##### **4.1.1 Introduction**

The GoI funded 'Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madrasa' (SPQEM) introduced in 2009 was implemented in Kerala from 2009-10 onwards. The objective of the scheme was to provide financial assistance to traditional institutions like Madrasas which generally give religious training, to provide education to Muslim children in modern subjects like Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, Hindi and English in their curriculum. It aimed at providing opportunities to students of Madrasas to acquire education comparable to the National Education System especially for secondary and senior secondary levels and prepare them for appearing in X and XII standard examination and also to provide vocational training to them to get employment. Madrasas which provided religious training to those children not attending regular schools were eligible for funding as per this scheme. State level Grant-in-Aid committee(SGIAC) was to recommend the applications received from various Madrasas to obtain Grant-in -Aid from GoI.

During 2010-11, all 547 Madrasas which were recommended for GoI assistance obtained Grant-in-Aid of ₹22.67 crore from GoI. During 2011-12, 1462 of the 2551 Madrasas had applied for financial assistance, against which GoK had obtained ₹71.18 crore in 2013-14.

##### **4.1.2 Scope and Coverage of Audit**

The audit was conducted from April to June 2015 covering the period 2010-15 to assess whether the Scheme, as implemented in the State, complied with the guidelines issued by GoI. The Principal Secretary, General Education Department and the Director of Public Instruction (DPI) were responsible for implementing the Scheme. Audit scrutinised the records of the DPI, offices of four Deputy Directors

of Education (DDEs) and District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET), in the four test checked districts of Kollam, Kozhikode, Malappuram and Wayanad selected by Probability Proportionate to Size without Replacement. Forty Madrasas in the four districts<sup>1</sup> were also test checked during the course of Audit.

## **Audit Findings**

### **4.1.3 Suitability of SPQEM for the State**

Audit scrutiny revealed that the children studying in 39 of the 40 Madrasas test checked were actually students who attended regular schools and had regular access to modern subjects. The Secretaries of these Madrasas also admitted that all the students studying under the scheme were regular school going students.

Thus, these Madrasas were not eligible for GoI assistance under the Scheme. Even though this fact was brought to the notice of GoK in the earlier Audit Report of the C&AG of India for the period ended March 2012, the GoK had failed to take remedial action. Instead, the GoK had again sought funds from GoI in 2014-15 without ensuring that the Madrasas were fulfilling the eligibility criteria for the scheme. Audit observed that the Secretary of the Department of General Education in GoK was heading SGIAC. The SGIAC comprising of a representative of GoI, DPI, the Regional Director in the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS) and two others, failed in their duty to recommend eligible Madrasas only for GoI grants under the scheme. The SGIAC failed to conduct a detailed scrutiny of the applications received from Madrasas and forwarded these applications by treating them as eligible ones to the GoI for release of funds. An amount of ₹176.18 lakh was released to 40 Madrasas test checked, of which ₹170.93 lakh was released to 39 Madrasas which were not eligible for Grant-in-Aid under this Scheme.

As the Central Grant-in-Aid Committee (CGIAC) declined (September 2015) to fund the Madrasas in the State since they were not working as per scheme guidelines, the State Chief Minister addressed GoI (October 2015) seeking central

---

1 Kollam, Kozhikkode, Malappuram and wayanad

assistance. It was admitted in the letter that Madrasas in the State were functioning only on part time basis and on holidays, with students attending mainstream education.

Audit observed that failure of the SGIAC in recommending Madrasas for funding without adequate scrutiny has resulted in GoK irregularly obtaining ₹93.85 crore from GoI during 2010-14. This is a serious matter of non-compliance where the members of the SGIAC have direct responsibility and calls for serious action by GoK against the officers of GoK in the committee and also need to be brought to the notice of the GoI with regard to the failure of the GoI representative in the SGIAC.

GoK confirmed (December 2015) the audit findings that all the Madrasas were conducting classes on part time basis only and that it has now been decided to provide financial assistance to eligible Madrasas only.

**[Audit paragraphs 4.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 contained in the Report of Comptroller and Auditor General of India (General and Social Sector) for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015]**

**[ Notes submitted by the Government on the above audit paragraph are included as appendix II]**

#### **Excerpts from the discussion of Committee with officials concerned**

1. To a query of the Committee, the Joint Secretary, General Education Department informed the Committee that the Madrasa grant was sanctioned in 2010-11 but due to the large number of applications received, they could not be verified as per the guidelines of MHRD (Ministry of Human Resources Development) in a short period of time. The reason for the audit query was due to forwarding of applications without verification and irregularly obtaining grants from GoI. He also informed that the grant was not received since 2014-15.

2. The Committee inquired with the officials concerned whether the children were studying in Madrasas while applying for the grants. The ineligibility criteria is that children studying in Madrasas should not study in other schools, whereas in Kerala, grants were allowed even to those children studying in Madrasas as well as in other schools.

3. The Joint Secretary, General Education Department informed the Committee that the children were studying in Madrasas at the time of submission of the applications, but all of them were not eligible for the grant as per the MHRD guidelines.

4. The Committee inquired whether any action was taken against those who failed to follow the norms and whether the Madrasa grant was sanctioned without following the norms, and whether Central Government released funds to Madrasas after 2013-14.

5. The Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that the Central Government funds were received for two years. As per the Central norms, grants were released to children studying only in Madrasas. The requests for grants were made after convincing the Central Government of the fact that the subjects like Mathematics, Science, Social Science, English and Hindi were not taught in Madrasas but were taught in regular Schools, and as a result an amount of ₹93.85 crore had been released in two years. During the audit inspection in 2014-15, it was noticed that instead of providing quality education, only religious studies were being imparted in all the 39 Madrasas and that led to the audit observation.

6. He also added that about ₹80.9 crore was spent, including ₹22.67 crore received in 2010-11 and ₹58.23 crore out of ₹71.18 crore received in 2013-14. After that, no funds had been received. In our State, children went to regular schools after studying in Madrasas in the morning. It had been reported to the Central Government that the scheme was not suitable for Kerala, and the Centre had taken the decision to release grants to eligible students who receive general education only through Madrasas and no funds had been provided since 2015.

## **Conclusion/Recommendation**

### **7. No comments**

#### **4.1.4 Assistance for National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS)**

Audit noticed that only one of the 40 test checked Madrasas viz., Shamsul Ulama Islamic Academy, Puzhamudi in Wayanad district had children at senior secondary level who were registered under NIOS accreditation and were eligible for assistance under the scheme. During the period 2010-2015, though this Madrasa had spent Rupees One lakh towards admission and examination fees in respect of 49 students in connection with NIOS accreditation, no amount was obtained as reimbursement from GoI.

The Madrasa Secretary stated (October 2015) that they did not seek reimbursement as they were not informed about the reimbursement process by the DDE and other officers. GoK stated (December 2015) that the Madrasas did not claim reimbursement and that request for reimbursement would be forwarded to GoI on receipt of the same from the Madrasa.

Failure of DPI and non-constitution of State Madrasa Board to keep the Madrasas informed about the reimbursement process had resulted in deprival of benefit to the eligible Madrasa.

**[Audit paragraph 4.1.4 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (General and Social Sector) for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015]**

**[Note submitted by the Government on the above audit paragraph is included as Appendix II]**

### **Excerpts from the discussion of Committee with officials concerned**

8. The Committee inquired about the status of reimbursement from Government of India to Shamsul Ulama Islamic Academy at Puzhamudi and whether the State Madrasa Board had been constituted.

9. The Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that Rupees One lakh was not given as reimbursement to the Shamsul Ulama Islamic Academy because it was not claimed and providing the reimbursement

would be considered, only after submission of the claim for the same by the academy. The Director also informed that Madrasa Board should be constituted by the Minority Welfare Department.

### **Conclusion/Recommendation**

#### **10. No comments**

##### **4.1.5 Payment to teachers of Madrasas in violation of scheme guidelines**

The seeking and subsequent release of grants under SPQEM was ab-initio wrong. To compound matters, the payment made to Madrasa teachers were also in violation of scheme guidelines. The GoI had clarified (February 2009) that financial assistance under SPQEM would be provided to a maximum of three full time graduate or post graduate (PG)/B.Ed teachers of modern subjects depending on the availability of students in the Madrasas. As per Clause 8(a) of the Guidelines, while each full time graduate teacher was to be paid salary for 12 months at the rate of ₹6,000 per month, teachers with PG/B.Ed qualifications were to be paid ₹12,000 per month. Though the Madrasas were functioning only on part time basis, 4201 teachers in 1453 Madrasas were paid remuneration of ₹45.55 crore during 2010-15 on full time basis, which was against scheme guidelines.

GoK admitted (December 2015) the fact that the teachers were paid remuneration by reckoning that the classes were held full time. As the Government accepted the gross violation of scheme guidelines which led to payment of excess remuneration, action has to be taken against officers responsible for the same and recover the overpaid remuneration.

##### **4.1.6 Mode of payment of salary to teachers against GoI instructions**

GoI requested (July 2009) State Governments to ensure better transparency and accountability in payment of salaries to Madrasa teachers by depositing salaries of teachers in their respective bank accounts. The DPI belatedly ordered (March 2014) all DDEs to ensure payment of teachers' salaries through their bank accounts. However, based on the directions of the Education Minister of the State, the DPI revoked (May 2014) his order and released the salaries to Madrasa

authorities instead of crediting into the bank accounts of the teachers, in clear violation of scheme guidelines, though orders issued by the Education Minister in this regard were also contrary to GoI instructions.

Thus, instructions aimed at ensuring transparency and accountability were flouted. Instances of complaints regarding non-receipt of salaries by Madrasa teachers which were not acted upon by DDEs, point to the serious compromise of accountability and transparency, due to which Audit could not obtain assurance that the teachers were indeed paid their remuneration.

GoK assured (December 2015) that steps would be taken to credit the salaries of the teachers to their respective bank accounts.

**[Audit paragraphs 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (General and Social Sector) for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015]**

***[ Notes submitted by the Government on the above audit paragraphs are included as Appendix III]***

**Excerpts from the discussion of Committee with officials concerned.**

11. The Committee inquired with the officials concerned whether the salaries of Madrasa teachers were paid directly. The Director, General Education Department replied that as against the direction, the payment was made through the Madrasa Committees because most of the teachers had not maintained bank account. The part-time teachers were paid ₹6,000 and full-time teachers were paid ₹12,000. Though it was suggested to give part-time salary, full-time salary was given in many Madrasas.

12. The Committee made it clear that the term Full-time in Madrasas refers to those category who were working in the morning and evening .

### **Conclusion/Recommendation**

#### **13. No comments**

#### **4.1.7 Monitoring and evaluation**

As per Clause 21(v) of scheme guidelines, the GoI and GoK were responsible for ensuring monitoring and evaluation of scheme. The feedback on students appearing in NIOS and qualitative improvement in their achievement

was to be collected by DPI and placed before the CGIAC which was not done. DPI was to furnish the accounts of Grant-in-Aid to GoI within one year along with monitoring report regarding number of Madrasas receiving assistance, and the amount received and utilised by Madrasas. However, DPI had not furnished (December 2015) accounts of Grant-in-Aid or monitoring report to GoI. The State Madrasa Board which was an important part of the scheme, expected to monitor the modernization programme and create awareness among the children of the Muslim community about the advantages of the scheme, was not constituted.

GoK stated (December 2015) that DPI would be instructed to constitute a mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of the scheme in the State.

#### **4.1.8 Conclusion**

The SPQEM was being implemented by GoK in violation of scheme guidelines. Thirty nine of the 40 test checked Madrasas in the four districts, though not eligible to receive financial assistance from GoI under the Scheme had received the grants, as the SGIAC failed in its basic responsibility of ensuring observance of the guidelines while recommending Madrasas for Grants-in-Aid. The only Madrasa which was eligible to receive benefits under the Scheme was deprived of due financial assistance. Irregular payment of full time wages to teachers who discharged part time duty in all these Madrasas was noticed, which was against scheme guidelines. The State Madrasa Board which was expected to monitor the Madrasa Modernisation Programme and enhance awareness of the scheme had not been constituted by GoK.

**[Audit paragraphs 4.1.7 and 4.1.8 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (General and Social Sector) for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015]**

**[ Notes submitted by the Government on the above audit paragraph are included as Appendix II]**

**Excerpts from the discussion of Committee with officials concerned.**

14. To a query of the Committee, about the Monitoring and Evaluation, the Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that all the files had been transferred to the Minority Welfare Department, where the monitoring and evaluation were now being done.

### Conclusion/Recommendation

**15. The Committee views that SGIAC have failed in the scrutiny of applications received from Madrasas and in forwarding the same to GoI for release of funds under SPQEM. The Committee notes that Madrasas which are eligible to receive benefits under the scheme are deprived of financial assistance. Hence, the Committee recommends that the Minority Welfare Department should strictly monitor and evaluate the functioning of SGIAC and take adequate measures to ensure compliance of the guidelines of SPQEM.**

#### **4.5 Infertuous expenditure on construction of a temporary additional floor at Pareeksha Bhavan.**

The injudicious decision of the Director of Public Instructions to construct a temporary additional floor on the six-storeyed building of Pareeksha Bhavan and failure of the Public Works Department to rightly assess the structural soundness of the work led to partial collapse of the structure and resultant infertuous expenditure of ₹2.35crore.

The General Education Department, Government of Kerala (GoK) accorded (February 2012) Administrative Sanction (AS) to the proposal of the Director of Public Instructions (DPI) for construction of a temporary additional floor with trussed roof to accommodate a computer lab, server rooms, system manager's room, toilets etc.. on existing<sup>2</sup> six-storeyed building of Pareeksha Bhavan<sup>3</sup>, Thiruvananthapuram. Technical Sanction (TS) was accorded (March 2012) by the Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department (PWD) and the work awarded to a contractor (June 2012). The GoK also sanctioned ₹one crore (February 2012) and ₹1.96 crore (February 2013) for civil and electrical works respectively. The GoK, further sanctioned (October 2014) ₹0.13 crore to

---

2 The Pareeksha Bhavan building was constructed in 1978.

3 The Pareeksha Bhavan conducts examinations for school leaving certificates, arranges for the valuation of answer scripts, processes marks, and announces results and issues diplomas, degrees and certificates.

Electrical Division of PWD for carrying out the SITC<sup>4</sup> of Ductable Split AC unit and re-arrangement of electrical installation and providing plug sockets in the newly constructed hall to comply with SITC standards. The civil works were completed (September 2014) incurring an up to date expenditure of ₹0.97 crore. The Executive Engineer of Electrical wing PWD(EE) reported (May 2018) that electrical works and works pertaining to installation of firefighting system were completed incurring an expenditure of ₹1.38crore.

Scrutiny of records revealed that the Joint Commissioner, Pareeksha Bhavan had written (June 2016) to the DPI and PWD that despite spending sizeable funds in the last four years, the additional floor was not functional due to lack of co-ordination between the civil and electrical wings in PWD. He, therefore sought co-ordinated efforts of both wings of PWD for timely completion of work. Subsequently in the same month, a portion of the newly constructed structure including parts of the ceiling collapsed and the aluminum fabrications were blown away due to strong wind, rendering the newly constructed structure unfit for use.

The National Building Code stipulated that wind forces and their effects should be taken into account while designing buildings, structures and components. However, the approved design provided for normal wind pressure only and avoided cross ventilation which could have minimised the high wind pressure on the sixth floor. The EE stated in reply (January 2019) that the then Executive Engineer and the Superintending Engineer had discussed (September 2012) the impact of wind force on the temporary structure on the sixth floor. The reply is not tenable in view of the fact that PWD did not conduct a feasibility study to assess the structural soundness of the construction or calculate wind-load to be withstood by the building prior to according TS in March 2012.

Joint verification conducted by Audit (October 2018) along with officials of Pareeksha Bhavan revealed that the newly constructed floor still remains unfit for

---

4 Standard Industrial Trade Classification.

use. Glass panels, which made up the sidewalls, were either blown away or broken to pieces and remnants of false ceiling were seen hanging from the roof, or totally missing at some places, as seen in the photographs below.



*Picture 4.1: Sidewalls blown away and glass panels broken to pieces at Pareeksha Bhavan, 16 October 2018*



*Picture 4.2: Remnants of false ceiling hanging from the roof at Pareeksha Bhavan, 16 October 2018*

Audit observed that the Joint Commissioner, Pareeksha Bhavan had voiced his disagreement (October 2011) to the idea of a temporary structure on the sixth floor of the 33 year old building. Instead, he had suggested constructing a new building in the open space in the premises, with the allotted funds. This decision was overruled by the DPI who went ahead with the proposal of constructing a temporary additional floor on the existing building.

Thus, the injudicious decision of the DPI to construct an additional floor on the existing six-storeyed building of Pareeksha Bhavan, coupled with failure of the PWD to consider the impact of wind force while designing the structure, resulted in partial collapse of the structure and resultant infructuous expenditure of ₹2.35 crore.

The GoK replied (January 2019) that the matter was brought to the notice of the PWD by the DPI and that steps were being taken by GoK to rectify the matter.

**[Audit paragraph 4.5 contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (General and Social Sector) for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018]**

**[Note submitted by the Government on the above audit paragraph is included as Appendix II]**

**Excerpts from the discussion of Committee with officials concerned.**

16. In response to a query of the Committee, the Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that a project was submitted to construct the upper floor in Pareeksha Bhavan in a manner useful for online examinations etc. In the first phase, rupees One Crore was allotted in 2012 and the PWD (Buildings) Department spent ₹ 96,86,777 and issued utilization certificate. In 2013, ₹1.96 Crore were given to PWD (Electrical) Department for fire fighting, electrification and air conditioning and ₹25 lakh for civil work and others to PWD (Buildings) wing. The audit objection was that, the cladding of the upper part of the hall fell and was damaged by winds in 2016, after which it was not used. After discussing with PWD electrical and buildings wings, some more money had to be spent to make it usable, and the hall could not be used as there was no electrical or fire fighting system.

17. The Committee inquired whether the cladding was fallen by the wind due to constructional defect, whether permission was obtained for that work as per building rules, whether fire fighting system and lift were installed and the amount for which the administrative sanction was given.

18. The Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department informed the Committee that the said work was completed in 2014 and issued a certificate of completion, but it was not used. The false ceiling and partition in the verandah had collapsed due to the wind. A report had been requested from the Executive Engineer about it. The work of the cable duct was not done earlier due to the audit inspection. With the remaining amount of ₹25 lakh, the work of the cable duct will be done immediately, minor repair work needs to be done in AC, as it was not used. An estimate could be given for the repair work of the false ceiling and a portion of the roof. The lift had been installed up to the floor immediately

below the additional floor. The construction had been done as per the building rules of that time. The hall had been constructed for the purpose of conducting examinations. Temporary sheet was used as the roof. The A.S. of the work was ₹1 Crore and the work was completed at a cost of ₹87 lakh. The Chief Engineer also added that only a portion of the verandah had collapsed.

19. The Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that the procedures related to the Corporation would be possible and made use of the hall, only if the fire and safety water tank for fire fighting system and the duct for taking high tension connection were constructed.

20. To a comment of the Committee that no permission are given for schools with sheeted roofs. The Director, General Education Department informed that there was a false ceiling under the aluminium roof and permission would be obtained as it was an office building.

21. The Committee reminded the officials about the audit reference that as per Technical Sanction given in March 2012, the PWD did not carry out a feasibility study to estimate the wind load that the building could withstand or assess the structural strength of the work. The Committee also inquired whether those things are to be checked before issuing technical permission.

22. The Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department informed the Committee that the building had a semi-permanent roof and it had been constructed with a sloping roof considering the wind effect in Thiruvananthapuram. So, there was less chance of the roof swaying. He added that only one span of the roof had swayed, so it is not proper to say that the technical approval was given without considering the wind effect.

23. The Senior Audit Officer added to the discussion by saying that, during the site inspection in connection with the said matter, it was found that one side of the upper part had fallen off and the windows were shaking. The audit paragraph had been prepared on the basis of the report given by the Executive Engineer and Superintending Engineer of PWD.

24. In response to a query from the Committee whether the Chief Engineer had conducted site inspection, the Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department replied to the Committee that she would conduct the site inspection and submit a report.

25. The Committee directed the concerned department officials to take necessary steps to make use of the hall which was constructed for the purpose of conducting the examination.

26. The Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that the work could begin only after getting permission from the Corporation.

27. The Committee opined that there was no deliberate lapse on the part of the officials in the construction of the building. The Committee inquired about the steps taken to rectify the defect in the construction and suggested that the Director, Public Instructions and the Chief Engineer (Buildings), PWD should conduct a joint inspection and complete the work at the earliest.

28. The Director, General Education Department informed the Committee that the work was planned to be completed within the month of March.

29. The Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department assured the Committee that the estimate would be prepared for the completion of the work of the roof and windows at the earliest and after joint inspection, the work would be completed within this academic year itself.

### **Conclusions/Recommendations**

**30. The Committee directs the Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department to conduct a site inspection to verify whether the works are completed there on without any delay and submit a report to the Committee.**

**31. The Committee directs the department to take necessary steps to rectify the defects in the construction of the additional floor of the six storeyed building of Pareeksha Bhavan and to see that the hall constructed for the purpose of conducting the examination should be made functional at the earliest.**

Thiruvananthapuram  
26<sup>th</sup> June 2024.

SUNNY JOSEPH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Public Accounts.*

## APPENDIX 1

## SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATION

Sl. No.	Para No.	Department Concerned	Conclusion/ Recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	15	General Education & Minority Welfare	The Committee views that SGIAC have failed in the scrutiny of applications received from Madrasas and in forwarding the same to GoI for release of funds under SPQEM. The Committee notes that Madrasas which are eligible to receive benefits under the scheme are deprived of financial assistance. Hence, the Committee recommends that the Minority Welfare Department should strictly monitor and evaluate the functioning of SGIAC and take adequate measures to ensure compliance of the guidelines of SPQEM.
2	30	General Education & PWD	The Committee directs the Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department to conduct a site inspection to verify whether the works are completed there on without any delay and submit a report to the Committee.
3	31	General Education	The Committee directs the department to take necessary steps to rectify the defects in the construction of the additional floor of the six storeyed building of Pareeksha Bhavan and to see that the hall constructed for the purpose of conducting the examination should be made functional at the earliest.

©  
Kerala Legislature Secretariat  
2025

KERALA NIYAMASABHA PRINTING PRESS