



# Evaluation Study

No. 42

**QUICK EVALUATION REPORT  
ON THE WORKING OF  
PLANT PROTECTION TRAINING CENTRE  
HYDERABAD**

**HYDERABAD**

**WING OF  
CO-OPERATION DEPARTMENT  
ANDHRA PRADESH**

*Price : 0.75*

# QUICK EVALUATION REPORT ON THE WORKING OF THE PLANT PROTECTION TRAINING CENTRE, HYDERABAD

Sector .. Agriculture.  
Implementing Agency.. Director of Agriculture.  
Area of Operation . . . Andhra Pradesh

## INTRODUCTION :

1. With a view to ensure that resources and energies are not frittered away on a large number of schemes and in order to evolve certain broad criteria for judging the usefulness or otherwise of the schemes so that only useful schemes in each sector of development are continued, it has been decided that quick evaluation of all schemes in respect of major sectors like Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Co-operation, Industries etc. should be undertaken before they are considered for inclusion in the IV Plan. The Agriculture and Animal Husbandry sectors were selected for this purpose in the first instance. This study was accordingly launched in August, 1968. The report is based on the material collected and the discussions held with the concerned officials, beneficiaries etc.

### Origin of the Scheme :

2. On the basis of the decisions arrived at a Plant Protection conference held at New Delhi in September, 1964, it was decided that it would be necessary to have the services of a Plant Protection Specialist at the Block level in the States during the IV Plan if Plant Protection work was to be given the push and attention it deserved, that the block level Plant Protection Specialist should be earmarked solely for Plant Protection work in lieu of an additional Agricultural Extension Officer in the Block to look after Plant Protection work, and that it would be desirable to organise a 3 month in-service training course in Plant Protection work for such officials at the agricultural colleges, Universities, etc., in the States. Accordingly, the Plant Protection Adviser, Government of India in his letter No. 85-5/61-PP & L, dated 3-10-1964, while enclosing a draft syllabus for conducting a training course, requested all the Directorates of Agriculture in the country to send him their suggestions to enable him to circulate an agreed training syllabus for adoption by all the States. The Plant Protection Adviser, Government of India also requested the Directors of Agriculture to prepare and send a detailed training programme which they propose for adoption in their respective States, and that such a scheme would also indicate the advance action proposed to be taken for the IV Plan and the phasing that would be necessary during the Plan period. The draft syllabus communicated by the Government of India provided for a nine months course in Plant Protection for training Agricultural Assistant etc., and a three months course of in-service training for training Plant Protection Specialists (gazetted) who are incharge of the work at the District level.

3. The Director of Agriculture considered these proposals and forwarded his proposals in this regard to the State Government on 3-12-1964.

These proposals interalia suggested that Agricultural Assistants, Extension Officers in the Blocks may be trained for a period of 3 months only as against 9 months course suggested by Government of India since most of them are Agricultural Graduates and hence do not need elaborate training over a period of 9 months, and that officers of District level such as District Agricultural Officers, Block Development Officers etc. may be trained for 4 weeks only as against the 3 months suggested by Government of India. The additional cost involved in sanctioning the scheme was estimated at Rs. 2,47,560. As there was no provision in the Budget Estimates for 1965-66, the Government in their Memo. No. 567/FP.II/65-7, dated 26-3-66 intimated the Director of Agriculture that it was not possible to sanction the scheme and requested him to renew his proposals after some time duly indicating the sources from which the expenditure could be met. Thereupon, the Director of Agriculture with his letter Nol. Roc. PP (3) /6604/64, dated 28-5-65 submitted the proposals for creation of a Plant Protection training centre at Hyderabad. The State Government, after due consideration, issued orders in G.O. Ms. No. 2418, F. & A., dated 23-9-1965 for the creation of the Plant Protection Training Centre with necessary staff, etc. The Plant Protection training centre at Hyderabad actually came into existence in February, 1966. It is interesting to note that the Director of Agriculture instead of sending his comments on the syllabus of the Government of India and then approaching the State Government for sanction of the Training Centre, straightaway submitted his proposals to the State Government and got orders issued in the matter without receiving the agreed syllabus from the Government of India. It is thus clear that the scheme was introduced in a hurried way.

#### **Scope of the Quick Evaluation Report :**

4. This Quick Evaluation Report has not attempted to make a study of the quality content of the training imparted in the Plant Protection training institute at Hyderabad. A quick glance has only been possible at the impact of the training course. The evaluation study has been limited in scope viz., the establishment and working of the Plant Protection Training Centre, the economies possible in the operation of the scheme and the policies to be adopted broadly to ensure the optimum supply of plant protection specialists etc. at various levels during the IV Plan period.

#### **Objectives of the Scheme :**

5. The main objective of the training centre is to improve the skills of the officers and Assistants of the Agriculture and Panchayati Raj Departments and their competence in Plant Protection measures to enable them to effectively implement agricultural programmes in the State by minimising the damage to crops due to pests and diseases.

#### **Slatting Pattern :**

6. Along with the creation of the Plant Protection training centre in September, 1965 certain officers and staff were sanctioned to run the training centre. At the time of sanctioning of the further continuance of the training centre in July, 1966, the Government sanctioned the creation of certain additional posts with a view to strengthen the training centre as the need to train all Agricultural Officers and Assistants, in the latest methods of crop protection at the training centre was keenly felt. The complement of staff working at the training centre located at Hyderabad as on date with their scales of pay is given below :

## TEACHING STAFF

<i>Designation</i>	<i>No. of posts sanctioned originally</i>	<i>No. of posts sanctioned in July, 1966</i>	<i>Total No. of Posts</i>	<i>Scale of pay attached to the posts</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
				Rs.
1. Principal .. ..	1	Nil	1	600-900
2. Assistant Agricultural Engineer .. ..	Nil	1	1	350-750
3. Plant Protection Officers .. ..	1	1	2	350-750
4. Plant Protection Assistants .. ..	2	Nil	2	230-400
5. Technical Assistant .. ..	Nil	1	1	230-400
6. Engineering Supervisors .. ..	1	1	2	180-400
7. Artist .. ..	Nil	1	1	180-375
8. Mechanic Grade - II .. ..	Nil	1	1	100-135
9. Mechanic Grade - III .. ..	1	Nil	1	80-120
10. Carpenter .. ..	1	Nil	1	80-120
11. Helpers .. ..	4	2	6	70-120
	(1 post kept vacant from the beginning)			
12. Lab. Attenders .. ..	4	Nil	4	55-70
<b>OFFICE STAFF</b>				
13. Office Superintendent .. ..	1	Nil	1	180-350
14. U. D. Cs. .. ..	1	Nil	1	125-200
15. L. D. Cs. .. ..	2	Nil	2	80-150
16. Typists .. ..	1	1	2	80-150
	(1 being paid steno allowance of Rs. 15p.m)			
17. Store-keeper .. ..	1	Nil	1	80-135
18. Drivers .. ..	2	2	4	70-100
	(1 post kept in abeyance from the beginning)			
19. Peons .. ..	5	2	7	50-65
20. Watchmen .. ..	2	Nil	2	Paid from contingencies.

### Financing of the Scheme

7. It was stated that the pattern of central assistance for such schemes was 75% grant for non-recurring expenditure and 25% grant for recurring expenditure. This is therefore, not a centrally sponsored scheme but an aided scheme. The pattern of financial assistance during the IV Plan period has changed and only block loans or block grant will be given to the States. As Plant Protection schemes do not figure as centrally sponsored schemes, the entire expenditure on this scheme would have to be borne by the State. The scheme will also form part of committed expenditure at the end of the financial year, if a timely review is not taken up and a decision taken before the end of the financial year regarding the discontinuance of the scheme.

8. The Plant Protection plan of the Agricultural Department for the IV Plan period has been discussed at pages 90-91 of the 'Fourth Five Year-Plan of Andhra Pradesh-A draft outline'. An extract of the plan may be seen at Annexure-A. It may be relevant to note here that the Plan envisages the strengthening of the pesticides laboratory at Rajendranagar in the Agricultural University by adding a bio-unit at the cost of Rs. 2.8 lakhs to the existing pesticides laboratory in the University.

### Working of the Scheme

9. As stated earlier, the Plant Protection training centre at Hyderabad came into being in February, 1966 with the aim of improving the skills of officers and Assistants concerned and their competence in the Plant Protection measures. The following three different kinds of training programmes are being conducted at the centre for the present.

#### (i) Three months training Programme :

Agricultural Extension Officers and Agricultural Assistants at Block level play an important role in the stepping up of agricultural production in the State. Therefore, an intensive training for a period of 3 months is being imparted to them in the identification and control of various pests and crop diseases, the use of modern pesticides, their proximity hazards, etc. The training programme is conducted in batches of 30 each at a time.

#### (ii) Four weeks orientation training to officers :

The officers at District and Block levels such as District Agricultural Officers, Plant Protection Officers and Block Development Officers etc., have to plan and Co-ordinate various plant protection measures and also procure the required pesticides and equipment in advance and stock them at all strategic points before the commencement of every season. They should also be able to plan and organise large scale campaigns of Plant Protection measures with latest techniques for control of plant pests and diseases. For this purpose the District Agricultural Officers, Block Development Officers, etc., are being given an orientation course of weeks in Plant Protection measures. Each batch consists of 10 trainees. As a number of Agricultural production programmes are implemented by these two categories of officers at field level, important subjects like soil and water managements of crops, scope and development of commercial and horticultural crops, planning in agriculture, rural credit, etc. have been included in the syllabus of the training course,

for the benefit of these officers. The trainees, for the duration of their training, are eligible to draw 1/3 of their pay as deputation allowance in addition to the T.A. and D.A. for the journeys performed by them for the training, while the candidates deputed from Hyderabad and Secunderabad are not eligible for the said allowances.

(iii) *Short duration training course :*

Under this programme short courses of 3-10 days duration are being conducted to improve the skills of the departmental staff on specific subjects like low volume application machinery, pest control schedules for High Yielding Varieties, modern pesticides and their safe use, etc.

(i) *Expenditure incurred from inception to 1967-68 :*

10. The expenditure incurred in running the training centre from its inception till 1967-68 years-wise and category-wise is given below :—

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>
Pay and Allowances .. .. .	2,387	60,315	1,05,010
<i>Contingencies</i>			
(i) Recurring .. .. .	5,078	35,049	53,097
(ii) Non-Recurring .. .. .	1,62,055	1,31,491	48,838

(ii) *Number of batches conducted and the number trained :*

The number of batches conducted and the number of officers and Assistant trained year-wise from the inception of the training centre till 1967-68 are furnished below :

**Officers Training Programme**

Year	No. of batches conducted	No. of Agricultural Officers trained	No. of B.D.Os. trained	Total No. of Officers trained :
1965-6 .. .. .	1	8	Nil	8
1966-67 .. .. .	6	29	23	52
1967-68 .. .. .	2	5	7	12
				<u>72</u>

### Assistants Training Programme

Year			<i>No. of batches conducted</i>	<i>No. of Agricultural Assistants trained</i>	<i>No. of A.E.Os. trained</i>	<i>Total No. Assistants trained</i>
1965-66	..	..	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
1966-67	..	..	3	43	31	74
1967-68	..	..	3	47	32	79
						153

In addition to the above, 4 batches consisting of a total number of 22 Assistant Agricultural Engineers, and 62 Agricultural Engineering Supervisors were trained during 1967-68 under "Short Duration Training Course."

(iii) As the training centre came into being in February, 1966, there was no time to conduct 'Assistants Training Programme' during 1965-66 which is a course spread over a period of 3 months. Only one batch of "Officers Training Programme" was conducted during that year. The number of Officers trained was 8, as against 10 prescribed by the Government. It is interesting to note that all the officers trained belonged to the Agricultural Department only and that no Block Development Officers were trained in that particular batch. During the years of 1966-67 and 1967-68, 3 batches of trainees pertaining to the "Assistants Training Programme" were trained. However, during 1966-67 and 1967-68 only 74 and 79 Assistants respectively were trained as against 120 prescribed by the Government. In the case of "officers' training programme," only 6 and 2 batches respectively were conducted in 1966-67 and 1967-68 as against 12 that ought to have been trained. The percentage of batches trained in 1966-67 and 1967-68 in the case of "Officers training programme" works out to about 50 percent and 18 percent respectively. The percentage of batches trained is much low during 1967-68 in the case of officers training programme. The number of officers trained during 1966-67 and 1967-68 were 52 and 12 respectively, as against 60 and 20 respectively. It is thus clear that excepting in 1965-66 the year of inception of the training centre, there has been considerable under utilisation of the centre both in regard to the number of training batches conducted and the number of trainees trained during 1966-67 and 1967-68. The optimum number of trainees in any year for the 3 months and 4 week courses will be 120 officers and 120 Assistants respectively per annum. This optimum was never reached any year and the total number of officials trained so far is only 225, while the potential for the period of the institutes existence comes to about 660 officials. The working of the Training institute may be said to have fallen short of the expectations as indicated above.

(iv) From para 10 (1) above, it is seen that considerable amounts were incurred under 'Non-recurring contingencies' during 1965-66 and 1966-67 respectively mainly for purchasing tools and other equipment. During 1967-68 there was considerable reduction in this item of expenditure. Much

of this expenditure could have been avoided if the Agricultural University had been entrusted with the responsibility of training the Plant Protection personnel.

(v) *Cost of Training one candidate.*

From paras 10 (i) and (ii) above the cost of training one candidate, excluding the non-recurring expenditure works out to approximately Rs. 933 in 1965-66, Rs. 756 in 1966-67 and Rs. 1737 in 1967-68 which appears to be quite high. As the Training centre was started in the fag end of the year 1965-66 and as no Assistants Training programme was conducted during that year for want of time, there is some justification if the cost of training has gone up during that year. During 1966-67, the cost of training has gone down to Rs. 760. There would have been further reduction, in the training cost had there been no creation of certain additional posts in July, 1966. The cost of training of one candidate has gone up very high during 1967-68 as the number of candidates trained were less, and as the expenditure towards pay and allowances went up due to increase in the number of posts. As justification for the shortfall in trainees, it is reported that candidates selected for training are not being relieved by concerned Heads of Departments. As the training is not only useful to the trainees but also to the Departments concerned, strict instructions may have to be issued by the Government for immediate relief of the trainees selected for Plant Protection Training.

**Views of the Trainees**

11. With a view to find out the impressions of the trainees regarding the usefulness of the training, a few Trainees were contacted. They have emphatically stated that the training is quite useful in as much as latest developments in Plant Protection measures are being taught, that the training greatly helps in refreshing and making their knowledge up-to-date and that they are better equipped after the training to perform their duties. They have also expressed that it would be better if refresher training is imparted to all concerned in the department periodically, say, once in 3 or 4 years. They were of the view that the training that is being imparted at the centre is mostly theoretical; and hence strongly felt that the practical aspects of the training should receive greater attention in future. This self-evaluation of the trainees deserves notice. However, refresher courses are unnecessary once in three or four years, as contended by the trainees.

**Manpower Requirements**

12. It is not known on what basis the Director of Agriculture took up the scheme relating to the training of the Plant Protection staff. It would appear that proper manpower requirements and studies were not made before the planning of the training course. The Director of Agriculture should now at least prepare manpower plan for Plant Protection Officers and Plant Protection staff, with the guidance of the Manpower Wing of the Planning and Panchayati Raj Department and make projections of Demand and Supply of Plant Protection specialists needed in the State during the Fourth Plan period. Plant Protection is one of the important inputs that needs special attention, in the Package programme that is being adopted in the new strategy for the agricultural break-through in the State. This aspect of Plant Protection—both prophylactic as well as control operations to combat pests and



diseases on crops should get the highest attention in the State during the IV and V Plans. This assumes added importance in view of the fact that the State has an ambitious programme of developing an additional ayacut of 2.05 million acres of land in the Nagarjunasagar Project area. Frequent review of the manpower demand and supply of requirements would also have to be done every six months or even once a quarter by the Planning Wing of the Director of Agriculture with the technical guidance and supervision of the Manpower Wing in the Planning and Panchayati Raj Department of the State. This would be indispensable to ensure the optimum supply of Plant Protection personnel during the IV and V Plans of the State. The Training programme should then have to be planned and revised depending on the performance, and reviews of the implementation of Agricultural Plans.

#### **Training in the Agricultural University :**

13. The annual liability cost of this training centre in 1967-68 was about 2.07 lakhs. The total non-recurring expenditure incurred on the training centre so far has been about Rs. 3.42 lakhs. The question that would arise in this connection is whether all this expenditure was unavoidable and whether any other better arrangement is possible. Paras 15 (i) to 15 (xiii) of this report indicate the economies that are possible by way of reduction of staff on the assumption that the training centre should continue, under the direct control of the Agriculture Department as it is at present.

14. It is however for serious consideration whether this training should be the responsibility of the Agriculture Department at all. The Plant Protection conference of 1964 was of the view that in-service training in Plant Protection work should be imparted in Agricultural Colleges and Universities. The University has the facilities by way of staff, expertise and other facilities to take up these short term training courses. It would appear that this training work can as well be entrusted to the Agricultural University with such stipulations and administrative arrangements as are deemed fit to ensure the efficient training of the departmental Plant Protection staff. In such a case, the existing training centre being run departmentally could be closed and the expenditure on this scheme should not become committed.

#### **Economies that can be effected in the running of the Institution :**

15. In the preceding para, it has been recommended that the imparting of Plant Protection training could be transferred to the Agricultural University in the interests of efficiency and economy.

(i) In this para, the economies that can be straight away effected in the running of the Institution on the assumption that the training centre should continue with the Agriculture Department for some more time, if the recommendations made in paras 13 and 14 above are not acceptable to the Government for any reason.

(ii) *Prima facie*, the institution is overstaffed. For an institution of this kind, there was no need to press for further strengthening of staff as was done in the year 1966. The institute should have made better use of the facilities in the city area and the Agricultural University, and planned for better field

studies and guest lectures by specialists instead of going in for permanent plant protection teaching staff. The economies possible by way of reduction of staff are briefly indicated below :—

(iii) The Principal's post may be retained.

(iv) The centre has one post of Assistant Agricultural Engineer and 2 posts of Engineering Supervisors. Of these 3 posts, 1 post of Asst. Agricultural Engineer and 1 post of Engineering Supervisor were created in July, 1966 in view of the need to strengthen the centre, while the other post of the Engineering Supervisor was created in the beginning itself. Besides these, there are 2 posts of Mechanics. From the duty list given in Annexure —B, it is seen that the Assistant Agricultural Engineer is incharge of teaching, arranging practical classes, field trips pertaining to application of machinery, arranging exhibitions and preparation of charts and posters pertaining to Plant Protection equipment etc. The training centre is having one Mobile Van for field trips pertaining to the application of machinery etc., in Plant Protection equipment in the districts, Blocks etc. From Annexure-C, it is seen that 9 training camps spreading over a period of 37 days in all were conducted during 1967-68 in Hyderabad, Mahaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Sangareddy, Karimnagar, Warangal, Kurnool and Khammam district headquarters and 136 field men, 121 Kamgars, 323 V.L.Ws. 22 Engineering staff 28 Artisans and cultivators were trained. No such training camps were arranged in 1966-67. As already stated earlier, the number of batches trained is far less than the required number of batches that should have been trained. For example, if the period of one month from 5-2-68 to 4-3-68 when both the officers and Assistants were simultaneously trained is taken, the Assistant Agricultural Engineer took 11 classes in respect of officers training and 10 classes in respect of Assistants Training *i.e.*, the number of man hours the Asst. Agricultural Engineer worked in a month at the most works out to 32 hours. It is thus clear that either the number of training camps conducted in the District Headquarters or the classes he took is not much. In the case of Engineering Supervisors it is seen from the duty list at Annexure-B that one Supervisor is mainly incharge of the 4 vehicles of the Centre, log books and assisting the Assistant Agricultural Engineer in arranging field trips etc. The Mechanics and drivers in the centre can look after the vehicles and maintain the log books, etc. The other Supervisor is incharge of workshop, its maintenance, tools, equipment, Audio Visual Aids, arranging film shows, etc. On a careful examination and keeping in view the optimum needs of staff for this institution one post of Supervisor would be over and above the requirements and may be abolished.

(v) Of the two mechanics available in the centre, it is stated that one is incharge of vehicles, while the other is incharge of workshop. As the centre has only 4 vehicles and a small workshop, there is absolutely no justification to provide for 2 mechanics. One post of Mechanic Grade-III should therefore be surrendered retaining only one.

(vi) There are 2 posts of Plant Protection Officers in the scale of Rs. 350-750. Though a list of duties have been given against each post in the duty list—vide Annexure-B, their main work appears to be teaching. For one month from 5-2-68 to 4-3-68, each Plant Protection Officer took about 18 classes of which 4 pertain to practicals each with a duration of about 6 hours in respect of Officers training and about 26 classes of which 4 pertain to practical in respect of Assistants training *i.e.*, each worked for about 102 man

hours in a month *i.e.*, about 4 hours per day which is not much. The Principal should himself take up more of teaching work and the experts and specialists available in the city area can be requested to give guest lectures for the Plant Protection staff whenever necessary. The departmental officers in the Directorate should also be requested to give lectures and take up teaching for a few hours a month without accepting remuneration. On a careful examination, it would appear that one post of the Plant Protection Officer can be surrendered.

(vii) There are two posts of Plant Protection Assistants and 1 post of Technical Assistant, all in the scale of Rs. 230-400. 1 Plant Protection Assistant is incharge of the Entomological Laboratory, assisting the Plant Protection Officer concerned in all works, while the other Plant Protection Assistant is incharge of the Library, issue of books and journals, etc. The Technical Assistant is incharge of hostel utensils, maintenance of Botanical gardens etc.—*vide* Annexure-B. It is surprising to note that one Plant Protection Assistant and one Technical Assistant have been kept incharge of Library, issue of books and journals and incharge of hostel utensils etc. Instead of wasting the talents of these technical personnel, these non-technical duties can as well be entrusted to one L.D.C. in the office. Of these three posts, only one post may be retained abolishing the other two posts forthwith.

(viii) The posts of Artist and Store-keeper may be retained. The Store-keeper may also be kept incharge of hostel utensils, etc., which work was hither to look after by one Plant Protection Assistant.

(ix) One post of Office Superintendent and one post of U.D. Clerk may be retained to look after office work. Of the two posts of L.D. Clerks one is incharge of finalisation of training programmes, maintenance of Casual Leave account, stamp account, despatch etc., while the other L.D. Clerk is incharge of accounts, preparation of pay and T.A. bills, etc. As the establishment of the centre is very limited, one U.D. clerk who is incharge of establishment may not be having enough work. Hence, the U.D. Clerk may be entrusted with finalisation of training programmes, maintenance of casual leave account and stamp accounts now attended to by one L.D. Clerk and the L.D. Clerk's post abolished. The other L.D. Clerk may also be entrusted with Library work referred to in para 15 (vii) above in addition to his present work.

(x) There is one post of L.D. Steno and one post of Typist. As there is office work and the steno is attached to the principal, these two posts may be retained.

(xi) The centre had 6 posts of Helpers in the beginning. Of these, one post was converted into that of Carpenter's post in March, 1968, while one more post was kept vacant from the beginning. This clearly shows that these posts were created without taking into account the need for such Helpers. The Carpenter's post may be retained for another year and there after abolished. Out of the remaining five posts of Helpers, two posts may be abolished immediately as the work load does not justify the existence of these posts.

(xii) There are four Laboratory Attenders in the Centre—one attached to Botanical gardens, one to the Library, one to the specimen plots and the fourth one to the Laboratory in the Centre. Here again, it is not known why the Laboratory Attenders are being used for garden work, etc. Moreover,

there are no botanical gardens in the centre. On enquiry it is learnt that after the training centre is shifted to another convenient and suitable building, the institute proposes to raise a botanical garden. As the Laboratories are very small, two posts of Laboratory Attenders may be abolished immediately and only two posts retained. To look after the specimen plots, the training centre may employ gardeners if necessary, out of contingent amounts available to the institution.

(xiii) There are seven posts of peons attached to the training centre. As per the existing scale, the Principal is entitled to two Peons, the Assistant Agricultural Engineer to one Peon, the two Plant Protection Officers to one Peon and the Office to one Peon. Hence, two Peons posts are surplus. These two posts of Peons may be surrendered immediately.

(xiv) One post of Driver kept in abeyance from the beginning may be abolished permanently.

(xv) Two posts of Watchmen may be continued till the Training Centre is shifted to a suitable building. Thereafter one post may be abolished.

16. From para 10 above, it is seen that Rs. 1,62,055 and Rs. 1,20,287 and Rs. 48,838 respectively spent during 1965-66, 1966-67 and 1967-68 towards non-recurring expenditure on the centre. No amount has been spent for the construction of buildings for the institution.

17. The Centre has 4 vehicles—one of which is a van used for conducting training camps in the districts. 2 other vans are being used to take the trainees to the field for practical training. One Jeep has been earmarked to bring Invitees lecturers, etc. The trainees who were contacted to the ascertain their views about the training, have specifically stated that no practical training worth the name is being imparted in the centre. The centre should be able to manage with two vans and a jeep. One van may be surrendered to the general pool of the Agriculture Department for utilisation depending on the need in the Districts.

#### **Important Recommendations.**

18. (i) The Plant Protection Training Centre was established as an Agricultural Departmental Plan scheme in February, 1966 to provide in service training to the Plant Protection Officials of the Agricultural and Panchayati Raj Departments. Three different courses for periods of three months, four weeks and 3 to 10 days short duration are being run by the Centre. At least 120 officers and 120 Assistants should have normally received the benefit of the training course every year, but in all only 72 officers and 153 Assistants have been trained during the last 2 years and 9 months of the existence of this training centre. The maximum benefit has thus not been ensured and to this extent, the working of the training course has not measured upto expectations.

(ii) A detailed evaluation of the quality content and impact of the training course was not made in this Quick Evaluation study, but from a brief opinion poll of some of the trainees, it came out that the training has generally been useful. The trainees however wanted less stress on theoretical knowledge but more of practical and field studies. Some of them suggested that formal diplomas or certificates could be awarded to the trainees.

(iii) The training centre, it would appear, was created on an *ad hoc* basis and is being continued for the last three years as a plan scheme without properly assessing the demand and supply of Plant Protection methods in the State. Plant Protection (prophylactic Plant Protection including control;— has to get high attention in an Agricultural State such as Andhra Pradesh. The Director of Agriculture should now at least plan for his manpower requirements of trained plant protection personnel in a scientific manner, and prepare a manpower plan of such personnel for the IV and V Plans of the State. Frequent review of the manpower demand and supply needs should be made by him every six months or even once a quarter, with the technical guidance of the Manpower wing of the Planning and Panchayati Raj Department in the State. The picture of the in service training plan required for the Plant Protection personnel will then only come into sharp focus and provide the data for planning training courses in the State.

(iv) The Plant Protection conference of 1964 was of the view that inservice training in Plant Protection work should be imparted in Agricultural Colleges and Universities. As the Agricultural University has the facilities by way of staff, expertise and other facilities to take up these short term training courses, it is for consideration, whether this training should be entrusted to it with such stipulations and administrative arrangements as are deemed fit to ensure the smooth and efficient training of the Plant Protection staff. In such a case the existing training centre being run departmentally could be closed so that the expenditure on this scheme will not become committed.

(v) Certain economies are possible by way of reduction of staff, if it is finally decided that the Agricultural University may not be able to deliver the goods by way of economic and efficient training of departmental personnel. The acceptance of the recommendations made would result in saving of about Rs. 28,000 per annum.

**Remarks of the Director of Agriculture and the further remarks of Evaluation wing of Planning and Panchayati Raj Department.**

19. (i) The Director of Agriculture to whom a copy of the quick Evaluation report was sent for comments agreed with the main recommendations such as assessment of Man Power requirements, stepping up the output of trainees as at the training Centre per annum etc. He did not, however, agree for the abolition of staff, as recommended in the report. Thereupon, a meeting was held in the chambers of Joint Secretary, Food and Agriculture Department, with the representatives of the Director of Agriculture, Principal incharge etc., on 4-8-1969. All the main recommendations were agreed to at this meeting. It was also unanimously agreed to in the said meeting to abolish the following staff :

Category	No. of Posts agreed to be abolished
1. Plant Protection Assistant	1
2. Engg. Supervisors	1
3. Drivers	1
4. Lab. Attenders	1
5. Helpers	2
6. Peons	1

(ii) The Food and Agriculture Department however agreed to the retrenchment of only 1 post of peon and 1 post of Lab. Attender. The Secretary (F & A) at Secretary's level reopened the issue of abolition of staff subsequently. It is odd that a decided issue has again been reopened without basis. The reasons for our pressing the disbanding of the staff mentioned above is briefly as follows.

(iii) *Plant Protection Assistant*.—In para 15 (vii) of the report the reasons for abolition of 1 post of Plant Protection Asst., out of the two posts of Plant Protection Assistants, which the training centre has are given in details. The Director of Agriculture, while enumerating the duties allotted to them, has now stated that the non-technical duties are attended to them in addition to their technical duties. In the duty list, which was handed over by the Principal, Plant Protection Training Centre at the time of evaluating the Centre, it was specifically stated that one Assistant is incharge of library, dealing with correspondence and purchases in respect of books & Journals, issue of books and Journals to the trainees, preparation of notes on technical literature etc. The above statements are at variance with each other. It is thus clear that one Assistant is mainly incharge of non-technical work, while the other Assistant is incharge of technical work. When the technical work of the Centre is being attended to by *only one Assistant*, it is not known why one post cannot be abolished, as recommended in the report especially when the Food and Agriculture Department have agreed that the total number of personnel trained during the last 3 years is not attractive. This is therefore for consideration of the Committee.

(iv) *Engineering Supervisors*.—The reasons for recommending for the abolition of one post of Engineering Supervisor are given in detail in para 15 (iv) of the report. According to the Director of Agriculture the trainees are divided into small batches of 2 or 3 during practical sessions and each batch is given a piece of equipment for study. It is said that each Supervisor with the help of a Mechanic can handle only 3 or 4 batches and that at no time can there be less than 8 such batches and it is hence essential to have two posts of Supervisors. Here again it may be pointed out that in the duty list furnished by the Principal, Plant Protection Training incharge of maintenance of Vehicles, their log books and assisting the Assistant Agricultural Engineer in all works etc. It is therefore not clear why the Director of Agriculture now says that both the Supervisors are incharge of practicals which is at variance with the statement of the Principal, Plant Protection Training Centre. Hence, it is not clear which is correct. Even if the Director of Agriculture's contention is accepted for the moment, it is not known as to why there should be 2 posts of Supervisors since the number of persons trained in each year is far less than the targetted figure. The Assistant Agricultural Engineer can himself take up some practical classes with the help of the Mechanic. It is relevant here to note that the training camps conducted during 1967-68 a whole year was only 37 days in all. The kind of practical training given to the trainees by way of demonstration and operation of elementary equipment such as sprayers, dusters is of the most, rudimentary kind and a second post of engineering supervisor is totally unnecessary. Hence, one post of Engineering Supervisor can be abolished, as recommended in the report. The State Evaluation Committee may kindly consider this.

(v) *Drivers*.—The Training Centre has got 4 Vehicles and 4 drivers posts from the beginning. Of these 4 posts of drivers, 1 post was kept in abeyance from the beginning. When the centre has been managing with 3 posts of

drivers only from its inception by keeping one post in abeyance, it is beyond one's comprehension as to why one post cannot be abolished. The State Evaluation Committee may therefore consider disbanding of this post.

(vi) *Helpers.*—The Training Centre had 6 posts of Helpers in the beginning. Of these, 1 post was converted into Carpenter's post in March 1968, while one more post is kept vacant from the beginning. It was recommended in the report that the Carpenter's post may be retained for another year and that out of the remaining 5 posts, 2 posts may be abolished. The Director of Agriculture says that 2 Helpers for workshop ; 2 Helpers for practical classes and 2 Helpers for field practice are essential. As the Centre has got 2 Mechanics for the workshop and practical classes which are limited, the Evaluation Wing is of the opinion that of the 5 posts of Helpers, 2 posts can be abolished without any difficulty as recommended in the report. Actually there is no case for having permanent helpers as in the Plant Protection Training Centre and it should be possible to manage with labour paid out of contingencies during special work load seasons. However keeping the need for continuity and development of skills, the retention of four helpers has been reluctantly agreed to. The additional posts of two *helpers* are not at all necessary and may be done away with.

20. Strictly speaking work study is also a part of Evaluation, and experience during evaluation has been that the departments are highly allergic to any cut in staff however reasonable and that the greatest resistance is for retention of posts such as superfluous helpers, peons, drivers etc.

21. The State Evaluation Committee at its 33rd meeting held on 23-1-1970 considered the Quick evaluation report on the working of Plant Protection Training Centre, Hyderabad and decided that the report should be sent to the concerned departments for examination and such action as they deem necessary.

## ANNEXURE A

Extract from Fourth Five-Year Plan Andhra Pradesh—A draft outline :

16. The importance of Plant Protection in Agricultural production need not be over emphasised. The outlay on Plant Protection measures will be Rs. 174.04 lakhs in the Plan. This outlay will be utilised on the following schemes :

		(Rs. in lakhs)
1.	Control of Pests and Diseases of crops .. .. .	151.00
2.	Establishment of Laboratories for testing pesticides at Rajendranagar .. .. .	4.20
3.	Epidemic control of crop pests and diseases including aerial sprayings .. .. .	18.84
	Total .. .. .	<u>174.04</u>

(i) Control of Pests and Diseases of crops :

Prohylatic as well as control operations to combat pests and diseases on crops will be intensified. During 1966-67, 88.5 lakh acres were given protection against pests and diseases and the coverage during 1967-68 was 91.00 lakh acres. This programme will be intensified and 350.62 lakh acres will be covered during the Fourth Plan as suggested by the Government of India. The strategy to be followed includes supply of adequate quantities of pesticides required in the States and providing full Plant Protection measures to crops. For this purpose mobile Plant Protection squads are being increased in the districts of the State. Some of the important schemes under this programme are briefly indicated below :

(i) Strengthening of the Pesticides Laboratory at Rajendranagar :

Quality control of pesticides to be used is very necessary. To ensure this a bio-testing unit is being added to the existing pesticide testing laboratory at Rajendranagar at a cost of Rs. 2.8 lakhs.

(ii) Mobile Plant Protection Squad :

At present there is only one Moible Plant Protection Squad in each district. It is proposed to add one more squard to each of the twenty districts in the State at a cost of Rs. 35.00 lakhs to improve efficiency and services to be made available to agriculturists.

(iii) Pilot Project on Package of Plant Protection Practices for High Yielding Varieties :

A Pilot Project for adoption and extension of Package of Plant Protection practices for High Yielding varieties is proposed at a cost of Rs. 10.00 lakhs.

(iv) Community Spraying, Etc.

Community spraying is becoming increasingly popular in the State. Andhra Pradesh has vast tracts where groundnut and paddy are grown each year. There is therefore need for community or aerial spraying to combat pests and diseases.



## ANNEXURE—B

## Duties of the Officials of the Plant Protection Training Centre, Hyderabad

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of the Post</i>	<i>Scale of Pay</i>	<i>Duties and Responsibilities</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		<i>Rs.</i>	
1.	Principal	600—900	Head of the Institute. Supervision, Administration and teaching.
2.	Assistant Agricultural Engineer	350—700	Teaching, arranging practical classes, Field trips pertaining to application of machinery, arranging exhibitions and shows, preparation of charts and posters pertaining of Plant Protection Equipment, maintenance of Workshop, Machinery, vehicles, Office building, furniture and conducting training and servicing programmes in the districts on Plant Protection Equipment and its maintenance. Incharge of Office Administration, control over Engineering and Ministerial staff, maintenance of stock registers incharge of stores and other equipment etc.
3.	Plant Protection Officer-I.	350—700	Teaching, arranging practical classes, field trips on crop pests and bilding up Entomolog cal Laboratory and its maintenance, purchase of laboratory equipment, Audio visual aids, books and journals. Incharge of library. Incharge of maintenance of Ornamental garden, incharge of stores, pesticides, procuring samples of all pres-ticides and their technical literature. Preparation of charts, posters, Flannel graphs in respect of Pests, arranging special lectures.
4.	Plant Protection Officer-II.	350—700	Teaching, arranging practical classes, field etc. on crop diseases and building up Plant Protection Pathological Laboratory, preparation of charts, posters, flannel graphs, exhibits etc, maintenance of class room, incharge of hostel, mess, its furniture and kitchen utensils, welfare for the trainees and indoor and outdoor games etc.
5.	Plant Pro-tecttion Assistant-I.	230—400	Incharge of Entomological Laboratory, Assist-ing the Plant Protection Officer (Entomology) in all works, collecting specimen crops of pests assisting and guiding the trainees in their practical classes,

## ANNEXUR B—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	Name of the Post	Scale of Pay	Duties and Responsibilities
		Rs.	
6.	Plant Protection Assistant-II.	230-400	Incharge of the Library dealing correspondence and purchases in respect of books and journals arranging books and journals as per Index, issue of books and journals to the trainees, preparation of notes on technical literature etc.
7.	Technical Assistant	230-400	Incharge of the hostel utensils, maintenance of Botanical garden specimen crops of the training centre. Preparation of notes and assisting the Plant Protection Officer in all works connected with the Plant Pathology.
8.	Agricultural Engineering Supervisor-I	180-400	Incharge of maintenance of vehicles, log books and assisting the Assistant Agricultural Engineer in all works, and training programmes in districts on Plant Protection Equipment.
9.	Agricultural Engineering Supervisor-II	180-400	Incharge of workshop, its maintenance Incharge of workshop tools, equipment, Audio visual aids, preparation of charts and posters pertaining to Plant Protection Equipment. Arranging Film shows, incharge of water and electricity, facilities of the building, preparation of sketches and estimates of non-standard items of furniture and its manufacture etc.
10.	Artist	180-375	Incharge of darkroom, preparation of charts posters of crops on pests and diseases, drawings of cut models etc.
11.	Superintendent	180-400	Incharge of Office and Supervision and control of Ministerial staff. Maintenance of Cash Book, guiding the staff, maintenance of cleanliness of Office. Checking of Personnel Registers run on notes, promptness in Office correspondence, proper check over staff and their day to day turnover of work etc.
12.	U. D. Clerk	125-200	Incharge of Establishment section, dealing with all establishment matters pertaining to Gazetted Officers, Assistants, Engineering Staff, Laboratory Attenders, Peons and Ministerial Staff, posting and transfers, disciplinary cases, pension cases, securities, Maintenance of Service Registers, securities, Maintenance of Service Registers, leave cases, office order book, Stock Files, Periodicals and correspondence or purchase of books and journals, etc.

## ANNEXURE B—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	Name of the Post	Scale of Pay	Duties and Responsibilities
		Rs.	
13.	L.D. Clerk-I	80-150	Incharge of all accounts matters, preparation of Pay and Travelling Allowance Bills of Officers and Staff maintenance of contingent bills, Security Deposit, Festival Advance, G.P.F., Stationery Stock Registers. Incharge of records, preparation of Budget statements, Periodicals, Details Contingent bills, audit, etc.
14.	L.D. Clerk-II	80-150	Incharge of all Correspondence pertaining to Training Programmes. Maintenance of Casual Leave account, Stamp account, Despatch and Registration of Tappals.
15.	Typist	80-150	All Typing Work.
16.	Steno-Typist Spl. Pay	80-150 Rs. 15	Taking dictations of the Officers and typing lecture notes.
17.	Store-keeper	80-135	Incharge of Stores, and purchases, maintenance of Stock Registers, Stock Files etc.
18.	Mechanic Grade-II	100-135	Incharge of Workshop.
19.	Mechanic Grade-III	80-120	Incharge of Vehicles.
20.	Helpers (5)	70-100	..
21.	Carpenter	80-120	..
22.	Drivers (4)	70-100	..
23.	Laboratory Attender	60-80	Attached to Botanical Garden of the Training Centre.
24.	Lab. Attender.	60-80	Attached to Library.
25.	Lab. Attender.	60-80	Attached to Specimen Plots
26.	Lab. Attender.	60-80	Attached to Laboratory.
27.	Peons (7)	50-65	..
28.	Watchman (2)	99	Paid from Contingencies.

## ANNEXURE—C

## Training Camps at the District Headquarters during 1967-68 (3 to 6 days)

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of the District</i>	<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Fieldmen men</i>	<i>Kam-gars</i>	<i>V.L. Ws.</i>	<i>Engin- neering Staff</i>	<i>Arti- sians &amp; culti- vators</i>	<i>Total</i>
1.	Hyderabad	12-7-67	18-7-67	15	16	..	..	..	31
2.	Hyderabad	21-7-67	28-7-68	19	16	..	..	..	35
3.	Mahaboob-nagar.	21-8-67	23-8-67	16	11	14	5	..	46
4.	Nalgonda ..	29-8-67	31-8-67	13	9	10	3	1	36
5.	Sangareddy..	8-9-67	10-9-67	10	12	6	..	15	45
6.	Karimnagar	23-9-67	25-9-67	11	2	30	..	..	43
7.	Warangal ..	20-10-67	23-10-67	26	21	122	4	..	173
8.	Kurnool ..	5-2-68	7-2-68	10	9	128	8	8	163
9.	Khammam	27-2-68	29-2 68	16	25	11	2	4	68
<b>Total ..</b>				<b>136</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>630</b>

**PRINTED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PRINTING AND STATIONERY AT THE  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT PRESS (C), MINT COMPOUND,  
HYDERABAD-A.P —1971.**