



4th HALF YEARLY MONITORING REPORT OF MDM FOR THE STATE OF MIZORAM

**Period:
1st April 2011 to 30th September 2012**

Districts Covered
1. Lunglei
2. Serchhip

**Nodal Officer:
Prof.R.P.Vadhera**

**Department of Education, Mizoram University,
Aizawl**

4th Half Yearly Monitoring Report of Mizoram University on MDM for the State of Mizoram (Period of 1st April 2012 to 30th September 2012)

1. General Information

Sl No	Information	Details																							
1.	Name of the Monitoring Institute	Mizoram University																							
2.	Period of the report	1 st April, 2012 to 31 st September, 2012																							
3.	Fund Released for the period	75% of the funds released for the period 1 st October, 2011 to 30 th September, 2012																							
4.	No. of Districts allotted	2 (Two) Districts																							
5.	Name of Districts Covered	1.Lunglei 2.Serchhip																							
6.	Dates of visit to the Districts / Schools	<p><u>1.Lunglei District:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>First team</u> consisting of 4 members visited the District/Sample schools from 16th to 21st July, 2012.</p> <p>(b) <u>Second team</u> consisting of 5 members visited the District/Sample schools from 16th to 21st July, 2012.</p> <p><u>2.Serchhip District:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>First team</u> consisting of 5 members visited the District/Sample schools from 13th to 17th August 2012.</p> <p>(b) <u>Second team</u> consisting of 5 members visited the District/Sample schools from 13th to 17th August 2012.</p> <p>Note: The remaining mandays were used for the development of (i) Master tables, (ii) data entry tables, (iii) data analysis, (iv) visit to SPD's office etc.</p>																							
7.	Number of elementary schools monitored	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Lunglei</th> <th>Serchhip</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Primary</td> <td>20</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Upper Primary</td> <td>20</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>40</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Lunglei	Serchhip	Primary	20	17	Upper Primary	20	23	Total	40	40											
Category	Lunglei	Serchhip																							
Primary	20	17																							
Upper Primary	20	23																							
Total	40	40																							
8.	Types of school visited	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Types of school visited</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Sr. No</th> <th>Types of school visited</th> <th>Lunglei</th> <th>Serchhip</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>Special training centers (Residential)</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>Special training centers (Non</td> <td>Nil</td> <td>Nil</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Types of school visited					Sr. No	Types of school visited	Lunglei	Serchhip		a	Special training centers (Residential)	1	2		b	Special training centers (Non	Nil	Nil	
Types of school visited																									
Sr. No	Types of school visited	Lunglei	Serchhip																						
a	Special training centers (Residential)	1	2																						
b	Special training centers (Non	Nil	Nil																						

			Residential)		
		c	Schools in Urban Areas	16	21
		d	School sanctioned with Civil Works	8	8
		e	School from NPEGEL Blocks	6	-
		f	Schools having CWSN	7	12
		g	School covered under CAL	7	10
		h	KGBVs	1	No KGBV
9.	Number of schools visited by Nodal Officer of the Monitoring Institute	20 Schools (20 Schools in Lunglei District and 20 Schools in Serchhip District)			
10.	Whether the draft report has been shared with the State Nodal Officer, MDM : YES / NO	YES			
11.	After submission of the draft report to the State Nodal Officer, MDM whether the MI has received any comments from the SPO: YES / No	YES			
12.	Before sending the reports to the GOI whether the MI has shared the report with State Nodal Officer, MDM	YES			

14. **Details regarding discussion held with state official:** A draft copy of the Monitoring Report was submitted to the State Nodal Officer (MDM), Govt. of Mizoram, 8th October 2012 for perusal and comments, and major field observations were shared in a face to face meeting with the State Nodal Officer (MDM) and other officials on 11th December 2012. The State Nodal Office was satisfied with the report and thus made no separate comments on the report.

15. **Selection Criteria for Schools:** As Per the TOR, 2010-2012, For details see Item No. 9

16. **Items to be attached with the report:**

- a) List of Schools with DISE code visited by MI.: **Enclosed**
- b) Name, Designations & address of persons contacted.
- c) Copy of Office order, notification etc. discussed in the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(Mid Day Meal)

A. LUNGLEI DISTRICT

District 1 (Lunglei)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. As per verification of records relating to MDM, and information given by teachers and students 100% of the sample schools from the district under reference served hot cooked meal on daily basis.2. The supply of food grains to schools in the state is done on quarterly basis, which was by and large regular.3. Buffer Stock of 1 (one) month's requirement was maintained by 55% of the sample schools (22) visited by MI.4. All the schools reported that foodgrain was not delivered to the schools. The schools had to make their own arrangement for picking of the foodgrains from retailer.5. None of the sample schools had ever received cooking cost for MDM in advance. In fact, at the time of the MI's visit, Cooking Cost was received upto the month of March 2012 only.6. None of the sample schools had ever prepared roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.7. As there was irregularity in the receipt of cooking cost, all the schools reported that they had to either purchase the required ingredients on credit by paying higher price or have to use funds from other resources.8. No discrimination was observed by the MI, nor was it reported by the teachers and students, on the basis of gender or caste in cooking and serving of MDM.10. The daily menu in majority of the sample schools was mainly rice preparation with dal or potato. At the same time, nutrela, seasonal vegetables, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs were also served occasionally.11. Only 2.5% (1) of the schools had displayed weekly menu for MDM in the sample schools visited.12. All the sample schools have been provided with the required number of cooks as per Govt. of India norms. Schools with larger enrollments have been provided with more cooks.
---------------------------------	--

13. Responses of the teachers and students revealed that in all the sample schools variety of foods as far as possible were served. The menu comprised mainly rice with dal/potatoes; pumpkin, nutrela, seasonal green vegetables and eggs were occasionally served to students in some of the schools.

14. An interaction with the children on the day of visit revealed that all the children were happy and satisfied with the quantity and quality of MDM served to them in schools.

15. All the sample schools had cooks specifically appointed for MDM service.

16. None of the sample schools had engaged SHG or NGO or contractors for cooking or serving of MDM.

17. In every sample schools cooks were paid remuneration of Rs.1500/- per month.

18. Remuneration to all cooks in the sample schools was paid quarterly, not monthly.

19. More than 70% of the cooks in the sample schools were female and all of them belonged to ST category.

20. Kitchen sheds – cum – store for MDM service was constructed in 100% of the schools visited by MI.

21. 72.5% (29) of the schools had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose.

22. 77.5% (31) of the sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM.

23. For cooking purposes, 77.5% (31) were using only firewood while 37.5% (15) were using both firewood and LPG for cooking of the MDM.

24. The process of cooking and storage of fuel is found to be safe in 77.5% (31) of sample schools whereas it was not safe in rest of the schools.

25. It was found that discipline and order is maintained by 100% of the sample schools with children while taking MDM.

26. 72.5% (29) of the schools reported that participation of parents in supervision and management was fair and while 27.5% (11) schools reported poor performance.

27. Participation of members of VECs in the inspection and supervision of MDM was good in only in 5% (2), fair in 82.5% (33) and poor in 12.5% (5) of the sample schools.

28. None of the sample schools maintained health cards/registers for their

	<p>students. Micronutrients such as Iron and folic acid, were given to children by 25% (10) of the sample schools only.</p> <p>29. As per the information received from the teachers of the sample schools 90% (36) of the sample schools were never monitored by State Level Officers. At the same time 10% (4) reported that they were rarely inspected by the State Level Officers.</p> <p>30. 90% (36) of sample schools reported that they had never been inspected by District Level Officers in relation to MDM while 10% (4) reported that the visit was very rare.</p> <p>31. Block Level Officers, as reported by 72.5% (29) headmasters of sample schools, had never visited them for inspection and monitoring of MDM. At the same time, 27.5% (11) said that such visits were rare.</p> <p>32. Frequent inspection of MDM service was done by Circle Level Officer in 10% (4) of the sample schools.</p> <p>33. As per the inputs received from 50% (20) of the headmasters and teachers of the sample schools, the introduction of MDM has improved the enrollment. In 90% (36) of the schools, there was an improvement in attendance as a result of MDM while as many as 100% (40) reported an improvement in the nutritional status of the children.</p> <p>34. Other incidental benefits of MDM reported by few schools were :</p> <p>a) Poor parents feel relieved from spending money for the Tiffin of their children.</p> <p>b) Teachers of all sample schools reported that children become more active with the serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.</p> <p>35. Health Check – up for students was not done by 17.5% (7) of the schools. At the same time, even the schools that reported to have done so did it only once last year.</p>
--	--

B. SERCHHIP DISTRICT

	<p>1. 100% of the sample schools from the district under reference served hot cooked meal on daily basis.</p> <p>2. The supply of food grains to schools in the state as a whole is done on quarterly not monthly.</p> <p>3. The spot verification of the sample schools showed that 80% (32) of the schools were maintaining buffer stock of one month's requirement for MDM.</p> <p>4. All the schools (100%) reported that food grain was not delivered at school.</p>
--	---

<p>District 2 : (Serchhip)</p>	<p>They also reported that food grains had to be transported from the retailer shop by hiring of vehicles.</p> <p>5. Cooking cost for MDM was not received in advance by any of the sample schools in Serchhip district. As a result of this, the schools had to purchase the required ingredients on credit and sometimes have to use funds from other resources.</p> <p>6. There was no case of discrimination on the basis of gender or caste in cooking and serving of MDM.</p> <p>7. The daily menu in all (100%) of sample schools include rice preparation with dal, nutreala, green leaves, potatoes, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin, eggs (occasionally) and tin fish (in some schools).</p> <p>8. Only 10% (4) of the sample schools in the district had displayed the weekly menu for MDM and 2 schools were able to adhere to the menu displayed.</p> <p>9. All sample schools have been provided at least 2 cooks. Schools with large enrollments have been provided with more cooks.</p> <p>10. Responses of the teachers and students revealed that all (100%) of the sample schools served a variety of food.</p> <p>11. All children (100%) from the sample schools expressed their happiness and satisfaction with the quantity and quality of food served in MDM.</p> <p>12. None of the sample schools had ever engaged any SHG or NGO or contractors for the cooking of MDM.</p> <p>13. All sample schools have the required number of cooks as per the norms of GOI. The number of cooks increased with students' enrolment.</p> <p>14. Food for MDM in all of the 40 sample schools is cooked and served by the cooks appointed for this purpose.</p> <p>15. The remuneration of the cooks was Rs.1500/- per month.</p> <p>16. Remuneration to all cooks in the sample schools was paid on a quarterly basis and not monthly.</p> <p>17. In terms of gender composition, almost all cooks, except a negligible percentage were female, and all the cooks in the sample schools belong to ST category as well as religious minority (Christian).</p> <p>18. 100% of the sample schools had constructed and were using their Kitchen sheds for MDM service.</p> <p>19. 100% of 40 sample schools from the district had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose. It was pleasing to know that a large majority of the</p>
---	--

	<p>sample schools (28) had PHE connection for water that is considered to be relatively safe for cooking and drinking.</p> <p>20. 65% of the sample schools were using only firewood and 35% (14) were using both LPG and firewood for cooking of MDM.</p> <p>21. The spot verification by MI revealed that the process of cooking and storage of fuel is safe only in 17.5% (7) of sample schools whereas it was not safe in rest of the schools.</p> <p>22. The students of all the sample schools (100%) were well disciplined and order was maintained by children while taking MDM.</p> <p>23. Participation of parents in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision is fair in only 20% (8) and poor in as many as 80% (32) of the sample schools.</p> <p>24. Participation of members of VECs in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision is good in 5% (2), fair in 15% (6) and poor in 80% (32) of sample schools.</p> <p>25. None of the 40 sample schools has ever prepared any roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.</p> <p>26. As per the report of the Headmasters of the sample schools and a spot verification, it was found that only 10% (4) of sample schools maintained health cards/registers for each child, and the remaining 90% (36) of sample schools did not maintain health record of children in any form.</p> <p>27. Micronutrients such as Iron, folic acid, vitamin-A and de-worming medicines were not given to any children of the sample schools visited by MI.</p> <p>28. 92.5% (37) the sample schools reported that their MDM programme was never monitored by State Level Officers while the remaining schools reported that the visit of State Level Officers was very rare.</p> <p>29. 35% (14) of headmasters of sample schools reported that District Level Officers have never visited their school for monitoring of MDM, whereas 65% (36) reported that the visit of district Level Officers was very rare.</p> <p>30. As many as 67.5% (27) of the headmasters of sample schools responded that they have never been inspected by Block Level Officer, whereas 32.5% (13) reported that their visits were very rare.</p> <p>31. It is pleasing to report that all the 100% of sample schools, as reported by their headmasters/teachers, were frequently inspected and monitored by their cluster level officers.</p> <p>32. 47.5% (19) of the headmasters reported positive effect of MDM on students' enrollment, and the remaining 52.5% (21) were not sure about its</p>
--	--

impact on enrollment.

33. 92.5% (37) of the headmasters reported positive effect of MDM on students' attendance, and the remaining 7.5% (3) were not sure about its impact on attendance.

34. 100% of the headmasters reported positive effect of MDM on students general well being and nutritional status of their students.

35. Other incidental benefits of MDM reported by few schools were :

a) Improves energy level of children and keep them active.

b) Poor parents feel happy as they do not have to pay for the Tiffin of their children.

36. 42.5% (17) of sample schools reported that they did not organize regular health check-up of their students, whereas 5% (2) of sample schools claimed to have done it on monthly basis, 2.5% (1) on quarterly basis, 7.5% (3) on half yearly basis and 42.5% (17) on yearly basis.

MDM MONITORING REPORT (LUNGLEI DISTRICT)

A. At School Level

1.	<p>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL :</p> <p>I) Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</p> <p>After interacting with the headmasters, teachers, students, cook and VEC/SMC present on the day of visit to the schools, and verification MDM registers, the MI were pleased to find that all 100% (40) of sample schools, despite delays in the supply of food grains, were serving hot cooked food on daily basis. To maintain daily service of MDM, some schools had to purchase the food grain from the market, or borrowed from the retailers/shopkeeper. Groceries were almost always purchased on credit due to late receipt of cooking cost.</p>																					
2.	<p>TRENDS :</p> <p>Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 70%;">Details</th> <th style="width: 20%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i</td> <td>Enrollment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2539</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2539</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iii</td> <td>No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2268</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2539</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2268</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM on the previous day</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2159</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>** Since all enrolled students in Mizoram opt for MDM, therefore, many sample school don't maintain MDM attendance register on day to day basis. This figure has been worked on the basis of student attendance registers.</i></p>	No.	Details		i	Enrollment	2539	ii	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	2539	iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	2268	iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2539	v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	2268	vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	2159
No.	Details																					
i	Enrollment	2539																				
ii	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	2539																				
iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	2268																				
iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2539																				
v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	2268																				
vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	2159																				
3	<p>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAINS TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</p> <p>i) Is school/implementing agency receiving food grain regularly? If there is delay in delivering food grains, what is the extent of delay and reasons for the same?</p> <p>The supply of food grains to schools in the state is done on quarterly not monthly basis, which is by and large regular.</p> <p>ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement maintained?</p>																					

	<p>At the time of visit of members of MI, 55% (22) sample schools were having buffer stock of rice for one month.</p> <p>iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</p> <p>All the sample schools (100%) reported that food grains was not delivered at the school. As such, the schools have to transport their food grain from the retailer shop.</p> <p>iv) Is the quality of food grain good?</p> <p>The spot verification of MI revealed that the quality of food grain in stock, at the time of visit was good. However, when the headmasters/teachers were asked about the quality of food grains (rice) received by school, 47.5% (19) of them reported it to be good quality and the remaining 52.5% (21) reported it to be of an average quality.</p>
4	<p>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING COOKING COST TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</p> <p>i) Is school/implementing agency received cooking cost in advance regularly? If there is delay in delivering cooking cost what is the extent of delay and reasons for it?</p> <p>None of the sample schools have ever received the cooking cost in advance. Like the food grains the cooking cost is released to the schools on quarterly basis not monthly and that too not in advance. At the time of visit of MI which was in July, the cooking cost received was upto March 2012.</p> <p>ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</p> <p>In view of the non release of cooking cost in advance, schools have to either purchase the required ingredients on credit, sometimes by paying higher cost or have to use funds from other resources.</p> <p>iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</p> <p>The cooking cost, as and when received by the VEC/SMC, is paid to the school, by the concerned VEC/SMC, in cash.</p>

5	<p>SOCIAL EQUITY :</p> <p>i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements?</p> <p>The MI observers did not observe any gender or caste (not relevant as there is no caste system in Mizo Society) or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements related to MDM.</p> <p>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</p> <p>In majority of the sample schools, food is served by the cooks supervised by the teacher in charge. In some schools where there are larger numbers of students, the teachers used to help in the distribution of food. Students form queues in front of the kitchen and after taking their food move to their respective classrooms in 36 schools (90%), 20% (8) eat in school verandah or school compound and 5% (2) eat in the dining hall. The order and discipline maintained by children taking MDM in all sample schools was appreciable.</p>
6	<p>VARIETY OF MENU :</p> <p>i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed?</p> <p>Only 2.5% (1) of the 40 sample schools in the district had displayed its weekly menu in the school premises, which, as per their report, they were following.</p> <p>ii) Who decides the menu?</p> <p>The day-to-day menu in 92.5% (37) of sample schools was decided solely by the teacher in-charge of MDM, and in the remaining 7.5% (3) it was decided by the school headmaster.</p>
	<p>iii) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily ?</p> <p>After spot verification of records related to MDM, discussions with the teacher in-charge MDM, Headmaster and interaction with children of the sample schools, it was found that all the sample schools (100%) serve a variety of food such as nutrela, green leaves, dal, potatoes, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs(occasionally).</p> <p>iv) Does the daily menu include rice/wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?</p> <p>The daily menu in all the 40 sample schools (100%) included rice preparation with dal, potatoes, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs (occasionally).</p>

7	<p>QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL :</p> <p>Feedback from children on quality and quantity of meal (If children were not happy please give reasons and suggestions to improve.)</p> <p>After interacting with the students in all sample schools and asking them about the quality and quantity of food served to them in MDM, the MI observers found that children were happy and satisfied with the quality and quantity of food served. When asked about their suggestion for improvement, some of them suggested that they would like it more if items like non-vegetarian items could be served more frequently.</p>
	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY :</p> <p>i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child?</p> <p>The MI team were surprised to find that only 5% (2) of sample schools maintained health cards/registers for each child, and the remaining 95% (38) of sample schools did not maintain health record of children in any form.</p> <p>ii) What is the frequency of health check-up?</p> <p>a) Monthly Health Check-up: None of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted monthly health check-up of children.</p> <p>b) Quarterly Health Check-up: Out of the 40 sample schools, only 2.5% (1) reported to have conducted health check-up of children on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>c) Half Yearly Health Check-up: Only 8 (20%), out of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted the health check-up of children on half yearly basis.</p> <p>d) Annual Health Check-up: 60% (24) of sample schools, as reported by their headmasters have conducted the health check-up of children on yearly basis.</p> <p>e) No health Check-up: It was disappointing to learn that as many as 17.5% (7) of sample schools did not organize any programme for the health check-up of children.</p> <p>iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin-A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically.</p> <p>a) Iron: Only 25% (10) of sample schools reported that they have given Iron tablets to their children.</p> <p>b) Folic Acid: It was given to children only by 5% (2) of sample schools.</p> <p>c) Vitamin A dosage and De-worming medicines: 10% (4) of the schools had given Vitamin dosage and none of the schools had given De-worming</p>

	<p>medicines to their students.</p> <p>iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</p> <p>As reported by the headmaster and teachers, the aforesaid micronutrients in the schools that reported to have given such micronutrients, were administered by teachers themselves in 3 schools, by a nurse in health sub-centres in 7 schools and by health workers in 2 schools.</p>
9	<p>STATUS OF COOKS :</p> <p>i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/NGO/Contractor)</p> <p>Food for MDM in all of the 40 (100%) sample schools was cooked and served by the cooks appointed for this purpose. None of the sample schools has ever engaged any NGO/SHG/Contractor for this purpose.</p> <p>ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms?</p> <p>The number of cooks engaged in the schools visited by MI was as per the norms of GOI. Schools having 25 or less than that were given 1 cook while those with more than 25 but less than 100 were given 2 cooks. Schools having more than 100 students but less than 200 were given 3 cooks. The number of cooks was increased accordingly.</p> <p>iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</p> <p>There were no helpers in any of the sample schools as all of them have been promoted as cooks from My 2010. All cooks in sample schools were paid a remuneration of Rs.1500/-pm in cash.</p> <p>iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helper regular?</p> <p>The remuneration paid to the cooks was not regular. All of the cooks in sample schools reported that they do not get their remuneration on monthly basis as it was always released quarterly along with the conversion cost. At the time of MI visit, the last remuneration received by the cooks was up to the month of March 2012.</p> <p>v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers?(SC/ST/OBC/Minority)</p> <p>All of the cooks in all sample schools were Scheduled Tribe. None of these cooks belonged to SC or OBC.</p>

INFRASTRUCTURE:**i) Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store constructed and in use?**

100% (40) of sample schools have constructed their kitchen shed and were using it for cooking and service of MDM as well as the storage of food grain and other materials relating to MDM, including and service utensils. Majority of the kitchen sheds were partially pucca with tin roof.

ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed MDM/SSA/Others.

Kitchen shed in the sample schools have been constructed under the SSA scheme.

iii) Kitchen shed constructed but not in use (Reason for not using)

The MI team, on their visit to Lunglei district did not find any kitchen shed constructed, but not in use.

iv) Kitchen shed under construction

There was no kitchen shed under construction in the sample schools visited by MI and all sample schools which had been sanctioned Kitchen Shed had constructed their kitchen shed and were using the same for MDM service.

v) Kitchen shed Sanctioned, but construction not started

There was no case of kitchen shed sanctioned but construction not started in the sample schools visited in Lunglei district.

vi) Kitchen shed not sanctioned

There was no case of kitchen shed not sanctioned in Lunglei district since all the sample schools had already been sanctioned Kitchen shed.

vii) In case the pucca kitchen shed is not available, where is the food being cooked and where the food grains/other ingredients are being stored.

The entire 40 sample schools had their pucca/partially pucca kitchen shed and were using it for cooking and storage of food grains and other materials relating to MDM including cooking and service utensils.

viii) Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?

29 of the sample schools from the district (72.5%) had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose and had PHE connection for water that is considered to be relatively safe for cooking and drinking. The remaining 12.5% (5) of sample schools were solely dependent on rain water harvesting.

ix) Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If available is it adequate?

The MI observers after having discussion with the cooks and visit to the kitchen shed in each sample school found that 77.5% (31) of the sample schools have adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM. The rest of the schools (9) had to use whatever utensils were available in turns when they had to prepare more than two items.

x) What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)

Out of the 40 schools visited by MI, as many as 62.5% (25) were using only firewood for cooking purpose. 15 of the sample schools (37.5%) were using both firewood and LPG.

SAFETY & HYGIENE :

i) General Impression of MI about hygiene:

a) Good: The hygiene and overall environment was found to be good in 57.5% (23) of sample schools.

b) Fair: In terms of environment and hygiene 40 % (16) of sample schools were fair.

c) Poor: 2.5% (1) of the sample schools were poor in terms of hygiene.

ii) Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating

All the 100% (40) of the sample schools claimed that they encourage children to wash hands before after eating of MDM.

iii) Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner?

Children in all sample schools were found to be well disciplined and order was maintained by them in taking MDM. The MI found that cooks and teachers played an important role in maintenance of such kind of discipline.

iv) Conservation of water

All the sample schools in the district visited by MI reported that due to scarcity of water by and large, the students were aware of the need to conserve water even before they were being taught by the teachers.

v) Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?

The cooking process and storage of fuel is by and large safe in 77.5% (31) of sample schools, and it was not so in only 22.5% (9) of sample schools.

12	<p>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION :</p> <p>i) Extent of participation by Parents in daily supervision, monitoring, participation:</p> <p>As per the information received from the schools, participation of parents in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision is poor in 27.5% (11) of sample schools while it was fair in 72.5% (29).</p> <p>ii) Extent of participation by VECs/Panchayats/Urban bodies in daily supervision and monitoring of MDM.</p> <p>Like parents the participation of members of VEC in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision is poor in 12.5% (5) of the sample schools while 82.5% (33) reported fair participation and good in 5% (2).</p> <p>iii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?</p> <p>None of the 40 sample schools has ever prepared any roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.</p>
13	<p>INSPECTION & SUPERVISION :</p> <p>i) Has the Mid day meal programme been inspected by any state/district/block level officers/officials? What is the frequency of such inspections?</p> <p>a) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by State Level Officer: While interacting with the MI observers 90% (36) of headmasters/teachers of sample schools reported that state level officers have never visited their schools for the purpose of inspection and supervision of MDM programme, and the remaining 10% (4) reported that the visits were quite rare.</p> <p>b) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by District Level Officers : 90% (36) of headmasters of sample school informed the members of MI that they were never visited by District Level Officers in connection with MDM while 10% (4) reported the visit as rare.</p> <p>c) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Block Level Officers : When asked about the inspection and supervision of their MDM programme by block level officers, 72.5% (29) of the headmasters of sample schools responded that they have never been inspected by Block level officer; whereas 27.5% (11) reported that their visits are very rarely.</p>

	<p>d) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Cluster Level Officers : Frequent inspection and supervision of MDM was reported by only 10% (4) of sample schools, while as many as 50% (20) reported not to have been supervised or monitored by the cluster level officers.</p>
14	<p>IMPACT OF MDM :</p> <p>i) Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment of children in school?</p> <p>While responding to the question relating to the impact of MDM on improvement of enrollment of children in schools, 50% (20) of the headmasters reported a positively.</p> <p>ii) Has the mid day meal improved the attendance of children in school?</p> <p>While responding to the question relating to the impact of MDM on improvement of attendance of children in schools, 90% (36) of the headmasters reported positively, while 10% (4) of the headmasters were not sure about its impact.</p> <p>iii) Has the mid day meal improved general well being (nutritional status) of children in school?</p> <p>100% (40) of the headmasters reported that the MDM did improve the general well being and nutritional status of children of their schools.</p> <p>iv) Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving of cooked meal in schools?</p> <p>Other incidental benefits of MDM reported by few schools were :</p> <p>a) Teachers of all sample schools reported that children become more active with the serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.</p> <p>b) Poor parents feel happy as they do not have to pay for the Tiffin of their children.</p>

APPENDIX-1

**List of Schools from Lunglei District, Visited by MI, with their
DISE Code**

Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code	Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code
1	Govt. P/S, Sethlun	2002702	21	Govt. M/S, Thuampui	0400801
2	Govt. P/S - II, Theiriati	0200905	22	Govt. P/S, Thuampui	0400802
3	Govt. D.M. M/S	0200911	23	Govt. P/S, Vanhne	0400602
4	Govt. Zobawk P/S,	0203503	24	Govt. M/S, Vanhne	0400601
5	Govt. M/S, Zobawk	0203502	25	Govt. M/S, Sazaikawn	0403801
6	Govt. Bazar P/S	0301703	26	Govt. P/S, Tawipui N-II	0202402
7	Govt. P/S Lunglawn	0200508	27	Govt. M/S, Tawipui N-I	0204403
8	Govt. M/S , Zohnuai	0301601	28	Govt. P/S I, Tawipui 'S'	0202102
9	Govt. P/S,Venglai	0400102	29	Govt. M/S, Tawipui S	0202101
10	Govt. P/S - II, Hauruang	0400403	30	Govt. P/S II, Thingfal	0203003
11	Govt. M/S, Salem	0200401	31	Govt. M/S, Thingfal	0203002
12	Govt. M/S, Venghlun	0400201	32	Govt. P/S, Phairuangkai	0402302
13	Govt. M/S, College Veng	0301801	33	Govt. M/S II, Lungsen	0301905
14	Govt. M/S II, Rahsi Veng	0400302	34	Govt.P/S III, Lungsen	0301906
15	Govt. P/S II, Venghlun	0400203	35	Govt. M/S, Zodin, Tlabung	0303101
16	Govt. P/S, Kikawn	0301704	36	Govt. M/S, Tlabung	0303201
17	Govt. P/S, Pukpui	0301302	37	Govt. M/S, Nunsury	0303301
18	Govt. P/S I, Zotlang	0301402	38	Govt.P/S II, Nunsury	0303303
19	LCM M/S	0200301	39	Govt. P/S, Rawpui	0100202
20	Govt. M/S, Electric	0200101	40	Govt. M/S, Rawpui	0100201

MDM MONITORING REPORT (SERCHHIP DISTRICT)

A. At School Level

1.	<p>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL :</p> <p>i) Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</p> <p>In Serchhip district, the headmasters, teachers, children, cook and, VEC/SMC members of all the sample schools (100%) reported that hot cooked food was served on all full working school days. In order to maintain regular service of MDM, arrangement had to be made by some schools by purchasing food grain from the market or borrowing from the retailers/shopkeeper.</p>																					
2	<p>TRENDS:</p> <p>Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">No.</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Details</th> <th style="text-align: center;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i</td> <td>Enrollment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2226</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2226</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iii</td> <td>No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1975</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2226</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1975</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi</td> <td>No. of children availed MDM on the previous day</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1993</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>** Since all enrolled students in Mizoram opt for MDM, therefore, many sample school don't maintain MDM attendance register on day to day basis. This figure has been worked on the basis of student attendance registers.</i></p>	No.	Details		i	Enrollment	2226	ii	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	2226	iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	1975	iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2226	v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	1975	vi	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day	1993
No.	Details																					
i	Enrollment	2226																				
ii	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	2226																				
iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	1975																				
iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2226																				
v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	1975																				
vi	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day	1993																				
3	<p>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAIN TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</p> <p>i) Is school/implementing agency receiving food grain regularly? If there is delay in delivering food grains, what is the extent of delay and reasons for the same?</p> <p>The supply of food grains to schools in the state is done on quarterly not monthly basis, which is by and large regular. When asked about the regularity of food grains, 29 of sample schools (72.5%) reported that the supply of food was not regular.</p> <p>ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement maintained?</p>																					

	<p>At the time of visit of MI to the sample schools, it was found that 80% (32) of the schools were keeping buffer stock of one month's requirement in the school.</p> <p>iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</p> <p>All the 40 sample schools (100%) reported that food grains were never delivered at their door step and they have to arrange for transportation of their food grain from the retailer shop to the school.</p> <p>iv) Is the quality of food grain good?</p> <p>The quality of rice which was available in each of 40 sample schools (100%) was found to be by and large good. However, when the headmasters/teachers were asked about the quality of food grains (rice) received by school, 47.5% (19) of them reported it to be good quality and the remaining 52.5% (21) reported it to be of an average quality.</p>
4	<p>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING COOKING COST TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</p> <p>i) Is school/implementing agency receiving cooking cost in advance regularly? If there is delay in delivering cooking cost what is the extent of delay and reasons for it?</p> <p>None of the sample schools had ever received the cooking cost in advance. Like the food grains the cooking cost is released to the schools on quarterly basis not monthly and that too not in advance. At the time of visit of MI to the district in the middle of August, cooking cost was received upto March 2012 only.</p> <p>ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</p> <p>As a result of delay of receiving cooking cost, schools had to either purchase the required ingredients on credit or had to use funds from other resources. This problem, the MI felt was largely responsible in bringing down the quality of MDM.</p> <p>iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</p> <p>The cooking cost, is released to VEC/SMC through Bank which is paid to the school, by the concerned VEC/SMC, in cash.</p>

5	<p>SOCIAL EQUITY:</p> <p>i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements?</p> <p>The MI observers did not observe any discrimination on the basis of gender, caste or community in cooking, serving or seating arrangements in eating of MDM.</p> <p>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</p> <p>In all sample schools food is served by the cooks supervised by the teacher in charge. Students make queues in front of the service window in kitchen. In 32 schools (80%), students eat their meal inside their respective classrooms or in the school verandah and school compound. There were 8 schools (20%) having a dining hall for MDM.</p>
6	<p>VARIETY OF MENU:</p> <p>i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed?</p> <p>Only 10% (4) of the sample schools in the district had displayed their weekly menu and out of these, only 50% (2) reported that they were able to adhere to it. The remaining 90% (36) did not display their MDM menu.</p> <p>ii) Who decides the menu?</p> <p>The decision with regard to the day-to-day menu in 70% (28) of sample schools is taken solely by the teacher in-charge of MDM, and in the remaining 30% (12) it is taken jointly by the school headmaster and teacher in-charge.</p> <p>iii) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily?</p> <p>After discussions with the teacher in-charge MDM, headmaster, members of VEC and interaction with children as well as verification of records relating to the utilization of cooking cost, it was found that all the 40 sample schools (100%) serve a variety of food such as rice preparation with dal, potatoes, cabbage and other green vegetables, brinjals, pumpkin, eggs (occasionally), tin fish/chicken/ (in some schools).</p> <p>iv) Does the daily menu include rice/wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?</p> <p>Yes, the daily menu in all the sample schools (100%) included rice preparation with dal, and green vegetables.</p>

7	<p>QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL:</p> <p>Feedback from children on quality and quantity of meal (If children were not happy please give reasons and suggestions to improve.)</p> <p>After interacting with the children in all sample schools, the MI observers found that the children were happy and satisfied with the quality and quantity of food served. At the same time, many of them suggested that they would like it very much if items like eggs, meat, fried rice, etc. are served more frequently.</p>
8.	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY:</p> <p>i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child?</p> <p>The MI team was surprised to find that only 10% (4) of sample schools maintained health cards/registers for each child, and the remaining 90% (36) of sample schools did not maintain health record of children in any form.</p> <p>ii) What is the frequency of health check-up?</p> <p>a) Monthly Health Check-up: 5% (2) of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted the monthly health check-up of children. However, after discussion with the Headmasters and teachers of these schools, their claim of monthly health check-ups was not a complete health check up in the truest sense as it was done by the teachers themselves in connection with their height and weight alone.</p> <p>b) Quarterly Health Check-up: Out of the 40 sample schools, 2.5% (1) reported that they have conducted quarterly health check-up of children.</p> <p>c) Half Yearly Health Check-up: Only 3 (7.5%) out of 40 sample schools reported to have conducted the health check-up of children on half yearly basis.</p> <p>d) Annual Health Check-up: According to the report of the sample schools, 42.5% (17) have conducted the health check-up of children on yearly basis.</p> <p>e) No health Check-up: It was shocking to know that as many as 42.5% (17) of sample schools did not organize any programme for the health check-up of children.</p> <p>iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin-A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically?</p> <p>None of the schools in Serchhip District had given any micronutrients and de-worming medicines to their students.</p> <p>iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</p> <p>This question is irrelevant for the district under reference as no medicine was given to the students.</p>

9	<p>STATUS OF COOKS :</p> <p>i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/NGO/Contractor)</p> <p>None of the sample schools had ever engaged any NGO/SHG/Contractor for this purpose. Food for MDM in all of the 40 sample schools (100%) was cooked and served by the cooks appointed for this purpose.</p> <p>ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms?</p> <p>The number of cooks engaged in the schools was according to the norms of GOI. Schools having less than 25 students were given 1 cook, those with 25 to 100 students were given two cooks and those having more than 100 students but less than 200 were given 3 cooks. The number of cooks increased accordingly.</p> <p>iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</p> <p>All cooks in sample schools were paid remuneration of Rs.1500/-per month. The mode of payment was Cash.</p> <p>iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helper regularly?</p> <p>The remuneration paid to the cooks was not regular. All of the cooks in sample schools reported that they did not get their remuneration on monthly basis as it was always released quarterly with the conversion cost. At the time of MI visit, the last remuneration received by most cooks was only upto March 2012.</p> <p>v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers ?(SC/ST/OBC/Minority)</p> <p>All of the cooks in all sample schools were Scheduled Tribe. None of these cooks belonged to SC or OBC.</p>
10	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE:</p> <p>i) Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store constructed and in use?</p> <p>Out of the 40 sample schools visited by MI, All the 40 schools (100%) have constructed their kitchen shed and were using it for cooking and service of MDM as well as the storage of food grain and other materials relating to MDM, including service utensils.</p> <p>ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed MDM/SSA/Others.</p> <p>Kitchen sheds in the sample schools had been constructed under the SSA scheme.</p> <p>iii) Kitchen shed constructed but not in use (Reason for not using)</p>

All the sample schools that received funds for construction of Kitchen Shed had constructed it thus this question becomes irrelevant.

iv) Kitchen shed under construction

All the sample schools that received funds for construction of Kitchen Shed had constructed it thus this question becomes irrelevant.

v) Kitchen shed Sanctioned, but construction not started

All the sample schools that received funds for construction of Kitchen Shed had constructed it thus this question becomes irrelevant.

vi) Kitchen shed not sanctioned:

All the sample schools that received funds for construction of Kitchen Shed had constructed it thus this question becomes irrelevant.

viii) Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?

All the 100% (40) of sample schools from the district had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose. It was pleasing to know that 70% (28) of sample schools had PHE connection for water that is considered to be relatively safe for cooking and drinking. However, large percentage of such schools were from the urban areas. The remaining 30% (12) of sample schools were solely dependent on rain water harvesting.

ix) Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If, Available is it adequate?

The MI observers after having discussion with the cooks and visit to the kitchen shed in each sample school found that 97.5% (39) of the sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM. However, it was found that 2.5% (1) of the schools did not have adequate utensils for preparation of MDM.

x) What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)

After discussion with the cooks, and headmaster, and visit to the kitchen shed, the MI observers found that 100% (40) of sample schools were using firewood, and out of these, 35% (14) were also using LPG for cooking of MDM.

11	<p>SAFETY & HYGIENE :</p> <p>i) General Impression of MI about hygiene:</p> <p>a) Good: In terms of environment and hygiene 52.5% (21) of sample schools were good.</p> <p>b) Fair: In terms of environment and hygiene 47.5 % (19) of sample schools were fair.</p> <p>c) Poor: In terms of environment and hygiene none of the sample schools were found to be poor.</p> <p>ii) Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating?</p> <p>All of the sample schools (100%) claimed that they encourage children to wash hands before after eating of MDM</p> <p>iii) Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner?</p> <p>The spot verification of MI revealed that children in all sample schools take meal in a very disciplined and orderly manner. Cooks and teachers play an important role in maintenance of such discipline by children.</p> <p>iv) Conservation of water</p> <p>Like all other districts, the children of schools visited by MI in Serchhip District were well aware of the general scarcity of water in the state, and therefore, they were accustomed to use it carefully.</p> <p>v) Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?</p> <p>The cooking process and storage of fuel is safe only in 17.5% (7) of sample schools, and it was not that safe in the rest of 82.5% (33) of sample schools.</p>
12	<p>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION :</p> <p>i) Extent of participation by Parents in daily supervision, monitoring, participation.</p> <p>Participation of parents in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision was poor in 80% (32) of sample schools and fair in only 10% (8) of the sample schools.</p> <p>ii) Extent of participation by VECs/Panchayats/Urban bodies in daily supervision and monitoring of MDM.</p> <p>As per the report from the sample schools, participation of members of VEC in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision was good in 5% (2), fair in 15% (6) and poor in a large majority (80%) of sample schools.</p>

	<p>iii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?</p> <p>None of the 40 sample schools has ever prepared any roster for day-to-day monitoring and supervision of the MDM for parents and community members.</p>
13	<p>INSPECTION & SUPERVISION :</p> <p>i) Has the Mid day meal programme been inspected by any state/district/block level officers/officials? What is the frequency of such inspections?</p> <p>a) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by State Level Officer: While interacting with the MI observers all the headmasters/teachers of 37 sample schools (92.5%) reported that state level officers have never visited their schools for the purpose of inspection and supervision of MDM programme. At the same time 7.5% (3) reported that these officials rarely visit schools for the monitoring of MDM.</p> <p>b) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by District Level Officers : 35% (14) of headmasters of sample school, while responding to the question of inspection of their MDM programme by District Level Officers, reported that the district level officers had never visited their school for this purpose. At the same time 65% (26) reported that these officials rarely visit schools for the monitoring of MDM.</p> <p>c) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Block Level Officers : When asked about the inspection and supervision of their MDM programme by block level officers, around 67.5% (27) of the headmasters of sample schools responded that they had never been inspected by Block Level Officer; whereas 32.5% (13) reported that their visits were very rarely. It was disappointing to learn that none of the schools were visited frequently by the Block Level Officers.</p> <p>d) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Cluster Level Officers : The members of MI are pleased to learn that all the 100% (40) of sample schools, as reported by their headmasters/teachers, were frequently inspected and monitored by the cluster level officers.</p>
14	<p>IMPACT OF MDM :</p> <p>i) Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment of children in school?</p> <p>While responding to the question relating to the impact of MDM on improvement of enrollment of children in schools, 47.5% (19) of the headmasters reported a positively impact and the remaining 52.5% (21) were not sure about its impact.</p>

ii) Has the mid day meal improved the attendance of children in school?

On the question relating to the impact of MDM on improvement of attendance of children in schools, 92.5% (37) of the headmasters reported positively, while 7.5% (3) could not give a definite answer.

iii) Has the mid day meal improved general well being (nutritional status) of children in school?

On the impact of MDM on improvement of general well being (nutritional status) of children in schools, 100% (40) of the headmasters reported positively.

iv) Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving of cooked meal in schools?

Other incidental benefits of MDM reported by few schools were :

- a) Improves energy level of children and keep them active.
- b) Poor parents feel happy as they do not have to pay for the Tiffin of their children.

APPENDIX-2
**List of Schools from Serchhip District, visited by MI, with their
with DISE Code**

Sl. No	Name of School	DISE Code	Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code
1	P/S – VII, Thenzawl	100904	21	M/S, Khumtung	301504
2	P/S – III, Thenzawl	100902	22	P/S – I, Khumtung	301501
3	P/S – II, Thenzawl	100915	23	M/S – I, Baktawng	301305
4	Zoram M/S Thenzawl	100912	24	P/S – I, Baktawng	301401
5	G. M/S, Thenzawl	100911	25	P/S, Buhkangkawn	301801
6	P/S, Buangpui	101201	26	M/S, Buhkangkawn	301802
7	M/S, Buangpui	101202	27	M/S – II, Chhingchhip	300403
8	M/S, Serchhip	100104	28	M/S – I, Chhingchhip	300306
9	Vengchung P/S, Serchhip	100101	29	P/S – IV, Chhingchhip	300402
10	Darnam P/S, Serchhip	100202	30	P/S – I, Chhiahtlang	100601
11	Chanmari P/S Serchhip	100403	31	National M/S, Chhiahtlang	100608
12	Model M/S, Serchhip	100408	32	P/S, New Serchhip	100503
13	GLM M/S, Serchhip	100204	33	M/S, New Serchhip	100504
14	CMS M/S, Serchhip	100206	34	M/S, Chhiahtlang	100607
15	M/S – I, E.Lungdar	200503	35	P/S – II, Chhiahtlang	100602
16	P/S – II, E.Lungdar		36	M/S, Ramlai	100411
17	M/S – II, E.Lungdar	200504	37	P/S – I, Keitum	201301
18	M/S, N. Vanlaiphai	200109	38	M/S – I, Bungtlang	201406
19	Oriental M/S, N. Vanlaiphai	200110	39	P/S – IV, Bungtlang	201404
20	M/S – II, Khawlailung	201107	40	M/S – II, Keitum	201306