

First Half Yearly Report

Monitoring of Implementation of MDM Programme for the State of Rajasthan

(1st October, 2010 to 31st March, 2011)



Shiv Charan Mathur Social Policy Research Institute, Jaipur

CONTENTS

Title	Page No.
<i>Preface & Acknowledgement</i>	3
<i>Foreword</i>	4
<i>Abbreviations</i>	5 – 6
General Information	7 – 8
Executive Summary of MDM Monitoring Report	9 – 12
Field Work - Glimpses	13 – 14
Districts summary of MDM monitoring	15 – 54
Bhilwara MDM Monitoring Report	15 – 28
Jaipur MDM Monitoring Report	29 – 41
Bundi MDM Monitoring Report	42 – 54

PREFACE & ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Institute was founded by Late Shri Shiv Charan Mathur to critically examine the governmental policies and programmes in 1985. Since then the Institute has been working on various issues of developmental concern. One of the core area has been Education and the Institute has completed a number of studies regarding issues of concern in the education sector. In this regard, one of the important assignment has been Monitoring of SSA Activities in Rajasthan. This is an important activity and calls for support from the Ministry, State, District, Block and right to school level.

We gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Shri P.K. Tiwari, Director, MHRD, Shri Tarun Gupta, Sr. Consultant, Ed.CIL, Ms. Veenu Gupta, Commissioner, SSA, Rajasthan, Ms. Indu Sharma, Dy. Director, SSA (Monitoring), Rajasthan, and the district, block and school level officers without which the work would not have been possible.

At the Institute, we are thankful to Shri Pradeep Mathur, Chairman, Dr. Sudhir Varma, Director and Shri Rahul Mathur, Member Secretary, SCM SPRI who significantly helped in the work. We owe immensely to Shri R.S. Rathore and Prof. Virendra Narain who ably lead the monitoring teams. Thanks are also due to Shri Vinod Kewalramani, Shri Pradeep Sharma, Shri Yogesh Cheepa, Shri Ranveer Singh, Shri Yogeshwar Singh, Shri Mahendra Singh and Shri Atul Sharma who relentlessly worked in the field for timely completion of the task.

(Manish Tiwari)
Joint Director, SCM SPRI

FOREWORD

Sarva Shikha Abhiyan aims to bring elementary education into the main stream of both quantitative and qualitative development. With the help of various interventions, it intends to support, monitor and supervise the educational process and academic activities in a school. In order to assess and analyze the implementation of the approved interventions and processes, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India engaged Monitoring Institutions (MIs) to take up monitoring of SSA and Mid Day Meal activities. The MHRD entrusted the responsibility of ten districts of Rajasthan for the period 2010 – 2012 to the Shiv Charan Mathur Social Policy Research Institute.

This is the first half – yearly monitoring report for three districts. The report is important particularly in the light of the RTE Act 2009 and spatial inequalities prevalent in the state.

I am sure this report will help the Ministry in understanding the situation at the ground level and in taking corrective measures.

(Dr. Sudhir Varma)
Director, SCM SPRI

ABBREVIATIONS

ABEEO	:	Assistant Block Elementary Education Officer
ADPC	:	Assistant District Project Coordinator
AEn	:	Assistant Engineer
BA	:	Bachelor of Arts
BEEO	:	Block Elementary Education Officer
BEO	:	Block Education Officer
BIS	:	Bureau of Indian Standards
BRC	:	Block Resource Center
CALP	:	Computer Aided Learning Programmes
CD	:	Compact Disk
CRC	:	Cluster Resource Center
DCF	:	Data Capture Format
DISE	:	District Information System for Education
DPC	:	District Programme coordinator
EVs	:	Education Volunteers
Gol	:	Government of India
HM	:	Head Master
IEP	:	Individual Educational Plan
ISO	:	Indian Standard Organization
KGBV	:	Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidhyalaya
LCD	:	Liquid Crystal Display
LEHAR	:	Learning Enhancement Activity in Rajasthan
MDM	:	Mid Day Meal

MI	:	Monitoring Institution
MIS	:	Management Information System
MLA	:	Member of Legislative Assembly
MoU	:	Memorandum of Understanding
NCF	:	National Curriculum Framework
NGO	:	Non-Government Organization
NPEGEL	:	National Programme for Education of Girls at Elementary Level
OBC	:	Other Backward Cast
OoSC	:	Out of School Children
PHED	:	Public Health and Engineering Department
PRI	:	Panchayat Raj Institution
RTE	:	Right to Education
SCM SPRI	:	Shiv Charan Mathur Social Policy Research Institute
SDO	:	Sub-Divisional Officer
SHG	:	Self Help Group
SMC/VEC	:	School Management Committee/Village Education Committee
Spl. Trg. Centre	:	Special Training Centre
ST	:	Special Training
TC	:	Transfer Certificate
ToR	:	Terms of References
UPS	:	Upper Primary School/ Uninterrupted Power Supply
VER	:	Village Education Register
WER	:	Ward Education Register

**1st Half Yearly Monitoring Report of
Shiv Charan Mathur Social Policy Research Institute, Jaipur
on MDM for the State of Rajasthan
for the period of 1st October 2010 to 31st March 2011.**

1. General Information

S.N.	Information	Details			
1.	Period of the report	1.10.2010 – 31.03.2011			
2.	No. of Districts allotted	Three			
3.	Districts' name	1. Bhilwara 2. Jaipur 3. Bundi			
4.	Month of visit to the Districts/Schools (information is to be given district wise i.e. District 1, District 2, District 3 etc)	Bhilwara	Jaipur	Bundi	
		December 2010	January 2011	Jan. - Feb. 2011	
5.	Total number of elementary schools (primary and upper primary to be counted separately) in the Districts Covered by MI (Information s to be given district wise i.e. District 1, District 2, District 3 etc.)	PS+UPS = Total 1988 + 1447 = 3435	PS+UPS = Total 2507 + 2224 = 4731	PS+UPS = Total 914 + 622 = 1536	
6.	Number of elementary schools monitored (primary and upper primary to be counted separately) Information is to be given for district wise i.e. District 1, District 2, District 3 etc.)	PS+UPS = Total 14 + 26 = 40	PS+UPS = Total 10 + 30 = 40	PS+UPS = Total 14 + 26 = 40	
7	Types of school visited	Bhilwara	Jaipur	Bundi	Total
a)	Special training centres (Residential)	2	2	1	5
b)	Special training centres (Non Residential)	3	3	5	11
c)	Schools in Urban Areas	8	8	8	24
d)	School sanctioned with Civil Works	4	4	3	11
e)	School from NPEGEL Blocks	3	4	6	13
f)	Schools having more than three CWSN	3	5	3	11
g)	School covered under CAL programme	3	5	3	11
h)	KGBVs	3	3	3	09
i)	Other type of school	11	6	8	25
	Total School Monitored	40	40	40	120
8.	Number of schools visited by Nodal Officer of the Monitoring Institute	13 schools	15 schools	11 schools	39 schools
9.	Whether the draft report has been shared with the Commissioner, MDM: YES/NO	YES			
10.	After submission of the draft report to the Commissioner, MDM whether the MI has received any comments: YES/NO	YES			
11.	Before sending the reports to the GOI whether the MI has shared the report with SPO: YES/NO				

12. Selection criteria for Schools

The selection of schools was done ensuring the representation of various types of schools. The schools were selected, taking into account their nature and location and also the specific kind of academic activities, particularly in their teaching and learning

process. On location basis in the rural – urban context, atleast 8 schools out of total 40 were selected from urban areas. Six schools with special training centres (3 residential and 3 non–residential), two with undergoing civil work activity, two National Programme of Education for Girls at Elementary Level, three Computer Aided Learning and 3 Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidhyala and three schools with minimum of 3 children with special needs, were selected. The remaining schools constituted the ones with specific problems like gender gap, higher proportion of SC/ST, low retention and higher drop out rate, school located in the area with sizeable out of school children and adversely affected by seasonal migration were selected. The total number of schools per district was 40.

Executive Summary of MDM Scheme Monitoring Report

1. Regularity in Serving Meal

- According to students fresh hot cooked food served in 110 (91.7%) schools out of 120 sampled schools.
- As per response of teachers and parents fresh hot cooked food served in 112 (93.3%) schools.
- In absolute terms most of the schools served fresh and hot cooked food. The school MDM register also gave the same information.

2. Trends

- Total enrollment across 120 sampled schools comes to 18181 and all of them are supposed to have opted MDM scheme.
- No. of students present in school on the day of MI visit – 12470 (68.6%).
- No. of students availing of MDM as per MDM register – 10789 (59.3%).
- No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit – 10270 (56.5%).
- No. of children availing MDM on the day previous to visit – 11190 (61.5%).
- The school attendance was only around 69% and only 59% of total enrolled children took the advantage of MDM.
- The reason for 41% children not taking MDM was cited as inferior quality of cooked food mostly supplied by NGO and also in some cases the food cooked in schools lacked taste and quality both.

3. Regularity in Delivering Food Grains at School Level

- Out of 120 sampled schools, 30 schools get MDM from NGO.
- The supply of food grains has been regular according to 74 (82.2%) schools where the food is cooked in the school premises while in remaining 16 (17.8%) schools the supply of food grains has been delayed.
- The quality of food grains was good according to 86 (95.5%) schools.

4. Regularity in Delivering Cooking Cost at School Level

- The no. of schools receiving cooking cost in time is 42 (46.7%), while 48 (53.3%) schools reported that there has been a delay of two to three months in this matters.
- In case of delay in cooking cost, the teachers manage the requirements through their own efforts.
- The cooking cost is generally receive by cheque from state govt.

5. Social Equity

- No discrimination in cooking, serving and seating arrangement was noticed in 113 (94.1%) schools. In the remaining schools some kind of discrimination was noticed against SC/ST children and there was separate seating arrangement for them and also for girls.
- The food was served mostly in verandah and open space available in school premises.
- In most of the schools the food is served by the cook and his helper. In some cases teachers and also children serve the food depending upon the situation.

6. Variety of Menu

- Menu was found displayed on the notice board of the school in 73 (60.8%) schools.
- There is standardized day-wise menu of food decided by state govt.

7. Variety in Served Food

- There is a variety of food served each day in 110 (91.7%) schools.

8. Quality and Quantity of Meal

- 61 (50.8%) school children have found the quality of food as good, for the remaining children the food was of average quality and bad enough.
- 102 (85%) school children found quantity of food as sufficient.
- Most of the children want the quality and quantity of food strictly in accordance with the norms set by state govt.

- Children prefer hot cooked food to be prepared at school level.
- Children want the food to be well cooked.

9. Supplementary

- Health card or health register is being maintained in 74 (61.7%) schools only.
- Most of the schools having health card or register, the medical check up is once in a year.
- Micronutrients are provided to children in 71 (59.2%) schools and supplied by health department of govt. of Rajasthan.

10. Status of Cooks

- The cook and his helper prepare food for children, in all the schools where the food is cooked within the school premises.
- The remuneration of cook and helper each is Rs. 1000/- per month.
- In most of the schools, the remuneration is paid in cash to cook and helper.
- The cook and helper are paid their remuneration, regularly in 40 (44.4%) schools only. It is indeed discouraging for the cooks who are not paid their remuneration in time.
- Most of the cooks are from the OBC social category.

11. Infrastructure

- There is pucca kitchen with shed in 83 (69.2%) schools, mostly constructed with SSA funds.
- In case there is no separate store, the foods grains are stored in class rooms or in HM office.
- In schools where pucca kitchen is not available (8 schools), the food is cooked either in the class room or out side in the school or at cook's residence (only 2 schools).
- Potable water is available in 86 (71.7%) schools for cooking of meal and drinking purposes.
- Utensils are available in 98 (81.7%) schools, but in a few schools, not adequate as per requirement.

- In 43 (47.8%) schools out of 90 schools, LPG is used for cooking. Wood is used in most of the remaining schools.

12. Safety and Hygiene

- Safety and hygiene are good in 53 (44.2%) schools, average in 59 (49.2%) and bad in remaining schools.
- Children are motivated to wash their hands before and after taking food in 73 (60.8%) schools.
- Children have the habit of saving water in 82 (68.3%) schools.
- There is no hazards involved while cooking or storing the food in 74 (61.7%) schools.

13. Inspection and Supervision

- In most cases the ADPC – and the BEO have visited the schools for monitoring the MDM. The visit by other officials has been occasional.

14. Impact

- The MDM has a positive impact on enrollment and health of the children.
- There is improvement in the children's discipline and their habit of sharing.
- Children prefer food cooked at the school premises.
- There is general distaste for the food supplied by NGO.

Field Work - Glimpses

Govt. UPS Khedi, Nainwa, Bundi



“MDM, A Great Equalizer”

Govt. Girls UPS, Nahar ka Chauhata, Bundi



**“Prayer before MDM”
Govt. PS Girls Sector – 7, Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur**



**“Girls at Work!
Where is Gender Sensitization?”**

Govt. PS Girls Sector – 7, Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur



**“Girls Sweeping the Floor,
Is It Proper?”**

Mid-Day Meal Scheme: - District Bhilwara

A. At School Level

1.	<p>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL: Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fresh cooked hot food served every day according to 37 out of 40 school students, though 3 school students gave negative response. Thus, MDM is a regular event in 92.5% schools visited by MI team. According to teachers, MDM served in 39 (out of 40) schools. Only in one school there has been disruption. But the parents gave the number of schools with uninterrupted MDM as 39 and MDM register too gave the same figure. <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hence there has been marginal variations among these sources of information. In absolute terms, however, the MDM has been a regular feature in most of the schools. The reasons for disruption in MDM in a few schools may be owing to delay in releasing the funds for supportive commodities like, vegetables spices, oil etc. 	Students, Teachers & Parents, and MDM register														
2.	<p>TRENDS: 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-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 90%;">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i.</td> <td>Enrollment</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii.</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iii.</td> <td>No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv.</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v.</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi.</td> <td>No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Details	i.	Enrollment	ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.	<p>School level registers, MDM Registers Head Teachers, Schools level MDM functionaries / Observation of the monitoring team. In case of centralized kitchen the no. of school served by it. Time taken in supply of hot cooked mid day meal from centralized kitchen.</p>
No.	Details															
i.	Enrollment															
ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal															
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit															
iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register															
v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit															
vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.															

S.N.	Categories	Class-wise position									
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total	%
(i)	Enrollment	930	693	594	566	545	657	567	529	5081	
(ii)	No. of children opted for MDM	930	693	594	566	545	657	567	529	5081	100%
(iii)	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	557	468	447	423	416	546	476	442	3775	74.3%
(iv)	No. of children availing the MDM as per MDM register	508	411	383	349	311	392	318	306	2978	58.6%
(v)	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	481	398	462	322	303	368	287	265	2886	56.8%
(vi)	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	558	454	394	362	313	387	318	306	3092	60.9%

Description: -

Total enrollment as per school registers across 40 schools comes to 5081 children, out of whom only 2978 children have availed MDM according to MDM register. Thus, only 58.6% children have availed MDM as shown in school register. Number of children present on the day of MI visit comes to 3775 which is 74.3% of the enrollment as shown in the school register. Out of 3775 children present in the school, 2978 i.e. 78.9% children take MDM in schools as per school MDM register.

- On the day of MI team's visit, 2886 i.e. 76.45% children, out of 3775 children present in the school, took the MDM.
- If one takes the total enrollment of 5081 students into account, then the no. of children availing MDM is woefully limited, as only 58.6% of them take MDM. Why do the rest of enrolled children not take MDM is a question to be taken seriously at the appropriate level. If the no. of children present in the school on the day of MI team's visit is taken into consideration, then too only 76.45% children took MDM on that day. What happened to remaining 23.55% children who were, in fact, present in the school but did not take MDM. The team noticed that in schools where the supply of cooked food was entrusted

	to an NGO-Nandi Foundation, a large no. of children opted out of MDM, complaining about the poor quality of food. It is a serious matter requiring stringent measures to ensure the supply of good quality cooked food.	
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>(ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement is maintained?</p> <p>(iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</p> <p>(iv) Is the quality of foodgrain good?</p>	School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.
	<p>(i) According to 25 (62.5%) schools the supply of food grains has been regular, though 7 (17.5%) reported delay in this matter. 8 schools (20%) have been getting cooked food through an NGO-Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(ii) As per the responses of 62.5% schools, there is a buffer stock for one month's requirement, though according to 17.5% schools the stock situation is not satisfactory. The remaining 20% schools are under the NGO -Nandi Foundation. The quantity of food grains (whenever made available) has been as per the indicated/marked weight, according to all schools (32) which serve hot cooked food to children.</p> <p>(iii) The food grain is delivered at the school level according to 26 (65%) schools, though 6 (15%) have shown reservation in this matter. 8 (20%) schools are under the NGO-Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(iv) The quality of food grains supplied to schools is good according to 32 schools. The remaining 8 are under the NGO-Nandi Foundation.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>As far as the supply of food grains is concerned, the quantity and quality, both have been at the satisfactory level according to most of the schools.</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>(ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</p> <p>(iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</p>	School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.
	<p>(i) Only 17 (42.5%) schools have received cooking cost in advance. 15 (37.5%) schools</p>	

	<p>have reported that there has been a delay of one/two months in this matter. The schools under NGO, have not given any information regarding the receipt of cooking cost by it.</p> <p>(ii) The schools with delayed supply of cooking cost have managed MDM on their own with the support of teachers and SMC members. In most cases there has been no disruption in MDM on this account.</p> <p>(iii) The schools managing MDM at their level have received cooking cost (in time or delayed) either in cash (42.5% schools) or through cheque (37.5% schools). The remaining 8 schools are under NGO-Nandi Foundation.</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>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</p> <p>(i) No discrimination in cooking, serving and in seating arrangements for taking food was noticed in 35 (87.5%) schools. There was some discriminatory sign in 5 (12.5%) schools in seating arrangements, wherein boys and girls were seen sitting separately. The discrimination was more subterfuged than obvious. The cooked food is served by cook (in 27.5% schools), by students (67.5% schools) and by SMC members in (5% schools).</p> <p>(ii) Food is served in school verandahs in 62.5% schools, in open space 32.5% school and in classrooms 5% schools. Obviously the burden of serving the food is on students in a majority of schools. Teachers are no where involved in this matter, though SMC members are active in a few cases, while the cook also does the job in some schools.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Seating arrangements for taking food are conditioned by the availability of space in a school. In most cases verandahs (if the school has this facility) are used for taking food.</p>	Observations / Probe/ interaction with the children.
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>ii) Who decides the menu?</p> <p>(i) Menu was found displayed at an appropriate place in 21 (52.5%) schools, though in 19</p>	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks. Obtain a copy of menu.

	<p>(47.5%) schools there was no such display of menu.</p> <p>(ii) In most cases the menu is a standardized day-wise variety of food to be given under MDM. In case of 34 (85%) schools this standardized menu is followed, while in 5 (12.5%) schools the menu is decided by the school head and in one school the SMC was found to determine the menu for MDM.</p>	
7.	<p>Variety in served food</p> <p>(i) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily?</p> <p>(ii) Dose the daily menu include rice / wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?</p>	<p>Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks.</p>
	<p>(i) Different variety of food is served on each day in 37 (92.5%) schools. Only 3 (7.5%) schools gave a negative response in this matter.</p> <p>(ii) Children get rice/wheat preparation Roti/Dal and Vegetables in 37 (92.5%) schools. 7.5% school do not find variety and the cooked food does not necessarily include Rice/Roti/Dal and Vegetables every day.</p>	
8.	<p>QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL :</p> <p>Feedback from children on</p> <p>a) Quality of meal:</p> <p>b) Quantity of meal:</p> <p>c) {If children were not happy Please give reasons and suggestions to improve.}</p>	<p>Observations of Investigation during MDM service</p>
	<p>a) According to 17 (42.5%) children, the food is good in quality, though 18 (45%) of them have described it as average in quality, 5 children (12.5%) have found MDM bad in quality.</p> <p>b) In quantity, however, 37 (92.5%) children have found the food as sufficient, while 3 (7.51%) of them have stated that the food given to them is not enough and fall far short of the required standard.</p> <p>c) Suggestions:</p> <p>1) The children do not like khichadi and also express dissatisfaction with regard to Roti, which according to them is only half-baked (particularly in case of food supplied by NGO-Nandi Foundation).</p> <p>2) The food supplied by Nandi Foundation is much below the quality standard. Out of 40 children only 8 take MDM supplied by this NGO.</p>	

	<p>3) Hygienic conditions in and outside the kitchen in some cases are not good.</p> <p>4) Sweetened rice should be included in the MDM.</p> <p>5) There is need to improve food both in qualitative and quantitative terms.</p> <p>6) The bread (Roti) should be well-baked and vegetables should be chopped in small pieces.</p>	
9.	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY:</p> <p>(i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child?</p> <p>(ii) What is the frequency of health check-up?</p> <p>(iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin – A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically?</p> <p>(iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</p>	<p>Teachers, Students, School Record/ School health card</p>
	<p>(i) Health card is maintained in 12 (30%) schools. 28 (70%) schools do not have such cards for students.</p> <p>(ii) The schools (12) which maintain health card for each child, have medical check up monthly (3 schools), quarterly (2 schools) half yearly (1 school) and yearly (6 schools). There is yearly medical check-up (though card is not maintained) in 15 other schools also. Thus, medical check up covers 27 schools (with or without the maintenance of health card). There is no medical support for the children of remaining 13 schools.</p> <p>(iii) 21 schools (52.5%) are provided with micro-nutrients (iron, Folic, Acid, Vitamin a dosages and deworming medicines) periodically.</p> <p>(iv) These medicines (micro-nutrients) are administered by Health Department. The micronutrients are administered at intervals of one month (8 schools), quarterly (3 schools) half yearly (2 schools) and yearly (8 schools). 19 schools (47.5%) have been deprived of this important health related support. This is woeful.</p>	
10.	<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>(ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms?</p> <p>(iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</p> <p>(iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers regularly?</p> <p>(v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers? (SC/ST/OBC/ Minority)</p>	<p>Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks-cum-helpers.</p>
	<p>(i) The cooks with their helpers cook food in all the 32 schools. In remaining 8 schools cooked food is served by NGO-Nandi Foundation</p>	

	<p>(ii) The number of cooks and helpers is as per GoI norms in 29 (72.5%) schools. In the rest of schools, local conditions and availability of cooks are deciding factors.</p> <p>(iii) Remuneration of cooks and helpers is Rs. 1000/- per month. Monthly emoluments to cooks and helpers are paid in cash in 70% schools and by cheque in 10% schools. Cooked food is served in 8 (20%) schools by Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(iv) Emoluments to cooks/helpers are paid regularly in 18 (45%) schools. The payment is not regular in 14 (35%) schools. 8 schools have cooked food from the NGO-Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(v) Most of the cooks/helpers are from the OBC with a few of them belonging to SC and ST and general category.</p>	
11.	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE: Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Constructed and in use ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed - MDM/SSA/Others iii) Constructed but not in use (Reasons for not using) iv) Under construction v) Sanctioned, but construction not started vi) Not sanctioned vii) Any other (specify) 	School records, discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.
	<p>(i) Pucca kitchen with shed and store exists in 32 schools. 8 schools have MDM from the NGO- Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(ii) The kitchens have been constructed under SSA in 18 (45%) schools and by other sources in 14 (35%) schools. 8 schools have cooked food from NGO-Nandi Foundation.</p> <p>(iii) There is no unused kitchen in any of the school.</p> <p>(iv) There is no kitchen under construction in any of the school.</p> <p>(v) There is no school for which kitchen has been sanctioned but construction has no yet begun.</p> <p>(vi) There is no school for which there is no sanction for constructing the kitchen.</p> <p>(vii) There is no other arrangement (except kitchen) for cooking in any of the school.</p>	
12.	<p>In the absence of pucca kitchen with store: In case the pucca kitchen shed is not available, where is the food being cooked and where are the foodgrains/other ingredients being stored.</p>	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members, Observation
	<p>(i) Food grains and cooking material stored in any of the school rooms including the room</p>	

	of the teacher-incharge. (ii) Since kitchen is available in all the 32 schools, the question of cooking elsewhere does not arise.	
13.	Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?	-do-
	(i) Water for cooking and drinking is available in 35 (87.5%) schools. (ii) Water is not available within the school premises in 5 (12.5%) schools for cooking and drinking purposes, water is brought from outside.	
14.	Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If, available is it adequate?	Teachers/Organizer of MDM Programme
	Utensils for cooking are available in 34 (85%) schools, though in a few schools, not as per requirements.	
15.	What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)	Observation
	Wood is used for cooking in 20 (50%) schools and gas cylinder is used in 12 (30%) schools. Cooked food is supplied in the remaining 8 (20%) schools by NGO-Nandi Foundation.	
16.	SAFETY & HYGIENE: i. General Impression of the environment, Safety and hygiene: ii. Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating iii. Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner? iv. Conservation of water? v. Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?	Observation
	(i) Good in 16 (40%) schools, average in 23 (57.5%) schools and bad in 1 (2.5%) school. (ii) Children are motivated to wash their hands before and after taking meal in 27 (67.5%) schools. There is no such motivation in 13 (32.5%) schools. (iii) The children maintain discipline at the time of MDM in 30 (75%) schools. No such discipline observed in remaining 10 (25%) schools. (iv) Children do have the habit of saving water in 26 (65%) schools. Unfortunately this habit is missing in 14 (35%) schools. (v) There is no hazard involved while cooking or storing the food stuff in 28 (70%) schools, but such safety norm is not visible in 12 (30%) schools.	

<p>17. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND AWARENESS:</p> <p>i) Extent of participation by Parents / VECs / Panchayats / Urban bodies in daily supervision, monitoring, participation.</p> <p>ii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?</p>	<p>Discussion with head teacher, teacher, Parents, VEC, Gram Panchayat members</p>																												
<p>(i) Community SMC/Panchayat/urban bodies members use to visit schools for monitoring MDM as under: -</p> <p>(a) Monthly as per response of 16 schools (40%).</p> <p>(b) Weekly according to 2 schools (57%).</p> <p>(c) Quarterly as stated by 7 schools (17.5%).</p> <p>(d) Half yearly as reported by 6 schools (15%).</p> <p>(e) Never as per the response of 9 schools (22.5%).</p> <p>(f) It is evident that monitoring of MDM by community stakeholders is not upto the required norms. It is indeed unfortunate.</p> <p>(ii) There is no roaster for monitoring MDM by community stakeholders in 37 (92.5%) schools. Only 3 (7.5%) schools have a roaster for this purpose.</p> <p>(iii) About the quality of MDM served to children, the awareness of community stakeholders is as under:</p> <table data-bbox="357 1108 1521 1407"> <tr> <td>(1) Poor</td> <td>- 2 schools (5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2) Satisfactory</td> <td>- 15 schools (37.5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3) Good</td> <td>- 13 schools (32.5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Very Good</td> <td>- 2 schools (5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(5) Excellent</td> <td>- 0 schools (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(6) The food supplied by Nandi Foundation (NGO) in 8 (20%) schools is much below the quality standard.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(iv) General awareness about MDM in absolute terms.</p> <table data-bbox="357 1459 1521 1627"> <tr> <td>(a) Just satisfactory</td> <td>- 3 (7.5%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Satisfactory</td> <td>- 14 (35%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Good</td> <td>- 21 (52.5%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Excellent</td> <td>- 2 (5%) schools</td> </tr> </table> <p>(v) Sources of awareness about MDM</p> <table data-bbox="357 1680 1521 1848"> <tr> <td>(a) Newspapers</td> <td>- 1 (2.5%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Villagers, friends and relative-</td> <td>- 2 (5%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Teachers</td> <td>- 3 (7.5%) schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Schools</td> <td>- 23 (57.5%) schools</td> </tr> </table>		(1) Poor	- 2 schools (5%)	(2) Satisfactory	- 15 schools (37.5%)	(3) Good	- 13 schools (32.5%)	(4) Very Good	- 2 schools (5%)	(5) Excellent	- 0 schools (0%)	(6) The food supplied by Nandi Foundation (NGO) in 8 (20%) schools is much below the quality standard.		(a) Just satisfactory	- 3 (7.5%) schools	(b) Satisfactory	- 14 (35%) schools	(c) Good	- 21 (52.5%) schools	(d) Excellent	- 2 (5%) schools	(a) Newspapers	- 1 (2.5%) schools	(b) Villagers, friends and relative-	- 2 (5%) schools	(c) Teachers	- 3 (7.5%) schools	(d) Schools	- 23 (57.5%) schools
(1) Poor	- 2 schools (5%)																												
(2) Satisfactory	- 15 schools (37.5%)																												
(3) Good	- 13 schools (32.5%)																												
(4) Very Good	- 2 schools (5%)																												
(5) Excellent	- 0 schools (0%)																												
(6) The food supplied by Nandi Foundation (NGO) in 8 (20%) schools is much below the quality standard.																													
(a) Just satisfactory	- 3 (7.5%) schools																												
(b) Satisfactory	- 14 (35%) schools																												
(c) Good	- 21 (52.5%) schools																												
(d) Excellent	- 2 (5%) schools																												
(a) Newspapers	- 1 (2.5%) schools																												
(b) Villagers, friends and relative-	- 2 (5%) schools																												
(c) Teachers	- 3 (7.5%) schools																												
(d) Schools	- 23 (57.5%) schools																												

	(e) Radio - 9 (22.5%) schools (f) Community stakeholders in 2 schools did not give information in this regard.																																								
18.	INSPECTION & SUPERVISION: i) Has the mid day meal programme been inspected by any state / district / block level officers/officials? ii) The frequency of such inspections?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, VEC, Gram Panchayat members																																							
	(i) State, district and block level officials have visited 23 (57.5%) schools out of 40 but 17 schools (42.5%) have not been visited for this purpose. (ii) The following is the no. of visits carried out by different level officials:																																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>S.N.</th> <th>Official</th> <th>No. of visits in a year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>Deputy Director</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>DIET Official</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>DEO</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>Additional DEO</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>ADPC - SSA</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>Deputy DEO</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7.</td> <td>BEO</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8.</td> <td>Additional BEO</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9.</td> <td>BRCF</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10.</td> <td>Resource Person</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11.</td> <td>Asstt. Engineer</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.</td> <td>Asstt. Extension Officer</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S.N.	Official	No. of visits in a year	1.	Deputy Director	1	2.	DIET Official	4	3.	DEO	3	4.	Additional DEO	2	5.	ADPC - SSA	17	6.	Deputy DEO	4	7.	BEO	31	8.	Additional BEO	5	9.	BRCF	8	10.	Resource Person	8	11.	Asstt. Engineer	3	12.	Asstt. Extension Officer	5	
S.N.	Official	No. of visits in a year																																							
1.	Deputy Director	1																																							
2.	DIET Official	4																																							
3.	DEO	3																																							
4.	Additional DEO	2																																							
5.	ADPC - SSA	17																																							
6.	Deputy DEO	4																																							
7.	BEO	31																																							
8.	Additional BEO	5																																							
9.	BRCF	8																																							
10.	Resource Person	8																																							
11.	Asstt. Engineer	3																																							
12.	Asstt. Extension Officer	5																																							
	<p>Evidently inspection and supervision by different level educational officials is not at the desired level. Only BEO seems to be more active in this regard. District and block level functionaries seem to observe mere formality by accidental visits to schools. Surprisingly 42.5% schools have not even visited once by these luminaries.</p> <p>The officials visiting schools for supervision and inspection do make observations and make suggestions which are of general nature. There is no evidence of concrete suggestions except that there should be improvement in MDM and that the records should be properly maintained.</p>																																								
19.	IMPACT Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment, attendance of children in school, general well being (nutritional status) of children? Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving cooked meal in schools?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, students, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.																																							

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) There is positive impact on enrollment status according to 22 (55%) schools, though 18 (45%) schools do not see any impact of MDM on enrollment.(ii) The positive impact is obvious on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Attendance which has improved- Health of children which has registered remarkable improvement according to 28 (70%) schools.(iii) There is positive impact on children's habit regarding hygiene, discipline, sense of equality, sharing etc according to 29 (72.5%) schools. |
|---|

20. General observations based on field experience

Field visits to selected no. of schools do not necessarily present truth in full measure. There are good, bad and average situations across the schools covered under a field investigation. Yet, there are certain points which do emerge in a generalized perspective. What has emerged is the fact that by and large the MDM scheme has been an acceptable venture for children, particularly of marginalized sections of the society. It is a fact that a vast majority of children studying in govt. schools are from these sections for whom at least one full meal in a day is an asset. There is definitely an improvement in children's health and positive habits have been inculcated in them due to shared food, seating arrangement (a few exceptions of discrimination notwithstanding) hygiene and discipline. The quality and quantity of food served under the MDM scheme is normally upto the required standards.

What, however, has emerged as a disturbing factor is the fact that MDM scheme entrusted to NGO (or a private agency) deviates from the standardized norms. In Bhilwada City the NGO-Nandi Foundation, has been supplying cooked food which is not upto the mark and children, by and large, have abstained from taking food served by this NGO. Strangely the supervisory and monitoring officials have not taken any remedial measure. This is a woeful situation rendering quite a large number of children deprived of MDM.

Though food grains are supplied well in time and schools do maintain buffer stock, there is a general complaint about delayed release of funds for cooking cost (supportive material like i.e. fuel, vegetables, spices etc.)

The credit for continuance of MDM even in a situation of non-availability of funds in time goes to the teachers who some how have maintained uninterrupted service of MDM in affected schools.

List of Sampled Schools visited by MI for MDM Monitoring

District- Bhilwara

S. N.	DISE Code	Name of the school	Block	Category of school
1	NA	PS Balapura	Baneda	Higher gender Gap
2	0401504	PS (SK) Kaharon ka kheda	Baneda	SC-populated
3	0402601	PS Sardarpura	Baneda	Higher gender Gap
4	0404503	PS Naradon ka Kheda	Baneda	Higher gender Gap
5	0409601	PS Kharolia Kheda	Baneda	Higher gender Gap
6	0401101	PS Khatikon ka kheda	Baneda	SC-populated
7	NA	UPS Shiksha Mitra Kendra Kankolia	Baneda	Spl. Trg Centre (NRC)
8	0401601	UPS Shiksha Mitra Kendra Moosa	Baneda	Spl. Trg Centre (NRC)
9	0847903	PS Bhawani Nagar Bhilwara	Suwana	Urban
10	0847902	UPS Girls (Joonabass) Bhilwara	Suwana	Urban
11	0847802	UPS (City) No 1 Bhilwara	Suwana	Urban
12	0846301	UPS (City) ward 8 Bhilwara	Suwana	Urban
13	0848301	UPS Sindhu Nagar (City) Bhilwara	Suwana	CWSN
14		UPS Girls Kalaripura (City) Bhilwara	Suwana	CWSN
15	0812501	UPS Takhatpura	Suwana	Civil work
16	0849301	UPS Chandra Sekhar Ajad Nagar Nari Mohala Bhilwara	Suwana	CALP
17.	1113912	UPS Sarana (106 Girls)	Mandalgarh	KGBV
18.	NA	PS Malka Khera (30 Girls) + 40 (Boys)	Mandalgarh	Spl. Trg. Centre -(RC)
19.	1111603	UPS Girls Khatwada	Mandalgarh	NPEGEL
20.	1110601	UPS Mohi	Mandalgarh	CWSN
21.	1107808	PS Mahuwa	Mandalgarh	Higher gender Gap
22.	1103603	PS Turra ka Jhopada	Mandalgarh	Higher gender Gap
23.	1106301	UPS (Sansk) Badanpura	Mandalgarh	Civil Work
24.	1108010	PS Chamaron Ka Jhopada	Mandalgarh	SC-populated
25.	0107705	UPS Padasoli	Asind	CALP
26.	0117704	PS Kachhion ka Bada	Asind	Spl. Trg. Centre (RC)

27.	0112802	UPS Sulwada	Asind	NPEGEL
28.	0122703	PS Rajpuria Ki Jhopadia ward-1	Asind	Urban
29.	NA	UPS Amali Kheda ki Jhopadia ward-1	Asind	Urban
30.	0115409	UPS Brahamano Ki Sareri	Asind	KGBV
31.	NA	UPS Shiksha Mitra Kendra Karanipura	Asind	Spl. Trg Centre (NRC)
32.	0112901	UPS Bhati Kheda	Asind	Civil Work7
33	0326302	UPS Kund Gate Shahpura	Shahpura	CALP
34	0313010	UPS Kanechan Kalan (44 Girls)	Shahpura	KGBV
35	0326201	PS Koli Colony ward - 8 Shahpura	Shahpura	Urban
36	0327401	UPS Kalinjari Gate ward-20	Shahpura	Urban
37	0314501	UPS Kajodia	Shahpura	Civil work
38	NA	PS Bairwa basti Kanechan kalan	Shahpura	SC-populated
39	0301706	UPS Rahad	Shahpura	SC-populated
40	0315001	GUPS Modi Pura	Shahpura	NPEGEL

Mid-Day Meal Scheme: - District Jaipur

A. At School Level

1.	<p>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL: Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</p> <p>(i) As per the response of 34 (85%) school students across 40 sampled schools, fresh cooked hot food served everyday, but according to 6 (15%) school students it was not so. Thus, MDM is a regular feature in 85% schools visited by the monitoring team.</p> <p>(ii) The response of teachers in this regard was just the same as of the students.</p> <p>(iii) Parents gave the number of schools with uninterrupted service of fresh hot cooked food as 31 (77.5%) and according to them in 9 (22.5%) schools the service of MDM was not regular.</p> <p>(iv) According to MDM register maintained in every school there was uninterrupted service of MDM in 33 (82.5%) schools. 7 (17.5%) schools did not have regularity in MDM.</p> <p>Comment: - Disruption in MDM in some schools has been noticed. A few schools (2 in number which have been identified) MDM has not been served for the last two months, since the NGO – Akchhay Patra, responsible for the supply of cooked food has given road block as reason for this disruption. In some cases, the excess number of children in a school has become the cause for delay in MDM, while cold cooked food is served in a few schools, since the food is cooked at the residence of the cook and gets cold by the time it reaches the school. The reasons given for disruption in MDM and service of cold cooked food are, to say the least, untenable and cannot be cited as valid reasons for disruption in MDM.</p>	Students, Teachers & Parents, and MDM register														
2.	<p>TRENDS: Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 90%;">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>i.</td> <td>Enrollment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ii.</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iii.</td> <td>No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iv.</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> </tr> <tr> <td>v.</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>vi.</td> <td>No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Details	i.	Enrollment	ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.	<p>School level registers, MDM Registers Head Teachers, Schools level MDM functionaries / Observation of the monitoring team.</p> <p>In case of centralized kitchen the no. of school served by it.</p> <p>Time taken in supply of hot cooked mid day meal from centralized kitchen.</p>
No.	Details															
i.	Enrollment															
ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal															
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit															
iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register															
v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit															
vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.															

S. N.	Categories	Class-wise position									
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total	%
i.	Enrollment	1314	1107	988	832	799	1004	864	769	7677	-
ii.	No. of children opted for MDM	1314	1107	988	832	799	1004	864	769	7677	100%
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	679	577	579	535	549	695	587	553	4754	62%
iv.	No. of children availing the MDM as per MDM register	672	554	544	458	498	581	509	466	4282	56%
v.	No. of children availing MDM on the day of visit	607	504	477	462	460	546	485	410	3951	51%
vi.	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	661	582	578	509	511	609	532	692	4674	61%

Description

The total enrolment across 40 schools as per school registers comes to 7677 out of whom 56% children have been availing MDM. 62% children were found attending the school on the day of team's visit, and the no. of children actually taking MDM on that day was 3951 which was 51% of the total enrollment. In fact, around 83% children present on that day took MDM.

Though the acceptability of MDM at the school level is widely acclaimed, only 56% children out of the total enrollment as per the school registers have been availing MDM. It is indeed woeful, requiring a deeper probe as to why 44% children are not availing MDM in schools. Even on the day of team's visit 17% children present did not take MDM. The average attendance in schools too is unsatisfactory. Only 62% attendance is poor enough requiring some stringent measures to bring enrolled children to schools. SMC's role herein becomes crucial.

3.	REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAINS TO SCHOOL LEVEL:	School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.
	(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?	
	(ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement is maintained?	
	(iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?	
	(iv) Is the quality of foodgrain good?	

Out of 40 schools, 22 get cooked food from the NGO – Akchhay Patra. Hence the following information pertains only to remaining 18 schools.

- (i) Out of 18 schools 17 have been getting regular supply of food grains and also in time.

	<p>Only one school gets the supply with a delay of 15 days. The reason for this delay rests with higher authorities.</p> <p>(ii) Buffer stock of food grains is available in 17 schools. Only in one school there is a delayed supply and hence buffer stock too is adversely affected. All the 18 schools get food grains as per the required quantity.</p> <p>(iii) Food grains are supplied directly to all the 18 schools.</p> <p>(iv) The quality of food grains supplied to 17 schools is good, while one school gave negative response in this regard.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>As far as the supply of food grains is concerned, the quantity and quality both, have been at the satisfactory level according to 94% schools out of 18 which have cooking arrangements within the school's premises. The percentage of such school out of 40 sampled schools comes to 45%.</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>(ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</p> <p>(iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</p>	<p>School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.</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>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</p>	<p>Observations / Probe/ interaction with the children.</p>

- (iii) There was no discriminatory practice noticed in 38 (95%) schools. Only in two schools, the SC and ST children were found sitting separately while taking MDM. There must have been some kind of compulsion behind those children's preference to sit separately during MDM.
- (ii-a) The cooked food is served by cook in 11 (27.5%) schools, by teacher in 5 (12.5%) schools and by students in 24 (60%) schools. It is clear that in a majority of schools the students are involved in serving cooked food, though the cook also carries out this job in some schools. Some steps need be taken to avoid students' involvement in serving MDM in large numbers – some exceptional situations not-withstanding.
- (ii-b) Food is served in verandas (65% schools) and in open space (35% schools). The seating arrangements for taking food are dependent on availability of space in a school. In most cases verandas are the obvious choice (if they are available in a school)

6. **VARIETY OF MENU:**

- i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed?
- ii) Who decides the menu?

Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks. Obtain a copy of menu.

- a) Weekly menu for MDM is displayed on a notice board for the benefit of the community in 20 (50%) schools, though there is no such display in the remaining 20 (50%) schools.
- b) The menu is decided by the state govt. and this practice is found in all the 40 schools.
- c) The weekly menu is given in the following table: -

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Vegetable-Roti	Dal-Rice	Dal-Roti	Khichadi/Dal - Roti	Dal-Roti	Vegetable-Roti

7. **Variety in served food**

- (i) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily?
- (ii) Dose the daily menu include rice / wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?

Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks.

	<p>(i) Different variety of food is served on each day in 36 (90%) schools, though this practice is not followed in the remaining 4 (10%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) Children do get Rice/Roti-Dal/Vegetables every day in 33 (82.5%) schools. But in 7 (17.5%) schools this menu is not strictly followed.</p>	
8.	<p>QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL : Feedback from children on</p> <p>a) Quality of meal: b) Quantity of meal: c) {If children were not happy Please give reasons and suggestions to improve.}</p>	<p>Observations of Investigation during MDM service</p>
	<p>(i) 19 (47.5%) children have found meal as good while according to 17 (42.5%) children the quality of food is just average. 4 (10%) children have described meal as bad in quality.</p> <p>(ii) According to 33 (82.5%) children the quantity of cooked food served to them is sufficient while 7 of them (17.5%) have described it as insufficient.</p> <p>(iii) Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Children prefer hot meal. 2. The cooking arrangement should be at the school under the supervision of parents. 3. The quantity and quality of meal should be strictly according to laid down rules. 	
9.	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY:</p> <p>(i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child? (ii) What is the frequency of health check-up? (iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin – A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically? (iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</p>	<p>Teachers, Students, School Record/ School health card</p>
	<p>(i) In place of health card for each child, there is a health register in 35 (87.5%) schools, though there is no such facility in the remaining 5 (12.5%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) There is annual health inspection in 25 (62.5%) schools, half-yearly inspection in 8 (20%) schools and monthly inspection in 2 (5%) schools. There is no health related inspection in 5 (12.5%) schools.</p> <p>(iii) 25 (62.5%) schools are provided with micro-nutrients (Iron, Folic Acid Vitamin – A) and dosages of deworming medicine periodically. There is no such facility in 15 (37.5%) schools, which do have health inspection as stated above.</p> <p>(iv) These medicines are supplied by Health Department in 22 (55%) schools, by women and Child Development Deptt. in 2 (5%) schools and by Education Department in 1</p>	

	(2.5%) school. The remaining 15 (37.5%) schools do not have this facility. These medicines are administered, monthly in 11 (27.5%) schools, quarterly in 3 (7.5%) schools, half yearly in 4 (10%) schools and yearly in 7 (17.5%) schools.																
10.	<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>(ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms?</p> <p>(iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</p> <p>(iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers regularly?</p> <p>(v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers? (SC/ST/OBC/Minority)</p>	<p>Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks-cum-helpers.</p>															
	<p>(i) Food is cooked by the cook and helpers in 18 (45%) schools. In the remaining 22 (55%) schools cooked food is served by the NGO Akchchaya Patra.</p> <p>(ii) The number of cooks and helpers is as per prescribed norms in 17 (42.5%) schools. while in 1 (2.5%) school the norm has not been followed. In total there are 21 cooks and helpers across 18 schools where MDM is cooked.</p> <p>(iii) Both, the cook as well as the helper, get Rs. 1000 per month. The payment is made in cash in 15 (37.5%) school and by cheque in 3 (7.5%) schools.</p> <p>(iv) The remuneration to cooks and helpers is paid regularly in 9 (22.5%) schools, while in 9 others the payment is not regular.</p> <p>(v) The social status of cook and helpers is as under: -</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(a) SC</td> <td>=</td> <td>1 (4.8%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) ST</td> <td>=</td> <td>4 (19%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) OBC</td> <td>=</td> <td>9 (42.9%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) General</td> <td>=</td> <td>7 (33.4%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>=</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </table>	(a) SC	=	1 (4.8%)	(b) ST	=	4 (19%)	(c) OBC	=	9 (42.9%)	(d) General	=	7 (33.4%)	Total	=	21	
(a) SC	=	1 (4.8%)															
(b) ST	=	4 (19%)															
(c) OBC	=	9 (42.9%)															
(d) General	=	7 (33.4%)															
Total	=	21															
11.	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE:</p> <p>Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store:</p> <p>i) Constructed and in use</p> <p>ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed -MDM/SSA/Others</p> <p>iii) Constructed but not in use (Reasons for not using)</p> <p>iv) Under construction</p> <p>v) Sanctioned, but construction not started</p> <p>vi) Not sanctioned</p> <p>vii) Any other (specify)</p>	<p>School records, discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.</p>															

	<p>i) Out of 18 schools (where food is cooked in school premises) 13 have Kitchen, while 5 schools have no proper kitchen.</p> <p>ii) Kitchens have been constructed in 16 schools, 4 under MDM scheme, 5 under SSA scheme and 7 by Panchayats.</p> <p>iii) Out of available kitchens in schools, only 13 are being used for cooking. 3 schools with the facility of kitchen, are getting cooked food from NGO – Akchchaya Patra.</p> <p>iv) Kitchens are under construction in 4 schools.</p> <p>v) Kitchen has been sanctioned for 9 schools, though construction is going on in 2 schools only. Construction work has not been initiated in the remaining 7 schools.</p> <p>Note: It may be mentioned that there are schools with kitchen facility, but cooked food is served by NGO and hence the kitchens in such schools remain unutilized while there are 5 schools out of 18 (where food is cooked) which do not have kitchen facility.</p>	
12.	<p>In the absence of pucca kitchen with store: In case the pucca kitchen shed is not available, where is the food being cooked and where are the foodgrains/other ingredients being stored.</p> <p>There are 5 such schools which have no pucca kitchen, though food is cooked within the school premises.</p> <p>(i) Cooking material is stored in classrooms – 13 schools. (ii) – Food is cooked in the class room – 1 school. – Open space in 2 schools. – At cook’s residence in 2 schools.</p> <p>Thus food is not cooked in proper kitchen in 5 schools. As stated above, 13 out of 18 schools do have kitchen but these do not have storing facility.</p>	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members, Observation
13.	<p>Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?</p> <p>(i) Potable water is available in 26 (65%) schools. (ii) Strangely there is no potable water facility in the remaining 14 (35%) schools.</p>	-do-
14.	<p>Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If, available is it adequate?</p> <p>Required no. of utensils are available in 24 (60%) schools, but here too only 21 (59.5%) schools have enough utensils, while in 3 (7.5%) schools these are insufficient.</p>	Teachers/Organizer of MDM Programme

15.	What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)	Observation
<p>(i) Wood in 14 (35%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) Kerosene stove in 2 (5%) schools.</p> <p>(iii) Gas cylinder in 2 (5%) schools.</p> <p>In 22 schools cooked food is served by NGO.</p>		
16.	<p>SAFETY & HYGIENE:</p> <p>i. General Impression of the environment, Safety and hygiene:</p> <p>ii. Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating</p> <p>iii. Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner?</p> <p>iv. Conservation of water?</p> <p>v. Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?</p>	Observation
<p>(i) General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good in 15 (37.5%) schools. - Average in 19 (49.5%) schools. - Bad in 6 (15%) schools. <p>(ii) Children are motivated to wash their hands before and after taking meal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, in 23 (57.5%) schools. - No, in 17 (42.5%) schools. <p>(iii) Children maintain discipline while taking meal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, in 31 (77.5%) schools. - No, in 9 (22.5%) schools. <p>(iv) Children have the habit of saving water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, in 24 (60%) schools. - No, in 16 (40%) schools. <p>(v) There is no hazard involved owing to the storing of fuel or cooking conditions in 15 (37.5%) schools, though in 3 (7.5%) schools, the possibility of hazard is not ruled out.</p>		
17.	<p>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND AWARENESS:</p> <p>i) Extent of participation by Parents / VECs / Panchayats / Urban bodies in daily supervision, monitoring, participation.</p> <p>ii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?</p>	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, Parents, VEC, Gram Panchayat members
<p>(Based on discussions with teacher/ head teacher, parent, SMC member and Panchayat representatives).</p> <p>(i) Visits by Parents/SMC member/PR representative etc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Weekly according to 10 (25%) schools. b) Monthly according to 18 (45%) schools. c) Quarterly as stated by 8 (20%) schools. 		

- d) Half yearly as per the response of 1 (2.5%) school.
- e) Never as reported by 3 (7.5%) schools.
- It is obvious that visits by these responsible people have not been at the required level, thus weakening the process of monitoring and supervision of MDM.
- (ii) There is no roaster prepared for the visit of community stakeholders for monitoring MDM in a sequence in 34 (85%) schools. Only 6 (15%) schools do maintain the roaster system.
- (iii) The opinion of parents/community members about the following:
 - 1) About quantity of MDM served in schools.
 - At PS level (200 responses):
 - a) Not at the required level – 12 (6%)
 - b) Satisfactory – 85 (42.5%)
 - c) Good – 82 (41%)
 - d) V. Good – 20 (10%)
 - e) Excellent – 1 (0.5%)
 - At the UPS level (150 responses)
 - a) Not at the required level – 15 (10%)
 - b) Satisfactory – 51 (34%)
 - c) Good – 60 (40%)
 - d) V. Good – 21 (14%)
 - e) Excellent – 3 (2%)
 - 2) About the quantity of MDM as prescribed by the state govt.
 - At PS level (200 responses)
 - a) Poor - 10 (5%)
 - b) Satisfactory – 104 (52%)
 - c) Good – 68 (34%)
 - d) V. Good – 16 (8%)
 - e) Excellent – 2 (1%)
 - At the UPS level (150 responses)
 - a) Poor - 12 (8%)
 - b) Satisfactory – 56 (37%)
 - c) Good – 60 (40%)
 - d) V. Good – 19 (12.7%)
 - e) Excellent – 3 (2%)
- (iv) General opinion about MDM (40 responses)
 - 1. Just satisfactory – 3 (7.5%) schools.
 - 2. Satisfactory - 13 (32.5%) schools.

3. Good - 22 (55%) schools.
 4. V. Good – 2 (5%) schools.
- (v) Source of information about MDM (multiple responses)
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. New Papers | - | 11 (27.5%) |
| 2. Villagers, friends and relative | - | 16 (40%) |
| 3. Teachers | - | 32 (80%) |
| 4. Schools | - | 34 (85%) |
| 5. Radio | - | 2 (5%) |
| 6. TV | - | 2 (5%) |
| 7. From own children | - | 8 (20%) |

18. **INSPECTION & SUPERVISION:**
- | | |
|--|---|
| i) Has the mid day meal programme been inspected by any state / district / block level officers/officials?
ii) The frequency of such inspections? | School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, VEC, Gram Panchayat members |
|--|---|

(i) State, district and block level officials have inspected and supervised MDM in 29 (72.5%) schools, but 11 (27.5%) schools have not been visited for this purpose.

(ii) The following is the no. of visits carried out by different level officials in a year:

S.N.	Official	No. of visits
1.	Deputy Director	1
2.	DEO	3
3.	DIET Official	5
4.	Zila Parishad	3
5.	MLA	1
6.	SDO	4
7.	ADPC	6
8.	BEEO	29
9.	ABEEO	5

(iii) The visitors have made general remarks while visiting MDM in schools like the food should be well cooked and that drinking water should be kept in hygienic conditions etc.

19. **IMPACT**
- | | |
|---|--|
| Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment, attendance of children in school, general well being (nutritional status) of children? Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving cooked meal in schools? | School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, students, VEC, Gram Panchayat members. |
|---|--|

- (i) Positive impact on enrollment according to 16 (40%) schools while 24 (60%) schools do not see any impact in this regard. In a positive sense, the enrollment of children from poor families has definitely gone up.
- (ii) There is positive impact on attendance according to 17 (42.5%) schools since children do not leave school in the post lunch session. But 23 (57%) schools do not see such impact on attendance.
- (iii) There is definite impact on the health of children according to 23 (57.5%) schools as they have gained weight and their health has improved considerably. But here too 17 (42.5%) schools have given a negative response.
- (iv) According to 50% schools, the children have become more disciplined owing to MDM since they eat together with a sense of equality. There is a growing sense of brotherhood among them, but 50% schools have not given a positive response in this regard.

20 General comments (investigator's views)

The MDM provides a mixed scenario in schools. Opinions are divided in positive and negative categories. But there is no denying the fact that MDM has received stability in schools despite glaring examples of neglect in the realm of supervision and monitoring. The officials have not visited schools to the extent they should, in order to see that there is no lapse on the part of school's management at any level. There are complaints of disruption in MDM owing to delayed supply of cooking cost. The NGO involved in supplying cooked food is reported to have not provided food in some schools owing to impediments in communication lines. While the food cooked in schools does have some quality control, there is no evidence of such control on the quality of food supplied by the NGO. Drinking water facility too is lacking in some schools.

Surprisingly the MDM has not contributed in enhancing enrollment in schools, though there is positive impact on the health of children. It is a fact that children coming from poor families have definitely benefitted by MDMS and this, in itself, is a contribution which needs be appreciated.

List of Sampled Schools visited by MI for MDM Monitoring

District- Jaipur

S. N.	DISE Code	Name of the school	Block	Category of school
1	0712001	UPS Heerawala	Jambaramgarh	NPEGEL
2	0710601	UPS Chavand ka Mand	Jambaramgarh	NPEGEL
3	0704305	PS Raigar Mohlla	Jambaramgarh	SC Populated
4	0708403	UPS Medrajsinghpura	Jambaramgarh	CWSN
5	1201308	UPS, panwalia	Sanganer	KGBV
6	2702306	UPS Pratap Nagar Sector- 3	Sanganer	CALP
7	2702208	UPS Pratap Nagar Sector- 6	Sanganer	Urban
8	2702413	UPS Jagatpura	Sanganer	Urban
9	1208001	UPS Ratlya	Sanganer	Civil Work
10	2702407	UPS Bhavgarh Bandhya	Sanganer	CWSN
11	0821503	PS Mohlla Raigran – 1	Bassi	SC Populated
12	0821511	UPS Railway Bassi	Bassi	CALP
13	0804019	UPS girl's Kanota	Bassi	NPEGEL
14	0812101	UPS Kalyanpura	Bassi	KGBV
15	0801402	UPS Bainada	Bassi	CALP
16	0811301	UPS girl's Mohanpura	Bassi	CALP
17.	0600501	UPS dhand	Amer	CWSN
18.	2805303	UPS Ghandichauk	Amer	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
19.	2805304	UPS Kunda	Amer	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
20.	0607401	UPS Rajawas	Amer	Urban
21.	0612301	UPS Dhabri	Amer	Civil work
22.	0608303	PS Jalsoo	Amer	NPEGEL
23.	1332101	UPS Sheetla	Chaksu	KGBV
24.	1331201	UPS Railway Station, Chaksu	Chaksu	CALP
25.	1332101	UPS Sheetla	Chaksu	Spl. Trg. Center (RC)
26.	1316301	PS Khajalpura	Chaksu	SC/ST Populated

27.	1330401	UPS No. 1 Chaksu	Chaksu	Urban
28.	1329902	PS Suraj Kunda ki Dhani	Chaksu	Urban
29.	1310901	PS Pachuda	Chaksu	SC/ST Populated
30.	1316001	UPS Thuni Rup Niwas	Chaksu	SC/ST Populated
31.	1315601	UPS Hunkan	Chaksu	Civil Work
32.	2502906	PS Pravatpuri, Jawahar Nagar	Jaipur City	Civil Work
33	2503003	PS Girl's Jawahar Nagar	Jaipur City	Urban
34	2502906	PS Girl's Teela No. 2 Jawahar Nagar	Jaipur City	Spl. Trg. Centre (RC)
35	2504403	UPS Ramganj	Jaipur City	Minority Populated
36	2505101	UPS Bans Badanpura	Jaipur City	CWSN
37	2505804	UPS Maharaja Adarsh Hawa Mahal	Jaipur City	Urban
38	2502701	UPS MNIT, JLN Marg	Jaipur City	Urban
39	2503403	PS Pataleshwar Agra Road	Jaipur City	CWSN
40	2800902	UPS Girl's Raigar Basti, Jhothwara	Jaipur City	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)

Mid-Day Meal Scheme: - District Bundi

A. At School Level

1.	REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL: Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?	Students, Teachers & Parents, and MDM register																																																																																														
	(i) As per the response of students across 40 sampled schools (both PS and UPS), fresh hot cooked food is served in 39 (97.5%) schools. Only in one (2.5%) school the service of meal is not regular. (ii) The responses of teachers, parents and also as per the MDM register in the schools, correspond to that of students.																																																																																															
2.	TRENDS: Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)	School level registers, MDM Registers Head Teachers, Schools level MDM functionaries / Observation of the monitoring team. In case of centralized kitchen the no. of school served by it. Time taken in supply of hot cooked mid day meal from centralized kitchen.																																																																																														
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 90%;">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i.</td> <td>Enrollment</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii.</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iii.</td> <td>No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv.</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v.</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi.</td> <td>No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Details	i.	Enrollment	ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.																																																																																	
No.	Details																																																																																															
i.	Enrollment																																																																																															
ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal																																																																																															
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit																																																																																															
iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register																																																																																															
v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit																																																																																															
vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.																																																																																															
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 5%;">S. N.</th> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 25%;">Categories</th> <th colspan="10" style="text-align: center;">Class-wise position</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">I</th> <th style="width: 5%;">II</th> <th style="width: 5%;">III</th> <th style="width: 5%;">IV</th> <th style="width: 5%;">V</th> <th style="width: 5%;">VI</th> <th style="width: 5%;">VII</th> <th style="width: 5%;">VIII</th> <th style="width: 5%;">Total</th> <th style="width: 5%;">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i.</td> <td>Enrollment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">804</td> <td style="text-align: center;">663</td> <td style="text-align: center;">623</td> <td style="text-align: center;">589</td> <td style="text-align: center;">564</td> <td style="text-align: center;">851</td> <td style="text-align: center;">625</td> <td style="text-align: center;">704</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5423</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii.</td> <td>No. of children opted for MDM</td> <td style="text-align: center;">804</td> <td style="text-align: center;">663</td> <td style="text-align: center;">623</td> <td style="text-align: center;">589</td> <td style="text-align: center;">564</td> <td style="text-align: center;">851</td> <td style="text-align: center;">625</td> <td style="text-align: center;">704</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5423</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">481</td> <td style="text-align: center;">445</td> <td style="text-align: center;">450</td> <td style="text-align: center;">415</td> <td style="text-align: center;">413</td> <td style="text-align: center;">599</td> <td style="text-align: center;">462</td> <td style="text-align: center;">676</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3941</td> <td style="text-align: center;">72.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv.</td> <td>No. of children availing the MDM as per MDM register</td> <td style="text-align: center;">445</td> <td style="text-align: center;">413</td> <td style="text-align: center;">416</td> <td style="text-align: center;">391</td> <td style="text-align: center;">387</td> <td style="text-align: center;">528</td> <td style="text-align: center;">432</td> <td style="text-align: center;">517</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3529</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v.</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">449</td> <td style="text-align: center;">428</td> <td style="text-align: center;">421</td> <td style="text-align: center;">388</td> <td style="text-align: center;">370</td> <td style="text-align: center;">494</td> <td style="text-align: center;">407</td> <td style="text-align: center;">476</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3433</td> <td style="text-align: center;">63.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi.</td> <td>No. of children aviating MDM on the previous day</td> <td style="text-align: center;">439</td> <td style="text-align: center;">403</td> <td style="text-align: center;">383</td> <td style="text-align: center;">370</td> <td style="text-align: center;">378</td> <td style="text-align: center;">525</td> <td style="text-align: center;">428</td> <td style="text-align: center;">498</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3424</td> <td style="text-align: center;">63.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S. N.	Categories	Class-wise position										I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total	%	i.	Enrollment	804	663	623	589	564	851	625	704	5423		ii.	No. of children opted for MDM	804	663	623	589	564	851	625	704	5423	100%	iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	481	445	450	415	413	599	462	676	3941	72.7%	iv.	No. of children availing the MDM as per MDM register	445	413	416	391	387	528	432	517	3529	65%	v.	No. of children availing MDM on the day of visit	449	428	421	388	370	494	407	476	3433	63.3%	vi.	No. of children aviating MDM on the previous day	439	403	383	370	378	525	428	498	3424	63.1%	
S. N.	Categories			Class-wise position																																																																																												
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total	%																																																																																					
i.	Enrollment	804	663	623	589	564	851	625	704	5423																																																																																						
ii.	No. of children opted for MDM	804	663	623	589	564	851	625	704	5423	100%																																																																																					
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	481	445	450	415	413	599	462	676	3941	72.7%																																																																																					
iv.	No. of children availing the MDM as per MDM register	445	413	416	391	387	528	432	517	3529	65%																																																																																					
v.	No. of children availing MDM on the day of visit	449	428	421	388	370	494	407	476	3433	63.3%																																																																																					
vi.	No. of children aviating MDM on the previous day	439	403	383	370	378	525	428	498	3424	63.1%																																																																																					
	Description The total enrolment of children across 40 sampled schools comes to 5423, out of whom 3529 (65%) children avail MDM as per MDM register. In fact the attendance on the day of																																																																																															

	<p>team's visit was 3941 (72.7%) which was quite satisfactory. Out of the children present in the school on the day of team's visit, 3433 (87%) children actually took MDM. On the day previous to the visit, 3424 (63.1%) children had taken MDM, which was quite near to the no. of children taking MDM on the day of team's visit. What after all is a matter of concern is the fact that 13% children though present in the school do not take meal.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<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>(ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement is maintained?</p> <p>(iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</p> <p>(iv) Is the quality of foodgrain good?</p> <p>(i) Out of 40 schools, 31 (77.5%) schools have been getting regular supply of food grains and also in time. But 9 (22.5%) schools have got supply with a delay of 2 to 3 months. The reason for this delay rests with higher authorities.</p> <p>(ii) The buffer stock for one month is available in 33 (82.5%) schools. The remaining 7 (17.5%) schools do not have buffer stock for one month since the contractor, responsible for the supply of food grains, does not have enough stock to provide buffer stock for one month at the school level. Only 34 (85%) schools get food grains as per the required quantity. There is shortage in the supply of food grains (as per requirement) in 6 (15%) schools. Again the responsibility for short supply of ration rests with higher authorities.</p> <p>(iii) The food grains are supplied directly to all the 40 schools.</p> <p>(iv) The food grain supplied to 37 (92.5%) schools is found to be in good quality. 3 (7.5%) schools are not satisfied with the quality of food grains supplied to them.</p> <p>Comment: In a majority of schools the supply of food grains is regular as per the required quantity. The delay in the case of some schools is a matter of concern, since the reasons given for the delay seem to be flimsy and hence untenable.</p>	<p>School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<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>(ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to</p>	<p>School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.</p>

	<p>ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme? (iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</p>	
	<p>(i) Only 17 (42.5%) schools have received cooking cost in time and regularly. In case of a majority of schools 23 (57.5%) there is a delay of 3 to 4 months.</p> <p>(ii) The schools with delayed supply of cooking cost manage MDM by taking cooking items by borrowing from shops.</p> <p>(iii) The cooking cost is delivered to school by cheque as reported by 12 (30%) schools. 28 schools (70%) get the cost in cash.</p>	
5.	<p>SOCIAL EQUITY: i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements? ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</p>	Observations / Probe/ interaction with the children.
	<p>(i) No discriminatory practice noticed at the MDM level in any of the 40 schools visited by the monitoring team.</p> <p>(ii) The seating and serving arrangements for MDM is as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food is served: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) by cook in 19 (47.5%) schools. b) by teacher in 5 (12.5%) schools. c) by students in 16 (40%) schools. - Seating for taking MDM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) in school room – 4 (10%) schools. b) veranda – 26 (65%) schools. c) open space – 10 (25%) schools. <p>Comment: Obviously children are involved in serving the MDM in quite a large number of schools. There is need to avoid children’s involvement in serving the food, though in some cases when the number of children is quite large, it may become inevitable.</p>	
6.	<p>VARIETY OF MENU: i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed? ii) Who decides the menu?</p>	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks. Obtain a copy of menu.

- a) The weekly menu of MDM found displayed on the notice board in 32 (80%) schools, though in 8 (20%) schools there was no such display of menu.
- b) Menu has been decided at the level of the state government as per the responses of all the 40 schools.
- c) The approved weekly menu is as under:

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Vegetable-Roti	Dal/ Vegetable-Rice	Dal-Roti	Khichdi/Dal-Rice	Dal-Roti	Vegetable-Roti

7. **Variety in served food**
- (i) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily?
- (ii) Dose the daily menu include rice / wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?

Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks.

- (i) According to 37 (92.5%) schools different variety of food is served on each day, though in the remaining 3 (7.5%) schools, there is no such variety
- (ii) Dal-Rice/Roti and Vegetables form the part of the menu every day in 35 (87.5%) schools. In the remaining 5 (12.5%) schools, this practice is not strictly followed.

8. **QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL :**
Feedback from children on
- a) Quality of meal:
- b) Quantity of meal:
- c) {If children were not happy Please give reasons and suggestions to improve.}

Observations of Investigation during MDM service

As per the responses of children, the following is the picture with regard to quality and quantity of meal served under the MDMs.

- (i) Quality:
- Good as per the responses of 25 (62.5%) children.
 - Average as per the responses of 15 (37.5%) children.
- (ii) Quantity:
- Sufficient as per the responses of 32 (80%) children.
 - Not sufficient as per the responses of 8 (20% children).
- (iii) The children of 20% schools have found meal insufficient. They demand food as per their need and requirement.

9.	SUPPLEMENTARY: (i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child? (ii) What is the frequency of health check-up? (iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin – A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically? (iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?	Teachers, Students, School Record/ School health card
	(i) In place of health card for each child, there is a health register in 27 (67.5%) schools. The remaining 13 (32.5%) schools there is no such arrangement. (ii) The health inspection is done in case of 27 schools, as per the following schedule: 1) Annually in 25 (62.5%) schools. 2) Half yearly in 2 (5%) schools. 3) There is no weekly, monthly or even quarterly medical check up in any of the school. (iii) Only 25 (62.5%) schools out of 40 are provide with micro-nutrients (Iron, Foric Acid, Vitamin A) and doses for dewforming. (iv) These medicines are provided by health department in 22 schools. 3 schools get them from the Education Department. These medicines are administered at the interval: - Monthly in 7 (17.5%) schools. - Quarterly in 5 (12.5%) schools. - Half yearly in 2 (5%) schools. - Yearly in 11 (27.5%) schools. - It is regrettable that as many as 15 schools do not have medical health care, and are deprived of such essential nutrients.	
10.	STATUS OF COOKS: (i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/ NGO/Contractor) (ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms? (iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment? (iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers regularly? (v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers? (SC/ST/OBC/Minority)	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks-cum-helpers.

- (i) Cooking and serving of cooked food is the responsibility of
- Cook in 25 (62.5%) schools.
 - Helper in 15 (37.5%) schools.
- It appears that mostly the cooking is done by the cook with the help of helpers, though in some cases the helper also cooks the food.
- (ii) The number of cooks and helpers as per the prescribed norms are in 38 (95%) schools. Only in 2 (5%) schools, the norm has not been followed.
- (iii) The monthly emolument of the cook and helper is Rs. 1000/- per month.
- The payment is made in cash in 36 (90%) school and in 4 (10%) schools the payment is by cheque.
- (iv) Only in 13 (32.5%) schools the cooks and helpers are paid emoluments regularly, while in 27 schools (67.5%) the payment is not in time.
- (v) The social status of cook and helper is as under:
- | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| (a) SC | = | 3 (7.5%) |
| (b) ST | = | 2 (5%) |
| (c) OBC | = | 26 (65%) |
| (d) General | = | 9 (22.5%) |
| Total | = | 40 |

The cooks and helpers are mostly from the OBC category since the schools locations are predominantly OBC populated. There are, however 9 (42.9%) cooks from the general category too.

11. INFRASTRUCTURE:

Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store:

- i) Constructed and in use
- ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed - MDM/SSA/Others
- iii) Constructed but not in use (Reasons for not using)
- iv) Under construction
- v) Sanctioned, but construction not started
- vi) Not sanctioned
- vii) Any other (specify)

School records, discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.

- i) Kitchens are available and also in use in 33 (82.5%) schools. only 7 schools do not have this essential facility.
- ii) The Kitchens have been constructed under:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MDMs = 4 (10%) schools. - SSA = 10 (25%) schools. - Panchayat = 20 (40%) schools. - DPEP = 2 (5%) schools. - Total = 36 schools (only 33 kitchen are in use) <p>(iii) 3 (7.5%) schools have kitchen but are not being used because these are in dilapidated condition, and the Panchayats responsible for their construction have not carried out the necessary repairs.</p> <p>(iv) Kitchen is under construction in 1 (2.5%) school.</p> <p>(v) There is no school for which kitchen has been sanctioned but work has not yet begun.</p> <p>(vi) There is no sanction for 3 schools (which have no kitchen, (either in use or dilapidated)).</p> <p>(vii) There is no other facility available in these schools in this regard.</p>	
12.	<p>In the absence of pucca kitchen with store: In case the pucca kitchen shed is not available, where is the food being cooked and where are the foodgrains/other ingredients being stored.</p>	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members, Observation
	<p>(i) There are 3 schools which have no pucca kitchen, while in 4 others , the kitchen is in dilapidated condition or is under construction (as in the case of one school)</p> <p>(ii) The food grains (in the absence of proper kitchen and storing facility) is stored in the class room of the school in the case of 7 (17.5%) school.</p> <p>(iii) The food is cooked in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Classroom = 1 (2.5%) school. (b) Open space = 6 (15%) schools. 	
13.	<p>Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?</p>	-do-
	<p>(i) Potable water for cooking and drinking is available in 35 (87.5%) schools. 5 (12.5%) schools do not have potable water for drinking and cooking.</p> <p>(ii) Non availability of potable water for cooking and drinking is a serious matter. Water is the most essential facility.</p>	
14.	<p>Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If, available is it adequate?</p>	Teachers/Organizer of MDM Programme
	<p>(i) Utensils are available in all the 40 schools.</p> <p>(ii) Utensils are not upto the requirement in 2 (5%) schools.</p>	
15.	<p>What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)</p>	Observation
	<p>(i) Wood in 19 (47.5%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) Gas cylender in 21 (52.5%) schools.</p>	

16.	SAFETY & HYGIENE: i. General Impression of the environment, Safety and hygiene. ii. Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating iii. Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner? iv. Conservation of water? v. Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?	Observation
<p>(i) General comments on hygien and health in the context of MDM management in school: - Good in 22 (55%) schools. - Average in 17 (42.5%) schools. - Bad in 1 (2.5%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) Children are motivated to wash their hands before and after taking meal. - Yes, in 27 (67.5%) schools. - No, in 13 (32.5%) schools.</p> <p>(iii) Children maintain discipline while taking meal. - Yes, in 35 (87.5%) schools. - No, in 5 (12.5%) schools.</p> <p>(iv) The children have water saving habit: - Yes, in 32 (80%) schools. - No, in 8 (20%) schools.</p> <p>(v) No hazard involved in fuel storage and cooking conditions: - in 31 (77.5%) schools. But in 9 (22.5%) schools the possibility of hazard is not ruled out.</p>		
17.	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND AWARENESS: i) Extent of participation by Parents / VECs / Panchayats / Urban bodies in daily supervision, monitoring, participation. ii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, Parents, VEC, Gram Panchayat members
<p>(Based on discussions with teacher/ head teacher/parent/SMC member and Panchayat representatives).</p> <p>(i) Visits by Parents/SMC member/PR representatives for monitoring MDM in schools: a) Weekly according to 16 (40%) schools. b) Monthly according to 20 (50%) schools. c) Quarterly as stated by 0 (nil) schools. d) Half yearly according to 1 (2.5%) school. e) Never according to 3 (7.5%) schools.</p> <p>(ii) The roaster is maintained for the visit of community members for monitoring in 6 (15%) schools, though in 34 (85%) schools, there is no roaster for this purpose.</p> <p>(iii) The opinion of community members about: 1- Quantity of meal served in the schools:</p>		

- At PS level (opinion of 200 persons)
 - a) Not at the expected level (Insufficient) – 0 (nil)
 - b) Satisfactory – 105 (52.5%)
 - c) Good – 72 (36%)
 - d) V. Good – 20 (10%)
 - e) Excellent – 3 (1.5%)
- At the UPS level (opinions of 130 persons)
 - a) Not at the expected level (Insufficient) – 0(nil)
 - b) Satisfactory – 47 (36.2%)
 - c) Good – 45 (34.6%)
 - d) V. Good – 32 (24.6%)
 - e) Excellent – 6 (4.6%)
- 2) Quantity of meal as prescribed by the state government.
 - At PS level (opinion of 200 responses)
 - a) Insufficient - 3 (1.5%)
 - b) Satisfactory – 81 (40.5%)
 - c) Good – 90 (45%)
 - d) V. Good – 23 (11.5%)
 - e) Excellent – 3 (1.5%)
 - At UPS level (opinion of 130 persons)
 - a) Insufficient – 0 (nil)
 - b) Satisfactory – 48 (36.9%)
 - c) Good – 48 (36.9%)
 - d) V. Good – 31 (23.8%)
 - e) Excellent – 3 (2.3%)
 - (iv) General opinion about MDM (40 responses)
 - 1. Just satisfactory – 0 (nil) schools.
 - 2. Satisfactory - 12 (30%) schools.
 - 3. Good - 24 (60%) schools.
 - 4. Average – 4 (10%) schools.
 - (v) The information about MDM comes to parents/community members through (multiple responses)
 - 1. News Papers - Nil
 - 2. Villagers, friends and relative - 1 (2.5%)
 - 3. Teachers - 1 (2.5%)
 - 4. Schools - 32 (80%)
 - 5. Radio - 6 (15%)
 - 6. TV - 1 (2.5%)
 - 7. Website - 0 (nil)
 - 8. Children - 5 (12.5%)

18.	INSPECTION & SUPERVISION: i) Has the mid day meal programme been inspected by any state / district / block level officers/officials? ii) The frequency of such inspections?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, VEC, Gram Panchayat members																																							
<p>(i) MDM has been supervised and inspected by state/district/block level officials according to 36 (90%) schools. 4 schools (10%) have not been visited by these officials for supervision and inspection of MDM.</p> <p>(ii) The following is the nos. of school visited by officials for inspecting and supervising MDM in a year:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="396 699 1291 1192"> <thead> <tr> <th>S.N.</th> <th>Official</th> <th>No. of visits</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1.</td><td>Collector</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>2.</td><td>Zila Parishad</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>3.</td><td>SDM</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>4.</td><td>DEIT</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>5.</td><td>AEN</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>6.</td><td>Pradhan</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>7.</td><td>DEO</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>8.</td><td>ADPC</td><td>7</td></tr> <tr><td>9.</td><td>BDO</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>10.</td><td>CDPO</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>11.</td><td>BEEO</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>12.</td><td>ABEEO</td><td>12</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(iii) According to visiting team, the MDM in schools was generally in accordance with the prescribed menu barring a few instances wherein the menu was not followed. The quality of food served to children was good. There was discipline among children while taking meal. In a general sense the arrangements for MDM were satisfactory and in accordance with prescribed norms.</p>			S.N.	Official	No. of visits	1.	Collector	2	2.	Zila Parishad	1	3.	SDM	4	4.	DEIT	2	5.	AEN	2	6.	Pradhan	1	7.	DEO	6	8.	ADPC	7	9.	BDO	1	10.	CDPO	2	11.	BEEO	20	12.	ABEEO	12
S.N.	Official	No. of visits																																							
1.	Collector	2																																							
2.	Zila Parishad	1																																							
3.	SDM	4																																							
4.	DEIT	2																																							
5.	AEN	2																																							
6.	Pradhan	1																																							
7.	DEO	6																																							
8.	ADPC	7																																							
9.	BDO	1																																							
10.	CDPO	2																																							
11.	BEEO	20																																							
12.	ABEEO	12																																							
19.	IMPACT Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment, attendance of children in school, general well being (nutritional status) of children? Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving cooked meal in schools?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, students, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.																																							
<p>(i) Positive impact on enrollment according to 16 (40%) schools, though 24 (60%) schools do not see any impact on enrollment. There is positive impact on enrollment at the primary level.</p> <p>(ii) Opinions are 50-50 as far as the impact on attendance is concerned. According to 20</p>																																									

(50%) schools the children of lower classes have stayed on in schools for the whole school time as a consequence of MDM.

(iii) There is visible impact on health of children according to 22 (55%) schools, though 18 (45%) schools do not find any improvement in children's health. The children's physique has improved according to 22 (55%) schools.

(iv) According to 16 (40%) schools, there is perceptible improvement at the level of discipline among children. They now form the que whenever so required and the habit of equality and brotherhood has been inculcated among them. This is a positive development, particularly in the context of caste and other kinds of social divisions in the society. The children are now a disciplined lot. But unfortunately this is the opinion of less than 50% schools. A majority of schools do not share this view.

20 General Comments

As stated above, a majority of schools, though accepting the value of MDM, do not find positive impact either on enrollment or attendance, though in terms of children's health there seems to be a majority support. There are some deficiencies in the supply of food grains and release of cooking cost which do put the MDM managers in a tight corner. Potable water too is not available in quite a large no. of schools which is a serious matter. It has to be seen that a largely acceptable programme as the MDM is believed to be, does not suffer owing to these avoidable lapses on the part of higher authorities.

List of Sampled Schools visited by MI for MDM Monitoring

District- Bundi

S. N.	DISE Code	Name of the school	Block	Category of school
1	0427083	UPS Girl's Rajat Grah, Bundi	Taleda	Urban
2	0427035	UPS Nahar ka Chauhatta	Taleda	Urban
3	0410801	UPS Devepura, Bundi	Taleda	Urban
4	0427482	UPS Chhatrapura, Bundi	Taleda	Civil Work
5	0425703	PS, Bairwa Basti	Taleda	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
6	0427491	UPS Khojagate, Bundi	Taleda	CWSN
7	0407203	PS Kaithuda	Taleda	Civil Work
8	0414301	PS Umrach	Taleda	NPEGEL
9	0405008	UPS Girls Barundhan	Taleda	NPEGEL
10	0425901	UPS Khatkad	Taleda	CALP
11	0424401	PS Samarba	Taleda	NPEGEL
12	0425907	PS Kalbelia Basti Khatkag	Taleda	Migrated population
13	0409202	PS Bairwa Basti Vinayika	Taleda	SC Populated
14	0429801	UPS Ganeshpura Bhilon ka	Taleda	High Dropout
15	0401206	PS Dabi	Taleda	Migrated population
16	0403801	UPS Bijadi	Taleda	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
17.	0404301	PS Aamthun	Taleda	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
18.	0400301	UPS Gopalpura Barad	Taleda	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
19.	0320001	PS Hapolai	Nainwa	Spl. Trg. Centre (RC)
20.	0308203	UPS Girls Talwas	Nainwa	CALP
21.	0319101	UPS Khedi	Nainwa	CALP
22.	0300104	PS Banjaro ka Dera	Nainwa	High Dropout
23.	0318127	UPS Beech Shahar, Nainwa	Nainwa	Urban

24.	0315529	UPS Daye	Nainwa	KGBV
25.	0318107	PS Raigar Colony	Nainwa	Urban
26.	0318111	PS Old Palace	Nainwa	Urban
27.	0315512	UPS Girls Daye	Nainwa	CWSN
28.	0310301	UPS Klanala	Nainwa	SC/ST Populated
29.	0310401	PS Falasthuni	Nainwa	Higher gender gap
30.	0125901	UPS Dara ki Nyagaon	Hindoli	NPEGEL
31.	0105606	PS Shivraj Nagar	Hindoli	CWSN
32.	0105609	UPS Hindoli	Hindoli	KGBV
33.	0109001	UPS Ashok Factory	Hindoli	NPEGEL
34.	0103902	UPS Basni	Hindoli	NPEGEL
35.	0205708	UPS Shankarpura, Lakheri	K. Patan	Urban
36.	0205702	UPS Lakheri City	K. Patan	Urban
37.	0205742	UPS Lakheri	K. Patan	KGBV
38.	0208102	UPS Girls Jaisathal	K. Patan	Spl. Trg. Centre (NRC)
39.	0220207	PS Moti Nagar	K. Patan	Higher gender gap
40.	0223404	UPS Ghat ka Barana	K. Patan	Civil Work