



## **2<sup>nd</sup> HALF YEARLY MONITORING REPORT OF MDM FOR THE STATE OF MIZORAM**

**Period:  
1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014**

### **Districts Covered**

- 1. Kolasib**
- 2. Mamit**

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

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

# INDEX

Sl.No.	Particulars/Details	Page No.
	<i>Index</i>	1
	<i>Foreword</i>	2
	<i>Acknowledgement</i>	3
1.	General Information	4-5
2.	Cover Page Executive Summary	6
3.	Executive Summary of both Districts	7-13
4.	Cover Page of the Kolasib District Report (District-1)	14-14
5.	Detailed Monitoring Report of Kolasib District (District - 1 Report)	15-26
6.	List of Sample Schools from Kolasib District with their DISE Code	27-27
7.	Any other relevant documents	-
8.	Cover Page of the Kolasib District Report (District-2)	28-28
9.	Detailed Monitoring Report of Mamit District (District - 2 Report)	29-40
10.	List of Sample Schools from Mamit District with their DISE Code	41-41
11.	Any other relevant documents	-

# FOREWORD

Mizoram University, Aizawl, the Monitoring Institute in charge of monitoring of 8 (Eight) districts of Mizoram feels privileged to be one of the Monitoring Institution across the country for broad based monitoring of MDM.

This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> half yearly report for the year 2013-14, covering a period from 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> Sept.2014, and is based on the data collected from two districts of Mizoram namely, Kolasib district, and Mamit district.

I hope the findings of the report would be helpful to both the Govt. of India and the State Government of Mizoram to understand the grass root level problems relating to the implementation of MDM programme in elementary schools in the State of Mizoram and to plan further necessary interventions.

In this context I extend my hearty thanks to Prof R.P.Vadhera, Nodal Officer, Monitoring MDM and his team members who have rendered a good service by taking pains to visit the schools located in the most inaccessible areas and preparing the report in time. I am extremely thankful to the authorities of the State office and the district offices for their unhesitating cooperation during the time of data collection.

*-sd-*

**Shri C. Zothankhuma**  
**Registrar**  
**Mizoram University,**  
**Tanhril, Aizawl - 796004**  
**Mizoram**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report would not have been possible without the active support of the State Nodal Officer MDM and State Project Office of SSA and, Mizoram and the district offices in respect of the districts visited. We thank the State Nodal Officer MDM and State Project Office of SSA and the District Project Coordinators of SSA-RTE for their cooperation.

Our heartfelt thanks are due to all the officials of MDM Cell and Education Department who helped the members of the visiting team in conducting field visit and to all the headmasters and teachers in the schools visited who provided us with relevant information.

We also thank all others who have cooperated in the Monitoring and Supervision work.

We also thank Govt. of India Officials, Additional Secretary(SE&L), Director and Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, Shastri Bhawan, C Wing, New Delhi – 110001 for providing an opportunity to undertake monitoring activities of MDM and providing funds.

We also thank Senior Consultant (Monitoring) MDM, EdCIL(India) Limited, Technical Support Group, Mid-Day-Meal, Vijaya Building, 5th Floor, 17- Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001 looking after the Monitoring Institution activities and their staffs for continues support and valuable guidance from time to time.

We also thank The Project Manager (MDM), Ed.CIL (India) Limited, Technical Support Group, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, Vijaya Building, 5th Floor, 17- Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001 for release of funds from time to time.

*-sd-*

**(R.P.VADHERA)**  
**Professor in Education**  
**Nodal Officer, MZU, Aizawl**

# 2<sup>nd</sup> Half Yearly Monitoring Report of Mizoram University on MDM for the State of Mizoram (Period of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014)

## 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Sl No	Information	Details																																
1.	<b>Name of the Monitoring Institute</b>	Mizoram University																																
2.	<b>Period of the report</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April, 2014 to 30 <sup>th</sup> September, 2014																																
3.	<b>Fund Released for the period</b>	75% of the funds released for the period 1 <sup>st</sup> October, 2013 to 30 <sup>th</sup> September, 2014																																
4.	<b>No. of Districts allotted</b>	2 (Two) Districts																																
5.	<b>Name of Districts Covered</b>	1.Kolasib 2.Mamit																																
6.	<b>Dates of visit to the Districts / Schools</b>	<p><b>1. <u>Kolasib District:</u></b>            (a) <u>Monitoring team</u> consisting of 5 members visited the District/Sample schools from 1<sup>st</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.            (b) <u>The Nodal Officer</u> with 3 team members visited the District/Sample schools from 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.</p> <p><b>2. <u>Mamit District:</u></b>            The team consisting of 5 members visited the District/Sample schools from 8<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>st</sup> September, 2014.  <b>Note:</b> <i>The remaining man-days were used for the development of (i) Master tables, (ii) data entry tables, (iii) data analysis, (iv) visit to SPD's office etc.</i></p>																																
7.	<b>Number of elementary schools monitored</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Kolasib</th> <th>Mamit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Primary</td> <td>22</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Upper Primary</td> <td>18</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td>40</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Kolasib	Mamit	Primary	22	19	Upper Primary	18	21	<b>Total</b>	40	40																				
Category	Kolasib	Mamit																																
Primary	22	19																																
Upper Primary	18	21																																
<b>Total</b>	40	40																																
8.	<b>Types of school visited</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Types of school visited</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sr. No</th> <th>Types of school visited</th> <th>Kolasib</th> <th>Mamit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>Special training centers (Residential)</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>School Based Special Training Centers (SBSTC)</td> <td>2</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>Schools in Urban Areas</td> <td>21</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>School sanctioned with Civil Works</td> <td>9</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e</td> <td>School from NPEGEL Blocks</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f</td> <td>Schools having CWSN</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>g</td> <td>Schools covered under CAL</td> <td>8</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sr. No	Types of school visited	Kolasib	Mamit	a	Special training centers (Residential)	2	2	b	School Based Special Training Centers (SBSTC)	2	Nil	c	Schools in Urban Areas	21	14	d	School sanctioned with Civil Works	9	5	e	School from NPEGEL Blocks	NA	NA	f	Schools having CWSN	6	5	g	Schools covered under CAL	8	7
Sr. No	Types of school visited	Kolasib	Mamit																															
a	Special training centers (Residential)	2	2																															
b	School Based Special Training Centers (SBSTC)	2	Nil																															
c	Schools in Urban Areas	21	14																															
d	School sanctioned with Civil Works	9	5																															
e	School from NPEGEL Blocks	NA	NA																															
f	Schools having CWSN	6	5																															
g	Schools covered under CAL	8	7																															

		h	KGBVs	NA	NA
9.	<b>Number of schools visited by the Nodal Officer of the Monitoring Institute</b>	10 Schools in Kolasib District. (The Nodal Officer, first time, in view of his heavy commitments could not personally visit the required number of schools in Mamit district. However, the field work in all 40 sample schools in Mamit district had been done by a field team led by Prof. Lalhmasai, Head of Department of Education, Mizoram University, who is of the same rank as Nodal officer).			
10.	<b>Whether the draft report has been shared with the State Nodal Officer, MDM</b>	YES			
11.	<b>After submission of the draft report to the State Nodal Officer, MDM whether the MI has received any comments from the SPO.</b>	YES			
12.	<b>Before sending the reports to the GOI whether the MI has shared the report with State Nodal Officer, MDM</b>	YES			

**13. Details regarding discussion held with state official:** A draft copy of the Monitoring Report was submitted to the State Nodal Officer (MDM), Govt. of Mizoram, 27<sup>th</sup> January 2015 for perusal and comments, and major field observations were shared in a face to face meeting with the State Nodal Officer (MDM) and other officials on 5th Feb., 2015

**14. Selection Criteria for Schools:** As Per the TOR, 2013-2015, (For details see Item No. 9)

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

- a) List of Schools with DISE code visited by MI.: **Enclosed Vide Annexure-1 and Annexure-2**
- b) Name, Designations & address of persons contacted.
  - i) District Project Coordinator (SSA), Kolasib District, Kolasib, Mizoram
  - ii) District Project Coordinator (SSA), Mamit District, Mamit, Mizoram
  - iii) State Nodal Officer (MDM), Directorate of School Education, Mc Donnall Hills , Aizawl Mizoram.
  - iv) Deputy State Nodal Officer (MDM), Directorate of School Education, Mc Donnall Hills , Aizawl Mizoram
- c) Copy of Office order, notification etc. discussed in the report.: **Nil**

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **MDM Monitoring Report of Kolasib and Mamit Districts**

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Mid-Day-Meal)

### 1. KOLASIB DISTRICT

<b>District 1 (Kolasib)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Hot cooked meal was served on a daily basis without any interruption by all 40 sample schools.</li><li>2. Supply of food grains to schools released on quarterly basis, and it was by and large regular in all sample schools.</li><li>3. Buffer Stock of 1 (one) month's requirement was maintained by 36 (90 %)of the sample schools.</li><li>4. Food grains is not delivered at the door step of school, however Rs.25 per bag is provided to the schools for transportation of food grains from ration/retailer shop to the school.</li><li>5. None of the sample schools had ever received cooking cost for MDM in advance.</li><li>6. All the schools reported that they had to either purchase the required ingredients on credit by paying higher price or have to use funds from other resources.</li><li>7. Roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM was never prepared by any of the sample schools.</li><li>8. As there was irregularity in the receipt of cooking cost, all the schools reported that they had to either purchase the required ingredients on credit by paying higher price or have to use funds from other resources.</li><li>9. There was no report of discrimination on the basis of gender or caste or community in cooking and serving of MDM. This claim was also verified by the MI team through direct observation.</li><li>10. The daily menu in majority of the sample schools was mainly rice preparation with dal or potato. At the same time, nutrela, seasonal vegetables, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs were also served occasionally by majority of the schools.</li><li>11. Only 22 (55%) of the sample schools had displayed weekly menu for MDM inside the school office or the Kitchen Shed which, however was not at a place noticeable to community. The rest (45%) had not displayed any kind of menu for MDM.</li><li>12. All the sample schools had been provided with the required number of cooks as per Govt. of India norms. Schools with larger enrollments were provided with more cooks.</li></ol>
---------------------------------	--



13. Responses of the teachers and students revealed that in all the sample schools variety of food as far as possible was served. The menu comprised mainly rice with dal/potatoes. Pumpkin, nutrela, seasonal green vegetables and eggs were occasionally served to students in some of the schools.
14. An interaction with the children on the day of visit revealed that all the beneficiaries of MDM were happy and satisfied with the quantity and quality of MDM served to them in schools.
15. All the sample schools had cooks specifically appointed for MDM service.
16. None of the sample schools had engaged SHG or NGO or contractors for cooking or serving of MDM.
17. The remuneration of the cooks in all the sample schools was Rs.1500/- per month.
18. Remuneration to all cooks in the sample schools was paid on a quarterly basis along with the conversion cost, not monthly.
19. Among the cooks in sample schools, all (100%) of them belonged to ST category.
20. Kitchen sheds – cum – store for MDM service was constructed in 100 per cent of the schools visited by MI and 25 (62.5%) of them were pucca.
21. All of the sample schools (100%) had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose.
22. All (100%) the sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM.
23. The kind of fuel used for cooking MDM was LPG in the case of 10 (25%) schools and firewood in the case of 30 (75%) schools.
24. The process of cooking and storage of fuel was found to be safe in all 40 sample schools.
25. Hygiene was good in the case of 36 (90%) schools and fair in 4 (10%) schools. Children in all (100%) the schools took meals in an orderly manner.
26. Participation by parents in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be fair in only 12 (30%) sample schools and poor by as many as 28 (70%) schools.
27. The extent of participation by VECs in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be fair in 22 (55%) schools and poor in 18 (45%) schools.
28. Health check-up of students on annual basis was done by 37 (92.5%) sample schools, twice a year by 2 (5%), and on quarterly basis by only 1 (2.5%) sample schools.
29. Health cards/registers for their students were maintained by 36 (90%) sample schools.
30. Iron was given to students by 36 (90%) of sample schools, folic acid by 34 (85%) and de-worming medicines by 25 (62.5%) of the sample schools.

	<p>31. Micro nutrients were administered to students by health teachers or teachers in charge of health who had received training.</p> <p>32. Inspection of MDM by State Level Officers was never done in 35 (87.5%) and rarely in 5 (12.5%) of the sample schools.</p> <p>33. Visit by District Level Officers was reported as never by 6 (15%) schools, rarely by 4 (10%) schools and frequently by as many as 30 (75%) schools.</p> <p>34. Block Level Officers never visited 4 (10%) schools for supervision of MDM and the visit was rare in another 4 (10%) and frequent visit was reported by 32 (80%) of the schools.</p> <p>35. The inspection of MDM by CRCCs at the time of their routine visits to schools was reported to be frequent by all the sample schools.</p> <p>36. 31. Introduction of MDM was reported to have improved the enrollment of students in 36 (90%) of the sample schools, attendance of children in 38 (95%) schools and, general well-being and nutritional status of the children was reported by all (100%) the schools.</p> <p>37. Other incidental benefits of MDM reported by few schools were :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) It relieved parents from spending money for the Tiffin of their children.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) Children became more active with the serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">c) The health of the students had improved a lot after the provision of MDM on a regular basis.</p>
--	---

## 2. MAMIT DISTRICT

<b>District 2 (Mamit)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. All sample schools, except one (PS-III, Mamit), from the district under reference served hot cooked meal on daily basis.</li><li>2. The supply of food grains to schools released on quarterly basis was by and large regular in 35(87.5%) sample schools, while 5 (12.5%) schools reported the supply of food grain to be irregular.</li><li>3. Buffer Stock of 1 (one) month's requirement was available in 36 (90 %) of the sample schools, whereas in 4 (10%) sample schools (4) schools it was not.</li><li>4. Food grains is not delivered at the door step of school, however Rs.25 per bag is provided to the schools for transportation of food grains from ration/retailer shop to the school.</li><li>5. None of the sample schools had ever received cooking cost for MDM in advance.</li><li>6. None of the sample schools had ever prepared roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.</li><li>7. As there was irregularity in the receipt of cooking cost, all the schools reported that they had to either purchase the required ingredients on credit by paying higher price or have to use funds from other resources.</li><li>8. No discrimination, on the basis of gender or caste or community in cooking and serving of MDM, was observed or reported by the teachers and students,</li><li>10. The daily menu in majority of the sample schools was mainly rice preparation with dal or potato. At the same time, nutrela, seasonal vegetables, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs were also served occasionally.</li><li>11. Most of the sample schools i.e 25 (62.5%) had displayed weekly menu for MDM</li></ol>
-------------------------------	---

at a place noticeable to community while the rest 15 (37.5%) did not to display the menu for MDM.

12. All the sample schools had been provided with the required number of cooks as per Govt. of India norms. Schools with larger enrollments were provided with more cooks.

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

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

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

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

17. Each cook in sample schools was paid remuneration of Rs.1500/- per month.

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

19. All cooks in sample schools belonged to ST category.

20. Kitchen sheds – cum – store for MDM service was constructed in 36 (90%) sample schools, 18 (45%) of them were pucca and another 18 (45%) of them were semi pucca. 4(10%) sample schools reported that they did not receive funds from MDM for constructing Kitchen shed but still 1 (2.5%) of them constructed Assam type kitchen shed.

21. All the sample schools had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose.
22. 36 (90%) the sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM.
23. The kind of fuel used for cooking MDM was LPG in the case of 3 (7.5%) schools and firewood in the case of 37(92.5%) schools.
24. The process of cooking and storage of fuel was found to be safe in all (100%) sample schools.
25. MI's impression about hygiene was good in the case of 39 (97.5%) schools and fair in 1 (2.5%) schools.
26. Children in all (100%) the schools took meals in an orderly manner.
26. Participation of parents in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be good in 16 (40%) of sample schools, fair in 10 (25%) and poor in 14 (35%) sample schools.
27. Participation of SMDC/VECs in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be good in 5 (12.5%) of sample schools, fair in 16 (40%) schools and poor in 19 (47.5%) schools.
28. Health check-up of children on half-yearly basis was reported to be done by 24 (60%) of sample schools, and the rest 16 (40%) sample schools reported that health check-up was done annual basis.
29. The number of schools that maintained health cards/registers for their students was 36 (90%).
30. Only 29 (72.5%) of sample schools served micronutrients such as Iron, folic acid and de-worming medicines.
- The micronutrients were administered by health teachers or teachers in charge of health who had received training.

31. As per the information received from the teachers of the sample schools, there was no inspection of MDM by State, District and Block Level Officers. The inspection of CRCCs at the time of their routine visits to schools was also very rare.

32. All the sample schools reported that MDM had improved the attendance of children as well as enrolment. The general well-being and nutritional status of the children were also highly improved as reported by all (100%) the schools.

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

a) Poor parents felt relieved from spending money for the Tiffin of their children.

b) Teachers of all sample schools reported that children became more active with the serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.

**DETAILED MDM MONITORING REPORT**

**KOLASIB DISTRICT  
(District-1)**

## DETAIL MDM MONITORING REPORT (KOLASIB DISTRICT)

### A. At School Level

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL :</b></p> <p><b>I) Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</b></p> <p>After interacting with the headmasters, teachers, students, cooks and verification of MDM registers, the team members of MI were pleased to find that in Kolasib District, all 40 (100% ) sample schools visited served hot cooked meal on a daily basis without any interruption. This information was verified with the students who also claimed that they were served MDM daily. Since cooking cost was never received in advance and was always received very late, to maintain daily service of MDM, the schools had to purchase groceries mostly on credit which sometimes became a problem as shopkeepers in some villages did not allow their bills pending for a very long time.</p>																					
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>TRENDS :</b></p> <p>Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">No.</th> <th style="width: 70%; text-align: center;">Details</th> <th style="width: 20%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i</td> <td>Enrollment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3366</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3366(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;">2946(87.5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2946(87.5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2946(100%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM on the previous day</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2991(88.9%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Note: Since all enrolled students in Mizoram opt for MDM, therefore, many sample schools don't maintain MDM attendance register on day to day basis.</i></p>	No.	Details		i	Enrollment	3366	ii	No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal	3366(100%)	iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	2946(87.5%)	iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2946(87.5%)	v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	2946(100%)	vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	2991(88.9%)
No.	Details																					
i	Enrollment	3366																				
ii	No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal	3366(100%)																				
iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	2946(87.5%)																				
iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2946(87.5%)																				
v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	2946(100%)																				
vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	2991(88.9%)																				



	<i>This figure has been worked on the basis of student attendance registers.</i>
3.	<p><b>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAINS TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</b></p> <p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The supply of food grains to schools in the state is done on quarterly not monthly basis. Although slight delay happened now and then, this seemed not to have affected the daily cooking of MDM and all the sample schools reported that they received food grain regularly.</p> <p><b>ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement maintained?</b></p> <p>At the time of school visits paid by MI, 36 (90%) sample schools were having buffer stock of rice for one month.</p> <p><b>iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</b></p> <p>Out of 40 sample schools selected as sample, 8 (20%) of the schools reported that food grain was delivered at the school premises. The remaining 32 (80%) schools had to make their own arrangement for picking of the food grains from retailer.</p> <p><b>iv) Is the quality of food grain good?</b></p> <p>The spot verification of MI as well as responses of the headmasters/teachers in all sample schools revealed that the quality of food grain in stock, at the time of visit was average.</p>

<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING COOKING COST TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</b></p> <p><b>i) Is school/implementing agency received cooking cost in advance regularly? If there is delay in delivering cooking cost what is the extent of delay and reasons for it?</b></p> <p>Cooking cost was never received in advance by any of the sample schools. Like the food grains, the cooking cost is released to the schools on quarterly basis not monthly and that too not in advance.</p> <p><b>ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</b></p> <p>As cooking cost was never released in advance, schools have to either purchase the required ingredients on credit, sometimes by paying higher cost or have to use funds from other resources.</p> <p><b>iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</b></p> <p>The cooking cost, as and when received by the VEC/SMC, is paid to the school, by the concerned VEC/SMC, in cash.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>SOCIAL EQUITY :</b></p> <p><b>i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements?</b></p> <p>There is no caste system in the Mizo society, thus, no question arises on caste discrimination. At the same time, the MI observers did not find any gender or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements related to MDM.</p> <p><b>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</b></p>

	<p>In all 40 (100%) of the sample schools visited by MI, food was served by the cooks and was sometimes supervised by the teacher-in-charge of MDM. Students form queues in front of the kitchen and after taking their food move to their respective classrooms in 30 (75%) schools. Students in 8 (20%) schools do not have specific place for seating and take their meal either in classrooms or verandahs or school compounds whereas children of 2 (5%) schools take meals in separate dining halls of the schools. Order and discipline was maintained by children taking MDM in all sample schools.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>VARIETY OF MENU :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed?</b></p> <p>Only 22 (55%) of the schools had displayed weekly menu for MDM inside the school office or the Kitchen Shed which, however was not at a place noticeable to community. The rest (45%) had not displayed any kind of menu for MDM.</p> <p><b>ii) Who decides the menu?</b></p> <p>The day-to-day menu in all 40 (100%) sample schools was decided solely by the teacher in-charge of MDM.</p> <p><b>iii) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily ?</b></p> <p>Responses of the teachers and students revealed that in all the sample schools variety of food as far as possible was served. The menu comprised mainly rice with dal/potatoes. Pumpkin, nutrela, seasonal green vegetables and eggs were occasionally served to students in some of the schools. On special occasions, meat was also served to the students by the schools.</p> <p><b>iv) Does the daily menu include rice/wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?</b></p>

	<p>The daily menu in majority of the sample schools was mainly rice preparation with dal or potato. At the same time, nutrela, seasonal vegetables, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs were also served occasionally by majority of the schools.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>QUALITY &amp; QUANTITY OF MEAL :</b></p> <p><b>Feedback from children on quality and quantity of meal (If children were not happy please give reasons and suggestions to improve.)</b></p> <p>An interaction with the children on the day of visit revealed that all the beneficiaries of MDM were happy and satisfied with the quantity and quality of MDM served to them in schools</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY :</b></p> <p><b>i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child?</b></p> <p>The number of schools that maintained health cards/registers for their students was 36 (90%). Iron was given to students by 36 (90%) of the schools, folic acid by 34 (85%) and de-worming medicines by 25 (62.5%) of the sample schools. These were administered by health teachers or teachers in charge of health who had received training.</p> <p><b>ii) What is the frequency of health check-up?</b></p> <p>a) <b>Monthly Health Check-up:</b> None of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted monthly health check-up of children.</p> <p>b) <b>Quarterly Health Check-up:</b> Only 1 (2.5%) out of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted health check-up of children on a quarterly basis.</p>

	<p>c) <b>Half Yearly Health Check-up:</b> 2 (5%) of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted the health check-up of children on half yearly basis.</p> <p>d) <b>Annual Health Check-up:</b> 37 (92.5%) of sample schools, as reported by their headmasters have conducted the health check-up of children on yearly basis.</p> <p><b>iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin-A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically.</b></p> <p>a) <b>Iron:</b> 36 (90%) of sample schools reported that they had given Iron tablets to their children.</p> <p>b) <b>Folic Acid:</b> It was also given to children by 36 (90%) of sample schools.</p> <p>c) <b>Vitamin A dosage and De-worming medicines:</b> Only 25 (62.5%) of the schools had given De-worming medicines to their students whereas none of the schools had given Vitamin A.</p> <p><b>iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</b></p> <p>As reported by the headmasters and/or teachers in all the 40 sample schools, the aforesaid micronutrients were administered by teachers (in-charge of health) who had undergone training for this purpose.</p>
9	<p><b>STATUS OF COOKS :</b></p> <p><b>i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/NGO/Contractor)</b></p> <p>Food for MDM in all of the 40 (100%) sample schools was cooked and served by the cooks appointed for this purpose. None of the sample schools has ever engaged any NGO/SHG/Contractor for this purpose.</p> <p><b>ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI</b></p>

	<p><b>norms?</b></p> <p>The number of cooks engaged in the schools visited by MI was as per the norms of GOI. Schools having 25 or less than that were given 1 cook while those with more than 25 but less than 100 were given 2 cooks. Schools having more than 100 students but less than 200 were given 3 cooks. The number of cooks was increased accordingly.</p> <p><b>iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</b></p> <p>There were no helpers in any of the sample schools as all of them have been promoted as cooks from May 2010. All cooks in sample schools were paid a remuneration of Rs.1500/-pm in cash.</p> <p><b>iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helper regular?</b></p> <p>The remuneration paid to the cooks was not regular. All of the cooks in sample schools reported that they did not get their remuneration on monthly basis as it was always released quarterly along with the conversion cost.</p> <p><b>v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers ?(SC/ST/OBC/Minority)</b></p> <p>In terms of social category - 95% of the cooks in the sample schools were Scheduled Tribe whereas the remaining 5% belonged to Scheduled Caste.</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>INFRASTRUCTURE:</b></p> <p><b>i) Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store constructed and in use?</b></p> <p>Kitchen sheds had been constructed and were in use for cooking and service of MDM as well as for storage of food grain and other materials relating to MDM, The kitchen sheds in the case of 25 (62.5%) schools was pucca while in the rest 15 (37.5%) schools it was not pucca and new kitchen sheds had been proposed for schools with old kitchen sheds.</p>

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

Kitchen sheds in the sample schools were constructed under the SSA or the MDM scheme.

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

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

**iv) Kitchen shed under construction**

There was no kitchen shed under construction in the sample schools visited by MI.

**v) Kitchen shed Sanctioned, but construction not started**

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

**vi) Kitchen shed not sanctioned**

There was no case of kitchen shed not sanctioned in Kolasib district since all the sample schools had already been sanctioned kitchen shed at one time or the other.

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

In the case of schools where pucca kitchen sheds were not available, food grain and other ingredients were being stored in the school offices.

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

	<p>All the 40 (100%) sample schools in Kolasib district had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose and majority of the schools had PHE connection for water that is considered to be relatively safe for cooking and drinking.</p> <p><b>ix) Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If available is it adequate?</b></p> <p>The MI observers after having discussion with the cooks and visit to the kitchen shed in each sample school found that all 40 (100%) sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM.</p> <p><b>x) What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)</b></p> <p>Out of the 40 sample schools visited by MI, as many as 30 (75%) were using firewood for cooking purpose, whereas the remaining 10 (25%) were using LPG only for cooking MDM.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><b>SAFETY &amp; HYGIENE :</b></p> <p><b>i) General Impression of MI about hygiene:</b></p> <p><b>a) Good:</b> The hygiene and overall environment was found to be good in as many as 36 (90%) of sample schools.</p> <p><b>b) Fair:</b> In terms of environment and hygiene 4 (10% ) of sample schools were fair.</p> <p><b>c) Poor:</b> No sample school was poor in terms of hygiene.</p> <p><b>ii) Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating</b></p> <p>Children in all 40 (100%) sample schools were encouraged to wash hands before and after eating of MDM.</p> <p><b>iii) Do the children take meals in an orderly manner?</b></p>



	<p>Children in all sample schools were found to be well disciplined and order was maintained by them in taking MDM. The MI found that cooks and teachers played an important role in maintenance of such kind of discipline.</p> <p><b>iv) Conservation of water</b></p> <p>All the sample schools in the district visited by MI reported that due to scarcity of water by and large, the students were aware of the need to conserve water even before they were being taught by the teachers.</p> <p><b>v) Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?</b></p> <p>The cooking process and storage of fuel is by and large safe in all 40 (100%) sample schools.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION :</b></p> <p><b>i) Extent of participation by Parents in daily supervision, monitoring, participation:</b></p> <p>As per the information received from the schools, participation of parents in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision was poor in as many as 28 (70%) of sample schools while it was fair in 12 (30%) schools.</p> <p><b>ii) Extent of participation by VECs/Panchayats/Urban bodies in daily supervision and monitoring of MDM.</b></p> <p>Participation of members of VEC in the day to day management, monitoring and supervision, as per the report of sample schools is poor in 18 (45%) and fair in 22 ( 55%) of the sample schools visited by MI in Kolasib District.</p> <p><b>iii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for</b></p>

	<p><b>supervision of the MDM?</b></p> <p>None of the 40 sample schools has ever prepared any roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>INSPECTION &amp; SUPERVISION :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the Mid-day meal programme been inspected by any state/district/block level officers/officials? What is the frequency of such inspections?</b></p> <p><b>a) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by State Level Officer:</b></p> <p>While interacting with the MI observers, 35 (87.5%) of headmasters/teachers of sample schools reported that state level officers had never visited their schools for the purpose of inspection and supervision of MDM programme. However, 5 (12.5%) schools reported that they were visited by State Level Officers on rare occasions.</p> <p><b>b) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by District Level Officers :</b></p> <p>6 (15%) of headmasters of sample school informed the members of MI that they were never visited by District Level Officers in connection with MDM. Rare visit was reported by 5 (12.5%) schools while the visit of District Level Officers was reported as frequent by 30 (75%) of the schools.</p> <p><b>c) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Block Level Officers :</b></p> <p>The MI team were pleased to find that the visit of Block Level Officers had improved a lot compared to previous visits. As many as 32 (80%) schools reported frequent visits while no visit and rare visit was reported by 4 (10%) schools each in Kolasib District.</p> <p><b>d) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Cluster Level Officers :</b></p>

	<p>All (100%) of the sample schools reported that the CRCCs paid frequent visits to the schools and also took time to supervise and inspect MDM.</p>
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>IMPACT OF MDM :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the mid-day meal improved the enrollment of children in school?</b></p> <p>As many as 36 (90%) sample schools reported that mid-day meal has improved the enrolment of children in schools and even opined that they would have very less enrolment had it not been for the service of MDM.</p> <p><b>ii) Has the mid-day meal improved the attendance of children in school?</b></p> <p>As many as 38 (95%) of the schools, reported that mid-day meal has improved the attendance of children in school.</p> <p><b>iii) Has the mid-day meal improved general well-being (nutritional status) of children in school?</b></p> <p>All of the 40(100%) sample schools reported that the MDM had improved the general well-being and nutritional status of children of their schools.</p> <p><b>iv) Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving of cooked meal in schools?</b></p> <p>a) It relieved parents from spending money for the Tiffin of their children.</p> <p>b) Children became more active with the serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.</p> <p>c) The health of the students had improved a lot after the provision of MDM on a regular basis.</p>

## APPENDIX – 1

### List of Schools visited by Monitoring Team in Kolasib District with DISE code

Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code	Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code
1.	Lungdai P/S-I	15020200701	21.	Phaisen P/S	15020300501
2.	Lungdai P/S-II	15020200702	22.	Bairabi P/S II	15020101002
3.	Lungdai P/S-III	15020200703	23.	Lungdai M/S - I	15020200704
4.	Serkhan P/S	15020200601	24.	Lungdai M/S – II	15020200705
5.	Nisapui P/S	15020200801	25.	Serkhan M/S	15020200602
6.	Thingdawl P/S - I	15020200301	26.	Nisapui M/S	15020200802
7.	Thingdawl P/S - III	15020200303	27.	Thingdawl M/S	15020200305
8.	Bualpui P/S	15020200401	28.	DSA UPS	15020200405
9.	Govt. P/S – IX, Kolasib	15020101301	29.	Selluau M/S	15020101302
10.	Govt. P/S – IV, Kolasib	15020100601	30.	Presbyterian M/S	15020100307
11.	Govt. P/S – XI, Kolasib	15020103801	31.	St. Maria M/S	15020100205
12.	Bilkhawthlir P/S-I	15020301302	32.	Khianga M/S	15020100101
13.	Bilkhawthlir P/S-III	15020301302	33.	Bilkhawthlir M/S I	15020300105
14.	Kharzawl P/S	15020300115	34.	Vairengte M/S III	15020300705
15.	Vairengte P/S VII	15020300803	35.	Saihapui ‘K’ UPS	15020300403
16.	Vairengte P/S II	15020300701	36.	Bukvannei UPS	15020301102
17.	Vairengte P/S V	15020300703	37.	Buhchangphai M/S	15020300302
18.	Saihapui ‘K’ P/S	15020300401	38.	Phaisen M/S	15020300502
19.	Bukvannei P/S	15020301101	39.	Bairabi M/S-I	15020101006
20.	Buhchangphai P/S	15020300301	40.	Pangbalkawn M/S	15020101102

**DETAILED MDM MONITORING REPORT**

**MAMIT DISTRICT  
(District-2)**

# DETAIL MDM MONITORING REPORT (MAMIT DISTRICT)

## A. At School Level

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL :</b></p> <p><b>I) Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?</b></p> <p>After interacting with the headmasters, teachers, students, cooks and VEC/SMC members present on the day of visit to the schools, and verification of MDM registers, the team members of MI were pleased to find that 39 (97.5%) sample schools, despite delays in the supply of food grains, were serving hot cooked food on daily basis. To maintain daily service of MDM, some schools had to purchase the food grain from the market, or borrowed from the retailers/shopkeepers. Groceries were mostly purchased on credit due to late receipt of cooking cost. However it need to be reported that 1 sample school, namely, PS-III in Mamit town was not serving MDM. The matter was brought into the notice of the concerned DPC, as well as State Nodal Officer MDM.</p>																					
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>TRENDS :</b></p> <p>Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 70%;">Details</th> <th style="width: 20%;">N and %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">i</td> <td>Enrollment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2335</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">ii</td> <td>No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2335(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;">1907(81.7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">iv</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2335(100%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">v</td> <td>No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1907(81.7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">vi</td> <td>No. of children availing MDM on the previous day</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1780(76.2%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>** Since all enrolled students in Mizoram opt for MDM, therefore, many sample</i></p>	No.	Details	N and %	i	Enrollment	2335	ii	No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal	2335(100%)	iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	1907(81.7%)	iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2335(100%)	v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	1907(81.7%)	vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	1780(76.2%)
No.	Details	N and %																				
i	Enrollment	2335																				
ii	No. of children opted for Mid-Day Meal	2335(100%)																				
iii	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	1907(81.7%)																				
iv	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	2335(100%)																				
v	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	1907(81.7%)																				
vi	No. of children availing MDM on the previous day	1780(76.2%)																				

	<p><i>schools don't maintain MDM attendance register on day to day basis. This figure has been worked on the basis of student attendance registers.</i></p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAINS TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</b></p> <p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The supply of food grains to schools released on quarterly basis was reported to be by and large regular in 35 (87.5 %), while 5 (12.5%) schools reported the supply of food grain to be irregular.</p> <p><b>ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement maintained?</b></p> <p>Buffer Stock of 1 (one) month's requirement was maintained by 36 (90%) of the sample schools visited by MI the rest 4 (10%) schools did not maintained.</p> <p><b>iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school?</b></p> <p>Majority of the sample schools which was 37 (67.5%) reported that food grain was not delivered to the schools. The schools had to make their own arrangement for picking of the food grains from retailer. While the rest 13 (32.5% ) schools reported that food grain was delivered at school.</p> <p><b>iv) Is the quality of food grain good?</b></p> <p>The spot verification of MI as well as responses of the headmasters/teachers in all sample schools revealed that the quality of food grain in stock, at the time of visit was average.</p>

<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>REGULARITY IN DELIVERING COOKING COST TO SCHOOL LEVEL :</b></p> <p><b>i) Is school/implementing agency received cooking cost in advance regularly? If there is delay in delivering cooking cost what is the extent of delay and reasons for it?</b></p> <p>None of the sample schools have ever received the cooking cost in advance. Like the food grains, the cooking cost is released to the schools on quarterly basis not monthly and that too not in advance.</p> <p><b>ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme?</b></p> <p>In view of the non-release of cooking cost in advance, schools have to either purchase the required ingredients on credit, sometimes by paying higher cost or have to use funds from other resources.</p> <p><b>iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?</b></p> <p>The cooking cost, as and when received by the VEC/SMC, is paid to the school, by the concerned VEC/SMC, in cash.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>SOCIAL EQUITY :</b></p> <p><b>i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements?</b></p> <p>The MI observers did not find any gender or caste (not relevant as there is no caste system in Mizo Society) or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements related to MDM.</p> <p><b>ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?</b></p> <p>In majority of the sample schools, food is served by the cooks supervised by</p>



	<p>the teacher-in-charge. In some schools where there are larger numbers of students, the teachers used to help in the distribution of food. Students form queues in front of the kitchen and after taking their food move to their respective classrooms in 31 (77.5%) schools. Students in 7 (17.5%) schools do not have specific place for seating and take their meal either in classrooms or verandahs or school compounds whereas children of 2(5%) schools take meals in separate dining halls of the schools. The order and discipline maintained by children taking MDM in all sample schools is appreciable.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>VARIETY OF MENU :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed?</b></p> <p>Most of the sample schools which was 25 (62.5%) had displayed weekly menu for MDM at a place noticeable to community while the rest 15 (37.5%) was not able to display the menu for MDM.</p> <p><b>ii) Who decides the menu?</b></p> <p>The day-to-day menu in all 40 sample schools was decided solely by the teacher in-charge of MDM.</p> <p><b>iii) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily ?</b></p> <p>After spot verification of records related to MDM, discussions with the teacher in-charge of MDM, Headmaster and interaction with children of the sample schools, it was found that all 40 (100%) sample schools served a variety of food such as nutrela, green leaves, dal, potatoes, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs (occasionally).</p> <p><b>iv) Does the daily menu include rice/wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?</b></p>

	<p>The daily menu in all the 40 sample schools (100%) included rice preparation with dal, potatoes, cabbage, brinjals, pumpkin and eggs (occasionally).</p>
7	<p><b>QUALITY &amp; QUANTITY OF MEAL :</b></p> <p><b>Feedback from children on quality and quantity of meal (If children were not happy please give reasons and suggestions to improve.)</b></p> <p>After interacting with the students in all sample schools and asking them about the quality and quantity of food served to them in MDM, the MI observers found that children were happy and satisfied with the quality and quantity of food served. When asked about their suggestions for improvement, some of them suggested inclusion of more variety of vegetables and non-vegetarian items.</p>
8.	<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY :</b></p> <p><b>i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child?</b></p> <p>The number of schools that maintained health cards/registers for their students was 36 (90%). Micronutrients such as Iron, folic acid and de-worming medicines, were given to children by majority of the sample schools which was 29 (72.5%). These were administered by health teachers or teachers in charge of health who had received training.</p> <p><b>ii) What is the frequency of health check-up?</b></p> <p>a) <b>Monthly Health Check-up:</b> None of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted monthly health check-up of children.</p>

	<p>b) <b>Quarterly Health Check-up:</b> None of the 40 sample schools reported to have conducted health check-up of children on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>c) <b>Half Yearly Health Check-up:</b> 24 (60%) of the sample schools reported to have conducted the health check-up of children on half yearly basis.</p> <p>d) <b>Annual Health Check-up:</b> 16 (40%) of the sample schools, as reported by their headmasters have conducted the health check-up of children on yearly basis.</p> <p><b>iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin-A dosage) and de-worming medicine periodically.</b></p> <p>a) <b>Iron:</b> 29 (72.5%) of sample schools reported that they had given Iron tablets to their children.</p> <p>b) <b>Folic Acid:</b> It was also given to children by 29 (72.5%) of sample schools.</p> <p>c) <b>Vitamin A dosage and De-worming medicines:</b> 29 (72.5%) of the schools had given De-worming medicines to their students whereas none of the schools had given Vitamin A.</p> <p><b>iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?</b></p> <p>As reported by the headmasters and/or teachers in all the 40 sample schools, the aforesaid micronutrients were administered by teachers (in-charge of health) who had undergone training for this purpose.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>STATUS OF COOKS :</b></p> <p><b>i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/NGO/Contractor)</b></p> <p>Food for MDM in all of the 40 (100%) sample schools was cooked and served by the cooks appointed for this purpose. None of the sample schools has</p>

	<p>ever engaged any NGO/SHG/Contractor for this purpose.</p> <p><b>ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms?</b></p> <p>The number of cooks engaged in the schools visited by MI was as per the norms of GOI. Schools having 25 or less than that were given 1 cook while those with more than 25 but less than 100 were given 2 cooks. Schools having more than 100 students but less than 200 were given 3 cooks. The number of cooks was increased accordingly.</p> <p><b>iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment?</b></p> <p>There were no helpers in any of the sample schools as all of them have been promoted as cooks from May 2010. All cooks in sample schools were paid a remuneration of Rs.1500/-pm in cash.</p> <p><b>iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helper regular?</b></p> <p>The remuneration paid to the cooks was not regular. All of the cooks in sample schools reported that they did not get their remuneration on monthly basis as it was always released quarterly along with the conversion cost.</p> <p><b>v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers ?(SC/ST/OBC/Minority)</b></p> <p>In terms of social composition, all cooks in 40 sample schools were Scheduled Tribe</p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>INFRASTRUCTURE:</b></p> <p><b>i) Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store constructed and in use?</b></p> <p>Pucca kitchen sheds cum store had been constructed and were in use for cooking and service of MDM as well as for storage of food grain and other materials relating to MDM, including service utensils in the case of 36 (90%)</p>

schools. Kitchen sheds in the rest 3 (10%) schools were not received funds for constructing new kitchen sheds cum store. And 1 school received funds but not yet constructed.

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

Kitchen sheds in the sample schools were constructed under the SSA scheme.

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

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

**iv) Kitchen shed under construction**

The MI team, on their visit to Mamit district did not find any kitchen shed which was under construction.

**v) Kitchen shed Sanctioned, but construction not started**

There was one case of kitchen shed sanctioned but construction not yet started in the sample schools visited in Mamit district.

**vi) Kitchen shed not sanctioned**

In 3 (7.5%) schools kitchen shed was not sanctioned in Mamit district.

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

In the case of 3 (7.5%) schools where new kitchen sheds were not sanctions and one school which had been sanctioned but had not started the construction, cooking of food was still managed in the schools and food grain and other

	<p>ingredients were being stored in the schools .</p> <p><b>viii) Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?</b></p> <p>All the sample schools had potable water for cooking and drinking purpose and had PHE connection for water that is considered to be relatively safe for cooking and drinking.</p> <p><b>ix) Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If available is it adequate?</b></p> <p>The MI observers after having discussion with the cooks and visit to the kitchen shed in each sample school found that 36 (90%) the sample schools had adequate utensils for cooking and service of MDM.</p> <p><b>x) What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)</b></p> <p>Out of the 40 schools visited by MI, as many as 37 (92.5%) were using firewood for cooking purpose, whereas, 3 (7.5%) of the sample schools were using LPG only.</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>SAFETY &amp; HYGIENE :</b></p> <p><b>i) General Impression of MI about hygiene:</b></p> <p>MI's impression about hygiene was good in the case of 39 (97.5%) schools and fair in 1 (2.5%) schools. Children in all 40 (100%) the schools took meals in an orderly manner.</p> <p><b>a) Good:</b> The hygiene and overall environment was found to be good in 39 (97.5%) of sample schools.</p> <p><b>b) Fair:</b> In terms of environment and hygiene 1 (2.5 %) of sample schools were fair.</p> <p><b>c) Poor:</b> No sample school was poor in terms of hygiene.</p> <p><b>ii) Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating</b></p> <p>All of the 40 (100% ) sample schools claimed that they encouraged children to wash hands before after eating of MDM.</p>

	<p><b>iii) Do the children take meals in an orderly manner?</b></p> <p>Children in all sample schools were found to be well disciplined and order was maintained by them in taking MDM. The MI found that cooks and teachers played an important role in maintenance of such kind of discipline.</p> <p><b>iv) Conservation of water</b></p> <p>All the sample schools in the district visited by MI reported that due to scarcity of water by and large, the students were aware of the need to conserve water even before they were being taught by the teachers.</p> <p><b>v) Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?</b></p> <p>The cooking process and storage of fuel is by and large safe in in all 40 (100%) sample schools.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION :</b></p> <p><b>i) Extent of participation by Parents in daily supervision, monitoring, participation:</b></p> <p>The extent of participation by parents in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be good by 16 (40%), to be fair by 10 (25%) schools and poor by 14 (35%) schools.</p> <p><b>ii) Extent of participation by VECs/Panchayats/Urban bodies in daily supervision and monitoring of MDM.</b></p> <p>The extent of participation by VECs in daily supervision and management of MDM was reported to be good by 5 (12.5%) to be fair by 16 (40%) schools and poor by 19 (47.5%) schools.</p> <p><b>iii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for</b></p>

	<p><b>supervision of the MDM?</b></p> <p>None of the 40 sample schools has ever prepared any roster for parents and community members for day-to-day supervision of the MDM.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>INSPECTION &amp; SUPERVISION :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the Mid-day meal programme been inspected by any state/district/block level officers/officials? What is the frequency of such inspections?</b></p> <p><b>a) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by State Level Officer:</b></p> <p>While interacting with the MI observers, headmasters/teachers of all 40 (100%) sample schools reported that state level officers had never visited their schools for the purpose of inspection and supervision of MDM programme</p> <p><b>Inspection and Supervision of MDM by District Level Officers :</b></p> <p>Headmasters of all 40 (100%) sample school informed that they were never visited by District Level Officers in connection with MDM.</p> <p><b>b) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Block Level Officers :</b></p> <p>When asked about the inspection and supervision of their MDM programme by block level officers, headmasters of all 40 (100%) sample schools responded that they had never been inspected by Block level officers for.</p> <p><b>c) Inspection and Supervision of MDM by Cluster Level Officers :</b></p> <p>35 (85%) of sample schools reported that the CRCCs hardly inspected and supervised MDM although they paid frequent visits to the schools for some other purposes. As per information received from rest of the schools, the cluster level officers rarely visited the schools and did not inspect and supervise MDM.</p>



<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>IMPACT OF MDM :</b></p> <p><b>i) Has the mid-day meal improved the enrollment of children in school?</b></p> <p>All of the 40 sample schools reported that MDM had improved the enrolment of children in school.</p> <p><b>ii) Has the mid-day meal improved the attendance of children in school?</b></p> <p>All of the 40 sample schools reported that MDM had improved the attendance of children.</p> <p><b>iii) Has the mid-day meal improved general well-being (nutritional status) of children in school?</b></p> <p>All of the 40 sample schools reported that the MDM did improve the general well-being and nutritional status of children of their schools.</p> <p><b>iv) Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving of cooked meal in schools?</b></p> <p>a) As per the reports of teachers in all the sample schools, children become more active as a result of serving of nutritious meals on a regular basis.</p> <p>b) Poor parents feel happy as they do not have to pay for the Tiffin of their children.</p>
-------------------	---

## APPENDIX- 2

### List of Sample Schools from Mamit District with their DISE Code

Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code	Sl. No.	Name of School	DISE Code
1.	Govt. P/S-V	15010103301	21.	Luimawi UPS	15010102604
2.	Govt. M/S - III	15010103302	22.	Luimawi P/S	15010102603
3.	Govt. P/S - III	15010100202	23.	Kanhmun M/S	15010102503
4.	Govt. P/S - I	15010100201	24.	Saithah M/S	15010200902
5.	Govt. M/S - I	15010100203	25.	Dapchhuah P/S	15010300701
6.	Hmunsam Public P/S	15010104303	26.	West Phaileng P/S - IV	15010201804
7.	Hmunsam Public UPS	15010104304	27.	West Phaileng P/S - I	15010201801
8.	Govt. P/S - II	15010104301	28.	West Phaileng M/S - I	15010201806
9.	Govt. M/S - II	15010104302	29.	West Phaileng P/S - III	15010201803
10.	Agape M/S	15010100707	30.	West Phaileng M/S - II	15010202701
11.	Kanhmun M/S	15010102503	31.	West Phaileng UPS	15010202705
12.	Rawpuichhip M/S	15010300904	32.	Tuahzawl M/S	15010300802
13.	Rawpuichhip P/S - I	15010300901	33.	Rulpuihlim P/S	15010401201
14.	Dapchhuah M/S	15010300702	34.	RulpuihlimM/S	15010401202
15.	Dampui P/S	15010300601	35.	Chungtlang P/S	15010400501
16.	Dampui M/S	15010300602	36.	Chhippui P/S I	15010200501
17.	Zawlnuam M/S - I	15010102003	37.	Chhippui M/S	15010200504
18.	Zawlnuam Public P/S	15010102105	38.	Lallen P/S	15010200601
19.	Bungthuam M/S	15010102402	39.	Lallen M/S	15010200602
20.	Bungthuam P/S	15010102401	40.	Saithah P/S	15010200901