

# EVALUATION STUDY ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA

*Sponsored by*  
Directorate of Programme Implementation & Evaluation  
Government of Meghalaya



Manju Singh  
Niharranjan Mishra



**COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad – 500 030

July 2010

# **Evaluation Study on Mid Day Meal Programme in Meghalaya**

*Sponsored by  
Directorate of Programme Implementation & Evaluation  
Government of Meghalaya*

**Manju Singh  
Niharranjan Mishra**



**COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Southern Regional Centre, Rajendranagar  
HYDERABAD – 500 030**

Telephone: 040 24016395, Telefax: 040 24001958

Email: [csdhyd@hotmail.com](mailto:csdhyd@hotmail.com)

[www.csdhyderabad.org](http://www.csdhyderabad.org)

JULY 2010

# CONTENTS

	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
	LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i - x
<b>Section - I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1 - 12</b>
	1 India's Response	1
	2 Genesis of the Mid Day Meal Programme	3
	3 Mid Day Meal in the State of Meghalaya	5
	4 Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation Study	10
<b>Section - II</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>13 - 18</b>
	1 Sampling Procedure	13
	2 Data Collection	16
	3 Data Analysis	16
	4 Timeline	17
<b>Section - III</b>	<b>MAIN OBSERVATIONS</b>	<b>19 - 56</b>
	1 Perception of the Sample Profile of the Present Study	
	1.1 District Wise Shift of the School	19
	1.2 Year of Commencement	20
	1.3 Gender, Age and Study Level, Distribution of Sample Students	21
	1.4 Caste-wise and Religion-wise Distribution of Sample Students	21
	1.5 Literacy level of Parents covered under the Study	22
	1.6 Distribution of Monthly Income of the Family	23
	2. Performance of MDMS : Some Observations	
	2.1 Effect of MDMS on Enrollment, Attendance and Span of Attention	24
	2.2 Meals as an Incentive	26
	2.3 Quality and Acceptance of MDMS	27
	2.4 Supply of Ration	34
	2.5 Basic Cooking and Storage	42
	2.6 Drinking Water Facilities and Health Support	48
	2.7 Monitoring	50
	2.8 Contribution of Stakeholders / Peoples Participation	52
	2.9 Social Inclusion	54
	2.10 Relating MDM Performance with Infrastructure Index	54
<b>Section - IV</b>	<b>CONSTRAINTS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS</b>	<b>57 - 69</b>
	1 Constraints and Bottlenecks	58
	2 Future Directions	63
	<b>References</b>	<b>70</b>
	Annexure - I : List of MDM Centres covered under present study	
	Annexure - II : List of Wholesalers interacted during study	
	Annexure - III : List of Schools Shift wise	
	Appendix - Schedules (5)	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Council for Social Development, Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad is grateful to the Government of Meghalaya for entrusting the evaluation study of Mid Day Meal Programme in Meghalaya. The Centre is particularly thankful to Shri Ajay Tiwari, Director, Programme Implementation and Evaluation, Meghalaya, Shillong and Shri S. Lyngdoh, Deputy Director for their continuous encouragement and support.

Sincere thanks are due to all the officials of Department of Elementary and Mass Education, Government of Meghalaya, especially to the district and block level officials without whose cooperation and willingness to provide us the necessary information, the study would not have become a success.

The entire study was carried out under the able leadership of Dr. K.S. Bhat, our former Regional Director. He had been giving continuous and valuable guidance right from the stage of conceiving the proposal to the stage of presenting the draft report. Our present Regional Director Dr. A.C Kutty Krishnan Nambiar is also supportive enough to produce this report.

Dr. Niharranjan Mishra, Assistant Professor who had the major responsibility of conducting field work and survey has done commendable work. He has completed the assignment in extremely unfamiliar surroundings. The Centre is all in appreciation for his hard and sincere work. The members of research team toiled hard in the field, during survey, they worked overtime at odd hours and gave invaluable assistance in report production.

The expert support from Shri Shailendra Bisht for analysis and interpretation of the data during evaluation study is praise worthy.

Last but not the least, the Council is grateful to all the stakeholders of MDMS in Meghalaya including students, teachers, and parents, members of management committees and suppliers who have given their whole hearted support to evaluation team. Their contribution and perception is proved immensely useful in visualizing present status of MDMS and for future pathways of MDMS in Meghalaya. The project could not have been completed in the present form if the respondents were not generous and humane enough to spare their invaluable time to give responses to the questionnaire and other valuable information relevant to the study. They deserve special gratitude and respect.

Special mention need to be made here of Mr. K. Sanjiva Rao for his efficient administrative support during study period. Mr. P. Kumar, Mr. B Ramesh and Ms. A. Jyotsna for helping in data processing. Sincere thanks to Ms. K. Mahalakshmi for her continuous and uninterrupted support for report presentation.

July 2010  
Hyderabad

Manju Singh

## LIST OF TABLES

S. No.	Table No.	Title of the Table	Page No.
		<b>Section – I</b>	
1	1.1	Block and District wise description of sample MDM centers	11
		<b>Section – II</b>	
2	1.1	Infrastructure Development Index	14
		<b>Section - III</b>	
3	1.1	Shift of the School	19
4	1.2	Year of commencement	20
5	1.3	Gender, Age and Study Level Distribution	21
6	1.4	Caste-wise and Religion-wise Distribution	21
7	1.6	Distribution of Monthly Income of the Family	23
8	2.1	Effect of MDMS on enrollment, attendance and span of attention (opinion)	24
9	2.1.1	Year-wise Enrollment of Students	24
10	2.1.2	Percentage increase in Total Enrollment	25
11	2.2	Students having meals at school and reasons for not having meal in the school	26
12	2.2.1	Parents Opinion: MDM a motivation for attending school	27
13	2.3	Level of satisfaction with MDMS Functioning	27
14	2.3.2	Parents' satisfaction : Regarding increased performance and quality of food	29
15	2.3.3	Amount of Food Served Per Child	29
16	2.3.4	Appearance, Taste, Smell and Texture of Food	30
17	2.3.5	Overall Acceptance of the meal	32
18	2.3.6	Frequency of receiving cooked meals	32
19	2.3.7	Reasons of not eating MDM	33
20	2.3.8	Preference & Dishes liked by the students	33
21	2.3.9	Serving Areas for MDM	34
22	2.3.9 (a)	Demand for extra serving and eating before and after school	34
23	2.4	Type of MDM provided in Schools	35
24	2.4.1	Frequency, Regularity and Reasons for irregularity of supply of ration	38
25	2.4.2	Frequency of receiving the supply as per the fixed norms by Government	39
26	2.4.3	Pre-information regarding delay of Supply of Ration	39
27	2.4.4	Action taken by the MDM In charge in case of Delay in supply of ration	40
28	2.4.5	Quality of ration received and Checking the Quality by MDM Centres	41
29	2.4.6	Reasons for returning back the supply of Ration and Action taken in the case of non-availability of cooked food	42
30	2.5	Availability of storage facilities	42

S. No.	Table No.	Title of the Table	Page No.
31	2.5.1	Alternative options for storage	43
32	2.5.2	Hygienic condition of cooking area	44
33	2.5.3	Arrangement of the Serving Plates	45
34	2.5.4	Process of utilizing the left over food at MDM Centre	45
35	2.5.5	Responsibility of washing plates and utensils	46
36	2.5.6	Responsibility of utensils wash and availability of wash area	47
37	2.5.6 (a)	Process of cleaning Plates	47
38	2.5.7	Hygienic condition of cooking area and MDM Distribution	48
39	2.5.8	Inspection of ration before cooking	48
40	2.6	Availability of Health Support	48
41	2.6.1	Drinking water facilities and regularity of supply	49
42	2.6.1 (a)	Source of drinking water	49
43	2.7	Inspection of higher authorities and stated reasons for not visiting	50
44	2.8	Menu Planning	52
45	2.8 (a)	Students' involvement in Menu Planning	52
46	2.8 (b)	Complaints / Suggestions extended the betterment of MDM	53
47	2.8 (c)	People's Participation	53

#### LIST OF FIGURES

S. No.	Figure No.	Title of the Figure	Page No.
1	1.2	Year of Commencement	20
2	1.5	Literacy level of sample Parents	22
3	1.5 (a)	Occupational Distribution	22
4	1.6	Caste wise distribution	23
5	1.6 (a)	Religion wise Distribution	23
6	2.1.1	Year-wise enrollment of Students	25
7	2.2.1	Parents motivation levels for attending schools	27
8	2.3.2	Parents Opinion: Regularity of Meal	29
9	2.3.4	Appearance, Taste, Smell and Texture of Food	31
10	2.5	Cooking shed availability	44
11	2.6	Complaints / Suggestion extended the betterment of MDM	53

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MDMS Scheme was initiated on the basis of the philosophy that "when children have to sit in class with empty stomachs, they cannot focus on learning". The scheme is important for improving enrolment, attendance and retention of primary school children, while simultaneously improving their nutritional status. Mid Day Meal Scheme had proved to be an effective means to check high dropout rates of children from economically weaker sections, while also addressing their nutritional needs.

Nutrition Support to Primary Education popularly referred to as Mid Day Meal programme (MDM) is considered as a means of promoting improved enrolment, school attendance and retention. MDM seeks to provide for each school child roughly a third of the daily nutrient requirement in the form of a hot fresh cooked meal. It is sometimes argued that in the case of children of poor households, the school meal may become a substitute rather than a supplement for the home meal. It is important to note that it is not merely the long-term effects of the school meal on the nutritional status but its Short-Term Effects on better attention, memory and learning that is important. There are several published reports based on well-conducted studies pointing to these beneficial short-term effects of the school meal on learning ability. A hungry child is a poor learner lacking in concentration. A mid day meal is an important instrument for combating classroom hunger and promoting better learning. Many children reach school with an empty stomach in the morning, since a good early morning breakfast is not a part of the household routine. Under these circumstances it is important to acknowledge the Short Term Effects of MDM on learning. MDM could thus be a means for not only promoting school enrollment but also better learning in schools. With children from all castes and communities eating together, it is also instrumental in bringing about better social integration.

MDM could serve the important purpose of improving school enrollment and attendance especially girls thus contributing to gender equality. With MDM, it will be easier for parents to persuade their children to go to school and for teachers to retain children in the classrooms. It could foster sound social behavior among children and dispel feelings of difference between various castes.

MDM can also contribute to gender equality by reducing the gender gap in education by boosting female attendance in school.

Most importantly MDM could trigger all round development of the entire school system- leading to better infrastructures in schools, better teaching facilities, a School Health Service and community involvement. Even now, after a long span of implementation of MDMS in Meghalaya, State is not able to fully resolve the problem of the children dropping out of primary schools. Poor enrolment and high school dropout rate are attributed to poor socio-economic conditions, child labour, lack of motivation and poor nutrition status of the children.

Present evaluation study on MDM programme in Meghalaya is carried out to assess the performance of the programme in the entire state. The main aim is to understand the constraints and bottlenecks in implementing the programme and to suggest policy measures for improvement in the functioning of the programme on the basis of in-depth observations. A comprehensive sample of seventy MDM centers from all seven districts of Meghalaya was exhaustively studied in the current evaluation study. Two blocks from each of seven districts were included to cover whole state. Assuming that the level of infrastructure would also affect the efficacy of MDM differently in different blocks of Meghalaya, selection of blocks was made on the basis of Infrastructure Development Index (IDI). IDI was calculated on the basis of NSS 2001 data for all the blocks at village level.

This study was based on intensive fieldwork approach. The data collection was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, secondary data was collected that facilitated finalization of the sample MDM centers and strengthen our idea and arguments over MDMS programme in Meghalaya. In the second and final phase, primary data was collected from all stakeholders - officials in various implementing institutions, students, management committees, teachers, parents, SHGs, etc. Primary data was collected using some tools like citizen report card, case study, interview, focused group interview, observation (participant and non-participant) and some PRA techniques. Some structured questionnaires were also used at the time of data collection. During the collection of the data some important aspects like enrolment, attendance and dropouts; delivery systems; infrastructural availability; social policy



and state services were also focused. Information in respect of occupation of the parents/guardians, distance of the residence from the school, socio economic profile of the beneficiaries were also obtained. Further descriptive and inferential statistics used for in-depth analysis and in order to ascertain the degree of relationship of selected variables in the study. Quantitative data is analyzed using SPSS and SAS software.

Here, it is worth mentioning that data collection was assigned to a team of experienced sincere and motivated researchers. Orientation was given to research team to administer the tools efficiently. Role play was held to understand the whole process of researching in field. Questions were asked in a non-suggestive manner that neither did nor provide any lead. Wherever possible, data were triangulated by repeating the same question to different stakeholders, to minimize errors in data collection. The program executing authorities were also taken into confidence. They were explained that the exercise was being conducted to improve implementation of the MDMS and not to find mistakes or scapegoats. Government officials and community stakeholders were involved during the survey exercise to get their cooperation, suggestions, and guidance.

The opinions and observations of all stakeholders including administrative officers, management committee, students, and parents reflects that MDM scheme has improve the status of primary education by enhancement of enrolment and attendance in some way. The response regarding the increase in span of attention after implementation of MDM was found marginal. Year wise record of the enrollment number based on the data provided by each MDM Centre also confirms this observation.

It was shared that in Meghalaya overall MDM had proved as an instrument in increasing enrollment in sample MDM Centres. As per the latest DISE data, the drop-out rate at primary level has come down to less than 10% which is commendable. The ultimate goal is, of course, to bring it down to 0% and the Education Department is striving in that direction. Reasons inferred from the discussions with the teachers and managing Committees for not having regular meal were that in some cases parents were not allowing them to eat and many, especially girl students, were feeling hesitant to have food in the schools. In most of the cases parents have feeling that

overall MDM has proved as a motivating force for children to attend the school quite regularly. The larger part of the SMC's was more or less satisfied with the Scheme but they expressed their dissatisfaction regarding the way of functioning of MDMS in the State. Teachers had argued that MDMS had disturbed their teaching schedules.

During interrogation while evaluation, various aspects of MDM like the frequency of meals served, the quality of food and the impact of MDM on children attendance and performance were tried to assess in the present study. Very few parents expressed their satisfaction over quality of food. Although they have strong feeling that it had improved their children performance and influenced their attendance. But majority of parents shared that it is not being served all five days in a week. Regarding the serving quantity except two centers in Ri bhoi and Jaintia almost all are serving less quantity than the prescribed norm. Next observation indicates some level of relief for the implementing officials that the quality of food was found of "fair" quality in most of the MDM Centres in the State. Reaffirming the previous feeling it was reflected that in majority of the MDM Centres in all the districts of State, students showed fair level of acceptance of cooked meal. Students regarding frequency of getting cooked meal, shared that a very few Centers were providing cooked meal regularly. Additional queries regarding giving preference for menu and preference of dishes revealed that most of the students being a non-vegetarian were fond of non-vegetarian dishes. Another observation made during study was that the amount served was less than sufficient for students. The revelation regarding serving area confirmed that most of the students have their meal in open space that gives important pointer with reference to hygienic condition in MDMS in the state. Almost all the sampled mid day meal centers were found serving cooked meal but two centers were observed distributing dry ration. The reason for distributing dry ration given by Head, SMC was that the money received was not enough to provide good quality food. They found it quite difficult to arrange cook and provide a good quality of food in this given amount. Otherwise if they involve teachers in cooking it would disturb teaching schedule so it was felt better to give only dry ration to the students.

Regarding the supply of ration, the record verification in the field confirmed an important fact that there was lack of proper coordination among all the stakeholders-starting from the top, from FCI delivery to the bottom at the level of schools. It took lot of time to reach supply of ration from FCI to school door. It may be due to non-receipt of transportation cost by wholesalers for three and a half years with effect from 2003-04. Wholesalers found it impossible to keep on paying for the transportation of MDM food grain from their pocket for long periods without getting reimbursement in time.

Another important problem, most of the school authorities raised on the insufficient conversion money provided under MDMS. They argued that because of very less amount of conversion money it is difficult to manage cooking regularly. The study confirmed another serious fact that most of the MDM centre authorities are not aware about the amount of conversion money and ration. Sometimes they were receiving ration once in 3 months and conversion money once in a year. Another issue was revealed by management committees that government is not providing ration for pre primary students. They were providing ration only for primary schools as SMC cannot differentiate while distributing meal as they did not feel ethical to give meals only to seniors. Because of this reason most of them disclosed that schools were not able to provide food for all the five days. Inquiring about the hands-on action for delay in supply of ration, most of the members of management committees shared that they did not make any arrangement. It was also told that among the reasons behind the returning back of supply was the recommendation of MDM Committees to return back the ration and less quantity of ration.

About proper storage facilities in their centers, it was observed during the assessment in the state that a very few MDM centers were having this facility. Only government schools were managing to have this facility with government financial support in all the districts. Those MDM centers where there were no proper facilities for storage of ration, most of them stored their ration in their offices and classrooms. Over fifty percentage sampled centers were found to have hygienic and clean cooking shed although it is important to point out here that all the cooking sheds were not functional, as some of them were built recently in the beginning of year 2008. Nearly all were using fuel wood for cooking MDM meals. Regarding fuel arrangement it was

also observed that in some schools even students were contributing in the collection of wood from near by forest areas and more interestingly it was stated that in some schools each student was bringing one piece each per day for cooking.

One of the objectives of MDMS is to take care of health of school going children. This assessment disclosed that a very few MDM centers were having weighing machine in their stock. Those few who were having weighing machine with them were mostly Government and Missionary schools. Enquiring about health check up facility being provided by school managing committees, facts captured was not very encouraging. In similar way, nutritional medicine, which are supposed to be distributed among school children as per the MDMS guideline, it was found that only very few of total sample MDM centers were distributing nutritional medicine in reality. During assessment of drinking water facility in this evaluation study, it was observed that more than 50 % of centers covered in the study were having adequate drinking water facility in their schools.

Assessment of the monitoring mechanism of MDMS in the state revealed that majority of centers had been inspected. Some school authorities expressed their dissatisfaction regarding monitoring of MDM as it was mostly limited to only road side schools. Team was also told that officials from block level like Deputy Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, Block Resource Coordinators, and Cluster Resource Coordinators had visited schools yearly once but their focus was not "only" the MDMS.

Another important observation made in the study that Government had not able to assess precisely the impact of the programme in terms of increase in enrolment, attendance and retention levels of children. No data has been collected from schools disclosing any definite pattern in enrolment, attendance and retention levels of children over the years for the main purpose of monitoring of the MDMS in the state. Otherwise also unless scientific design like randomization control trial is not adopted for evaluation and monitoring, it cannot be concluded that only because of MDMS performance has improved or specific objectives have been attained.

State-level and District-level Steering-cum-Monitoring Committees have by and large been held as stipulated in the guidelines although the frequency of field level inspections is definitely not as per desired frequency despite instructions issued from time to time to the District level and the Sub-Divisional level authorities/ functionaries.

The general assumption that performance of any programme may be influenced by the availability of the infrastructure facilities in the specific area is also found some what true in the case of performance of MDM in Meghalaya. The level of Infrastructure Development Index and MDM Performance Index was observed associated in some of the cases. This confirms that monitoring, accessibility and approach might be instrumental in enhancement of MDM performance in the area.

Thus present evaluation study reinforced many of the observations reflected in the earlier studies carried out in various other states in India. This strongly advocates for the improvement in the planning as well as in the process monitoring.

- There exist several bottlenecks in the implementation of Mid Day Meal Scheme. Major gaps in processing of the scheme includes lack of awareness regarding vision behind the scheme among all the stakeholders including teachers and parents has led to shortfalls in realizing the objectives of the MDM. Majority of stakeholders feel that since MDM is provided free of cost, there was no point in raising their voice regarding the pitfalls in implementation. Insufficient resources and infrastructure to provide good quality food was also revealed by majority of the stakeholders. Absence of systematic process monitoring for delivering Mid day meal and absence of community participation, loss of teaching hours due to supervision of MDM by teachers and so on were observed. SMCs also complained of delays in release of funds and the low rate of conversion cost per head. Misuse of ration for other than providing meal i.e., to replace worn out kitchen utensils, compensate transportation expenses, were also reported in certain schools indicating lack of infrastructure to run the MDM scheme. Additionally, it was shared that there is no dedicated officer exclusively to look after this scheme at the District level and, as a result, this greatly hampered the effective implementation and monitoring of

this important flagship scheme of the Govt. of India. This is one of the reasons why they were not able to implement the programme with complete sense of accountability.

The findings from this study strongly recommend “Process Monitoring” and “Improvement in Planning” for scaling up the exercise to improve performance in all the schools in the state. It includes Comprehensive, periodical and systematic orientation to sensitize all stakeholder including the policy makers, implementers, teachers, center level officials and community people to make them understand this scheme well. This would help them to become more efficient and active partner of the programme that will certainly enhance its performance.

Sufficient financial resources should be provided per head conversion cost budget was felt very low. Thus it is recommended that it should be linked with specially designed price index that should take care of commodities used for preparation of the MDM. Adequate infrastructure viz. provisions of kitchen sheds, kitchen devices and facility of drinking water should be ensured in all schools. The State government needs to strengthen the internal controls as well as the inspection and monitoring mechanism at all levels. Accountability for maintenance of records at various levels should be prescribed and monitored. It is recommended to limit teachers’ involvement in the programme to supervision activities. Decentralization of power among SMC members is recommended. More powers are asked to be delegated to Head teacher as far as management of MDMS is concerned. Delivery of the food grain should be regular, direct and convenient to the centers. Uniform implementing mechanism for delivery of ration at door steps of schools is suggested in all the districts. Having sensed the genuine problem of in managing supply in time in schools, it is suggested that funds should be provided in advance to the implementing agencies through the state nodal officer for the transportation of food grains. To enhance the performance level of MDMS, there should be some modalities to rise per child budget with systematic mechanism of process monitoring this will help in smooth running of the programme. It is also suggested to implement the scheme with alternative approach of partnership with NGO’s and local self help groups. It could be resolved by sharing the burden with corporate world as the Corporate Social responsibility. Linkage with poverty alleviation programmes in rural and urban areas, adequate support of the Union

Ministry of Health and the state Health Departments for the school health programme and support from the Department of Women and Child Development for nutrition education is also recommended for managing resources.

The state government should vigorously coordinate with the Ministry to ensure that the data on enrolment, attendance and retention flows from the school level to state level in a transparent manner with records of compilation maintained at each level i.e. school level, district level and state level. Periodical checks should be arranged to crosscheck the data for accuracy. It should provide for analysis of feed back received and take remedial action, when required. Outcome indicators should be prescribe to measure and report on improvements in education, health and nutrition. It should use the data received from the states for such an evaluation. Extensive use of the computerized MIS (CMIS) net for monitoring purposes. External agencies should be involved in monitoring and supervision to ensure greater accountability. Elected representatives may also be involved in supervision. Accountability issue is a major facet in good governance. Specific dedicated departmental arrangement is suggested to assign the sole responsibility of MDMS. This would encourage sense of ownership among the actors who play major role in the execution. Fostering stronger community participation through Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), and such other units of the school system in the implementation of the programme could help in improving its performance. MDM could also be used as a platform to strength school health programme through ensuring healthy environment in schools such as environmental sanitation, provision of safe drinking water and routine medical checkups.

In response to the difficulties of 'on-site feeding' alternative approaches for delivering an appropriately-timed and high quality, consistent ration are developed in other parts of India. Different models are referred here for perusal of planners : a) The schools model, which have become strong partners with the Government to run the MDMP (e.g. Gujarat), b)The NGOs model like Naandi and ISKCON. These institutions however, bank on funding to provide the meals, c) The Government private sector partnership model, e.g. TATAs and Wipros, d) Women empowerment model e.g Tamil Nadu. These models are suggested to have more efficient systems for the delivery of meals to school children. Government has to work out their logistics and choose the model / models most suited for their State.

In brief it could be believed that this programme had shown the way to social transformation by encouraging children from different backgrounds to sit and eat together, and therefore its role in bringing together diverse social groups was important. It emphasizes the right to quality food and schooling, diverse groups eating together and learning and building a smarter and healthier India. It also revolve around a few overlapping issues like Responsibilities (of regulatory authorities), Rights (of children), Nutrition (for health), Quality (for the value chain elements involved) and Development (overall attainment of vision i.e., future for the Indian Child and Country).

The evaluation team has high expectations that Government of Meghalaya would have serious effort for improve performance of MDMS in their State by giving serious thought to this evaluation report. Appropriate level of attention is sought for proper orientation of stakeholder, perfect and periodical monitoring, mid course corrections, encouraging people' participation, adopting appropriate model of execution and alternative resource mobilization as these are the major actors linked with the improvement in the performance of MDMS.

The present evaluation study has tried to focus on the given assignment of evaluating the actual performance of the MDMS. It aimed to understand its process of implementation and its impact on beneficiaries in Meghalaya within a short span of six months. Although we were able to fathom the magnitudes of financial and administrative process and benefits perceived by the stakeholders at the local level, there are many aspects that remained untouched in current evaluation study. The scope of this study could be expanded to ascertain administrative and financial efficiencies (or the lack of it) and other aspects in much more detail. A separate and contextual study may be conducted to understand these aspects. In fact, a much larger study at the state level could be conducted that not only includes aspects not covered in this study, but also widens the sample size of schools, and stakeholders to get a much broader and representative picture of Meghalaya's MDM scheme on various dimensions.

\*\*\*\*



## Section – I

# INTRODUCTION

*Hunger, we feel sometimes, is the worst tribulation of being poor. Not knowing where the next meal is coming from day after day is a fear not many of us reading this have experienced. But, unfortunately millions do, everyday.*

*For parents, nothing brings them down to their knees like a hungry child at home, who refuse to drink water again and again for breakfast, for lunch and for dinner. It is no surprise then that the number of malnourished and starving children in India is more than that in Sub-Saharan Africa.*

### 1. INDIA'S RESPONSE

The challenge for us in the country has been to ensure fewer and fewer children go to bed hungry. The Supreme Court of India in one of its landmark decisions, linked a feeding programme to the government's quality education programme. This was to encourage poor families to enroll their children in government schools and thereby enable them to guarantee at least one square meal a day. Called as MDMS, all State Governments in the country have to ensure that every child coming to a government school gets one wholesome meal for lunch on school days.

Logistically, the problem was tackled through government schools in India that educate 60 per cent of the country's children, most of them being from below poverty-line background (the family earns less than Rs 700 a month). With parents (often single) going off for wage labour early in the morning, the children usually come to school hungry because kitchen fires at home are only lit in the evenings after the father or the mother brings home the daily wage.

To address, the Government of India, in its wisdom, launched the MDMS. It was designed to provide every child enrolled in a government school, nutritiously cooked afternoon meal every day. The meal not only fights hunger, it brings a hungry child's attention back to the lessons, and it also encourages out-of-school children to get enrolled so that they can at least be assured of one wholesome meal every day.

The MDMS is a well-intentioned programme. Government of India has attempted to address the fundamental problems of health, education, and overall development of children in the country by implementing programme all over the country. It provides children with at least one nutritionally adequate meal a day. This program is known to lead to higher attention spans, better concentration, and improved class performance. School meal program also provides parents with a strong incentive to send children to school, thereby encouraging enrollment and reducing absenteeism and dropout rates. It supports health, nutrition, and education goals and consequently will have a multi-pronged impact on a nation's overall social and economic development.

There is also evidence to suggest that apart from enhancing school attendance and child nutrition, mid day meals have an important social value and foster equality. As children learn to sit together and share a common meal, one can expect some erosion of caste prejudices and class inequality. Moreover, cultural traditions and social structures often mean that girls are much more affected by hunger than boys. Thus the mid day meal programme can also reduce the gender gap in education, since it enhances female school attendance.

Mid day meal has also helped the poor families that, engulfed in poverty, hunger and starvation striving hard to have one square meal a day, can not even think of sending their children to schools. The poor households such as those headed by widows or landless labourers value that assurance of a free lunch every day for their children. The contribution of mid-day meals to food security and child nutrition seems to be particularly crucial in tribal areas where hunger is endemic (Dreze and Goyal, 2003). School feeding Programme is a direct approach to improve the nutritional status of the children who are in the stage of rapid development requiring special nutritional requirement (Mishra, 2002; Dogra and Dogra, 2003). Highlighting the importance of MDM programme Saxena (2003) claimed that it has lowered the widespread incidence of malnutrition primarily among children of poor families and to increase their access to education. Shiva Kumar (2003) says that mid day meal helps the malnourished and well nourished children to overcome short term hunger and thereby increase their concentration and learning inside the classroom. It not only takes care of the dietary

gap but can also be effective in ensuring that short-term hunger does not inhibit their capacity to learn (Mathew, 2003) This programme has created a very congenial atmosphere for education, health growth and overall well-being of the poor and needy children (Dhananjayan, 2003; Kanam, 2003). According to Shiva Kumar (2003), in poor countries like India school feeding programmes serve as an incentive for parents to enroll their children. They ensure higher attendance and reduce dropout rates. These programmes increase the possibility of retaining children in school for a longer period during day and thereby increasing the learning opportunities for them. According to Saihjee Aarti (2003), in recent survey, almost all schools (95%) in Tamil Nadu reported that noon meal programme has helped in increasing enrollment and retention of girls. Kameshwari's (2003) study reflects that mid day meal has brought a sharp increase in school enrollment and attendance rates across all the states and more importantly narrowing the gender gaps in school attendance rates. Dreze and Goyal (2003) says that mid day meal programme has helped in undermining caste prejudices by creating an atmosphere of seating together and sharing meal together in school. Shiv Kumar (2003) says that school feeding programme serve as a very effective mechanism for strengthening the socialization process. It helps to break the caste and class barriers. The study done by Dreze and Goyal (2003) reveals that MDM provides an excellent opportunity for female employment in rural areas and liberating working women from the burden of having to feed the children at home during the day.

Supreme Court of India has even passed an order in 2001 instructing all the states in the country to provide the midday meal to all government school children. But the implementation of the programme has run into rough weather.

## 2. GENESIS OF THE MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME

Introduction of mid day meal scheme (MDMS) in India occurred several decades ago. It was the then Madras Corporation which first developed a school lunch programme way back in 1925. However, it was about 50 years later that such a scheme was given any serious attention at the national level. In the year 1974, the National Policy on Children declared that country's children were its supreme human resource. This policy enjoined the state to ensure full physical and mental development of

children. By the mid 1980s three States viz. Gujarat, Kerala and Tamilnadu and the UT of Pondicherry had universalized a cooked Mid Day Meal Programme with their own resources for children studying at the primary stage. Mid Day Meal was also being provided to children in Tribal Areas in some States like Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. By 1990-91 the number of States implementing the mid day meal programme on a large scale basis with their own resources had increased to twelve, namely, Goa, Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh. In another three States, namely Karnataka, Orissa and West Bengal, the programme was being implemented with State resources in combination with international assistance. Two more States, namely Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, were implementing the programme entirely with international assistance.

Later, The National Program of Nutritional Support to Primary Education, commonly known as the Mid-Day Meal Scheme (MDMS), was launched in India in August 1995. The MDMS covered all students in primary schools run or funded by the Government throughout the country. Initially the MDMS provided 3 kilograms of food grain per student per month. On 28 November 2001, the Supreme Court directed state governments to introduce cooked mid-day meals in all government and government-assisted primary schools within six months (see legal action section for further details). This landmark order was one of the first achievements of the right to food campaign. The order was followed by organized public pressure for the introduction of cooked mid-day meals in primary schools, e.g. in the form of a countrywide "day of action on mid-day meals" in April 2002.

In response to this pressure, and the Court orders, all state governments have initiated mid-day meal programmes. Today, with more than 100 million children covered, India's mid-day meal programme is by far the largest school feeding and nutrition programme in the world.

The quality of mid-day meals, however, varies a great deal between different states. Some states, notably in Southern India, have reasonably good mid-day meal programmes. Others initially introduced ramshackle mid-day meals on a shoestring

budget, mainly to appease the Supreme Court. The campaign focuses not only on the implementation of Supreme Court orders but also on quality issues.


Under this scheme the central government provides 100 grams food grain (wheat or rice) per child per school day, free of charge, and Rs. 1.00 per student per day toward cooking conversion costs. The State Government also contributes Rs.1.00 per student per day toward cooking conversion charges. This share was Rs 0.50 earlier but was increased to Rs. 1.00 from the Financial Year 2006-07.

The MDMS is supposed to provide a minimum of 300 calories and 8-12 grams of protein per child per school day, for a minimum of 200 days annually. The infrastructure for the MDMS is supposed to be developed by the state government from funds available under other schemes.

The MDMS is also being used to support administration of six monthly doses of deworming medication and Vitamin A supplementation, weekly doses of iron and folic acid supplements, and other micronutrients depending on common deficiencies found in the local area.

### **3. MID DAY MEAL IN THE STATE OF MEGHALAYA**

The National Programme for Nutritional Support to Primary Education (NP-NSPE) commonly known as the Mid Day Meal Scheme has been implemented in the State of Meghalaya since 1995 by providing uncooked rice to primary school children @ 3 Kg. per child per month. As per directive of the Supreme Court vide its order dated 28th November 2001, all state governments including the Government of Meghalaya were directed to implement the Mid Day Meal Scheme by providing every child in Government and Government aided lower primary schools with a cooked Mid Day Meal. The cost of conversion of food grains into hot cooked meals has to be met jointly by the Government of India @ Rs. 1.80 p. per child per day and the State Government @ Re. 0.20 p. per child per day for lower primary schools and @ Rs.2.30 per child per day by Government of India and @ Re.0.20 p. by the State Government for upper primary schools. As it stands now, cooked Mid Day Meal has been provided to all Government, Government aided primary schools and EGS Centres and upper primary schools in EBBs in the State. For implementation of the scheme, the




Government of India provides food grain free of cost through Food Corporation of India (FCI). The Government of India also reimburses the cost of transportation of rice @ Rs. 50/- per quintal, which has been subsequently revised to @ Rs. 100/- per quintal. The transportation cost is initially paid by the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDA) of the respective District (*Till 2007 and now DC is taking care of this*) and reimbursed by the Government of India. In compliance with the orders of the Supreme Court of India, the State Government has taken steps to provide cooked meals for 10 months in a year to all the Government and Government aided primary schools and EGS centers. Government issued Notification No. EDN.130/93/837, Dated 29-11-2002 directing school Managing Committees of all Government and Government aided schools to implement provision of cooked Mid-Day Meal to all school children. Similar instructions have been issued by the Directorate of Elementary and Mass Education, vide No. DEME/GB/Misc/MDM/4/2002/60, dated: 10-12-2002 for providing cooked meals with required calories and proteins preferably locally available vegetables including fruits and bananas.

### 3.1. Flow of Food grains

Food grains are issued by F.C.I. to wholesalers based on allocation made by the concerned Deputy Commissioner (Supply). The wholesalers issued the food grains to the schools based on the enrolment of children as confirmed by the Deputy Inspectors of Schools. There are five FCI godowns in the State.


Location of FCI Godowns			
1	East Khasi Hills	-	Shillong
2	Ri-Bhoi	-	Khanapara
3	Jaintia Hills	-	Khliehtyrshi (Jowai)
4	East Garo Hills	-	Williamnagar
5	West Garo Hills	-	Tura

Food grains are lifted by the wholesalers / Government nominees and transported to the schools. The FCI as well as the Government nominees have sufficient storage facilities for food grains. At the school level, the School Managing Committees are responsible for storage and custody of food grains. The total number of wholesalers who have been listed as nominees for MDMS for the State is mentioned below.



### 3.2. Flow of Funds

Directorate of Elementary and Mass Education, Meghalaya is the nodal agency to implement the MDMS.



Following Types of Funds are available under MDMS programme in Meghalaya:

- Conversion cost @ Rs.2 per child per day for 210 days in a year.
- Kitchen devices @ Rs.2500/- per school and @ RS.2000/- per EGS Centre. The Government of India has also provided fund for procuring kitchen devices to 1450 schools @ Rs.5000/- per school. Kitchen devices have been sanctioned for 468 Upper Primary Schools in EBBs.
- Management, Monitoring and Evaluation - Funds have been provided to the Deputy Inspector of Schools and DIETs for Monitoring the Scheme. Third Party Evaluation has been entrusted to SRC NEHU. Report is being awaited.



- The Government of India has provided funds for construction of Kitchen sheds @ Rs. 60,000/- per school for 2539 Government LP Schools. Funds have been released to all Government Primary Schools for construction of Kitchen sheds and the work is in progress. Sanction for construction of kitchen sheds to 468 UPS in EBBs has just been received from the Government of India.
- Transport subsidy Till recently the transport cost to the wholesalers is paid by the District Rural Development Agencies on production of the bills by the respective wholesalers. But during the years, viz. 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, many Districts have not received transport subsidy. In the previous years the DRDAs used to send their requirement directly to the Government of India. Presently, the Directorate of Elementary and Mass Education, as the State Transport Nodal Agency of Mid Day Meal Scheme, have taken up the responsibility of compiling the requirements of transportation charges for lifting of food grains of all the Districts and forwarding the same to the Government of India for sanction.

#### Funds made available under Mid Day Meal Scheme

Year	Amount Sanction		Amount Released to Districts
	Govt. of India	State	
2004-05	Rs. 543.89 lakhs (Conversion Cost)	Rs. 135.00 lakhs	Rs. 7,52,91,900/-
2005-06	Rs. 687.78 lakhs (Conversion Cost)	Rs. 135.00 lakhs	Rs. 8,63,10,752/-
	Rs. 12.38 lakhs (MME)	-	Rs. 11,78,000/-
2006-07	Rs. 659.73 lakhs (Conversion Cost)	Rs. 150.00 lakhs	Rs. 8,63,57,072/-
	Rs. 72.48 lakhs (Cooking Devices)	-	Rs. 72,48,000/-
	Rs. 34.46 lakhs (MME)	-	Rs. 12,36,600/-
2007-08	Rs. 2372.31 lakhs (Conversion Cost)	Rs. 263.60 lakhs	Rs. 2635.90 lakhs
	Rs. 23.650 lakhs +Unspent Balance of Rs. 22.09 lakhs (MME)	-	Rs. 22.09 Lakhs
	Rs. 1523.40 lakhs (Kitchen Sheds)	-	Rs. 1523.40 lakhs
	Rs. 95.88 lakhs (Conversion cost in EBBs)	Rs. 8.34 lakhs	Rs. 104.22 lakhs
	Rs. 23.40 lakhs (Kitchen devices in EBBs)	-	Rs. 23.40 lakhs
	Rs. 280.80 lakhs (Kitchen sheds in EBBs)	-	Rs. 280.80 lakhs

Source: <http://mdmsmeghalaya.gov.in>

The amount under the Head "Management, Monitoring and Evaluation" was spent on School Level expenses, management / supervision, training, internal / external evaluation and external monitoring evaluation. The Government of India has sanctioned a sum of Rs. 23.65 lakhs (including Rs. 2.00 lakhs for EBBs) for 2007-08 and the same has been released by the State Finance Department on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008.

#### System for procuring cooking ingredient :

The School Managing Committees follow the cost of the menu for cooking ingredients in respect of fuel, condiments, oil etc., as prescribed by the Government of India as follows :

Primary School			Upper Primary School		
Pulses	-	0.75 p	Pulses Vegetables including leafy	-	0.75 p
Vegetables including leafy	-	0.60 p	Oil & Fat	-	0.60 p
Oil & Fat	-	0.25 p	Salt & Condiments	-	0.25 p
Salt & Condiments	-	0.15 p	Fuel	-	0.25 p
Fuel	-	0.25 p	Labour	-	0.50 p
Labour	-	0.50 p			
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>Rs. 2.00</b>	<b>Total</b>	-	<b>Rs. 2.50</b>

#### 4. Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation Study

The scope of the present study is to take up the evaluation of Mid Day Meal Scheme in the entire state of Meghalaya implemented by the Directorate of Elementary and Mass Education, Government of Meghalaya. The study is to be completed in six months timeframe mid of February to mid of August 2009.


The main objectives of the evaluation study are:

- To assess the performance of the programme.
- To examine monitoring mechanism and the extent of involvement and contribution of various stakeholders at different levels in implementation of the programme in the state.

- To find out the constraints and bottlenecks in the proper implementation of the programme.
- To suggest policy measures to improve the functioning of the programme.

To achieve this, the study has focused on the actual performance of the MDMS and also aimed at understanding its process of implementation and its impact on beneficiaries in Meghalaya. For the purpose of study, sample MDM centers (Table 1.1) selected from all the seven districts of the State.

District Code	Name of District	Name of Block
01	West Garo Hills	Rongram
		Dadenggiri
02	East Garo Hills	Songsak
		Samanda
03	South Garo Hills	Baghmara
		Rongara
04	West Khasi Hills	Nongstoin
		Mairang
05	Ri Bhoi	Umsning
		Umling
06	East Khasi Hills	Mawphlang
		Mylliem
07	Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat
		Thadlaskein



Map showing blocks selected in the present study

## Section - II

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Present evaluation study on MDM programme in Meghalaya is carried out to assess the performance of the programme in the entire state. The main aim is to understand constrains and bottlenecks in implementing the programme and to suggest policy measures for improvement in the functioning of the programme on the basis of in-depth observations.

#### 1. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

A comprehensive sample of seventy MDM centers from all seven districts of Meghalaya was exhaustively studied in the current evaluation study. Two blocks from each of seven districts were included to cover whole state.

It is generally assumed that performance of any Government / Non-Government initiative may be influenced by the availability of the infrastructure facilities in the specific area. There are always possibilities that the execution of the programme may be affected by various amenities available in the particular village like transportation facilities, total number of existing post offices, no of available telephones, no of schools and colleges, hospitals, banks, drinking water, power supply etc. It is always assumed that these factors may help increase the accessibility of people hence enhance the performance of the programme. Following this idea, it is assumed that level of infrastructure would also affect the efficacy of MDM differently in different blocks of Meghalaya. In the process of selection of blocks, Infrastructure Development Index (IDI) was calculated for all the blocks at village level on the basis of NSS 2001 data.

The census data for each village is available from the government of India in digital format. Accordingly, a primary requirement was to combine all the village level census data (collected by the Government of India) at the block and the district level. Given the volume of data, the aggregation task for all the villages in

Meghalaya on about 21 different measures was executed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS 9.1).


Principle Component Analysis (PCA) is used to calculate weights for accessibility index. In this procedure, the eigenvectors corresponding to the first principal component are taken as weights. This is based on the rationale that the first principal component accounts for the maximum variance.

The index values also helped us in selecting the sample blocks for the study and also to see the influence of the systemic and individual level variables related to accessibility on the uptake of various government services and facilities. Table below reflects the calculated index scores of all the blocks of all seven districts of the state. Index scores are re-scaled 0 -100.

District Code	Name of District	Name of CD Block	Index
01	West Garo Hills	Selsella	100
		Dalu	63.01841
		Zikzak	46.44574
		Rongram	46.20451
		Betasing	41.07973
		Tikrikilla	30.56384
02	East Garo Hills	Dadengiri	4.615899
		Dambo Rongjeng	79.44615
		Resubelpara	64.15747
		Songsak	30.35688
03	South Garo Hills	Samanda	8.122777
		Chokpot	61.37934
		Baghmara	15.95034
04	West Khasi Hills	Rongara	1.145252
		Mawshynrut	71.54737
		Nongstoin	50.17868
		Mawkyrwat	46.11471
05	Ri Bhoi	Mairang	32.09422
		Ranikor	13.36575
06	East Khasi Hills	Umsning	86.52741
		Umling	54.90967
		Mawphlang	48.79777
		Mawsynram	34.09859
		Shella Bholaganj	32.71747
		Pynursla	25.18337
07	Jaintia Hills	Mylliem	15.55138
		Mawryngkneng	5.161636
		Mawkynrew	0
		Laskein	20.77206
		Khliehriat	65.97656
		Thadlaskein	25.4083
		Amlarem	23.89815

On the basis of IDI scores, two blocks from each of the seven districts was included in the study. Table below shows the details about all the MDM centers covered in the present evaluation study. Two blocks from each district were selected - one having high level of infrastructure and another having lower level of infrastructure. From each block five MDM centers were chosen randomly (Annexure No. I). From each of the sample MDM centers, approximately 10 percent students on roll in schools or 20 students (which ever is more) were interviewed for the study. Besides students, ten percent parents were also interrogated. Proportionate sampling method is used for the selection of sample students and parents.

Flow Chart: Sampling Procedure



## 2. DATA COLLECTION

This study was based on intensive fieldwork approach. The data collection was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, secondary data was collected that facilitated finalization of the sample MDM centers and strengthen our idea and arguments over MDMS programme in Meghalaya. After the orientation programme of the research team in the second and final phase, primary data was collected from all stakeholders - officials in various implementing institutions, students, management committees, teachers, parents, SHGs, etc. Primary data was collected using some tools like citizen report card, case study, interview, focused group interview, observation (participant and non-participant) and some PRA techniques. Some structured questionnaires were also used at the time of data collection. During the collection of the data some important aspects like enrolment, attendance and dropouts; delivery systems; infrastructural availability; social policy and state services were also focused. Information in respect of occupation of the parents/guardians, distance of the residence from the school, socio economic profile of the beneficiaries were also obtained.

## 3. DATA ANALYSIS

Infrastructure Development Index was calculated for assessing the level of infrastructure of all the blocks of Meghalaya before selection of blocks in each district (Village Data, Census of India 2001). The census data for each village is available from the government of India in digital format. Accordingly, a primary requirement was to combine all the village level census data (collected by the Government of India) at the block and the district level. Given the volume of data, the aggregation task for all the villages in Meghalaya on about 21 different measures was executed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS 9.1).

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to calculate weights for accessibility index. The index values had helped us in selecting the sample blocks for the study and also to see the influence of the systemic and individual level variables related to accessibility on the uptake of the various government services and facilities.



Further descriptive and inferential statistics used for in-depth analysis and in order to ascertain the degree of relationship of selected variables in the study. Quantitative data is analyzed using SPSS and SAS software.

#### 4. TIMELINE

Sl. No.	Activities / tasks		Months
1.	Preliminary Work and Review of literature	February	0.5
2.	Construction of research tools, pre-testing, pilot survey and finalization	Feb-March	1.5
3.	Data Collection	Feb-March	1.5
4.	Data Processing & Data Analysis	April-May	01
5.	Drafting the report	May-June	01
6.	Finalization of the report	July-Aug	01
Total Period		06	

#### *Scoping and School Selection:*

Field visits to two nearby villages helped define the scope of the study and identify the key issues faced by primary schools and stakeholders. Seventy Lower primary and upper primary government run or aided schools were selected from all seven districts of Meghalaya. Two blocks from each district (one developed and another not so developed) were selected in the sample on the basis of Infrastructure Development Index. Seventy mid day meal centers from 14 blocks (5 schools each block) were studied covering rural urban centers randomly.

#### **PROCESS**

**Methodology:** This evaluation study broadly contained the following steps:

- Project scoping through discussions with stakeholder and village visits
- Developing, field testing, and finalizing survey instruments;
- Conducting the actual surveys
- Collecting secondary data
- Analyzing data
- Finalizing report following the consultations with stakeholders.

#### *Survey Instruments*

A mix of participatory observation tools including Citizen Report Card (CRC) for assessing social accountability were used in this study. PRA techniques were used to gather information regarding execution of MDMS-flow of funds and grains while the CRC was used to generate citizen satisfaction scores on the management and delivery

of the MDMS in schools. School children and their parents were surveyed for this purpose. Other stakeholders like teachers, wholesalers, administrative officials were also engaged to collect relevant information. Separate questionnaires specially designed for the survey covering all aspects of the MDMS were used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data through detailed semi-structured interviews.

*The **Citizen Report Card** is a commonly used tool for participatory impact evaluation. The CRC is a survey instrument that taps information on users' awareness, access to, and satisfaction with publicly provided services.*

*It contains information about the key constraints the poor face in assessing public services, their views about the quality of services, and their experiences in interacting with public officials.*

After the MDM centers were selected, visits to all selected schools were conducted to observe implementation of MDMS. Head of Management Committees, teachers, students, parents and suppliers were interviewed for collection of primary data. From each of the sample MDM centers, approximately 10 percent students on-roll in schools or 20 students, whichever is more, were interviewed for the study. Apart from students, ten percent parents of the enrolled students from each MDM center were also interviewed. Proportionate simple random sampling method is used for the selection of sample students and parents. Data collection was assigned to a team of experienced sincere and motivated researchers. Orientation was given to research team to administer the tools efficiently. Role play was held to understand the whole process of researching in field. Questions were asked in a non-suggestive manner that did not provide any lead. Wherever possible, data were triangulated by repeating the same question to different stakeholders, to minimize errors in data collection. The program executing authorities were also taken into confidence. They were explained that the exercise was being conducted to improve implementation of the MDMS and not to find mistakes or scapegoats. Government officials and community stakeholders were involved during the survey exercise to get their cooperation, suggestions, and guidance.

#### **Finalizing Report**

*Recommendations that emerged from the analysis and discussions were documented and presented to the funding authority i.e. Government of Meghalaya, The state government is expected to currently deliberating over the findings from this study and is considering scaling up the exercise to improve performance in all the schools in the state.*

## Section - III

### MAIN OBSERVATIONS

Present evaluation study reflects the opinions and observations of all stakeholders including Administrative Officers, Management Committee, Students and Parents.

To begin with, understanding the profile of sample end unit of observation, it would be appropriate to describe about the sample studied in this present evaluation.

#### 1. PERCEPTION OF THE SAMPLE PROFILE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

This part of the report highlights brief sample profile of MDM Centres, students and parents were interacted during present evaluation study. Seventy MDM Centres were visited during the study from all seven districts of Meghalaya. From each district 10 MDM Centres were studied. In all a total of 1503 students selected from all MDM Centres covered from all seven districts were interacted for the assessment of MDMS. Similarly other stakeholder- 1100 parents were also interviewed for understanding their views regarding the performance of MDMS in Meghalaya.

##### 1.1 District Wise Shift of the School

The sample of MDM Centres covered during present evaluation study constitutes 43 % schools having morning shifts, 57 % having noon shifts and 53.1 % both the shifts (Table 1.1). The timings of morning shift were from 6.30 A.M to 11.00 a.m. and of noon shift from 9.30 a.m. to 3.00 p.m.

District	Shift	
	Morning	Noon
Jaintia Hills	2	8
East Garo Hills	5	5
Ri-Bhoi	3	7
East Khasi Hills	0	10
West Khasi Hills	2	8
West Garo Hills	9	1
South Garo Hills	9	1
Total	30 (42.9)	40 (57.1)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

1.2. Year of Commencement

District	Table 1.2 : Year of commencement									
	1996	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Jaintia Hills	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	1	0
East Garo Hills	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	3
Ri-Bhoi	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	2
East Khasi Hills	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	3
West Khasi Hills	0	0	0	3	2	2	2	0	0	1
West Garo Hills	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	3
South Garo Hills	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	2
Total	3 (4.3)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	13 (18.6)	12 (17.1)	6 (8.6)	13 (18.6)	2 (2.8)	5 (7.1)	14 (20.0)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Information regarding year of commencement of MDMS confirms that majority of the Centres have started the programme in their schools from 2002 and afterwards whereas only four schools were running this programme before year 2002.




Fig 1.2 : Year of Commencement

Present study had focused on 1503 student in total to gauge their views regarding performance of the MDMS in the state of Meghalaya. Looking at the sample students it is clear that 45.6 % of sample size was males, whereas 54.4 % was females.

This female domination confirms the typical distinctive nature of Meghalaya society in India. More number of girl students was interacted than boy students.

### 1.3. Gender, Age and Study Level, Distribution of Sample Students

District name	Gender		Age (in years)			Study Level	
	Male	Female	4-6	6-10	10-16	Lower Primary	Upper Primary
Jaintia Hills	117	126	5	89	149	144	99
East Garo Hills	76	127	0	59	144	134	69
Ri-Bhoi	113	120	10	108	115	160	73
East Khasi Hills	109	131	2	85	153	124	116
West Khasi Hills	117	115	0	156	76	200	32
West Garo Hills	81	95	7	65	104	139	37
South Garo Hills	73	103	12	79	85	144	32
Total	686 (45.6)	817 (54.4)	36 (2.4)	641 (42.6)	826 (55.0)	1045 (69.5)	458 (30.5)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Table 1.3 shows gender-age-and-study level wise distribution of the sample. It reveals that 55 % sample falls in the age group of 10-16 years, 42.6 % in 6-10 years age group and 2.4 % in the age group of 4-6 years. Age distribution indicates that more number of students were studying in LPS even though average age was higher than normal. One of the reasons inferred from this trend may be delayed admission in schools. Majority of sample students (69 %) were in LPS and 30.5 % were in UPS in the present sample.

### 1.4. Caste-wise and Religion-wise Distribution of Sample Students


District name	Caste				Religion		
	SC	ST	BC	OC	Hindu	Muslim	Christian
Jaintia Hills	9	234	0	0	32	1	210
East Garo Hills	0	203	0	0	3	0	200
Ri-Bhoi	11	221	0	1	0	1	232
East Khasi Hills	1	232	3	4	37	0	203
West Khasi Hills	0	232	0	0	0	0	232
West Garo Hills	20	138	0	18	39	0	137
South Garo Hills	48	127	1	0	57	1	118
Total	89 (5.9)	1387 (92.3)	4 (0.3)	23 (1.5)	168 (11.2)	3 (0.2)	1332 (88.6)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Table 1.4 shows social structure of the sample students benefited from MDMS. Total of 92.3 % of sample students belong to ST category, 5.9 % to SC and only 1.8 % students' falls in OC and BC category in this study.

As anticipated district-wise student distribution as per the religion reflected in Table 1.4 confirms that most of them are followers of Christian religion (88.6 %) because the most common religion followed in Meghalaya is Christianity.

### 1.5. Literacy level of Parents covered under the Study



Parents interacted during present evaluation study reveals that 30.1 % respondents were male and 69.9 % were female that again affirms the matrilineal dominance of Meghalaya State. Educational qualification of parents interacted during study shows that 37 % were illiterate, 20.8 % were having primary education, 23.6 % upper primary and 18.6 % were having high school level education.

Fig 1.5 Literacy level of sample Parents




Fig 1.5 (a) Occupational Distribution

Occupational distribution of parents interacted in the sample is shown in Fig 1.3 reveals that majority of them were in agricultural labour (39.6 %) and involved in agriculture (28.2 %).

### 1.6. Distribution of Monthly Income of the Family

	Frequency	Percent
Below 1000	79	7.2
1000-2500	388	35.3
2501-5000	326	29.6
5001-10000	299	27.2
10000-20000	08	.7
Total	1100	100.0

Income distribution of the family demonstrates that most of them (64.9 %) fall in the bracket of Rs. 1000 to 5000 per month. Caste and Religious distribution of the sample reflected same trend as prevailing in Meghalaya society i.e., 95.9 % ST community and 94 % Christian (Fig 1.6 & 1.6 (a)).




Fig 1.6 Caste wise distribution




Fig 1.6 (a) Religion wise Distribution

## 2. PERFORMANCE OF MDMS: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Various aspects of performance of MDMS are reflected here in this write up. It includes observations regarding enhancement of enrollment, quality and acceptance of MDM, supply of ration, drinking water facility, basic cooking, storage and monitoring, etc. These revelations were inferred from the interaction with SMC, teachers, students, parents and officials during the present evaluation study. It is worthy to mention before description about our reflections that our results are also based upon the opinions shared by all stakeholders.

## 2.1 Effect of MDMS on Enrollment, Attendance and Span of Attention

The primary motive behind running MDM scheme is to improve the status of primary education by enhancement of enrolment and attendance. In Meghalaya, SMCs gladly avowed that MDMS has increased enrollment, attendance as well as span of attention in school. In about 40 % MDM Centres included in this study SMC In-charge had opinion that MDMS had increased enrollment and it had also helped in increasing attendance in schools (Table 2.1).

	Increase in enrollment	Increase in Attendance	Increase in span of attention
Jaintia Hills	3	4	4
East Garo Hills	8	6	4
Ri-Bhoi	3	3	3
East Khasi Hills	3	4	2
West Khasi Hills	5	5	1
West Garo Hills	1	1	1
South Garo Hills	5	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b> (40.0)	<b>28</b> (40.0)	<b>19</b> (27.1)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

The response regarding the increase in span of attention after implementation of MDM was found very less. Only 27.1 % SMCs felt that span of attention of students had increased. Year wise record of the enrollment number based on the data provided by each MDM Centre is shown in Table 2.1.1 confirms this observation.

### 2.1.1. Year-wise Enrollment of Students

District Name	2003-04			2004-05			2005-06			2006-07			2007-08		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Jaintia Hills	135 (48.0)	146 (52.0)	281 (100.0)	154 (48.4)	164 (51.6)	318 (100.0)	306 (45.5)	366 (54.5)	672 (100.0)	283 (42.2)	387 (57.8)	670 (100.0)	419 (49.6)	426 (50.4)	845 (100.0)
East Garo Hills	321 (47.8)	351 (51.2)	672 (100.0)	278 (52.2)	306 (57.8)	584 (100.0)	261 (47.7)	299 (52.3)	560 (100.0)	448 (45.5)	537 (54.5)	985 (100.0)	513 (46.6)	588 (53.4)	1101 (100.0)
Ribhoi	372 (46.0)	437 (54.0)	809 (100.0)	509 (52.2)	467 (47.8)	976 (100.0)	474 (47.7)	520 (52.3)	994 (100.0)	517 (46.7)	589 (52.3)	1106 (100.0)	495 (47.6)	546 (52.4)	1041 (100.0)
East Khasi Hills	245 (45.1)	298 (54.9)	543 (100.0)	570 (52.1)	524 (47.9)	1094 (100.0)	522 (47.4)	580 (52.6)	1102 (100.0)	574 (47.0)	649 (53.0)	1223 (100.0)	643 (46.8)	730 (53.2)	1373 (100.0)
West Khasi Hills	301 (49.3)	309 (50.7)	610 (100.0)	331 (48.0)	359 (52.0)	690 (100.0)	421 (50.1)	420 (49.9)	841 (100.0)	395 (44.6)	491 (55.4)	886 (100.0)	344 (27.1)	927 (62.9)	1271 (100.0)
West Garo Hills	165 (49.7)	167 (50.3)	332 (100.0)	153 (46.8)	174 (53.2)	327 (100.0)	156 (50.5)	153 (49.5)	309 (100.0)	232 (46.3)	269 (53.7)	501 (100.0)	284 (48.2)	305 (51.8)	589 (100.0)
South Garo Hills	140 (47.5)	155 (52.5)	295 (100.0)	142 (49.5)	145 (50.5)	287 (100.0)	235 (48.7)	248 (51.3)	483 (100.0)	291 (49.2)	301 (50.8)	592 (100.0)	278 (45.7)	330 (54.3)	608 (100.0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1679</b> (47.4)	<b>1863</b> (52.6)	<b>3542</b> (100.0)	<b>2137</b> (49.9)	<b>2139</b> (50.1)	<b>4276</b> (100.0)	<b>2375</b> (47.9)	<b>2586</b> (52.1)	<b>4961</b> (100.0)	<b>2740</b> (45.9)	<b>3223</b> (54.1)	<b>5963</b> (100.0)	<b>2976</b> (43.5)	<b>3852</b> (56.5)	<b>6828</b> (100.0)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages






Fig 2.1.1 Year-wise enrollment of Students

### 2.1.2 Percentage increase in Total Enrollment

Year of enrollment	No. of students enrolled	% of increase in enrollment
2003-04	3542	0.00
2004-05	4276	20.72
2005-06	4961	16.02
2006-07	5963	20.20
2007-08	6828	14.51

Table 2.1.2 reveals the increment in enrollment of students that may assumed due to MDMS. Figure 2.1.1 clearly reveals that MDM had proved as an instrument in increasing enrollment in sample MDM Centres.



Interaction with Mother's Group at EGS centre in Rongram Block, West Garo Hill

## 2.2 MEALS AS AN INCENTIVE

Most of the SMCs in all the districts confirmed during this evaluation that meal is a main incentive for attracting students for attending school on a regular basis. Table 2.2 reflects that most of the students are having regular meals in schools. The reasons for not having meals in schools are also shown in this table. It is important to clarify here that among 70 MDM centers covered under the present study 68 centers were found serving cooked meal, reason why data related to cooked meal reflect only 68 MDM centers instead of 70.

District	Students having their meal in school	Reasons for not having meals	
		Parents not allow	Feeling shy
Jaintia Hills	8	1	0
East Garo Hills	7	0	3
Ri-Bhoi	9	1	0
East Khasi Hills	8	0	1
West Khasi Hills	9	0	1
West Garo Hills	9	1	0
South Garo Hills	10	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>60 (88.2)</b>	<b>3 (37.5)</b>	<b>5 (62.5)</b>

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*



**Langstiehrim Government L.P School  
Mairang Block, West Khasi Hills**

Reasons inferred from the discussions with the teachers and Managing Committees for not having regular meal were that in some cases parents were not allowing them to eat and many, especially girl students, were feeling hesitant to have food in the schools.



**Researcher interacting with the SMC Secretary  
at Rongram Gorkha Govt. L.P. School**



**Interaction with SMC member in Ramakrishna  
Mission LP School at Shillong**

### 2.2.1. Opinion regarding MDM as a motivation

It was understood that parents have feeling that overall MDM is a motivating force for children to attend the school quite regularly. Table 2.2.1 indicates that 46.8 % parents believe that MDMS is motivating their children to attend school regularly.

	Frequency	Percent
Going regularly	515	46.8
Going sometimes	473	43.0
Going only for food	112	10.3
Total	1100	100.0




Fig. 2.2.1 : Parents motivation levels

### 2.3. Quality and Acceptance of MDMS

About half of the SMCs included in the sample expressed that they are more or less satisfied with the MDMS. Although around 28 % of sample MDM Centres expressed their dissatisfaction regarding the way of functioning of MDMS in the State (Table 2.3).

District	Satisfaction level			
	Satisfied	OK	Not satisfied	Not at all satisfied
Jaintia Hills	3	1	4	2
East Garo Hills	1	5	2	2
Ri-Bhoi	2	1	0	7
East Khasi Hills	3	1	4	2
West Khasi Hills	3	2	1	4
West Garo Hills	4	2	2	2
South Garo Hills	2	5	2	1
Total	18 (25.7)	17 (24.3)	15 (21.4)	20 (28.6)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

Some of the teachers argued that MDMS had disturbed the teaching schedule. As it is, there is scarcity of teachers and if they are also involved in other than teaching activities, teaching is bound to affect negatively. Although research team was informed that

there are instructions from State Government authorities prohibiting teachers from engaging themselves in cooking, etc especially during school hours

have been issued since 2006 and 2007 in addition to GOI guidelines circulated earlier.



**Bynther L.P. School, Madan Bynther village,  
Mairang Block, West Khasi Hills**

### 2.3.1 Regularity of Meal

During interrogation while evaluation, various aspects of MDM like the frequency of meals served, the quality of food and the impact of MDM on children attendance and performance were enquired into to assess the programme. In the sample 39.6 % of parents felt that quality of food was satisfactory as shown in Table 2.3.2. This table also reflects that 43.9 % parents have viewed that MDMS has influenced the performance of children positively. About the serving frequency of meal it was confirmed that 66.1 % parents stated that meal was being served twice in week. This view is different from students' response. The probable reason of this may be due to one of the facts that parents may have responded on the basis of indirect information and having rough idea about the fact.

### 2.3.2. Parent’s Satisfaction: Regarding Increased Performance and Quality of Food

Table 2.3.2  
Parents’ satisfaction : Regarding increased performance and quality of food

	Increased satisfaction		Quality of Food	
	F	%	F	%
Yes	483	43.9	436	39.6
No	551	50.1	596	54.2
No Idea	66	6.0	68	6.2
Total	1100	100.0	1100	100.0




Fig 2.3.2 Parents Opinion: Regularity of Meal

### 2.3.3. Amount of Food Served Per Child

It is a matter of concern that although Government has fixed the norms of food to be served per child in the state but it was observed that in most of the MDM Centres in all the districts only 50 gram rice per child (less than the prescribed norm) was found distributed among children in schools (Table 2.3.3). Only two MDM Centres one each in Ri-bhoi and Jaintia hills found providing 200-250 grams rice per child. It is important to refer that in Meghalaya school authorities find it difficult to

Table 2.3.3  
Amount of food served per child

District	50 g	50-100 g	150-200 g	200-250 g
Jaintia Hills	5	1	2	1
East Garo Hills	6	4	0	0
Ri-Bhoi	8	1	0	1
East Khasi Hills	7	2	0	0
West Khasi Hills	7	3	0	0
West Garo Hills	9	1	0	0
South Garo Hills	9	1	0	0
Total	51 (75.0)	13 (19.1)	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

exclude pre-primary school children from participation in the Mid-Day Meal programme since most primary schools have pre-primary sections attached to them. This affects the entitled quota per child.



**Pyndengumiong School, Mairang village,  
Mairang Block, West Khasi Hills**

#### 2.3.4. Appearance, Taste, Smell and Texture of Food

Next observation indicates some level of relief for the administrative officials that the quality of food was found to be of “fair” quality in most of the MDM Centres. Quality of food was assessed in terms of appearance, taste, smell and texture in the present evaluation study. Table 2.3.4 indicates that food was found to be “good” quality only in one MDM Centre i.e., East Khasi Hills with respect to all three criterion of assessment.

District	Appearance			Taste			Smell			Texture		
	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good
Jaintia Hills	3	6	0	3	6	0	3	6	0	3	6	0
East Garo Hills	3	7	0	5	5	0	4	6	0	5	5	0
Ri-Bhoi	3	7	0	3	7	0	4	6	0	3	7	0
East Khasi Hills	2	6	1	2	6	1	2	6	1	2	6	1
West Khasi Hills	3	7	0	2	8	0	3	7	0	4	6	0
West Garo Hills	1	9	0	2	8	0	1	9	0	2	8	0
South Garo Hills	5	5	0	5	5	0	6	4	0	6	4	0
Total	20 (29.4)	47 (69.1)	1 (1.5)	22 (32.4)	45 (66.1)	1 (1.5)	23 (33.8)	44 (64.7)	1 (1.5)	25 (36.8)	42 (61.8)	1 (1.5)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages




Fig 2.3.4 : Appearance, Taste, smell and Texture of Food



Cooking Mid Day Meal-William Nagar, East Garo Hills

### 2.3.5. Overall Acceptance of the Meal

Reaffirming the earlier observation it was found that in majority of the MDM Centres in all the districts of State, students have shown fair level of acceptance of cooked meal. As referred in Table 2.3.5 regarding quality of food this table also confirms only one MDM in East Khasi Hills was having good level of acceptance (highest) of cooked meal. In all the districts covered in the study 70.6 % of total students were having fair level of acceptance of meal served in MDMS.

District	Poor	Fair	Good
Jaintia Hills	3	6	0
East Garo Hills	3	7	0
Ri-Bhoi	3	7	0
East Khasi Hills	2	6	1
West Khasi Hills	1	9	0
West Garo Hills	2	8	0
South Garo Hills	5	5	0
Total	19 (27.9)	48 (70.6)	1 (1.5)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

### 2.3.6. Frequency of receiving cooked Meal

The response of the students regarding frequency of getting cooked meal, Table 2.3.6 shows that a very few Centres were providing cooked meal regularly i.e., 5 times in a week. Majority (60.9 %) of the students revealed that they are receiving cooked meal four times in a week, whereas 12.5 % shared that they were getting cooked meal only once in a week. One observation was noticed in Mairang Block in West Khasi district was that Centres were not providing food on market day (once in a week) when most of the students did not attend school.

District	Once in a week	Twice in a week	Thrice in a week	Four times in a week	Five times in a week	Not eating by choice	Dry Ration*	Total
Jointo Hills	57	80	30	0	29	23	23	242
East Garo Hills	0	27	30	0	146	0		203
Ribhei	12	101	60	0	43	8		224
East Khasi Hills	69	106	56	0	6	2	11	250
West Khasi Hills	0	50	150	18	12	2		232
West Garo Hills	23	5	41	71	33	3		176
South Garo Hills	11	45	98	1	15	6		176
Total	172	414	465	90	284	44	34	1503

\* Two MDM Centres providing dry ration

### 2.3.7. Reasons for not eating MDM

Out of 1503 students total 44 students were observed not eating mid day meal by their own choice in Meghalaya. Intensive probing to understand the reasons for not eating MDM regularly as stated by the students (Table 2.3.7) were - (1) meal was not tasty (25.0%), (2) meal was unhygienic (15.9 %), (3) meal was not sufficient in quantity (40.9 %), and (4) sometimes parents did not allowed them to eat (9 %).



District	No Taste	Un hygienic	Inappropriate Quantity	Parents disallow	Lunch box from home	Any other	Total
Jaintia Hills	0	2	15	4	1	1	23
East Garo Hills	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ri-Bhoi	0	4	3	0	1	0	8
East Khasi Hills	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
West Khasi Hills	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
West Garo Hills	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
South Garo Hills	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Total	11 (25.0)	7 (15.9)	18 (40.9)	4 (9.0)	3 (6.8)	1 (2.3)	44

### 2.3.8. Dishes liked by the Students

Additional queries were made regarding giving preference for menu and preference of dishes. In MDMS, generally students responded that they did not have any preference in the menu (63.9 %). Further, it was observed that most of them being non-vegetarians, they were fond of non-vegetarian dishes like meat, pork, chicken and eggs (Table 2.3.8). Fruits were least preferred by the students (0.6%). Team members were also told by parents in Jaintia Hills that all of them eat locally cultivated rice at home. But the rice provided in MDM was always brought from outside the state and its whitish quality gave different taste which was not liked by the children.

District name	No preference	Meat / pork	Chicken	Eggs	Dal- rice	Fruits
Jaintia Hills	45	57	39	40	56	6
East Garo Hills	0	51	37	97	18	0
Ri-Bhoi	10	94	18	58	53	0
East Khasi Hills	0	72	2	75	88	3
West Khasi Hills	0	97	17	82	36	0
West Garo Hills	20	32	25	85	14	0
South Garo Hills	21	54	20	76	5	0
Total	96 (63.9)	457 (30.4)	158 (10.5)	513 (34.1)	270 (18.0)	9 (0.6)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

### 2.3.9. Serving Area for MDM

The assessment of MDMS in the state confirmed that more than 89 % of students were having their meals in open areas in the schools, whereas a very few 5.9 % were having in their classrooms (Table 2.3.9). This gives an important pointer with reference to the hygienic condition in MDMS.

District	Class room	School veranda	Open place in school
Jaintia Hills	0	0	9
East Garo Hills	1	0	9
Ri-Bhoi	0	0	10
East Khasi Hills	1	0	8
West Khasi Hills	1	2	7
West Garo Hills	0	1	9
South Garo Hills	1	0	9
Total	4 (5.9)	3 (4.4)	61 (89.7)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

District	Demand for extra serving	Eating before	Eating after
Jaintia Hills	74.0%	97.9%	82.2%
East Garo Hills	93.1%	82.8%	93.6%
Ri-Bhoi	98.2%	99.1%	92.0%
East Khasi Hills	80.8%	94.0%	91.6%
West Khasi Hills	83.6%	97.4%	98.3%
West Garo Hills	99.4%	89.8%	99.4%
South Garo Hills	99.4%	83.5%	97.2%
Total	88.8%	92.7%	93.0%


*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

This sample study also confirmed that most of the students (about 92.7 %) usually ate food before coming as well as after going back (93%) to home even if they had MDM at schools (Table 2.3.9 (a)). These observations might lead us to infer that the amount served was less than sufficient for students.

### 2.4. SUPPLY OF RATION

Present evaluation study includes interrogations with all the stakeholders in the state which include like administrative officials, members of Managing Committees, students, parents and suppliers. This section throws light on the status of supply of ration for MDMS.

Interactions with members of Managing Committees included in the present evaluation study reveal that in 68 out of 70 selected MDM Centres, cooked meal was being supplied in almost all the 7 districts of Meghalaya except in two places. Table 2.4 shows that one MDM Centre in Jaintia Hills and one MDM Centre in East Khasi Hills were providing only dry ration to the students. The reason for distributing dry ration given by Head, SMC was that the money received was not enough to provide good cooked food. They found it quite difficult to arrange cook and provide a good quality of food in this given amount. If they involved teachers in cooking, it would disturb teaching schedule. Hence it was felt better to give only dry ration to the students. At the time of presentation of draft report members mentioned that the Department will look into such cases and takes necessary action in the light of clear instructions issued from time to time.



Interaction with Head Mistress,  
Mawphlang, East Khasi Hills

District	Cooked	Dry ration
Jaintia Hills	9	1
East Garo Hills	10	0
Ri-Bhoi	10	0
East Khasi Hills	9	1
West Khasi Hills	10	0
West Garo Hills	10	0
South Garo Hills	10	0
Total	68 (97.1)	2 (2.9)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

In Meghalaya fair price dealers are supposed to deliver the ration at the door of the schools but in most of the cases it was not found so. In many instances school authorities had revealed that they were managing to bring ration directly from wholesaler. It was also found that in South Garo Hills there was not a single fair price dealer. Further, Nongstoin in West Khasi Hills they had to spare lots of time and money for the above stated reason. Sometimes, as there was no fixed time for delivering ration, school authorities have to come back with no ration in hand due to either non availability of stock or absence of the wholesaler. Transportation of ration from the main road was also difficult. Overall this affair would cost them

very high. Evaluation team also sensed the difficulty as most of the schools were far off from main roads and due to lack of transport facilities, most of the schools had to depend on local labourers. It is relevant to understand that non-receipt of transportation cost by wholesalers for three and a half years with effect from 2003-04 and wholesalers found it impossible to keep on paying for the transportation of MDM foodgrain from their pocket for long periods without getting reimbursement in time. The amount is yet to be released by the Govt. of India although the State Government has sent the claims for reimbursement.

One of the secretaries of Management Committee shared that it is very difficult to manage transportation of ration as it is quite expensive. Some of them even mentioned the practice of selling a portion of the rice to meet the transport cost. In some cases it was also found that teachers were bearing the transport cost from their own pockets. There were also instances when they were deducting some amount of rice from the given amount of quantity to adjust the transport cost. About 65 % of selected MDM Centres disclosed that ration supply was always irregular. The reason behind the irregularity in supply was expressed mostly as 'problem in supply'. It is logical to refer that Govt. of India releases foodgrain on quarterly basis. Hence the schools cannot expect monthly supply as foodgrain is supplied once in three months.

Some of them (21.6%) confirmed that they were not getting supply regularly because of the bad weather and traffic problems in the area.

The record verification in the field confirmed an important fact that there was lack of proper coordination among all the stakeholders - starting from the top, from the FCI delivery point to the bottom at the level of schools. Sometimes it took more than three months to reach from FCI to school door. Although it was found that FCI was providing ration in time, since last November it was stated that FCI was not receiving any ration from the Government for MDMS. It was mentioned during presentation that this is due to the dispute between the Govt. of India and the State Government on the issue of enrollment. Based on the enrollment figures approved by PAB, it was opined by the Govt. of India that the entitlement for

the whole year had already been released during the first two quarters. FCI officials justified this by stating that they were not getting their pending bills cleared from Ministry of HRD on time.

Another important problem, most of the school authorities raised was about the insufficient conversion money provided under MDMS. They argued that because of very less amount of conversion money, they found it difficult to manage cooking regularly without disturbing teaching schedule. It was informed during presentation of draft report that it is a fact that in Meghalaya where prices of almost everything are higher, the amount of conversion or cooking cost approved by the Govt. of India is inadequate. Regarding release of conversion cost once a year, the problem in the past was late receipt of fund from the Govt. of India and unavoidable procedural delays on the part of the State Government also. However, recently the State Government has taken steps to expedite release of funds to schools for the implementation of this scheme.

They also discussed the problem of not having permanent cook in their schools. There was always chance of leaving the assignment of cooking. On condition of anonymity, few had disclosed that sometimes they would sell rice in order to meet the extra expenditure. The study confirmed another serious fact that most of the MDM centre authorities were not aware of the amount of conversion money and ration. Sometimes they were receiving ration once in 3 months and conversion money once in a year. Some authorities were not at all bothered about regular supply as they think it was free supply and there was no point of raising voice and lodging complaint about irregularity of delivery of ration and release of conversion money.

#### **2.4.1. Frequency, Regularity and Reasons for Irregularity in the Supply of Ration**

Enquiring about the frequency of supply of ration in MDM Centres in the state, it was found that only 15.8 % MDM Centres were receiving ration monthly, 2.8 % receiving once in four months and majority 81.4 % were receiving ration quarterly. Some 5.6 % of the School Management Committees in the sample confirmed that

supply of ration was regular (Table 2.4.1). This includes one MDM Centre in East Garo, two in East Khasi Hills and one in South Khasi Hills.

It was shared by Management Committees that government is not providing ration for pre-primary students. They were providing ration only for primary school. SMC could not differentiate while distributing meal as they did not feel ethical to give meals only to seniors. Because of this reason most of them disclosed that schools were not able to provide food for all the five days.

Table 2.4.1 : Frequency, Regularity and Reasons for irregularity of supply of ration

District	Always	Some times	Never	Once in four months	Quarterly	Monthly	Supply Hurdle	Bad weather & Traffic problem
Jaintia Hills	0	2	8	0	7	3	9	1
East Garo Hills	1	0	9	0	9	1	7	3
Ri-Bhoi	0	6	4	0	6	4	10	0
East Khasi Hills	2	7	1	1	7	2	5	5
West Khasi Hills	0	5	5	0	10	0	4	6
West Garo Hills	0	0	10	0	10	0	10	0
South Garo Hills	1	0	9	1	8	1	10	0
Total	4 (5.6)	20 (28.7)	46 (65.7)	2 (2.8)	57 (81.4)	11 (15.8)	55 (78.4)	15 (21.6)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

#### **Power Thrust: Another Problem**

*In one case New Secretary was found highly enthusiastic to implement the MDMS at high level of efficiency but power thrust was posing obstruction. The Secretary of Kusimkolgre Government Lower Primary School, William Nagar, East Garo Hills reported to Central Observatory Committee that Ex-Secretary was not handing over the stock of ration received during the year 2008. They were looking forward for solution.*

#### **2.4.2. Frequency of receiving the supply as per the fixed norms by Government**

It was found during evaluation study that Management Committees were generally not receiving the ration as per the fixed norms by the Government as reflected in Table 2.4.2. Furthermore they were not aware of the fixed norms given by Government. Members of draft presentation meeting shared that the Department has been and will be undertaking awareness campaigns on all aspects of the scheme.

District	Always	Sometimes	Never	Not aware
Jaintia Hills	1	7	2	0
East Garo Hills	0	6	4	0
Ri-Bhoi	0	7	2	1
East Khasi Hills	0	4	3	3
West Khasi Hills	0	2	6	2
West Garo Hills	0	5	5	0
South Garo Hills	1	4	2	3
	2 (2.8)	35 (50.0)	24 (34.3)	9 (12.9)

### 2.4.3. Pre-information regarding delay of Supply of Ration

Interface with Management Committees revealed that 40 % of the sample of Centres in Meghalaya was usually pre-informed regarding delay in ration supply. On the contrary 58.6 % were never informed about the delay in the ration supply (Table 2.4.3).

District	Always	Some times	Never
Jaintia Hills	0	4	6
East Garo Hills	0	5	5
Ri-Bhoi	0	6	4
East Khasi Hills	0	1	9
West Khasi Hills	0	2	8
West Garo Hills	0	6	4
South Garo Hills	1	4	5
Total	1 (1.4)	28 (40.0)	41 (58.6)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

### 2.4.4. Action Taken by the MDM in charge in case of delay in supply of ration

Inquiring about the hands-on action for delay in supply of ration, most of the members of the Management Committees shared that they did not make any arrangement in case of delay. Some of them affirmed that they have often informed higher officials regarding delay. Members commented during draft presentation that the Education Department has already looked into this particular grievance to prevent its recurrence. During the last few months, a number of instructions have been issued to the Deputy Commissioners on this issue.

District	Tried to contact supplier	Informed higher officials	Both of the above	No action
Jaintia Hills	1	0	2	7
East Garo Hills	0	1	0	9
Ri-Bhoi	1	4	1	4
East Khasi Hills	0	3	0	7
West Khasi Hills	0	3	0	7
West Garo Hills	0	1	2	7
South Garo Hills	0	3	0	7
Total	2	15	5	48
	(2.8)	(21.4)	(7.1)	(68.6)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Evaluation team was also informed by many school authorities in some of the schools in Shillong that they were not aware and also not able to differentiate between wholesalers and fair price dealers in their area. It was also told that often they have complained about the delay in the supply of ration to Deputy Inspector, but no satisfactory action was followed (Table 2.4.4). This not only reflects their ignorance and awareness regarding implementation of the MDMS, but also their apathy towards the programme.



Interaction with R.C. Marak,  
Wholesaler, William Nagar, East Garo



Interaction with Smt. V.S. Momin  
(Fair Price Shop Dealer at Rongram, West Garo Hill)



## 2.4.5. Quality of ration and Checking the Quality by MDM Centres

District	Quality of dry ration supply					Centres checking the ration
	Good	Fair	Poor	Unable to observe		
Jaintia Hills	3	6	1	0		2
East Garo Hills	5	4	1	0		2
Ri-Bhoi	4	6	0	0		3
East Khasi Hills	4	3	3	0		7
West Khasi Hills	7	2	0	1		3
West Garo Hills	5	3	2	0		6
South Garo Hills	3	4	3	0		4
Total	31 (44.3)	28 (40.0)	10 (14.3)	1 (1.4)		27 (38.6)

*Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

In the present evaluation study, it was revealed that Managing Committees received supply of good quality of dry ration (about 44 percent) and some 40 percent was receiving fair quality of dry ration. But 14.3 % of Management Committees of MDM Centre in Jaintia Hills, East Garo, East Khasi, West Khasi and South Garo hills shared that they got poor quality of dry ration (Table 2.4.5). Maximum numbers of MDM Centres in West Khasi Hills were satisfied for receiving good quality of supply. In some cases (7.14 %) it was noticed that supplied ration was returned when it was found to be not of good quality. But most of them had never taken any action for returning bad quality of ration. Regarding the checking of quality of ration, only 38.6 % SMCs were checking its quality regularly. Maximum number of schools in East Khasi Hills was checking the quality of ration on regular basis. Officers stated during meeting that the quality should be satisfactory in 100% of the schools where the scheme is implemented as instructions have been issued from time to time regarding quality certification.

On condition of anonymity some SMC authorities in Mairang, West Khasi hills disclosed that wholesalers were not allowing them to check the quality of ration and they had to bring the supply of available quality. Most of the time quality was not up to the mark. Even complaining did not result as they turned deaf ears.

#### 2.4.6. Reasons for returning back the supply of Ration and Action taken in case of non-availability of cooked food

Table 2.4.6  
Reasons for returning back the supply of Ration and Action taken in the case of non-availability of cooked food

District	Reasons		Action in case of Non-availability of cooked food		
	Recommendation of MDM Committee	Less quantity of supply	Biscuits	Informed children to bring lunch	No action
Jaintia Hills	1	0	1	2	6
East Garo Hills	0	0	0	0	10
Ri-Bhoi	0	1	2	4	4
East Khasi Hills	0	1	0	7	2
West Khasi Hills	1	0	2	4	4
West Garo Hills	1	0	0	3	7
South Garo Hills	0	0	0	0	10
	3	2	5	20	43
	(60.0)	(40.0)	(7.4)	(2.9)	(63.2)

*Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Evaluation Committee members were told that among the reasons behind returning the supply was the recommendation of the MDM Committees to return back the ration (in 60 % cases), and less quantity of ration (40 % of cases) (Table 2.4.6). Further they clarified that in case of non-availability of cooked food; biscuits were made available (7.4 %) to school children, and also sometimes children were informed in advance to bring lunch to school. But in most of the cases, it was also revealed that no action was being taken in the case of non-availability of cooked food in MDM Centres.

#### 2.5. BASIC COOKING AND STORAGE

It was observed during the assessment in the state that a very few (24.3 %) MDM Centres were having proper storage facilities in their Centres. Only government schools were managing to have this facility with government financial support in all the districts. Among government aided schools only 2 or 3 were having storage facilities with the support from the Management. Table 2.5 revealed that most (87.1 %) of MDM Centres among the

Table 2.5  
Availability of storage facilities

District Name	Proper storage facilities	Facility	
		On a raised platform	Floor
Jaintia Hills	2	1	9
East Garo Hills	3	0	10
Ri-Bhoi	0	2	8
East Khasi Hills	1	3	7
West Khasi Hills	6	3	7
West Garo Hills	2	0	10
South Garo Hills	3	0	10
Total	17	9	61
	(24.3)	(12.9)	(87.1)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

sample were keeping dry ration on the floor particularly in East Garo, West Garo and South Garo. It was mentioned by the officials that government schools have been provided the requisite infrastructure but it will take some more time for other schools to be provided with necessary infrastructure as the State Government is totally dependent on GOI for funds. Proposals have been sent to GOI.

### 2.5.1. Alternative Options for Storage

Evaluation team confirms that in those MDM Centres where there were no proper facilities for storage of ration, most of them stored the ration in their offices (31.5 %) and classrooms (37 %) as shown in Table 2.5.1 It was also viewed that a few were keeping in the homes of their Secretary or teacher.



A glance from a Kitchen shed in Jaintia Hills



Interaction with the cook at Jaintia Hills

The inspection of separate shed for cooking MDM meal confirmed that about 52 % of total sample MDM Centres were having separate cooking shed. In East Khasi hills, only one MDM centre among the sample was found to have separate shed whereas in South Garo Hills, maximum number of Centres (eight) were having cooking sheds. As EGS Centres and government

District	Class room	Teachers home	Secretary home	Community Hall	Office
Jaintia Hills	5	1	1	0	1
East Garo Hills	2	0	1	0	4
Ri-Bhoi	3	2	0	0	5
East Khasi Hills	5	1	1	1	2
West Khasi Hills	2	1	0	0	1
West Garo Hills	0	0	6	0	2
South Garo Hills	3	2	0	0	2
Total	20 (37.0)	7 (13.0)	9 (16.7)	1 (1.8)	17 (31.5)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

aided schools have not received any grant for kitchen shed, they face great problem during rainy season. Because of non-availability of shed in these schools, space was often shared. Even when they were having ration in stock, they were not able to provide cooked food because of lack of shed. Sometimes they were depending on villagers during rains when they used to cook at home and bring cooked meal for children. Additionally it is important to point out here that all the cooking sheds were not functional. Some of them were built very recently in the beginning of year 2008. It was informed that Government was providing Rs. 60,000/- for a shed in 2006-08.




Fig 2.5: Cooking shed availability

### 2.5.2. Hygienic Condition of Cooking Area

The assessment of hygienic condition of cooking areas in current study as reflected in Table 2.5.2 reveals that more than 50 % of Centres were having fair and good hygienic condition in cooking areas with respect to its cleanliness and dryness. Only two schools in East Khasi Hills were rated highest with regards to hygienic condition of cooking area.

District	Poor	Fair	Good
Jaintia Hills	5	4	0
East Garo Hills	4	6	0
Ri-Bhoi	4	6	0
East Khasi Hills	4	3	2
West Khasi Hills	4	6	0
West Garo Hills	6	4	0
South Garo Hills	4	6	0
Total	31 (45.6)	35 (51.5)	2 (2.9)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages

Only one MDM Centre in East Khasi District was found using LPG. All others (98.5 %) Centres were using fire wood for cooking MDM meals. Regarding fuel arrangement it was also observed that in some schools even students were contributing in the collection of wood from near by forest areas. More interestingly it was stated that in some schools every student was bringing one piece each per day for cooking.

### 2.5.3. Arrangement of the Serving Plates

It was observed in the present study that in 86.8 % of the entire sample of MDM Centres, students were bringing their own plates from their homes (Table 2.5.3). It was found that Government had arranged serving plates only in 8.8% of MDM Centres in the entire sample. It was stated that DI office had supplied utensils in

District	Govt.	School	Own Home
Jaintia Hills	2	1	6
East Garo Hills	0	0	10
Ri-Bhoi	1	1	8
East Khasi Hills	1	0	8
West Khasi Hills	1	0	9
West Garo Hills	1	0	9
South Garo Hills	0	1	9
Total	6 (8.8)	3 (4.4)	59 (86.8)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

most of the schools at the beginning of MDMS but those utensils were not of use now. It was clarified during draft presentation that the Government of India has provided funds only for the procurement of cooking utensils but not for serving plates. As of now, students have been bringing their own plates.

After that no additional fund was sanctioned for the purchase of utensils. One centre at West Khasi Hills unveiled that this reason pushed them to sell part of the rice to purchase new utensils. Some of the authorities also complained that capacity of cooking vessels were not verified as per the strength of the schools at the time of the purchase, and hence they had to purchase bigger vessels as per their respective requirement.

### 2.5.4. Process of Utilizing the Left over Food at MDM Centre

Interaction with SMCs confirmed that in 58.8% sample MDM Centres, the left over food was thrown outside. Table 2.5.4 confirmed that only 4.5 % take home their meals. Another fact also understood that a

District	Students take to home	Workers take to home	Throw outside
Jaintia Hills	2	4	3
East Garo Hills	0	3	7
Ri-Bhoi	0	3	7
East Khasi Hills	0	4	5
West Khasi Hills	1	2	7
West Garo Hills	0	3	7
South Garo Hills	0	6	4
Total	3 (4.4)	25 (36.7)	40 (58.8)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

very few MDM Centres among our sample were having help for washing the plates. Mostly 94.2 students were cleaning the plates on their own.

### 2.5.5. Cleaning of Plates & Utensils

District	Washing the plates after eating		Washing the utensils		
	Students themselves	Person appointed by school	Teachers	Cook	Workers appointed by school
Jaintia Hills	7	2	0	7	2
East Garo Hills	10	0	2	8	0
Ri-Bhoi	8	2	1	9	0
East Khasi Hills	9	0	0	9	0
West Khasi Hills	10	0	0	8	2
West Garo Hills	10	0	0	10	0
South Garo Hills	10	0	1	9	0
Total	64 (91.4)	4 (8.6)	4 (5.9)	60 (88.2)	4 (5.9)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

Table 2.5.5 revealed that in most of the MDM Centres, students (91.4 %) themselves were washing their own plates. But in a very few schools in Jaintia Hills and Ri-Bhoi (8.6 %), help were taken by the person appointed in the schools.

#### ***Different Story : Risk Evasion\****

*One school in Jaintia Hills were not interested in taking responsibility of cooking food. It was observed that schools were not willing to take risk of food poisoning during serving of cooked meal. So administration in their school opted for second alternative of giving dry ration in place of cooked meal. There is a need to check this kind of attitude especially in social responsible leaders.*

*\* Officials during presentation meeting showed concern over this issue and mentioned that department will enquire into this and take appropriate action.*

### 2.5.6. Responsibility of Utensils Wash, Availability of Wash Area and Hygiene

It was also noticed that in one school in South Garo Hills, one school in Ri-Bhoi and two schools in East Garo teachers (5.9 %) were involved in washing utensils after cooking meals. But in the majority of schools, cook has the responsibility to wash utensils.

Table 2.5.6 shows the availability of washing area in MDM Centres in different districts. It reflects that 63.2 % Centres were having separate washing area and 36.8 % were not having any washing area for washing utensils.

District	Washing of utensils			Availability of washing area
	Teachers	Cook	Workers appointed by school	
Jaintia Hills	0	7	2	6
East Garo Hills	2	8	0	7
Ri-Bhoi	1	9	0	7
East Khasi Hills	0	9	0	2
West Khasi Hills	0	8	2	6
West Garo Hills	0	10	0	7
South Garo Hills	1	9	0	8
Total	4 (5.9)	60 (88.2)	4 (5.9)	43 (63.2)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

An observation of the hygienic condition of washing process revealed (Table 2.5.6 (a)) that in most of the schools, plates were being cleaned by only water. A very few (4.4 %) were cleaning their plates with detergent and only two schools in Jaintia Hills in entire state were using scrubber and detergent for washing plates.

District	Only water	Water + detergent	Scrubber+ detergent
Jaintia Hills	7	0	2
East Garo Hills	10	0	0
Ri-Bhoi	7	3	0
East Khasi Hills	9	0	0
West Khasi Hills	10	0	0
West Garo Hills	10	0	0
South Garo Hills	10	0	0
Total	63 (92.6)	3 (4.4)	2 (2.9)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

### 2.5.7. Hygienic Condition of Cooking Area and MDM Distribution

Table 2.5.7 reveals the hygienic condition of the cooking area. It was observed that more than half were having clean and dry cooking area, but 67.6 % were not having clean and dry distribution area.

	Clean and dry-cooking area			Clean and dry-Distribution distribution		
	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good
Jaintia Hills	5	4	0	5	4	0
East Garo Hills	4	6	0	8	2	0
Ri-Bhoi	4	6	0	6	4	0
East Khasi Hills	4	3	2	5	2	2
West Khasi Hills	4	6	0	7	3	0
West Garo Hills	6	4	0	7	3	0
South Garo Hills	4	6	0	8	2	0
	31 (45.6)	35 (51.5)	2 (2.9)	46 (67.6)	20 (29.4)	2 (2.9)

### 2.5.8. Inspection of Ration before cooking

Study also confirms that 45.6 % sample MDM Centres were having a fair level of inspection before cooking as shown in Table 2.5.8.

District	Inspection Level		
	Poor	Fair	Good
Jaintia Hills	5	4	0
East Garo Hills	6	4	0
Ri-Bhoi	5	5	0
East Khasi Hills	4	3	2
West Khasi Hills	4	6	0
West Garo Hills	5	5	0
South Garo Hills	6	4	0
	35 (51.5)	31 (45.6)	2 (2.9)

### 2.6. Drinking Water Facilities and Health Support

This assessment disclosed that a very few MDM Centres were having weighing machines in their stock; only 25 % of them had these machines who were mostly Government and Missionary schools.

Enquiring about health check up facility being provided by school Managing Committees, facts found were not very

encouraging. Only 26.5 % of sample MDM Centres were having health check up facility. In similar way, nutritional medicine which was supposed to be distributed among school children as per the MDMS guideline, it was found to be distributed only in 16.2 % of the total sample of MDM Centres (Table 2.6).

District	Weighing machine	Nutritional medicine	Health checkup facilities
Jaintia Hills	0	0	3
East Garo Hills	7	1	1
Ri-Bhoi	2	0	3
East Khasi Hills	1	0	2
West Khasi Hills	2	4	4
West Garo Hills	2	2	2
South Garo Hills	3	4	3
Total	17 (25.0)	11 (16.2)	18 (26.5)

\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages



### 2.6.1. Available Drinking water Facilities in schools

During the assessment of drinking water facility, it was observed that more than 50 % of Centres covered in the study were having drinking water facility in their schools. But only about 45.7 % of schools were having regular water supply in the entire state. However, Garo Hills schools were facing water problem. When enquired

District	Drinking water facility in schools	Regular water supply
Jaintia Hills	1	1
East Garo Hills	4	3
Ri-Bhoi	6	6
East Khasi Hills	9	7
West Khasi Hills	10	7
West Garo Hills	5	5
South Garo Hills	3	3
Total	38 (54.3)	32 (45.7)

*\* Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*

about the source of drinking water supply, it was revealed that most of them were having tap water supply whereas 10.5 % of schools were getting water from tube well as described in Table 2.6.1. Most of the schools had water storage facilities but many were not viewed clean. It was informed that storage tank used to be cleaned once in six months. It is worthwhile to mention here that Drinking water facilities are provided by PHE Department and Health support is provided by Health & FW Department through convergence. The education Department is in regular touch with these Departments to ensure maximum coverage of the schools throughout the State through their schemes like the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM).

District	Tap	Hand pump	Tube well	Total
Jaintia Hills	1	0	0	1
East Garo Hills	4	0	0	4
Ri-Bhoi	5	1	0	6
East Khasi Hills	7	1	1	9
West Khasi Hills	8	0	2	10
West Garo Hills	4	0	1	5
South Garo Hills	3	0	0	3
Total	32 (84.2)	2 (5.3)	4 (10.5)	38* (100.0)

*Figures in parenthesis shows percentages*  
*\* Remaining Centres are having regular water supply*

It was indicated that among schools who were having water facility, 81.6 % were having adequate supply of water for their children.

## 2.7. MONITORING

One of the objectives of the current study is to assess the monitoring mechanism of MDMS in the state. Total 71.4 % heads of the SMCs revealed that their Centres had been inspected. Further probing disclosed that only once in a year higher authorities used to visit in majority (90%) of the MDM Centres (Table 2.7). Members and officials presented in draft presentation agreed that overall situation in the state is far from being satisfactory. Ideally the inspection should be once a month. Despite shortage of manpower, the Department has taken steps to improve monitoring of the scheme throughout the State.

Advance questioning regarding reasons for not visiting MDM Centres reflected in Table 2.7 shows that most of them had no idea about why authorities were not visiting. However a few respondents expressed that because of the distance and less connectivity authorities might not have visited MDM Centres.

District	Inspection done	Frequency of visit			Reasons of not visiting		
		Fort night	3 weeks	Yearly	More distance	No Contact	No idea
Jaintia Hills	8	1	0	7	0	1	1
East Garo Hills	6	0	0	6	1	0	3
Ri-Bhoi	6	0	0	6	1	1	2
East Khasi Hills	7	1	0	6	0	1	2
West Khasi Hills	9	0	1	8	1	0	0
West Garo Hills	7	0	2	5	1	0	2
South Garo Hills	7	0	0	7	0	1	2
	50 (71.4)	2 (4.0)	3 (6.0)	45 (90.0)	4 (20.0)	4 (20.0)	12 (60.0)

Interaction with Management Committees and teachers revealed that one Team from NEHU had made some visits regarding MDMS but they never verified the records. It was also told that report of this team was still awaited. Some school authorities expressed their dissatisfaction regarding monitoring of MDM as it was mostly limited to only road side schools. The present Team was also told that officials from block level like Deputy Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, Block Resource Coordinators, and Cluster Resource Coordinators had their yearly visits but their focus was not only the MDMS. Visitors registers kept in the school had enough proof that no comments connected to MDM were recorded.

Some school teachers defended the action of their officials by saying that there was no convenient mode available for inspection of interior schools, and also due to hard pressed schedules with various assignments, officials were not able to cover many schools in their inspection. One of the officials stated that inspections were not specifically made for MDMS. In many cases it was found that accountants were not qualified and were not able to maintain accounts properly.

***Success Story : Leadership makes Difference***

*Shri Vijaya Kumar, a Proactive District Collector of William Nagar, East Garo Hills could make significant difference in the performance of MDMS in that area. He was able to start distribution of cooked meal in his area because of his own efforts since beginning when no area in the state could start providing cooked meal. District Collector with his own initiative was able to influence FCI to provide ration from July 2008, that no other district in entire state could receive it. His leadership and dynamism had satisfied all stakeholders in the area including - Members of SMCs, students, teachers and parents.. Proper coordination and management had improved the performance of MDMS in his area.*

In Khasi Hills a successful system found introduced as a ration card as it was felt easy to maintain the records. But in most of the other cases records were not properly maintained, cheques numbers were not mentioned specifically, although overall expenditure statement was made perfectly, but not the amount received.

The Government gets its feedback on the impact of the programme in terms of increase in enrollment, attendance and retention level of children from the DISE which is very comprehensive and which is collected annually. However, with a view to improving the implementation of the scheme and its impact, the State Government has started commissioning 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluation studies whose reports are to serve as vital inputs for effecting policy changes at all levels.

Observations during study also disclosed that the provisions for programme evaluation and regular monitoring and inspections in the scheme design, were not effectively followed anywhere. The steering and monitoring committees which monitors the scheme at state level meets once a year as stipulated in the Guidelines and its decisions were communicated to all concerned for compliance. However, on the whole, a weak internal control and monitoring system was seen throughout the evaluation study.

Further, most of the schools which were included in the study, regular inspections were neither carried out to ensure the overall quality of mid day meal served, nor were they properly maintained basic records such as issue and receipt of food grains, quality of meal and evidence of community participation (through village education committees and parent teacher associations).

## 2.8. CONTRIBUTION OF STAKEHOLDERS / PEOPLES PARTICIPATION

One of the pillars of good performance and governance of any initiative is the extent of involvement and cooperation from all the stakeholders. To understand the involvement of officials, SMC, students, teachers and parents, thorough enquiry was made in the current evaluation study.

It was inferred from the serious discussions with Director, Programme Implementation and Evaluation, Meghalaya and other officials in the state that they were seriously concerned about the MDM implementation and desired to have precise pathways for better execution of the MDMS in the state of Meghalaya. Their extremely cooperative gesture encouraged research team to probe into deep roots in the minor details and understand the strengths and weaknesses and future direction of the programme.

District	Higher officials	MDM Committee	HM / teachers
Jaintia Hills	0	1	8
East Garo Hills	0	1	9
Ri-Bhoi	0	0	10
East Khasi Hills	0	0	9
West Khasi Hills	0	0	10
West Garo Hills	0	4	6
South Garo Hills	1	0	9
	1 (1.5)	6 (8.8)	61 (89.7)

District	Students' involvement in menu planning
Jaintia Hills	2
East Garo Hills	3
Ri-Bhoi	8
East Khasi Hills	23
West Khasi Hills	1
West Garo Hills	3
South Garo Hills	0
Total	40 (2.7)

Enquiring participation of SMC's involvement in menu planning, it was known that in majority cases (89.7 %) Head teacher or teachers were planning menu. Only in one Centre, in South Garo Hills, the menu was provided by higher officials (Table 2.8).

Regarding the role of the students in menu planning, the interrogation with the students on the issue of the preference of meal suggested that in majority of cases

their choice was not asked. Majority 97.3 % students expressed that they were not involved in the menu planning. Only 2.7 % of sample students expressed that they were a part of the menu planning Table 2.8 (a).

Similarly parents were also not involved in the menu planning as disclosed by students. It is appropriate to refer that although there is no guidelines regarding involvement of parents in menu planning but it was shared that their active involvement may improve MDM performance. Parents were also interviewed for assessing their contribution in MDMS. It was revealed that in the State 91.2 % parents were taking no interest (Table 2.8 (b)). No contribution was reflected regarding extending their complaints or suggestions for the better performance of MDMS.

Table 2.8 (b)  
Complaints / Suggestion extended the betterment of MDM

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	37	8.8
No	382	91.2
Total	419	100.0




Fig. 2.6 : Complaints / Suggestion extended the betterment of MDM

Table 2.8 (c)  
People's Participation

District	PTA	Senior Citizen	Health Worker
Jaintia Hills	7	0	0
East Garo Hills	8	1	1
Ri-Bhoi	7	2	1
East Khasi Hills	10	2	0
West Khasi Hills	9	0	0
West Garo Hills	7	0	0
South Garo Hills	10	0	0
	58 (82.9)	5 (7.1)	2 (2.8)

It was interesting to note as seen in Table 2.8 (c) that most of the MDM Centres were having Parent Teacher Association for managing MDM (82.9 %) in all the seven districts covered under the present study. But their functional efficiency was not observed very high. Another limitation shared by members of the SMC's was that in many cases due to lack of coordination between Secretary of SMC and head teacher's performance in MDMS was suffering.

Further in some districts like East Khasi Hill, East Garo Hills and Ri-Bhoi, encouraging practice was seen where senior citizens and health workers were also involved in this programme. But in the entire state, health workers were involved only in one MDM Centre each in East Garo Hills and Ri Bhoi.

## 2.9. Social Inclusion

Social inclusion is not a problem in Meghalaya unlike in the rest of the country since the society here is highly egalitarian. Moreover, the scheme covers practically each and every school-going child. No one is excluded. The very few children who opted out did so for a variety of reasons as explained in para 2.3.7.

## 2.10. Relating MDM Performance with Infrastructure Index

It is generally assumed that performance of any programme may be influenced by the availability of the infrastructure facilities in the specific area. The three dimensions of infrastructure (Mobility, Information and Development) contribute at both the systematic and the individual level and a minimum basic quantity of all these dimensions at both the levels is deemed necessary for meaningful access to the services and facilities. It is always possible that the execution of the programme may be affected by various amenities available in the particular village like transportation facilities, total number of existing post offices, no of available telephones, no of schools and colleges, hospitals, banks, drinking water, power supply etc. It is always assumed that these factors may help increase the accessibility of people hence enhance the performance of the programme.

As referred in the earlier section, Infrastructure Development Index was calculated for assessing the level of infrastructure of all the blocks of Meghalaya before selection of blocks in each district. The census data for each village is available from the government of India in digital format. Accordingly, a primary requirement was to combine all the village level census data (collected by the Government of India) at the block and the district level. Given the volume of data, the aggregation task for all the villages in Meghalaya on about 21 different measures was executed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS 9.1).

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to calculate weights for accessibility index. In this procedure, the eigenvectors corresponding to the first principal component are taken as weights. This is based on the rationale that the first principal component accounts for the maximum variance.


The index values also helped us in selecting the sample blocks for the study and also to see the influence of the systemic and individual level variables related to accessibility on the uptake of the various government services and facilities.

For the MDM performance index, we used the similar procedure with the variables collected through the questionnaire administered for the study. The variables were related to performance of MDMS. This exercise was done to balance the effect of level of infrastructure on the performance of MDM.

District	Block	Development Index	MDM Performance Index	Development Index	MDM Performance Index
South Garo Hills	Rongara	-3.66	-2.5261	0	1.802739
West Garo Hills	Dadenggiri	-3.32	-0.14678	0.411124547	3.834355
East Garo Hills	Samanda	-2.98	-3.01633	0.822249093	1.384149
East Khasi Hills	Mylliem	-2.261	4.30526	1.69165659	7.635794
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	-2.22	-3.65781	1.741233374	0.836412
Jaintia Hills	Thadlaskein	-1.307	0.96529	2.8452237	4.783913
East Garo Hills	Songsak	-0.83	-2.11395	3.422007255	2.154659
West Khasi Hills	Mairang	-0.66	-1.789	3.627569528	2.432122
West Garo Hills	Rongram	0.71	-4.63737	5.284159613	0
East Khasi Hills	Mawphlang	0.95891	7.07409	5.585139057	10
West Khasi Hills	Nongstoin	1.09	-2.16536	5.743651753	2.110762
Ri-Bhoi	Umling	1.55	-1.06451	6.299879081	3.050738
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	2.62	-0.19943	7.593712213	3.789399
Ri-Bhoi	Umsning	4.61	1.32135	10	5.08794

Above table shows the IDI and MDM performance Index in ascending order. MDM performance Index is calculated on the basis of select variable studied in the study. Both the indices have been rescaled to 1 to 12.

The figure clearly shows the level of Infrastructure Development Index and MDM Performance Index in all blocks. In case of Mawphlang Block in East Khasi, both the indices were found high. In East Khasi accessibility, information and connectivity are always higher, reason why it might be assumed that performance is also better.



Similarly these two factors are found related in the case of Umsning block in Ri-Bhoi district. This area is situated on Assam border and also near to national highway. Thus monitoring, accessibility and approach might be instrumental in enhancement of MDM performance in the area.

If Myllem case is focused in East Khasi, same factors - easy accessibility, closeness to capital, increased awareness and exposure might be felt responsible for the higher level of MDM performance, although IDI was not found so high in the area.

Another interesting association could be explored in the case of Block Rongram in Tura, West Garo Hills. The figure here shows that MDM performance was found lowest although IDI is not so low. Reasons behind this could be, found out after the field experience, that the location of this area is very remote. This causes genuine “reach related” problems of approaching and monitoring and affecting its performance.



## Section - IV

### CONSTRAINTS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Nutrition Support to Primary Education popularly referred to as Mid Day Meal Programme (MDM) is considered as a means of promoting improved enrolment, school attendance and retention. MDM seeks to provide for each school child roughly a third of the daily nutrient requirement in the form of a hot fresh cooked meal. It is sometimes argued that in the case of children of poor households, the school meal may become a substitute rather than a supplement for the home meal. It is important to note that it is not merely the long-term effects of the school meal on the nutritional status but its Short-Term Effects on better attention, memory and learning that is important. There are several published reports based on well-conducted studies pointing to these beneficial short-term effects of the school meal on learning ability. A hungry child is a poor learner lacking in concentration. A mid day meal is an important instrument for combating classroom hunger and promoting better learning. Many children reach school with an empty stomach in the morning, since a good early morning breakfast is not a part of the household routine. Under these circumstances it is important to acknowledge the Short Term Effects of MDM on learning. MDM could thus be a means for not only promoting school enrollment but also better learning in schools. With children from all castes and communities eating together, it is also instrumental in bringing about better social integration.

MDM could serve the important purpose of improving school enrollment and attendance especially girls thus contributing to gender equality. With MDM, it will be easier for parents to persuade their children to go to school and for teachers to retain children in the classrooms. It could foster sound social behavior among children and dispel feelings of difference between various castes.

MDM can also contribute to gender equality by reducing the gender gap in education by boosting female attendance in school.

Most importantly MDM could trigger all round development of the entire school system- leading to better infrastructures in schools, better teaching facilities, a School Health Service and community involvement.

Even now, after a long span of implementation of MDMS in Meghalaya school enrolment is not universal. State is not able to fully resolve the problem of the children dropping out of primary schools. Poor enrolment and high school dropout rate are attributed to poor socio-economic conditions, child labour, lack of motivation and poor nutrition status of the children.

MDMS was initiated on the basis of the philosophy that "when children have to sit in class with empty stomachs, they cannot focus on learning". The scheme is important for improving enrolment, attendance and retention of primary school children, while simultaneously improving their nutritional status.

## 1. CONSTRAINTS AND BOTTLENECKS

The following findings which reflect the constraints and bottlenecks are drawn on the basis of information gathered and analysed in intensive discussions with all stakeholders of MDMS in Meghalaya. It is believed that these issues are limiting the reach of MDMS to students in the fullest manner.

- There are evidences of lack of clarity regarding the objectives to be achieved by the scheme to most of the stakeholders in the state although most of the Teachers, Parents, Managing Committee Members and Students were not aware of the baseline of MDMS.
- Majority of stakeholders particularly parents and teachers felt that whatever they were receiving was free, and hence there was no reason of raising questions regarding its weaknesses in implementation process.

- Most of the teachers were lacking appropriate level of orientation regarding objectives of the MDMS and hence felt it as wastage of the time and energy. Although every year there is a compulsory 20 days training for all teachers where there is a module on MDM also under SSA.
- MDMS, which started with an aim to improve the status of primary education, is yet to have scientific & precise assessment of the impact of the scheme with respect to the increase in enrolment, attendance and retention level of children. Further, state governments have not found to have attempted to establish any system for measuring a direct relationship between the increase in attendance and the MDMS scheme.
- Evaluation team was not able to see any systematic Government mechanism to assess the outcome of the scheme in terms of well-defined parameters during evaluation period.
- Department still need to have an efficient system of reliable data capture and reporting by the MDM centers. Although with effect from 2007-08 and especially from 2008-09, the Department has made significant improvements in data recording and reporting, the outcome of these efforts is yet to be clearly visible due to inherent weaknesses in monitoring. There were many cases of resorting to over reporting of the enrolment while projecting the requirement of funds. This is justified by some school authorities as it has to be seen in the context of inclusion of pre-primary enrollment figures as they felt that leaving out the younger ones was unethical from their point of view. It was also felt that there was no system of cross checking of the data of enrolment furnished by the SMC.
- The state-wide audit of the implementation of the scheme revealed weak internal controls and monitoring. The provisions for programme evaluation and regular monitoring and inspections in the scheme design, were not effectively followed nor the results analyzed for review of errors and

introduction of changes on the basis of lessons learnt. It was observed that the steering and monitoring committees set up by the department to monitor the scheme did not meet so regularly.

- In most of the schools where sample checking was done during evaluation, regular inspections were not carried out to ensure the overall quality of midday meal served, nor were basic records such as issue and receipt of food grains, meal quality and evidence of community participation (through village education committees and parent teacher associations) maintained.
- Many instances of the teachers spending considerable teaching time in supervising the cooking and serving of meals were noticed despite the fact that instructions were repeatedly issued saying that teachers are not allowed to cook mid-day meal. This results in loss of teaching hours in the state. On the other side, it was also noted that in Garo Hills, cooking is mainly done by Mothers' Unions and SHGs while elsewhere in the State, the schools make use of the amount provided under the scheme plus some contribution from their own side.
- One of the objectives of the scheme was to positively impact on the nutritional and health levels of primary school children; which was the main objective of the revised scheme in September 2006. It was observed that the Government has yet to collect data on the nutritional status of children covered under the midday meal scheme. Very weak linkages were felt with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for the health checks prescribed under the scheme followed up by the Ministry. In most of the children micro nutrient supplements and de-worming medicines were not administered.
- Evaluation of the implementation of the scheme in the state revealed leakages, deficient infrastructure, delayed release of funds and inflated transportation costs etc.

- Two SMCs - (i) RKMLPS, Myllem East Khasi Hills, and (ii) Khliehriat Secondary School, Khliehriat, Jaintia Hills were not serving cooked meal; instead they were supplying dry ration to avoid inconvenience and risk. Their logic was that they did not want to disturb their teaching schedule and also they preferred to avoid problem of food infection.
- It was also seen in some cases that SMC's were using ration to compensate the in-sufficient conversion and transportation cost.
- SMCs were having serious complaint regarding timely release of funds.
- In few cases of the upper primary schools it was found that they have not received ration and conversion money till date.
- Most of the SMCs expressed dissatisfaction over the rate of conversion cost per head. All shared the view that it would be extremely difficult to engage permanent cook in that meager amount. This was also burden on teachers.
- It was also observed in some cases that part of ration was sold for purchase of kitchen devices as they were spoiled after a long use. It was found that these devices were supplied in the beginning of the MDM.
- Schools were not receiving ration for their pre primary section. They were getting ration only for LPS students hence finding it difficult to serve cooked meal to all their students for all five days.
- The level of People's participation in the programme was found very low. This reflected the awareness level and programme ownership of the society.
- Administrative officials were also found not properly trained in maintaining accounts and also expressed the problem of financial deficiency to bear the responsibilities of MDMS.

- Ignorance regarding the objectives and process of MDMS was a major bottleneck for effective execution and active participation of stakeholders.
- It was felt that due to mismatching enrolment data between Center and State Government, SMCs were not receiving sufficient food grain supply; this pressed them to reduce the frequency of MDMS in the schools.
- Officials have a strong feeling about the systemic problem of this scheme. It was shared that there is no dedicated officer exclusively to look after this scheme at the District level and, as a result, this greatly hampered the effective implementation and monitoring of this important flagship scheme of the Govt. of India. This is one of the reasons why they were not able to implement the programme with complete sense of accountability.
- Government officials have a serious complaint regarding mismatching students statistics. Central Government don't accept Statistics given by State. This pressed Government to deduct and adjust the quota. As per the State Government Statistics is total enroll in 2008-09 is 6.27 lakhs whereas Central Government gave sanction for 2.16 lakh students.
- Another main issue raised by implementing department was the delay in releasing of money both by the State and Central Government.
- Wholesalers were also found working without any interest as they were not receiving the transport cost in time. Some had stated that their bills for last three years were still not cleared.
- Lack of coordination between School secretaries and head teachers was found as a major hurdle in executing MDMS effectively. In most of the cases Secretaries were found illiterates and appointed on political backing, thus creating problem in recording and sharing information.

## 2. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

After observing various constraints and bottlenecks during the evaluation study of MDMS in Meghalaya, there is an urgent need for a serious and sincere brainstorming for making headway in the effective execution of the programme.

A few suggestions are placed below for the better execution of MDMS which is required for the development of the future generation. These views are recommended after having intensive interaction with all the stakeholders involved in the programme in the State.

- Comprehensive, periodical and systematic orientation is mandatory to sensitize all stakeholders including the policy makers, implementers, teachers, center level officials and community people to make them understand this scheme well. This would help them to become more efficient and be active partners in the programme that will certainly enhance its performance.
- It appeared from the study that some teachers consider MDM as a distraction to teaching and learning. We should strive to correct this apprehension and make persuasive efforts to sensitize the teachers by explaining to them the advantages of providing meal in the school as a means of improving school attendance, retention and learning abilities of the children. Teachers must appreciate MDM as being a part of education, requiring their full cooperation. The slight increase in responsibilities that MDM may impose will be rewarded by better returns in terms of improved performances for their teaching efforts. Every effort must be made to enlist the cooperation of teachers. They should become enthusiastic participants rather than sullen by bystanders.
- The State government needs to strengthen the internal controls as well as the inspection and monitoring mechanism at all levels. Accountability for maintenance of records at various levels should be prescribed and monitored.

- The State should ensure that adequate infrastructure viz. provisions of kitchen sheds, kitchen devices and facility of drinking water are available in all schools.
- It should put in place a system to ensure that the teaching time of the teachers is not lost in connection with the midday meal and there is no adverse impact of the scheme on the primary objective of education.
- It is recommended to limit teachers' involvement in the programme to supervision activities.
- Decentralization of power among SMC members is recommended. More powers are to be delegated to Head teacher as far as management of MDMS is concerned. It was felt that many Secretaries being politically powerful, there was a huge gap and lack of coordination between Secretaries and head teachers in some instances.
- Uniform implementing mechanism for delivery of ration at door steps of schools is suggested in all the districts (eg. in some cases wholesalers and in some other cases fair price dealers are taking care of delivery of ration).
- Maintenance of ration card is found very successful for keeping record of flow of grain in some cases (Khasi Hills). Replication is recommended of such example in all places.
- Having sensed the genuine problem of in managing supply in time in schools, it is suggested that funds should be provided in advance to the implementing agencies through the state nodal officer for the transportation of food grains.
- MDM could be a platform for strengthening the school health programme in order to produce a real impact. This should lead the relevance and importance of a new programme today. It should consist of more than routine medical checkup. It must strive to ensure healthy environment in



schools, environmental sanitation and provision of safe drinking water. A blanket programme of adding a few supplements to the school meal may not be appropriate for the entire area. It should be for the School Health System in each location to decide as to the nature of supplements, medical or otherwise, required at that level.

- Transportation and conversion cost are felt insufficient. It is recommended to resolve this issue of shoe-string budget with the help of resource mobilization from other sources.
- Currently, the Government of India (GOI) supplies food grains (wheat/rice) free through Food Corporation of India (FCI) and reimburses transportation cost at fixed rates. The allocation for various activities like preparation of food, cooking fuel, creation of physical facilities, manpower resources and organization of capacity building is being undertaken by the states. It is, perhaps, possible that the Government may issue clear instructions regarding use of these funds for the purposes of MDMS like creating physical infrastructure facilities (kitchen shed, drinking water, storage etc) and provision of innovative employment opportunities like cooking, cleaning vessels, management and supervision, and transporting ration. This will help resolve the problem of resource crunch with regard to transportation and conversion cost.
- To enhance the performance level of MDMS, it is also suggested to implement the scheme with alternative approach of partnership with NGO's and local self help groups. Credible participation, wherever possible, should be encouraged.
- Problem of the scarcity of funds could be resolved by sharing the burden with corporate world. As the Corporate Social responsibility, they could share a part of financial burden and help in monitoring as well the execution of the MDMS in a desired manner.

- Linkage with poverty alleviation programmes in rural and urban areas, adequate support of the Union Ministry of Health and the state Health Departments for the school health programme and support from the Department of Women and Child Development for nutrition education are also recommended for managing resources.
- The department should set realistic and specific objectives and goals for the scheme. Outcome indicators should be prescribe to measure and report on improvements in education, health and nutrition. It should use the data received from the states for such an evaluation.
- The state government should vigorously coordinate with the Ministry to ensure that the data on enrolment, attendance and retention flows from the school level to state level in a transparent manner with records of compilation maintained at each level i.e. school level, district level and state level. Periodical checks should be arranged to crosscheck the data for accuracy. It should provide for analysis of feed back received and take remedial action, when required.
- Extensive use of the computerized MIS (CMIS) net for monitoring purposes. External agencies are to be involved in monitoring and supervision to ensure greater accountability. Elected representatives could also be involved in supervision.
- An online periodic should be brought into for the analysis of outcome indicators and reporting. This will help easy flow of the evaluation.
- Accountability issue is a major facet in good governance. Specific dedicated departmental arrangement is suggested to assign the sole responsibility of MDMS. This would encourage sense of ownership among the actors who play major role in the execution.

- Government needs to establish a system to ascertain improvement in nutritional levels of children. It should coordinate with the concerned department and ensure maintenance of health cards in all the schools to monitor the health status of the children.
- Fostering stronger community participation through Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), and such other units of the school system in the implementation of the programme could help in improving its performance. It will also help in reduction of leakages and mismanagement.
- A memorandum of understanding be entered into with the key stakeholders (state governments, local bodies, etc.) on the key parameters. This will help them to understand their responsibilities that will improve performance of MDMS.
- Drawing on the private sector and NGOs for the school feeding programme overcomes many of the difficulties of on-site preparation of meals, and may be one of the many inexpensive ways to feed children in schools. The private sector in this case could be a local caterer (in towns) or an NGO. An example of NGO and Government of India partnership is ISKCON supplying MDMs in Bangalore and Delhi. The Akshaya Patra Foundation (ISKCON) has been providing free meals everyday to children studying in government schools in and around Bangalore city, Hubli, Mysore, Hassan and Mangalore in southern India.

Another model for public-private partnership was also evolved in Hyderabad where Naandi Foundation manages a central kitchen to provide cooked meals to more than 2 lakh children in Hyderabad. The foundation signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the State Government, which had set up a biggest central kitchen in Uppal in the outskirts of the city. This centralized kitchen setup where cooking can be undertaken in a centralized kitchen, and cooked hot meal can be distributed under hygienic

conditions. This arrangement would call for efficient management not only with respect to cooking but also transportation and distribution.

- Women Self Help Groups and Panchayats can be involved like in Tamil Nadu. This will also give an opportunity to the community to participate in the programme both in cooking of the meal as well as monitoring its distribution.
- In response to the difficulties of 'on-site feeding' alternative approach for delivering an appropriately-timed (with regard to effecting improvements in learning capacity) and high quality, consistent ration is developed in other parts of India. These models are suggested to have more efficient systems for the delivery of meals to school children. Different models are referred here for perusal of planners.
  - ◇ The schools model, which have become strong partners with the Government to run the MDMP (e.g. Gujarat)
  - ◇ The NGOs model like Naandi and ISKCON. These institutions however, bank on funding to provide the meals.
  - ◇ The government private sector partnership model, e.g. TATAs and Wipros
  - ◇ Women empowerment model e.g Tamil Nadu.

It is up to the Government to work out their logistics and choose the model / models most suited for their State. Having these observations, it is suggested that to overcome many problems relating to onsite- cooking, state Government of Meghalaya can opt any of the above model for the programme.

- The implementing Department could periodically convene meetings of officers from different districts involved in MDM to discuss the progress of the programme, to inject mid-course correction, if any, and to provide such additional support whenever needed.

The evaluation team has high expectations that Government of Meghalaya would put in serious effort to improve the performance of MDMS in their State by giving serious thought to the observations of this study Team. Appropriate level of attention is sought for proper orientation of stakeholder, perfect and periodical monitoring, mid course corrections, encouraging people' participation, adopting appropriate model of execution and alternative resource mobilization as these are the major actors linked with the improvement in the performance of MDMS.

The present evaluation study has tried to focus on the given assignment of evaluating the actual performance of the MDMS. It aimed to understand its process of implementation and its impact on beneficiaries in Meghalaya within a short span of 4 - 6 months. Although we were able to fathom the magnitudes of financial and administrative process and benefits perceived by the stakeholders at the local level, there are many aspects that remained untouched in current evaluation study. The scope of this study could be expanded to ascertain administrative and financial efficiencies (or the lack of it) and other aspects, more particularly the nutritional aspect, in much more detail. A separate and contextual study may be conducted to understand these aspects. In fact, a much larger study at the state level could be conducted that not only includes aspects not covered in this study , but also widens the sample size of schools, and stakeholders to get a much broader and representative picture of Meghalaya's MDM scheme on various dimensions.

## REFERENCES

- Deoadhar, Mehndiratta, Ramani, Mavalankar, Ghosh and Braganza, (2007) Mid Day Meal Scheme: Understanding Critical Issues with reference to Ahmedabad City, Working Paper, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
- Dhananjaya (2003) "Origin and Growth of Nutritious Noon Meal Programme in Tamil Nadu", Kurukhetra, Vol-46.
- Dogra, M. & Bharat Dogra (2003) "Reforming the Mid Day Meal Programme", www.righttofood.com
- Dreze, J. & Aparajita Goyal (2003) "Future of Mid Day Meal", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Nivember.
- Government of India (2002): *Report of the High Level Committee on Long-Term Grain Policy*, Department of Food and Public Distribution, New Delhi.
- Kameswari, J. (2003) "Education and Nutrition", *Yojana*, Vol-42.
- Kanam (2003) "Nutritional Support to Primary Schools, *Yojana*, Vol-1.
- Mahendra Dev, S (2003): 'Right to Food in India', Working Paper 50, Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad.
- Mishra, S. (2002) "National support to Primary Education (Mid Day Meal Programme) in Orissa- It Impact on Enrollment, Attendance, Retention and Drop outs among School going Children", Vision 2020, NCDS, Bhubaneswar.
- Nutrition Foundation of India (2003a): 'Mid-Day Meal Programmes in Schools in India: The Way Forward', background papers circulated at a workshop on Mid-Day Meal Programmes in Schools in India held at the India International Centre, New Delhi, August 1.
- - (2003b): 'A Report of the Workshop on 'Mid-Day Meal Programmes in Schools in India', mimeo, Nutrition Foundation of India, New Delhi.
- Saijhee, A. (2003) "Child Nutrition and Poverty in South India- Noon Meals in Tamil Nadu", Concept, New Delhi.
- Saxena, N.C. (2003) "Food Assistance Programme and Their Role in Allocating Poverty and Hunger in India", www.righttofood.com.
- Shiva, Kumar (2003) "Food Security and Child Rights", UNICEF, New Delhi.
- <http://www.nsa.org.in>
- <http://mdmsmeghalaya.gov.in>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Annexure – I**

**LIST OF MDM CENTRES COVERED UNDER PRESENT STUDY.**

S.No	District	Block	Village	School
<b>I</b>	<b>Jaintia Hills</b>			
1		Khliehriat	Khliehriat	Khliehriat UP School
2		Khliehriat	Diengshynrum	Diengshynrum Govt LP School
3		Khliehriat	Byndihati	Byndihati Govt Aided UP School
4		Khliehriat	Mookhep	Mookhep UP School
5		Khliehriat	Dkhiah	Dkhiah West Govt LP School
6		Thadlaskein	Ummulong	Presbyterian LP Govt Aided School
7		Thadlaskein	Ummulong	Little Flower Govt Aided LP School
8		Thadlaskein	Mukhla	Mukhla Raid Govt Aided LP School
9		Thadlaskein	Jowai	Jowai Govt UP School
10		Thadlaskein	Mukhla	Mukhla Nongrim EGS Centre
<b>II</b>	<b>East Garo Hills</b>			
1		Samanda	Kumsim Kolgre	Kumsimkolgre.Govt LP School
2		Samanda	Willimnagar	Williamnagar town UP School
3		Samanda	Rongrenggiri Baiza	Rongreng baiza Govt Z.P School
4		Samanda	Rangmal Badim	Badim Govt.LP School
5		Samanda	Willimnagar	Greenyard Secondary School
6		Songsak	Rongrengchidikgme	Rongrengchidikgme LP School
7		Songsak	Rongap	Rongap Non Govt LP School
8		Songsak	Rongap	Rongap UP School
9		Songsak	Nengsam Songgital	Nengsam Sangittal upgraded LP School
10		Songsak	Sawegre	Edikkson Dshira Govt LP School
<b>III</b>	<b>Ri-bhoi</b>			
1		Umsning	Mawlyndep	Mantyadep UP School
2		Umsning	Umbir	Khrum Diengiei LP School
3		Umsning	Lum Roman	St. Michael LP School
4		Umsning	Mawlyndep	R.C LP School
5		Umsning	Umralleng	R.C LP School
6		Umling	Nongpoh	St Paul RCLP Govt Aided LP School
7		Umling	Pahamlapong	Ribhoi Presbyterian Govt Aided LPS
8		Umling	Lurbhai	Lurbhai UP School
9		Umling	Lewmawlong	Lewmawlong Govt LP School
10		Umling	Pahamri-OH	St.Ignasius Govt Aided UP School
<b>IV</b>	<b>East Khasi Hills</b>			
1		Myllem	Sadew	Raid Sadew UP School
2		Myllem	Myllem	St Marry UP School
3		Myllem	Myllem	RKM LP School
4		Myllem	Pomlum	Pomlum LP School
5		Myllem	Khindela	Ramkrishna Mission Govt Aided UP School
6		Shillong MPL	Shillong	Policy LP School
7		Mawphlang	Marbisu	Marbisu Seng Khasi LP School
8		Mawphlang	Mawphlang	Mawphlang Govt. UP School
9		Mawphlang	Marbisu	Marbisu Govt. LP School
10		Mawphlang	Mawngap	Multi Purpose UPS (Govt Aided)

Contd..

<b>V</b>	<b>West Khasi Hills</b>			
1		Mairang	Madan Bynther	Bynther Govt Aided LP School
2		Mairang	Langtor	Langtor Govt Aided UP School
3		Mairang	Mairang	Langstiehrim Govt LP School
4		Mairang	Mairang	Pyndengumiong Long Govt LP School
5		Mairang	Mairang	Mission Mairang Govt Aided LP School
6		Nongstoin	Mawiong	Mawiong Lumsyniew UP School
7		Nongstoin	Mawpun	New Nongstoin Govt LP School
8		Nongstoin	Pyndengrei	St.Peters RC LP School
9		Nongstoin	Nong Pyndeng	Nong Pyndeng Govt LP School
10		Nongstoin	Nongstoin	Nongstoin Govt. LP School
<b>VI</b>	<b>West Garo Hills</b>			
1		Rongram	Rongram	Gorka Govt LP School
2		Rongram	Ganol Apal	Ganol Apal Govt. LP School
3		Rongram	Bangdagri	Bangdagri Govt LP School
4		Rongram	Asanang	Asanang Govt LP School
5		Rongram	Alla-gipokgre	Alla-gipokgre EGS
6		Dadenggree	Dokramagre	Dokramagre Govt Aided LP School
7		Dadenggree	Songatdinggre	Songatdinggre Govt LP School
8		Dadenggree	Dilsigre	Dilsigre Govt UP School
9		Dadenggree	Ajrigre	Ajrigre EGS Pre-Primary
10		Dadenggree	Dadenggree	Dadengre Govt LP School
<b>VII</b>	<b>South Garo Hills</b>			
		Rongara	Reservegittim	Reservegittam Govt LP School
		Rongara	Wagekona	Wagekona Govt .LP School
		Rongara	New Rongra	New Rongra EGS LP School
		Rongara	Dobakol	Rongra Dobakol Govt. LP School
		Rongara	Gaobari	Gaobari Govt. LP School
		Baghmara	Rangdokram	Rangdokram SSA Govt Aided UP School
		Baghmara	Baghmara	Baghmara Govt. LP School
		Baghmara	Dabit Ampangdam	Dabit Ampangdam Govt LP School
		Baghmara	Dalitmahagittam	Dalitmahagittam LP School
		Baghmara	Dosigittim	Dosigittim Govt. LP School EGS Upgraded



## Annexure – II

### LIST OF WHOLESALERS INTERACTED DURING STUDY

Sl. No.	Name of the Wholesalers	Place	District
1	M/s B.R. Marak	Willimnagar	East Garo Hills
2	M/s R.C. Marak	Willimnagar	East Garo Hills
3	B. Sangma	Baghmara	South Garo Hills
4	Chandan Choudhary	Baghmara	South Garo Hills
5	E. Marak	Rongara	South Garo Hills
6	Gautam Prasad	Tura	West Garo Hills
7	Weneth Sangma	Rongram	West Garo Hills
8	A.S. Kharmawlong	Mairang	West Khasi Hills
9	N. Syiem	Nongstoin	West Khasi Hills
10	R. Syiem	Nongstoin	West Khasi Hills
11	Perina	Ladthadlaboh	Jaintia Hills
12	Hermiki	Thadlaskein	Jaintia Hills
13	B. Lyngdoh	Shillong	East Khasi Hills
14	Smt. H. Tyngkan	Jowai	Jaintia Hills

**Annexure - III**

**LIST OF SCHOOLS SHIFT WISE**

Sl. No.	District	Block	Village	Morning Shift Schools
1.	Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	Mookhep	Mookhep UP School
2.		Khliehriat	Dkhiah	Dkhiah West Govt LP School
3.	East Garo Hills	Samanda	Kumsimkolgre	Kumsimkolgre Govt LP School
4.		Samanda	Rongrenggiri Baiza	Rongreng baiza Govt Z.P School
5.		Samanda	Rangmal Badim	Badim Govt.LP School
6.		Songsak	Rongrengchidikgme	Rongrengchidikgme LP School
7.		Songsak	Rongap	Rongap Non Govt. LP School
8.	Ri-Bhoi	Umsning	Umbir	Khrum Diengiei LP School
9.		Umsning	Umralleng	R.C LP School
10.		Umling	Lewmawlong	Lewmawlong Govt. LP School
11.	West Khasi Hills	Mairang	Mairang	Pydengumiong Govt LP School
12.		Mairang	Mairang	Mission Mairang Govt Aided LP School
13.	West Garo Hills	Rongram	Rongram	Gorka Govt LP School
14.		Rongram	Ganol Apal	Ganol Apal Govt.LP School
15.		Rongram	Bangdagri	Bangdagri Govt LP School
16.		Rongram	Asanang	Asanang Govt LP School
17.		Rongram	Alla-gipokgre	Alla-gipokgre EGS
18.		Dadenggree	Dokramagre	Dokramagre Govt Aided LP School
19.		Dadenggree	Songatdinggre	Songatdinggre Govt LP School
20.		Dadenggree	Ajrigre	Ajrigre EGS Pre-Primary
21.		Dadenggree	Dadenggree	Dadengre Govt LP School
22.	South Garo Hills	Rongara	Wagekona	Wagekona Govt.LP School
23.		Rongara	New Rongra	New Rongra EGS LP School
24.		Rongara	Dobakol	Rongra Dobakol Govt.LP School
25.		Rongara	Gaobari	Gaobari Govt. LP School
26.		Baghmara	Rangdokram	Rangdokram SSA Govt Aided UP School
27.		Baghmara	Baghmara	Baghmara Govt.LP School
28.		Baghmara	Dabitampingban	Dabitampingban Govt LP School
29.		Baghmara	Dalitmahagittam	Dalitmahagittam LP School
30.		Baghmara	Dosikgittim	Dosikgittim Govt LP School EGS Upgraded

Contd..

Sl. No.	District	Block	Village	Noon Shift Schools
1.	Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	Khliehriat	Khliehriat UP School
2.		Khliehriat	Diengshynrum	Diengshynrum Govt LP School
3.		Khliehriat	Byndihati	Byndihati Govt Aided UP School
4.		Thadlaskein	Ummulong	Presbyterian LP Govt Aided School
5.		Thadlaskein	Ummulong	Little Flower Govt Aided LP School
6.		Thadlaskein	Mukhla	Mukhla Raid Govt Aided LP School
7.		Thadlaskein	Jowai	Jowai Govt UP School
8.		Thadlaskein	Mukhla	Mukhla Nongrim EGS Centre
9.	East Garo Hills	Samanda	Willimnagar	Willimnagar town UP School
10.		Samanda	Willimnagar	Greenyard Secondary School
11.		Songsak	Rongap	Rongap UP School
12.		Songsak	Nengsam Songgital	Nengsam Sangittal upgraded LP School
13.		Songsak	Sawegre	Edikkson Dshira Govt LP School
14.	Ri-bhoi	Umsning	Mawlyndep	Mantyadep UP School
15.		Umsning	Lum Roman	St. Michael LP School
16.		Umsning	Mawlyndep	R.C LP School
17.		Umling	Nongpoh	St Paul RCLP Govt Aided LP School
18.		Umling	Pahamlapong	Ribhoi Presbyterian Govt Aided LPS
19.		Umling	Lurbhai	Lurbhai UP School
20.		Umling	Pahamri-OH	St. Ignasius Govt Aided UP School
21.	East Khasi Hills	Mylliem	Sadew	Raid Sadew UP School
22.		Mylliem	Mylliem	St Marry UP School
23.		Mylliem	Mylliem	RKM LP School
24.		Mylliem	Pomlum	Pomlum LP School
25.		Mylliem	Khindela	Ramkrishna Mission Govt. Aided UP School
26.		Shillong MPL	Shillong	Policy LP School
27.		Mawphlang	Marbisu	Marbisu Seng Khasi LP School
28.		Mawphlang	Mawphlang	Mawphlang Govt. UP School
29.		Mawphlang	Marbisu	Marbisu Govt. LP School
30.		Mawphlang	Mawngap	Multi Purpose UPS Govt Aided
31.	West Khasi Hills	Mairang	Madan Bynther	Bynther Govt Aided LP School
32.		Mairang	Langtor	Langtor Govt Aided UP School
33.		Mairang	Mairang	Langstiehrim Govt LP School
34.		Nongstoin	Mawiong	Mawiong Lumsyniew UP School
35.		Nongstoin	Mawpun	New Nongstoin Govt LP School
36.		Nongstoin	Pyndengrei	St. Peters RC LP School
37.		Nongstoin	Nong Pyndeng	Nong Pyndeng Govt LP School
38.		Nongstoin	Nongstoin	Nongstoin Govt. LP School
39.	West Garo Hills	Dadenggree	Dilsigre	Dilsigre Govt UP School
40.	South Garo Hills	Rongara	Reservegittam	Reservegittam Govt LP School

# APPENDIX

# COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad - 500 030

## EVALUATION STUDIES ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA

### FOOD SUPPLY PROVIDER : FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA

1. Date of visit:
2. Name of the FCI:
3. Address:
4. Commencement of MDM supply (year):
5. Total number of whole sellers to whom it is supplying:
6. Quantity supply to each suppliers:

	Quantity
a) Rice	
b) Wheat	
c) Any others specify	

7. The frequency of supplying materials: ( )  
(a) Weekly (b) Fortnightly (c) Monthly
8. Do you receive the money immediately from the whole sellers: ( )  
(a) Yes (b) No
9. Where are you procuring all those materials: ( )  
(a) Farmers directly (b) Mediators (c) APMCs (d) Any other sources (specify)
10. Do you procure those materials in time: ( )  
(a) Yes (b) No
11. If no, why ?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. Do you have proper storage facilities: ( )  
(a) Yes (b) No
13. Do you use any containers for storing those food materials: ( )  
(a) Yes (b) No
14. If yes, what are the containers:  
(a) Bag (b) Ground (c) Metal
15. Do you check for the following parameters of quality in the ingredients? ( )  
(a) Stones (b) Insects (c) Over ripeness (d) Bad odor (e) Any other (specify)

Remarks:

Name of the Investigator:

# COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad-500 030

## EVALUATION STUDIES ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA

### MANAGING COMMITTEE

Name of the MDM Centre:

Address:

Village:

Block:

District:

Head of the MDM Managing Committee:

Ph.No (office):

Mobile:

1. Name of the MDM In-charge / teacher:
2. Type of school: ( )  
(a) Boys (b) Girl (c) Co-education
3. Shift of the school: ( )  
(a) Morning (b) Evening (c) Extended
4. Date of commencement of MDMP: ( )
5. What is the type of MDM: ( )  
(a) Cooked (b) Dry ration
6. Total number of beneficiaries under this scheme during last five years:

Year	Boys	Girls	ST	SC	Total
2003-04					
2004-05					
2005-06					
2006-07					
2007-08					
Jan,2009					

7. The quantity of different items received during last five years:

Items	Quantity (in quintal)					
	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	Jan,2009
Cereals						
Pulses						
Vegetables						
Spices						
Oil						
Any other (specify)						

### 8. Supply of Ration

- (a) Supply of ration: ( )  
(i) Monthly (ii) Weekly (iii) Daily
- (b) Regularity of supply of ration: ( )  
(i) Always (ii) Sometimes (iii) Never

- (c) If it is not regular, number of days missed in the previous month: \_\_\_\_\_
- (d) If it is not regular, number of days the supply delayed in the previous month: \_\_\_\_\_
- (e) What are the reasons stated by the fair shop suppliers for irregularity ( )  
 (i) Bad weather (ii) Traffic problem  
 (iii) Financial problem (iv) Supply hurdle  
 (v) Combination of all above factors (vi) Any other (specify)
- (f) Do the supplier usually gives pre-information regarding delay in supply to respective authority: ( )  
 (i) Always (ii) Sometimes (iii) Never
- (g) Action was taken by the MDM In-charge w.r.t. irregular/ delayed supply of MDM ?
- | Action Taken                  | Food Missed | Food Delayed |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| (i) Tried to contact supplier |             |              |
| (ii) Informed higher official |             |              |
| (iii) Both of the above       |             |              |
| (iv) No action                |             |              |
- (h) Do you receive the supply as per the fixed norm by government: ( )  
 (i) Always (ii) Sometimes (iii) Never
- (i) Action taken by the authority if the quantity of food supplied was inadequate: ( )  
 (i) Inform to the higher officials (ii) Fruits distributed  
 (iii) HM/Teachers contribute to provide food (iv) No action  
 (v) Any thing else (specify)
- (j) How would you describe the quality of dry ration supplied to you: ( )  
 (i) Good (ii) Fair (iii) Poor (iv) Unable to observe
- (k) Do you check for the following parameters of quality in raw ingredients? ( )  
 (i) Stones (ii) Insects (iii) Over ripeness  
 (iv) Bad odor (v) Any other (specify)
- (l) Has the ration ever returned back: ( )  
 (i) Always (ii) Sometimes (iii) Never
- (m) If yes, what was the reason ? ( )  
 (i) Food disliked by children (ii) On the basis of MDM committee evaluation report  
 (iii) Late arrival (iv) Less quantity of food (v) Combination of all above  
 (vi) Any other, specify

## 9. Storage

- (a) Do you have proper storage facilities: ( )  
 (i) Always (ii) Sometimes (iii) Never
- (b) Where do you keep raw ingredients? ( )  
 (i) On a raised platform (ii) Floor (iii) Any other (specify)
- (c) If no, what you do ? ( )  
 (i) Store in class room (ii) In teacher's home  
 (iii) Sarapanch's home (iv) Every day collect from fair shop supplier  
 (v) Corridor (vi) Any other (specify)

## 10. MDM Managing Committee

(a) Details of the staff of the MDM

Sl. No.	Staff	Number	Honorarium (Rs./Month)
(i)	Kitchen in charge		
(ii)	Store in charge		
(iii)	Head cook		
(iv)	Cooks		
(v)	Helpers		
(vi)	Sweepers		
(vii)	Any other		
	Total		

(b) Process of appointment of staffs engaged in meal making:

(c) Is there any PTA committee involved: Yes / No

(d) Is there any senior citizen involved: Yes / No

(e) Is there any health worker involved: Yes / No

## 11. Preparation

(a) Is there any separate cooking shed for cooking: Yes / No

(b) What is the fuel used for cooking: ( )  
(i) LPG (ii) Wood (iii) Any other Specify

(c) Are utensils washed before used: Yes / No

(d) Are there any facilities of refrigeration: ( )

(e) Are food items washed before preparation: Yes / No

(f) Are prepared food items kept covered: Yes / No

(g) What is the timing lapse between food prepared and food serving? ( )  
(i) Half an hour (ii) 1 hour (iii) 2 hour (iv) More than 2 hour

## 12. MDM distribution

(a) How often meals are served in a day: ( )  
(i) Once (ii) Twice

(b) How meals are served? ( )  
(i) On the plates brought by the students (ii) On the plates given by the school  
(iii) On the paper (iv) On the leaf

(c) Who provides utensils? ( )  
(i) Government (ii) School arrange (iii) Parents (iv) Others (Specify)

(d) Where MDM is served? ( )  
(i) Class room (ii) School varanda  
(iii) Open place in school. (iv) Others (Specify)

(e) Is the same menu being served every day : Yes / No

(f) If no, provide the list of menu for different days in a week ?



- (g) Who prepare the menu ? ( )  
 (i) Fixed by higher officials (ii) MDM committee  
 (iii) HM/Teachers (iv) Students (v) Combination of all
- (h) Do the students eat all foods: Yes / No
- (i) In case some foods are left out, what you do with that ? ( )  
 (i) Tell the students to take their home  
 (ii) The workers took their home  
 (iii) Throw it outside
- (j) Action taken by the MDM in charge for meal distribution to children in case of non-availability of cooked food: ( )  
 (i) Fruits distributed (ii) Informed children to bring lunch  
 (iii) Cancel class after tiffin hour (iv) No action
- (k) Amount of food served per child ( )  
 (i) 0-50g (ii) 50-100g (iii) 100-150g (iv) 150-200g  
 (v) 200-250g (vi) above 250g.
- (l) Is the same amount of food served to all students: Yes / No
- (m) Do all the students eat together: Yes / No
- (n) If no, why ? ( )  
 (i) Caste feeling (ii) Parents do not allow their children  
 (iii) Due to un-hygenic (iv) Any other, specify
- (o) Do all students having their meal in school: Yes / No
- (p) If no, what percent are not eating: \_\_\_\_\_
- (q) If no, why: ( )  
 (i) Their parents are not allowing (ii) Food are not taste  
 (iii) Some do not want to share the place with others (iv) Unhygienic condition  
 (v) Any others, specify

### 13. Water

- (a) Do you have source of drinking water in school: Yes / No
- (b) Is the water supply regular: Yes / No
- (c) If Yes, then:

Source of water (i) Tap (ii) Hand Pump (iii) Tube well (iv) Any other	
Is it stored	Yes / No
Is it kept covered	Yes / No
How is water drawn from stored container (i) Ladle (ii) Glass using bare hands (iii) Others	
Is the water supply adequate for children ?	Yes / No

(d) If water is stored, which type of vessel used to use ?

(i) Metal	
(ii) Plastic	
(iii) Any other (specify)	
(iv) Combination of both the above	

(e) How long has the water been stored ? ( )

(i) 12 hours (ii) 1 day (iii) 2 days (iv) More than 2 days

(f) Do the children bring their own water bottles from home ? Yes / No

(g) If yes, the percentage of children bringing water bottles from home ? ( )

(i) 0 – 25 % (ii) 26 – 50 %  
(iii) 51 – 75 % (iv) 76 – 100 %

(h) In case of non-availability of water, children have water from ( )

(i) Outside the school (ii) Share water with friends (iii) Any other

#### 14. Post Lunch

(a) Who washed the utensils after eating ? ( )

(i) Students themselves (ii) Students took to their home  
(iii) Workers appointed by school (iv) Any other, specify

(b) Is there any washing areas are there in school: Yes / No

(c) Utensils are cleaned with ( )

(i) Only water (ii) Water + detergent/soap  
(iii) Scrubber + detergent/shop (iv) Any other, specify

(d) Kitchen waste disposal

(i)	Garbage bins provided	
(ii)	Through around the MDM centre	
(iii)	Through outside centre	

#### 15. Monitoring

(a) Do any higher authority visits for inspection of MDM: Yes / No

(b) If yes, how frequently ? ( )

(i) Once in every fortnight (ii) Once in a month  
(iii) Once in every three months (iv) Yearly once

(c) If no, why: ( )

(i) More distance (ii) No proper communication facilities  
(iii) No complain (iv) No idea

**16. Level of Satisfaction**

- (a) Level of satisfaction with MDM programme: ( )  
 (i) Fully satisfied (ii) Satisfied (iii) OK  
 (iv) Not satisfied (v) Not at all satisfied
- (b) If not, why: ( )  
 (i) Burden (ii) Waste of time
- (c) Has the enrollment increased after implementation of MDM: Yes / No
- (d) Has the attendance increased after implementation of MDM: Yes / No
- (e) Has the span of attention of the students increased after implementation of MDM: Yes / No
- (f) Do you have any comment on this scheme: (specify)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- (g) Do you maintain any records or not: Yes / No

**17. Personal Evaluation through observation**

- (a) Cleanliness of Different Areas

	<b>Cooking</b>	<b>Distribution area 5 (b)</b>
(i) Clean and dry		
(ii) Well lit / ventilated		
(iii) Insects / pest infestation		
(iv) Overall rating of the area		

Code: (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good

- (b) Food Evaluation

<b>Sensory evaluation</b>	<b>Rating</b>
(i) Appearance	
(ii) Taste	
(iii) Smell	
(iv) Texture	
(v) Overall acceptability	

Code : (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good

Remarks:

Name of the Investigator:

# COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad-500 030

## EVALUATION STUDIES ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA

### PARENTS

1. Name of the Respondent:
2. Parents of :
3. Age:
5. Educational Qualification:
7. Monthly Income of the family: ( )  
(a) Below 1 thousand (b) 1000-2,500 (c) 2,500-5,000 (d) 5,000-10,000  
(e) 10,000-20,000 (f) More than 20,000
8. Caste:
9. Religion:
10. Do you send your children to school every day: Yes / No
11. Do you allow them to have their meal in school: Yes / No
12. If no, why: ( )  
(a) Food is not hygienic (b) Quality is not good (c) Quantity is not enough  
(d) Social discrimination (e) Any other, specify
13. Do you feel cooked meals as substitute or supplement to regular food: Yes / No
12. Impact of MDM on the children:  
(a) Weight gain Yes / No  
(b) Frequency of falling ill Increase/ Decrease/ Constant  
(c) More active in the studies Yes / No  
(d) Performance increased Yes / No  
(e) Do you feel it has increased nutrition of your children Yes / No
13. Were you satisfied with the quality of food ? Yes / No
14. Do you feel MDM has disturbed the teaching activities in the school: Yes / No
15. Did you ever gave any complain/suggestion for the betterment of MDM: Yes / No
16. If yes, mention the staff and his/ her position to whom you gave complain: \_\_\_\_\_
17. How regularly meal is served ( )  
(a) Everyday (b) \_\_\_\_\_ times in a week (c) \_\_\_\_\_ times in a month
18. Your opinion on hygienic ness of food ( )  
(a) Good (b) Fair (c) Bad
19. Impact of MDM on motivation of children to attend the school: ( )  
(a) Going regularly (b) Going sometimes (c) Going only for food  
(d) Not going (e) Anything else, specify
20. Impact of meals on afternoon attendance ( )  
(a) Increased (b) No impact (c) Decreased
21. What you feel the impact of MDM on socialization process of children: ( )  
(a) Increased (b) Decreased (c) No impact
22. Suggestions to overcome shortcomings of the scheme:

Remarks:

Name of the Investigator:

# COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad-500 030

## EVALUATION STUDIES ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA STUDENTS

### General Information:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Father's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: \_\_\_\_\_  
Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Caste: \_\_\_\_\_  
Religion: \_\_\_\_\_ School Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Village: \_\_\_\_\_  
Block: \_\_\_\_\_ District: \_\_\_\_\_

Shift you visited: ( ) - (a) Morning (b) Evening (c) Both

1. Do you come to school regularly: Yes / No
2. If no, why? ( )  
(a) Work at home (b) No interest in reading (c) Parents do not allow me to come  
(d) Any other, specify
2. Do you eat MDM at school: Yes / No
3. Frequency of eating: ( )  
(a) Daily (b) Once in a week (c) Twice in a week (d) Thrice in a week  
(e) Four times in a week (f) Five times in a week (g) Six times in a week
3. If no, why: ( )  
(a) It is not taste (b) It is not hygienic (c) Quantity is very less  
(d) My parents do not allow me (e) My mother gives my lunch box every day  
(f) Social discrimination (g) Any other
3. If yes, do you get regular MDM: Yes / No
4. Name of the dish, which is liked the most: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Name of the dish, which is disliked the most: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you eat the entire amount of food given to you: Yes / No
7. Do you ask more serving: Yes / No
8. Do you eat before coming to school: Yes / No
9. Do you eat after going home: Yes / No
10. Do your school provide MDM regularly: Yes / No
11. If no, have you asked about the reason for not serving: Yes / No
12. Time of distribution of MDM: \_\_\_\_\_
13. What is the total time taken for food distribution: \_\_\_\_\_
14. Do the MDM management committee ever asked you about your choice of food items: Yes / No
15. Do you bring your lunch box to school: Yes / No
16. Do any of you involved in menu planning: Yes / No
17. Do any of your parents involved in menu planning: Yes / No

Remarks:

Name of the Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

# COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad-500 030

## EVALUATION STUDIES ON MID DAY MEAL PROGRAMME IN MEGHALAYA

### FOOD SUPPLIER PROVIDER : WHOLE SELLERS / FAIR PRICE SHOP DEALER

1. Date of visit:
2. Name of the Wholesellers:
3. Address:
4. MDM supply started (year):
5. Procurement and storage of food items -

Sl. No.	Raw materials	Quantity purchased at one time (quintal)	Code-1	Code-2	Code-3	Code-4
			Source of buying	Frequency	Container used for storage	Quality in your view
1	Cereals					
2	Pulses					
3	Vegetables					
4	Spices					
5	Oils					
6	Any other (specify)					

Code-1: (a) FCI (b) From farm (c) APMC (d) Any other source (specify)

Code-2: (a) Daily (b) Weekly (c) Fortnightly (d) Monthly

Code-3: (a) Ground (b) Bag (c) Drum

Code-4: (a) Good (b) Average (c) Poor

6. Do you check for the following parameters of quality in the ingredients?

	Yes	No
(a) Stones		
(b) Insects		
(c) Over ripeness		
(d) Bad odor		
(e) Any other (specify)		

7. Where are the containers containing raw ingredients placed? ( )  
 (a) On a raised platform (b) Floors (c) Any others (specify)
8. Do you receive the food items in time: ( )  
 (a) Always (b) Sometimes (c) Never
9. If no, why - ( )  
 (a) The supplying agency is not giving in time  
 (b) The adequate quantity is not available  
 (c) Quality of supply is not good.  
 (d) Lack of transport facilities  
 (e) Lack of storing facilities  
 (f) Any other (specify)

10. Storing facility:

Adequate space	Cleanliness	Dryness	Ventilation

Code : (a) Poor (b) Average (c) Good

11. Whom do you supply food items: ( )  
 (a) MDM managing committee (b) Fair price shop,  
 (c) School (d) Any others (specify)
12. Total number of fair price shops / MDMC Managing Committee / School to whom you are supplying: ( )
13. How much quantity you are supplying to each fair price shops / MDMC Managing Committee / School:

Sl. No.	Raw materials	Quantity supplied at one time (quintal)	Code-1: Frequency of supplying materials
1	Cereals	Rice	
		Wheat	
2	Pulses		
3	Vegetables		
4	Spices		
5	Oils		
6	Any other specify		

Code-1: (a) Weekly (b) Fortnightly (c) Monthly

14. Do you receive the money immediately from the fair price shops: ( )  
 (a) Always (b) Sometimes (c) Never
15. Where are you procuring all those materials: ( )  
 (a) FCI (b) Mediators (c) APMCs (d) Farmers directly (e) Any other, specify
16. Do you procure those materials in time: ( )  
 (a) Always (b) Sometimes (c) Never
17. If no, why - ( )  
 (a) The supplying agency is not giving in time  
 (b) The adequate quantity is not available  
 (c) Quality of supply is not good.  
 (d) Lack of transport facilities  
 (e) Lack of storing facilities  
 (f) Any other (specify)
18. Methods of delivering materials: ( )  
 (a) Lifting by fair price shop / MDM MC (b) Delivery at fair price shop / MDM MC  
 (c) Mix of A & B
19. Do any higher authority comes for a surprise checking of the material: ( )  
 (a) Always (b) Sometimes (c) Never
20. Name of the Agency : Designation:
21. Frequency of visiting: ( )  
 (a) Fortnight (b) Monthly (c) Quarterly (d) Six month (e) Yearly

Remarks:

Name of the Investigator: