



**OVERVIEW
OF
THE MONITORING INSTITUTIONS'
ACTIVITIES UNDER
SARVA SHISKHA ABHIYAN
(As on 1st January, 2011)**

Overview of the Monitoring Institutions' activities under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) is an initiative of the Government of India to achieve the goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education. For successful implementation of the programme, an effective monitoring system is essential. Monitoring is very important for any programme and it is required on continuous basis. The Ministry felt that it would be more fruitful to involve professional institutions in this task. Accordingly, the Department of School Education & Literacy, during the year 2003-2004, had identified key monitoring institutions to monitor the implementation of the programme in the States/ UTs.

2. During the year 2005-06, it was decided to **revamp the system** so that the MIs are fully aware of the areas that needed to be covered in their concurrent monitoring reports and the outputs are relevant, pointed and factually based. To facilitate the revision, a meeting of MIs was held on 12.07.2005 at New Delhi. Based on the discussion, a draft TOR was prepared. The broad highlights of the revised TOR (2006-08) were also shared with State Education Secretaries in a meeting held on 22-23rd September, 2005 at New Delhi. Their suggestions were incorporated in the revised TOR (2006-08), which were again discussed with the monitoring institutions in a meeting held on 14.12.2005 at New Delhi. The revised TOR (2006-0) were accepted by the MIs and approved by the Ministry. **The Salient features of the Terms of Reference (TOR) (2006-08) are given below:**

- The Monitoring institution would be engaged for a 2 year period.
- The scope of work would now include MDM and KGBV in addition to SSA
- 5% of Elementary Schools /EGS/AIE centre would be visited during period of two years. Viz. 2006-07 and 2007-08
- There would be six monthly reports covering 25% of the number of Districts allotted to the Monitoring Institutes.
- The Costing has been revised
- The tasks have been detailed.
- The SPO &DPO must share latest physical, financial progress with MI as per TORs.
- Monitoring Institutions will furnish their six monthly reports to SPO and GOI

3. As per the revised TOR (2006-08) the monitoring institutions were required to sign a MOU with GOI to under take monitoring activities in the States/UTs, for a period of two years (2006-08).The said ToR came into effect from 1st April 2006. **41 Monitoring Institutions had signed the MOU with the Ministry.**

4. According to the TOR (2006-08), the Ministry had received 155 half yearly monitoring reports covering 563 districts during the year 2006-07 and 2007-08 covering all the 35 States/UTs by the 41 Monitoring Institutions. The Ministry had started follow-up action on the report submitted by MIs.

5. The TOR for the year 2006-08 ended on 31-03-2008. The Ministry prepared a new TOR for the year 2008-2010 on the similar lines of TOR 2006-08. **The salient features of the revised TOR 2008-10 are given below :**

- The Monitoring institution to be engaged for 2 years period (2008-10) w.e.f. 01.08.2008..
- The scope of work includes MDM and KGBV in addition to SSA.
- 5% of Elementary Schools /EGS/AIE centre will be visited during period of two years. Viz. 2008-09 and 2009-10.
- There would be six monthly reports covering 25% of the number of Districts allotted to the Monitoring Institutes.
- The period of six monthly report for the 1st six months of 2008-09 is 1.08.2008 to

31.01.2009 and date of submission of report is 28.02.2009/ 31.03.2009 (as per the minutes). The 2nd six months of 2008-09 period is 1.02.2009 to 31.07.2009 and the date of submission of the report is 30.08.2009.

- The period of six monthly report for the 1st six months of 2009-10 is 1.08.2009 to 31.01.2010 and date of submission of report is 28.02.2010. The 2nd six months of 2009-10 period is 1.02.2010 to 31.07.2010 and the date of submission of the report is 30.08.2010.
- The Costing has been revised
- The tasks have been detailed.
- The SPO & DPO must share latest physical, financial progress with MI as per TORs.
- Monitoring Institutions would furnish their six monthly reports to SPO and GOI

6. The Ministry has received 42 MOUs for undertaking monitoring activities for the year 2008-10. The details are given at **Annexure-I**

7. According to the TOR (2008-10), the Ministry has received 43 half yearly monitoring reports covering 156 districts during the 1st six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009 covering 27 States and 4 UTs from 39 Monitoring Institutions. The State wise & Institute wise detail of the reports received is given at **Annexure-II**.

The summary of status of the 1st half yearly monitoring reports of the year 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2009 to 31.01.2009 is given in the **Annexure-III**. The reports received from the MIs' are shared and discussed during the Project Approval Board (PAB) meetings held during the month of February 2009 to May 2009 while considering the Annual Work Plan & Budget 2009-10 of 35 States/UTs. The MIs observations are included in the Appraisal notes of each state and UT. The MI's observations are considered in the PAB meetings also. The Ministry/TSG is taking necessary follow-up action on the report submitted by MIs.

8. Similarly, the Ministry has received 35 half yearly monitoring reports covering 120 districts during the 2nd six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.02.2009 to 31.07.2009 covering 27 states/UT's from 24 MI's The detail of the reports received is given in **Annexure-IV**.

A summary of Reports, covered district & States for the ToR (year 2008-10) is given Below
:

	2008-09		2009-10		Total (2008-10)s
	1st Six Months	2nd Six Months	1st Six Months	2nd Six Months	
Reports	43	35	19	19	116
Districts	156	120	75	60	411

The TOR for the year 2008-10 has ended on 31-07-2010

9. After enactment of RTE Act, 2009 the education scenario has changed and in order to undertake the field monitoring more intensively and rigorously, the Ministry has recently revised the Terms of Reference (ToR) with consultation with MIs, in a National Review Meeting held in June, 2010 for Monitoring of SSA-RTE. The revised ToR would be for two years and is effective from Oct. 1st, 2010, a copy of revised MOU with TOR in at **Annexure-V**. So far, 35 Monitoring Institutes (list at Annexure VI) have already signed the Memorandum of Association (MoU) as per revised ToR for the period of two years i.e. Oct. 1st, 2010 to Sept. 30th, 2012 and remaining are in the process. Some new Institutes/Universities like National Institute of Technology (NIT), Tiruchirappalli, Tezpur University and Dibrugarh University have also given their consent to undertake the monitoring of SSA interventions. The salient features of the revised TOR for 2010-12 are as under:-

1. The MI shall monitor the Schemes with the objectives of (i) assessment and analysis of the implementation of the approved interventions and processes underlying these interventions at the habitation and school level keeping in view the overarching goals of these schemes and the provisions under RTE Act, 2009 and (ii) identification of the social, cultural, linguistic or other barriers coming in the way of successful implementation of the

schematic interventions and attainment of these goals.

2. The MI shall cover all the districts allotted to it during the period of two years and 40 Elementary Schools in a block of 6 months in each of the districts to be covered during that period. It is obvious, therefore, that the MI will cover one fourth of the districts allotted to it in the every block of 6 months.
3. If the MI is allotted state/UT having four or less than four districts, it must cover one district in every block of 6 months even if it means covering the same district in each of the four blocks.
4. The MI shall select the schools to be visited, as far as possible, as per the following criteria:
 - (a) Higher gender gap in enrolment,
 - (b) Higher proportion of SC/ST students,
 - (c) Low retention rate and higher drop-out rate
 - (d) Schools with a minimum of three CWSN.
 - (e) The habitation where the school is located at has sizeable number of OoSC.
 - (f) The habitations where the school is located at witnesses in-bound and out-bound seasonal migration,
 - (g) The habitation where the school is located at is known to have sizeable number of urban deprived children.
 - (h) The school is located in a forest or far flung area.
 - (i) The habitation where the school is located at witnesses recurrent floods or some other natural calamity.
5. The MI shall also ensure that at least eight out of 40 schools are from urban areas, six are with Special Training Centers (three residential and three non-residential) attached to it, two have civil works sanctioned for them, two are from NPEGEL blocks and three have a minimum of three CWSN (priority to those having other than Orthopedically Impaired children), three each are covered under the Computer Aided Learning (CAL) and KGBV scheme.
6. The selection of schools shall be done on the basis of the latest school report card generated through DISE, HHS data and consultation with the district SSA functionaries. The procedure and criteria adopted for the selection of schools shall form an essential part of the MI's report.
7. The MI shall carefully select the persons, if someone other than the nodal officer is to undertake the monitoring, and ensure that they are properly and adequately trained. However, under no circumstances the responsibility of monitoring shall be outsourced or sublet to any other agency and the collection of data be seen as an exercise not integral to the overall responsibility of monitoring. Besides, the Nodal Officer must visit himself / herself at least one third of the selected schools in every block of 6 months, and make a mention in the report to be submitted to TSG/MHRD.

List of Monitoring Institutions (42) signed MOU during the year 2008-10

Sl. No.	Name of the Monitoring Institution	State/UT
1.	National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh
2.	Rajiv Gandhi University, Itanagar	Arunachal Pradesh
3.	Gauhati University, Guwahati	Assam
4.	Jamia Millia Islamia, Delhi	Bihar
5.	A.N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies, Patna	Bihar
6.	Regional Institute of Education, Bhopal	Chhattisgarh
7.	Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda (M.S.), Vadodara	Gujarat Daman & Diu
8.	Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, Ahmedabad	Gujarat
9.	Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Haryana
10.	Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla	Himachal Pradesh
11.	University of Jammu	Jammu & Kashmir
12.	University of Kashmir, Srinagar	Jammu & Kashmir
13.	Xavier Institute of Social Service, Ranchi.	Jharkhand
14.	Institute for Social & Economic Change, Bangalore	Karnataka
15.	Regional Institute of Education, Mysore	Karnataka
16.	Centre for Development Studies Trivandrum	Kerala Lakshadweep
17.	Tata Institute of Social Science, Mumbai	Maharashtra Goa
18.	Madhya Pradesh Institute of Social Science Research, Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh
19.	Indian Institute of Education, Pune	Maharashtra Dadra & Nagar Haveli
20.	Manipur University, Manipur	Manipur
21.	North Eastern Hills University, Shillong	Meghalaya
22.	Mizoram University	Mizoram
23.	Nagaland University	Nagaland
24.	Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar	Orissa
25.	Dr. Parshuram Mishra Institute of Advanced Study in Education Sambalpur	Orissa
26.	Punjab University, Chandigarh	Punjab
27.	Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur	Rajasthan
28.	Social Policy and Research Institution, Jaipur	Rajasthan
29.	Centre for Development and Communication Studies, Jaipur	Rajasthan
30.	University of North Bengal, Darjeeling	Sikkim
31.	IIT Madras	Tamil Nadu
32.	Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore	Tamil Nadu
33.	Tripura University, Tripura	Tripura
34.	Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
35.	Govind Ballabh Pant Social Science Institute, Allahabad	Uttar Pradesh
36.	Centre of Advanced Development Research, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
37.	University of Lucknow, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
38.	National Institute of Administrative Research, Mussoorie	Uttaranchal
39.	Indian Institute of Management, Kolkata	West Bengal Andaman & Nicobar
40.	Visva - Bharti University, Sriniketan	West Bengal
41.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi	Delhi

42.	Pondicherry University, Puducherry	Puducherry
-----	------------------------------------	------------

Note Please:

(i) 2 New MIs Social Policy and Research Institution, Jaipur, Centre for Development and Communication Studies, Jaipur has signed MOU for the period 1-02-2009 to 31-07-2010 (1 year and six months only).

(ii) 1 MI Gauhati University, Guwahati has signed MOU for the period 1-02-2009 to 31-07-2010 (1 year and six months only).

(iii) 1 MI i.e. Madhya Pradesh Institute of Social Science Research, Ujjain has signed MOU for the period 1-02-2009 to 31-07-2010 (1 year and six months only) for additional 18 districts in Madhya Pradesh earlier handling by TISS, Mumbai . TISS Mumbai has assigned 25 districts in Madhya Pradesh State .According they have undertaken monitoring activities in 7 districts in 1st Six months of 2008-09 for the period 1-08-2009 to 31-01-2009. The 18 districts they have to undertake monitoring activities during the one years and six months. TISS Mumbai has withdrawn in undertaking monitoring activities for 18 districts. The same work i.e. 18 district monitoring has been given to MPISSR, Ujjain.

ANNEXURE –II**I. List of Monitoring Institutions who have submitted 1st six months of 2008-09 reports for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009 covering 27 States and 4 UTs from 39 Monitoring Institutions**

Sl. No.	Name of the MI	State	No of reports receive	No Districts Monitored	Name of the districts monitored
States					
1.	National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh	1	6	1. Chittoor 2. Hyderabad 3. Karimnagar 4. Krishana 5. Medak 6. Nalgonda
2.	Rajiv Gandhi University, Itanagar	Arunachal Pradesh	1	4	1. Lower Subansiri 2. Upper Subansiri 3. West Siang 4. Upper Siang
3.	Jamia Millia Islamia, Delhi	Bihar	1	5	1. Aurangabad 2. Gaya 3. Jahanabad 4. Nawada 5. Rohtas
4.	A.N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies, Patna	Bihar	1	5	1. Khagaria 2. Lakhisarai 3. Munger 4. Sheikhpura 5. Sheohar
5.	Regional Institute of Education, Bhopal	Chhattisgarh	1	5	1. Bilaspur 2. Dhamtari 3. Kabirdham 4. Rajnandgaon 5. Durg
6.	The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda	Gujarat	1	4	1. Kutch 2. Narmada 3. Navsari 4. Panchmahals
		Daman & Diu	1	2	1. Daman 2. Diu
7.	Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research	Gujarat	1	3	1. Gandhinagar 2. Mehsana 3. Banaskantha
8.	Kurukshetra University	Haryana	1	5	1. Bhiwani 2. Hisar 3. Karnal 4. Rewari 5. Panipat
9.	Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	1	3	1. Mandi 2. Hamirpur 3. Sirmour
10.	University of Jammu	Jammu & Kashmir	1	3	1. Poonch 2. Samba 3. Reasi
11.	University of Kashmir, Srinagar	Jammu & Kashmir	1	3	1. Kulgam, 2. Ganderbal 3. Bandipora

Sl. No.	Name of the MI	State	No of reports receive	No Districts Monitored	Name of the districts monitored
12.	Xavier Institute of Social Sciences, Ranchi	Jharkhand	1	6	1. Bokaro 2. Dhanbad 3. Giridih 4. Koderma 5. Hazaribag 6. Chatra
13.	Institute for Social & Economic Change, Bangalore	Karnataka	1	5	1. Kodagu 2. Dakshina Kannada 3. Udupi 4. Belgaum 5. Chikkodi
14.	Regional Institute of Education, Mysore	Karnataka	1	3	1. Bidar 2. Raichur 3. Dharwad
15.	Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum	Kerala	1	4	1. Thiruvananthapuram 2. Kollam 3. Kottayam 4. Wayanad
16.	Tata Institute of Social Science, Mumbai	Madhya Pradesh	1	7	1. Vidisha 2. Sehore 3. Rajgarh 4. Guna 5. Bhopal 6. Ashoknagar 7. Harda
		Goa	1	1	North Goa
		Maharashtra	1	4	1. Mumbai Main 2. Mumbai Suburban 3. Nandurbar 4. Thane
17.	Madhya Pradesh Institute of Social Science Research, Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh	1	7	1. Shajapur 2. Rewa 3. Damoh 4. Umaria 5. Anuppur 6. Sheopur 7. Shahdol
18.	Indian Institute of Education, Pune	Maharashtra	1	5	1. Washim 2. Hingoli, 3. Parbhani, 4. Nanded 5. Latur
19.	North Eastern Hills University, Shillong	Meghalaya	1	2	1. Ri Bhoi 2. Jaintia Hills
20.	Mizoram University	Mizoram	1	2	1. Mamit 2. Kolasib
21.	Manipur University, Imphal, Manipur	Manipur	1	3	1. Senapati 2. Tamenglong 3. Ukhrul
22.	Nagaland University	Nagaland	1	1	1. Zunheboto

Sl. No.	Name of the MI	State	No of reports receive	No Districts Monitored	Name of the districts monitored
23.	Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar	Orissa	1	5	1. Nayagarh 2. Bhadrak 3. Gajapati 4. Ganjam 5. Mayurbhanj
24.	Dr. Parshuram Mishra Institute of Advanced Study in Education Sambalpur	Orissa	1	3	1. Sundargarh 2. Deogarh 3. Kalahandi
25.	Punjab University, Chandigarh	Punjab	1	5	1. Fatehgarh sahib 2. Hoshiarpur 3. Jalandhar 4. Kapurthala 5. Patiala
26.	Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur	Rajasthan	1	4	1. Ajmer 2. Baran 3. Bikaner 4. Chittorgarh
27.	University of North Bengal	Sikkim	1	1	1. East Sikkim
28.	IIT Madras	Tamil Nadu	1	3	1. Nagapattinam 2. Thiruvarur 3. Theni
29.	Indian Institute of Management Bangalore	Tamil Nadu	1	5	1. Erode 2. Coimbatore 3. Namakkal 4. Karur 5. Nilgiris
30.	Tripura University, Tripura	Tripura	1	1	1. South Tripura
31.	Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	1	5	1. Sitapur 2. Bahraich 3. Lakhimpur Kheri 4. Balrampur 5. Shrawasti
32.	Govind Ballabh Pant Social Science Institute, Allahabad	Uttar Pradesh	1	4	1. Varanasi 2. Azamgarh 3. Bhadohi S.R.N. 4. Ballia
33.	Centre of Advanced Development Research, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	1	6	1. Lalitpur 2. Jalaun 3. Hamirpur 4. Mahamaya Nagar 5. Etawah 6. Mathura
34.	University of Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	1	3	1. Badaun 2. Bareilly 3. Shahjahanpur
35.	NIAR Massoorie	Uttarakhand	1	3	1. Haridwar 2. Uttarkashi 3. Pauri

Sl. No.	Name of the MI	State	No of reports receive	No Districts Monitored	Name of the districts monitored
36.	Visva - Bharti University, Sriniketan	West Bengal	1	3	1. Birbhum 2. Bankaura 3. Murshidabad
37.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi	Delhi	1	3	1. Central Delhi 2. North East 3. New Delhi
38.	Pondicherry University, Puducherry	Puducherry	1	1	1. Mahe
39.	IIM Kolkata	West Bengal	1	1	1. Kolkata
		Andaman and Nicobar	1	2	1. North & Middle Andaman 2. South Andaman
	Total MI : 39 MIs	Total reports Receive d: 43	43	Total Districts monitored : 156	

* One MI Gauhati University, Gauhati has not signed the MOU for the 1st Six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009

II. List of Monitoring Institutions who not have submitted 1st half yearly/ six months of 2008-09 reports for the period of 1.02.2009 to 31.07.2009 from 1 Monitoring Institution for one district

Sl. No.	Name of the MI	State	No of reports receive	No Districts not monitored	Name of the district for which monitoring activities not taken place
1.	IIM Kolkata	West Bengal	1	1	24 North Parganas

III. Status of reports for the 1st Six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009

Sl. No.	Reports	Status
1.	Total number of reports to be received for 1 st Six of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009	43
2.	Reports received	43
3.	Total number of States to be covered	27 States
4.	Covered States	27 States
5.	States not involved in monitoring activities for the 1 st Six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1-08-2008 to 31-01-2009	1 State (Assam state) One MI Gauhati University, Gauhati has not signed the MOU for the 1 st Six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009
6.	Total Number of UTs to be covered	4 UTs
7.	Covered UTs.	4 i.e. Delhi, A&N, Puducherry, Daman & Diu
8.	UTs not involved in monitoring activities for the 1 st Six months of 2008-09 for the period of 1.08.2008 to 31.01.2009 3 MI's (i) IIE Pune for Dadra and N. Haveli, (ii) Punjab University for Chandigarh UT (iii) Centre for Development Studies for Lakshadweep ** 3 MIs of the above have informed that they have undertaken monitoring activities in the concerned states like Maharashtra, Kerala & Punjab. As they are not able to get time to do monitoring activities they informed that they will undertake monitoring activities during 2 nd six months of 2008-09 i.e. for the period 1.02.2009 to 31.07.2009 for the districts assigned. The Ministry has approved the same.	**3 i.e. Darda & N. Havel, Chandigarh and Lakshadweep
9.	Total Number of districts to be covered:	157
10.	Total Number of districts covered	156
11.	Total Number of districts pending	1 i.e. 24 North Parganas district in the state of West Bengal to be monitored by IIM Kolkata
12.	Total Number of MIs to submit reports	39
13.	Number of MI's submitted reports	39 MI's submitted 43 reports

IV. List of Monitoring Institutions who have submitted 2nd half yearly/ six months of 2008-09 reports for the period of 1.02.2009 to 31.07.2009 from 31 Monitoring Institutions (35 reports)

Sl. No.	Name of MI	State / UT	No of reports to be received	No. of districts Allocated for 2 nd installment of 2008-09	Name of the districts monitored
1.	National Institute of Rural Development	Andhra Pradesh	1	6	1. Adilabad 2. Guntur 3. Kurnool 4. Mahabubnagar 5. Prakasam 6. Ranga Reddy
2.	Rajiv Gandhi University	Arunachal Pradesh	1	4	1. Changlang 2. Lohit 3. Lower Dibang Valley 4. Kurung Kumey
3.	Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi	Bihar	1	5	1. Banka 2. Bhojpur 3. Buxar 4. Kaimur 5. Nalanda
4.	A. N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies, Patna	Bihar	1	5	1. Begusarai 2. Jamui 3. Katihar 4. Sitamarhi 5. Siwan
5.	Regional Institute of Education, Shyamla Hills, Bhopal (MP)	Chhattisgarh	1	5	1. Jaspur 2. Korba 3. Korea 4. Mahasamund 5. Sarguja
6.	Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Haryana	1	5	1. Panchkula, 2. Kaithal, 3. Fatehabad, 4. Sirsa, 5. Gurgaon
7.	Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	1	3	1. Shimla 2. Lahaul & Spiti 3. Kinnaur
8.	Xavier Institute of Social Service, Ranchi	Jharkhand	1	6	1. Jamtara 2. Deoghar 3. Godda 4. Sahibganj 5. Pakur 6. Dumka

9.	M.P. Institute of Social Science Research, Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh	1	6	1. Chhatarpur 2. Panna 3. Satna 4. Sidhi 5. Singrauli 6. Shivpuri
10.	North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong	Meghalaya	1	2	1. West Khasi Hills 2. West Garo Hills
11.	Mizoram University	Mizoram	1	2	1. Aizawl 2. Champhai
12.	NKC Centre for development studies, Orissa.	Orissa	1	4	1. Jajpur 2. Balasore 3. Boudh 4. Kandhamal
13.	Dr. P. M. Institute of Advanced Study in Education, sambalpur	Orissa	1	3	1. Nabarangpur 2. N u a p a d a 3. K o r a p u t
14.	Panjab University	Punjab	1	5	1. Gurdaspur 2. Ludhiana 3. Mohali 4. Nawanshahar 5. Ropar
		Chandigarh	1	1	Chandigarh
15.	Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur	Rajasthan	1	4	1. Dungarpur 2. Jaisalmer 3. Pali 4. Pratappgarh
16.	Indian Institute of Management Bangalore	Tamil Nadu	1	4	1. Thiruchirapally 2. Salem 3. Dharmapuri 4. Krishnagiri
17.	IIT Madras	Tamil Nadu	1	3	1. Kanniyakumari 2. Thoothukudi 3. Sivaganga
18.	Tripura University	Tripura	1	1	1. North Tripura
19.	Giri Institute of Development Studies	Uttar Pradesh	1	4	1. Sant Kabir Nagar 2. Siddharth Nagar 3. Hardoi 4. Barabanki
20.	G.B. Pant Social Science Institute, Allahabad	Uttar Pradesh	1	4	1. Mau 2. Chandauli 3. Fatehpur 4. Ghazipur
21.	National Institute of Administrative Research	Uttaranchal	1	4	1. Nainital, 2. Almora 3. Udham Singh 4. Nagar
22.	Visva - Bharati University	West Bengal	1	2	1. Howrah 2. Siliguri

23.	IIE Pune	Maharashtra	1	4	1. Bhandara 2. Gondia 3. Aurangabad 4. Jalna
		Dadra and N. Havel	1	1	1. Dadra and N. Haveli
24.	Centre of Advanced Development Research (CADR), Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	1	5	1. Farrukhabad 2. Auraiya 3. Mahoba 4. Chitrakoot 5. Kanpur Nagar
25.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi	Delhi	1	3	1. North Delhi 2. North West Delhi 3. West Delhi
26.	TISS Mumbai	Goa	1	1	1. North Goa
		Maharashtra	1	4	1. Dhule 2. Kolhapur 3. Jalgaon 4. Ahmednagar
27.	Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, Ahmedabad	Gujarat	1	3	1. Ahmadabad 2. Bhavnagar 3. Patan
28.	M S University of Baroda, Vadodara	Gujarat	1	4	1. Dangs 2. Junagadh 3. Porbandar 4. Surendranagar
29.	Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum	Kerala	1	3	1. Alappuza 2. Kozhicode 3. Pathanamthitta
		Lakshadweep	1	1	1. Lakshadweep
30.	Manipur University	Manipur	1	2	1. Chandel 2. Churachandpur
31.	Pondicherry University	Pondicherry	1	1	1. Puducherry
		31 MIs	35	120	

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is made on _____ day of _____ Month _____ 2010 between the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi and _____
(name of Monitoring Institute with full address).

2. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi – 110001, hereinafter referred to as Government of India (GOI), agreed to engage _____ (name of Monitoring Institute with complete address), hereinafter referred to as Monitoring Institute (MI), for monitoring implementation of SSA Programme including National Programme for Education of Girls at Elementary Level, Mid-day-Meal Scheme and Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidhyalaya Scheme, hereinafter referred to as Schemes, for two years from 1st October, 2010 to 30th September, 2012. The agreed terms and conditions of this engagement are detailed hereinafter.

3. The MI shall monitor the Schemes with the objectives of (i) assessment and analysis of the implementation of the approved interventions and processes underlying these interventions at the habitation and school level keeping in view the overarching goals of these schemes and the provisions under RTE Act, 2009 and (ii) identification of the social, cultural, linguistic or other barriers coming in the way of successful implementation of the schematic interventions and attainment of these goals.

- i. The MI shall cover all the districts allotted to it during the period of two years and 40 Elementary Schools in a block of 6 months in each of the districts to be covered during that period. It is obvious, therefore, that the MI will cover one fourth of the districts allotted to it in the every block of 6 months.
- ii. If the MI is allotted state/UT having four or less than four districts, it must cover one district in every block of 6 months even if it means covering the same district in each of the four blocks.
- iii. The MI shall select the schools to be visited, as far as possible, as per the following criteria: -
 - (j) Higher gender gap in enrolment,
 - (k) Higher proportion of SC/ST students,
 - (l) Low retention rate and higher drop-out rate
 - (m) Schools with a minimum of three CWSN.
 - (n) The habitation where the school is located at has sizeable number of OoSC.
 - (o) The habitations where the school is located at witnesses in-bound and out-bound seasonal migration,
 - (p) The habitation where the school is located at is known to have sizeable number of urban deprived children.
 - (q) The school is located in a forest or far flung area.
 - (r) The habitation where the school is located at witnesses recurrent floods or some other natural calamity.
- iv. The MI shall also ensure that at least eight out of 40 schools are from urban areas, six are with Special Training Centers (three residential and three non-residential) attached to it, two have civil works sanctioned for them, two are from NPEGEL blocks and three have a minimum of three CWSN (priority to those having other than Orthopedically Impaired

children), three each are covered under the Computer Aided Learning (CAL) and KGBV scheme.

- v. The selection of schools shall be done on the basis of the latest school report card generated through DISE, HHS data and consultation with the district SSA functionaries. The procedure and criteria adopted for the selection of schools shall form an essential part of the MI's report.
 - vi. The MI shall carefully select the persons, if someone other than the nodal officer is to undertake the monitoring, and ensure that they are properly and adequately trained. However, under no circumstances the responsibility of monitoring shall be outsourced or sublet to any other agency and the collection of data be seen as an exercise not integral to the overall responsibility of monitoring. Besides, the Nodal Officer must visit himself / herself at least one third of the selected schools in every block of 6 months, and make a mention in the report to be submitted to TSG/MHRD.
4. The MI shall undertake the monitoring in accordance with the Terms of Reference and the Tools for Monitoring enclosed with the MoU (**Annexure-A**).
 5. The Tools for Monitoring can be revised by the first party in consultation with the MI with a view to improving the quality of the monitoring as per the Terms of Reference enclosed.
 6. The MI shall submit the draft reports pertaining to SSA and MDM in respect of the districts covered in a block of 6 months within one month of the last date of that block to the State Project Director and the Director of the MDM scheme respectively. State Project Director and the Director of MDM scheme shall arrange for sharing of the draft report with the MI and district SSA/education department functionaries within 15 days of the receipt of the draft report and shall convey their comments thereon to the MI within 7 days of the meeting. The MI shall submit the final reports in respect of SSA and MDM within 15 days of receiving the comments of the SPD and Director, MDM. If the meetings at the State Project Office/Directorate of MDM are not held and their comments not received within the prescribed timeframe, MI shall not be required to wait any longer and shall go ahead with the finalization of the report. The final reports shall be addressed to the SPD of SSA & Director, MDM in the State/UT and separate copies thereof in respect of SSA and MDM be endorsed to the Consultants (Monitoring Institutes), TSG for SSA and MDM respectively and the designated officers in the Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.
 7. The Government of India shall supply a copy each of the approved Annual Work Plan and Budget and Appraisal Report for the state/UT concerned, SSA framework for implementation, SSA manual for procurement and financial management and proceedings of the workshops held under the various component to the MI to facilitate the monitoring.
 8. The MI shall approach the State Project Director for a meeting with the Programme Officers/Consultants of various components to discuss and have a clear idea of the programmatic aspects. The State Project Director shall arrange such meeting as early as possible, so that the schedule of school visits is not affected adversely.
 9. The MI shall furnish to the State Project Office and the District Project Office the complete programme of school visits to be undertaken in the six monthly block at least 10 days ahead of the first school to be visited and it shall be the responsibility of the District Project Director concerned to communicate this programme to the sub-district level functionaries, schools and school management committees concerned and to make the necessary arrangements for the transport and stay of the MI representatives.
 10. The GOI shall pay the MIs as per the costing detailed below: -
 - (i) The MI shall spend two full days for visit to each of the schools and be entitled to the payment of Rs. 3,000/- for each school monitored.
 - (ii) It shall be entitled to the payment of Rs. 25,000/- for contingent expenditure per district covered for the whole period of two years.
 - (iii) The MI shall be paid an amount of Rs. 15,000/- for the preparation of each of the

half yearly reports.

- (iv) The MI shall be entitled to the payment of the cost of training of 5 field investigators per district for 5 days @ Rs. 200/- per person per day for each block of 6 months.
- (v) The representatives of the MI undertaking the visits to the SPO/DPO/school shall be entitled to claim TA/DA as per the rules of the MI provided they do not avail the transport facility or hospitality from the SSA authorities. The TA/DA will be paid by the Monitoring Institute from the grants released by the Government of India and claimed as expenditure while seeking further release of grants. TA/DA claims will need to be submitted in the prescribed format together with all related bills in original and with a certificate that arrangements for transport and hospitality was not made by the SSA.

11. The details of the terms of payment by GOI will be as follows: -

- (i) The Government of India shall pay 75% of the entitled amount to the MIs as first installment of the first year, so that the MI can start the monitoring work of the second 6 monthly block immediately after submitting the report for the first 6 monthly block.
- (ii) Balance of 25% of the entitled amount for the first year shall be paid to the MI only after expenditure to the tune of 75% of the amount released as first installment is incurred and the expenditure statement duly certified by the Finance Office/Registrar of the MI is furnished and the report for the first half yearly block is submitted.
- (iii) 75% of the entitled amount to the MIs as 1st installment of the second year of the project shall be paid subject to furnishing of both the half yearly report of the previous year and incurring of expenditure of at least 75% of the funds released during previous year. The unspent balance with MI for the first year of the project will be adjusted while releasing the first installment of second year.
- (iv) 2nd installment for the second year of the project shall be released only after the MIs furnish both the half yearly reports for the second year of the project.

12. This MOU can be annulled at any time by both the sides by giving a notice of two months, giving the reasons for such action to the other.

13. In the event of any question, dispute or differences arising under or out of or in connection with the activities as above and as detailed in the Terms of Reference to the Monitoring Institutes, the same shall be referred to the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy or to any other person appointed by him.

Agreed and Accepted.

(Signature)

Authorized Signatory
Monitoring Institutes

(Signature)

Shri Ravi Chand
Under Secretary
Department of School Education & Literacy
Ministry of Human Resource Development
Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi

Name of MIs Signed MOU for 2010-12

Sl. No.	State/UT	Name of Monitoring Institution	MoU Status
1.	Andhra Pradesh	NIRD, Hyderabad	Received
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Rajiv Gandhi University	Received
3.	Bihar - 1	Jamia Millia, Delhi	Received
4.	Bihar - 2	A.N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies	Received
5.	Chhattisgarh	RIE, Bhopal	Received
6.	Gujarat - 1 , Daman & Diu	M. S. University of Baroda	Received
7.	Gujarat - 2	Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research	Received
8.	Haryana	Kurushetra University	Received
9.	Himachal Pradesh	Himachal University	Received
10.	Jammu & Kashmir-1	University of Jammu	Received
11.	Jammu & Kashmir-2	University of Kashmir	Received
12.	Jharkhand	Xavier Institute of Social Service (XISS)	Received
13.	Karnataka - 1	Institute for Social & Economic Change Bangalore	Received
14.	Karnataka - 2	RIE, Mysore	Received
15.	Madhya Pradesh - 2	MPISSR, Ujjain	Received
16.	Maharashtra - 1 , Dadra & N. Haveli	Indian Institute of Education, Pune	Received
17.	Meghalaya	NEHU, Shillong	Received
18.	Mizoram	Mizoram University	Received
19.	Orissa - 1	NKC Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar	Received
20.	Orissa - 2	Dr. P.M. Institute of Advanced Study in Education	Received
21.	Punjab , Chandigarh	Punjab University	Received
22.	Rajasthan - 1	Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur	Received
23.	Rajasthan - 2	Social Policy and Research Institution, Jaipur	Received
24.	Rajasthan - 3	Centre for Development and Communication Studies, Jaipur	Received
25.	Sikkim	University of North Bengal, Darjeeling, West Bengal	Received
26.	Tamil Nadu - 2	IIT Madras	Received
27.	Tripura	Tripura University	Received
28.	Uttar Pradesh - 1	Giri Institute of Social Science Institute, Lucknow	Received
29.	Uttar Pradesh - 2	GB Pant Social Science Institute Allahabad	Received
30.	Uttar Pradesh - 3	CADR, Lucknow	Received
31.	Uttar Pradesh - 4	University of Lucknow	Received
32.	Uttaranchal	NIAR, Mussoorie	Received
33.	West Bengal - 2	Visva-Bharati University	Received
34.	Delhi	Centre for Study of Developing Societies	Received

The matter is being pursued with remaining MIs.

Terms of Reference for the Monitoring of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan & Mid-Day Meal Programmes by the Monitoring Institutes (2010-12)

1. Objectives: -

- (i) Assessment and analysis of the implementation of the approved interventions and processes underlying these interventions at the habitation and school level keeping in view the overarching goals of these schemes and the provisions under RTE Act, 2009.
- (ii) Identification of the social, cultural, linguistic or other barriers coming in the way of successful implementation of the schematic interventions and attainment of these goals.

2. Scope of Work: -

The programmes to be covered are:-

- (i) Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan including National Programme for Education of Girls at Elementary Level and the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya Scheme.
- (ii) Mid-day meal scheme.

3. Duration of the ToR: -

This ToR will be in force for the period from 1st October, 2010 to 30th September, 2012.

4. Scale of work: -

- (i) The MI shall cover all the districts allotted to it during the period of two years and 40 Elementary schools in a block of 6 months in each of the districts to be covered during that period. It is obvious, therefore, that the MI will cover one fourth of the districts allotted to it in the every block of 6 months.
- (ii) If the MI is allotted state/UT having four or less than four districts, it must cover one district in every block of 6 months even if it means covering the same district in each of the four blocks.
- (iii) The MI shall select the schools to be visited, as far as possible, as per the following criteria: -
 - (s) Higher gender gap in enrolment,
 - (t) Higher proportion of SC/ST students,
 - (u) Low retention rate and higher drop-out rate
 - (v) The school has a minimum of three CWSN.
 - (w) The habitation where the school is located at has sizeable number of OoSC.
 - (x) The habitations where the school is located at witnesses in-bound and out-bound seasonal migration,

- (y) The ward/unit of planning where the school is located at is known to have sizeable number of urban deprived children.
- (z) The school is located in a forest or far flung area.
- (aa) The habitation where the school is located at witnesses recurrent floods or some other natural calamity.
- (iv) The MIs shall also ensure that at least 8 out of 40 schools are from urban areas, 6 are with Special Training Centers (3 residential and 3 non-residential) attached to it, 2 have civil works sanctioned for them, 2 are from NPEGEL blocks 3 have a minimum of 3 CWSN (priority to those having other than OI children) and 3 each are covered under the Computer Aided Learning (CAL) and KGBV scheme.
- (v) The selection of schools shall be done on the basis of the latest school report card generated through DISE, HHS data and consultation with the district SSA functionaries. The procedure and criteria adopted for the selection of schools shall form an essential part of the MI's report.

5. Reports:

- (i) The MI shall submit the draft reports pertaining to SSA and MDM in respect of the districts covered in a block of 6 months within one month of the last date of that block to the State Project Director, SSA and the Director of the MDM scheme respectively.
- (ii) The State Project Director, SSA and the Director of MDM scheme shall arrange for sharing of the draft report with the MI and district SSA/education department functionaries within 15 days of the receipt of the draft report and shall convey their comments thereon to the MI within 7 days of the meeting.
- (iii) The MI shall submit the final reports in respect of SSA and MDM within 15 days of receiving the comments of the SPD and Director, MDM. If the meetings at the State Project Office/Directorate of MDM are not held and their comments not received within the prescribed timeframe, MI shall not be required to wait any longer and shall go ahead with the finalization of report.
- (iv) The final reports shall be addressed to the SPD of SSA & Director, MDM in the State/UT and copies of reports in respect of SSA be endorsed to the Sr. Consultant (Monitoring Institutes), Technical Support Group (TSG), Educational Consultants India Limited (Ed.CIL), 10-B, I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002 (email: tarungpt@gmail.com) and the Under Secretaries in-charge of Monitoring Institutions in the Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001 (email: ravichand.edu@nic.in). A separate report for MDM shall be sent to the in-charge consultant (Monitoring MDM), Technical Support Group (TSG), Educational Consultants India Limited (Ed.CIL), 10-B, I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002 (email: rkishrajee@gmail.com) and the Deputy Secretary in-charge monitoring MDM, Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001 (email: gaya.prasad@nic.in).

6. Terms of Payment: -

The GOI shall pay the MIs as per the costing detailed below: -

- (vi) The MI shall **spend two full days for the visit to each of the schools** and be entitled to the payment of Rs. 3,000/- for each school. It shall also be entitled to the payment of Rs. 25,000/- for contingent expenditure per district for the whole period of two years.

- (vii) The MI shall be paid an amount of Rs. 15,000/- for the preparation of each of the half yearly reports.
- (viii) In addition, the MI shall be entitled to the payment of the cost of training of 5 field investigators per district for 5 days @ Rs. 200/- per person per day for each block of 6 months.
- (ix) The representatives of the MI undertaking the visits to the SPO/DPO/Field will be entitled to claim TA/DA as per the rules of the MI provided they do not avail the transport facility or hospitality of the SSA authorities. The TA/DA will be paid by the Monitoring Institute from the grants released by the Government of India and claimed as expenditure while seeking further release of grants. TA/DA claims will need to be submitted in the prescribed format together with all related bills in original with a certificate that arrangements for transport and hospitality was not made by the SSA.
- (x) The details of the terms of payment by GOI will be as follows: -
 - (v) The Government of India shall pay **75% of the entitled amount** to the MIs as first installment of the first year, so that the MI can start the monitoring work of the second 6 monthly block immediately after submitting the report for the first 6 monthly block.
 - (vi) Balance of 25% of the entitled amount for the first year shall be paid to the MI only after expenditure to the tune of 75% of the amount released as first installment is incurred and the expenditure statement duly certified by the Finance Office/Registrar of the MI is furnished and the report for the first half yearly block is submitted.
 - (vii) 75% of the entitled amount to the MIs as 1st installment of the second year of the project shall be paid subject to furnishing of both the half yearly report of the previous year and incurring of expenditure of at least 75% of the funds released during previous year. The unspent balance with MI for the first year of the project will be adjusted while releasing the first installment of second year.
 - (viii) 2nd installment for the second year of the project shall be released only after the MIs furnish both the half yearly reports for the second year of the project.

7. Tasks of the MIs: -

The Monitoring Institution shall furnish an analytical report on the following aspects of the programme implementation based on the empirical evidence relating to the indicators given below: -

1. Access:

I. Physical Access:

- i. Name & category of the school visited and distance of the school from each of the habitations it is catering to.
- ii. If the children from habitations at a distance greater than what is prescribed for a neighborhood school are enrolled in the school, reasons thereof.
- iii. Presence of any natural or man-made barrier which in the opinion of teachers, students or SMC members poses any in problems to children in accessing the school.

- iv. Name and distance of the upper Primary school from the habitation the school is located at.

II. Quality of Access:

- i. Number of classrooms in the school and student classroom ratio.
- ii. Are the classrooms properly lighted and ventilated?
- iii. How are the blackboards located in the classrooms?
- iv. Does the school have ramp with handrails? If yes, pl. comment on its quality.
- v. Does the school have separate toilet units for boys and girls and are they adequate for the children enrolled in the school?
- vi. Do the toilet units have running water supply? If not, are they used and maintained properly?
- vii. Is the drinking water facility in running condition and do the children get safe drinking water or there are complaints of water being polluted or having higher iron, arsenic contents ?
- viii. Does the school have a play ground?

III. Social Access:

- i. If the share of SC, ST, Muslim & Girl children in enrollment is proportionate to their share in population of the habitation/neighborhood cater to.
- ii. If there is any major variation in the pattern of attendance in respect of SC, ST, Muslim and Girl children.
- iii. Efforts made to remove the social, cultural, linguistic barriers at the level of teachers, peers, family and community members.
- iv. If any overt or covert, manifest or subtle discrimination against children of any social group or community by the teachers or peers is observed

2. Intervention for out of school children:

- i. No. of children not enrolled in the school as seen from the VER /WER (gender and social category-wise and age group-wise – 6 -10 years and 11-14 years).
- ii. When was the VER / WER last updated and how frequently is it reviewed and updated?
- iii. No. of children who dropped out of the school. Please comment on the system for identifying a child as a dropout.
- iv. Efforts made to bring them back to school.
- v. Whether school submitted report on drop outs on monthly, quarterly or half-yearly or annual basis to the higher authorities?
- vi. Did any child left school because of seasonal migration of the family. If yes, number of children having left school?

- vii. If children of seasonal migrant families held back in the school through seasonal hostels or some other intervention?
- viii. If no such arrangement made, if migration/ transfer certificate issue to them by the school.
- ix. Has any special training intervention been started for the OoSC? If yes, please give details covering following points: -
 - Nature of special training (residential or non-residential)
 - Imparted through regular teachers or Education Volunteers
 - No. of children enrolled and found present on the day of visit
 - Duration of training received by the EVs.
 - TLMs provided to the children.
 - Learning achievement level of the children and if it appear possible to mainstream them within the given time frame.
 - If the fund for honorarium and other expenses received in time.

3. Quality: -

I. Enabling conditions: -

- i. Number of teachers (Male & Female), PTR and teachers' vacancies.
- ii. Are teachers available for each class and for teaching Science, Mathematics and languages? (in case of upper primary school)
- iii. No. of untrained teachers.
- iv. Details of the training received during this year (CRC level, BRC level, induction level or 60 days training – residential or non-residential).
- v. If text books were received in time for all the subjects and all mediums of instruction.
- vi. If school grant, maintenance grant and TLM grant were received in time.

II. Teaching Learning Process: -

- i. Teachers' understanding of the constructivist approach to teaching learning process.
- ii. Involvement of children in teaching learning process.
- iii. Method of evaluation being followed in the school.
- iv. Onsite academic support teachers are receiving.
- v. Give your comments on the classroom management with reference to:-
 - Whether children are made to sit in small groups.
 - If groups are formed of children from the same class or with children from different classes.
 - If children from disadvantaged groups and children with disabilities sit separately and on the back benches.
 - If children have any role in the management of classroom.

III. Computer Aided Learning (CAL): -

- i. The status of upkeep and maintenance of the Computers & other accessories provided under CAL.
- ii. Whether activity based digital content/ teaching learning materials are used as supplementary materials to the course materials or are integrated with the teaching learning process part classroom transaction.
- iii. Whether the subject teachers who have been provided with training on use of CAL resources are comfortable on use of CAL resources & equipments.

- iv. Whether the activities are regularly monitored & support is provided by the state?

4. Girls Education, NPEGEL & KGBV: -

- i. Gender gap in enrolment, attendance and learning achievement and reasons thereof.
- ii. Efforts made to address the gender gap – at the levels of mindset and removing the physical barriers.
- iii. Participation level of girls in classroom processes and co-curricular activities.
- iv. Involvement of community and parents in the management of KGBVs.
- v. Capacity building of teachers – training, periodic review meetings and academic support by district, block and clusters level functionaries.
- vi. Quality and adequacy of facilities available.

5. Inclusive Education: -

I. In the classroom: -

- i. Sitting arrangement for the CWSN.
- ii. Participation level of the CWSN in classroom processes and efforts made to optimize it.
- iii. Peer interaction with CWSN: Friendly, Neutral or Taunting/teasing/bullying.
- iv. Type of peer support observed.
- v. Teacher's behaviour towards CWSN.
- vi. Do they have appropriate kind of TLMS?
- vii. Is the evaluation process tailored to their needs?

II. From the Teachers: -

- i. Training received and confidence level of the teacher to handle classrooms with CWSN.
- ii. Are Individualized Educational Plan (IEPs) prepared for CWSN.
- iii. On-site academic support by the Resource Teachers – frequency of visits, time spent by the resource teachers in the school and nature of support provided.
- iv. Nature and frequency of interaction with the parents of the CWSN.
- v. What is the additional support or facilities required?

III. From the Parents: -

- i. Nature of disability of the child and counseling received by them to tackle that.

- ii. If the child attended any medical assessment camp, diagnosed to be in need of some assistive device, supplied the assistive device and issued a disability certificate.
- iii. If the assistive device is in a working condition or in need of repair/replacement.
- iv. (In case of a child under HBE) frequency of visits by the Resource Teacher and care giver and time spent with the child.

6. Civil Works: -

- i. Whether SMC/VEC has been adequately trained for implementing civil works (minimum 2 to 3 times training during the construction period).
- ii. Whether the community manual, design drawings are available with the SMC/VEC or within the school premises.
- iii. Whether the separate accounts for civil works are being maintained daily and details available on transparency board installed in the school premises for the purpose.
- iv. Number of times the technical persons visited the construction site and whether there is any authentication done or instruction given (visits should be at the time of construction foundation level, plinth level, lintel level, roof level, flooring and finishing level).
- v. Whether daily cement account is being maintained and is authenticated by Technical personals.
- vi. The system of fund flow (whether through cheque, draft, E-transfer) and time take to transfer the funds in the account of SMC/VEC.
- vii. Whether the MOU is being signed between the SSA authorities and SMC/VEC before release of funds.
- viii. Any good practices in civil works which can be replicated in other places/in other States.

7. Community Mobilization: -

- i. Familiarity level of the SMC members with their roles and responsibilities as notified by the State Government.
- ii. Familiarity of the SMC members with the DISE captures format, school report card and VER / WER.
- iii. Familiarity of the SMC members with the guidelines regarding School Development Plan and training received by them in this regard.
- iv. Frequency of SMCs meetings held and issues discussed.
- v. Role of SMCs members in monitoring teacher and student attendance and importance given to their feedback.
- vi. Contribution made by the community for the uplift of school or educational scenario of the habitation.

8. MIS: -

- i. Did the school supply data under DISE for the latest year? If yes, does the school have a copy of the filled-in Data Capture Format (DCF).
- ii. Whether any training on filling up of DCF was provided to the teacher/head teacher?
- iii. Did the CRC coordinator/headmaster conducted the Jan-Vaachan (as a measure of social audit) of DISE data reported in the DCF? If yes, what was the date of Jan-Vaachan.
- iv. Did the school receive the printed copy of the School Report Cards? If yes, is it being displayed at the notice board or kept in the file?
- v. If the DCF/School report card is available with the school does it match with the actual position in the school.
- vi. Are the schools records being maintained and updated regularly?

9. Financial Management: -

- i. Nature of financial records and registers maintained.
- ii. Mode of transfer of fund to the SMC/VEC from the state or district levels.
- iii. Type of funds/grants received and the month of receipt.
- iv. System for the drawl of fund from the SMC/VEC account.
- v. If the proposals for expenditure and expenditure statements are shared with the community. If yes, is there any instance of community expressing objection/reservation about any transaction?
- vi. If the VEC/SMC is covered by audit. If yes, has the audit observations been shared with the community.
- vii. Any instance of community mobilizing resources for the school.

**Terms of Reference for the Monitoring of Mid-Day Meal Programmes
by the Monitoring Institutes (2010-12)**

Revised TOR (2010-12) in respect of monitoring of MDM activities Submission of MDM Reports:

The Monitoring Institutes (MI) would send their reports to the Director, Mid Day Meal Scheme at the draft level and after discussions, finalize their reports. The Director, MDM, on receipt of the draft report would give his comments within fifteen days. If the MI receives no comments in this period it will finalize the report. The final Report will thereafter be sent to the Director, MDM and Principal Secretary / Secretary of the Nodal department with a copy to GOI, latest by 31st January & 31st July respectively, every year.

2. Mid-Day Meal Scheme: -

A. At School Level

1.	REGULARITY IN SERVING MEAL: Whether the school is serving hot cooked meal daily? If there was interruption, what was the extent and reasons for the same?	Students, Teachers & Parents, and MDM register														
2.	TRENDS: Extent of variation (As per school records vis-à-vis Actual on the day of visit) <table border="1" data-bbox="337 1010 974 1367"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="337 1010 407 1045">No.</th> <th data-bbox="407 1010 974 1045">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1045 407 1081">i.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1045 974 1081">Enrollment</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1081 407 1117">ii.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1081 974 1117">No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1117 407 1173">iii.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1117 974 1173">No. of children attending the school on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1173 407 1230">iv.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1173 974 1230">No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1230 407 1287">v.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1230 974 1287">No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1287 407 1367">vi.</td> <td data-bbox="407 1287 974 1367">No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Details	i.	Enrollment	ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal	iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit	iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register	v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit	vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.	School level registers, MDM Registers Head Teachers, Schools level MDM functionaries / Observation of the monitoring team. In case of centralized kitchen the no. of school served by it. Time taken in supply of hot cooked mid day meal from centralized kitchen.
No.	Details															
i.	Enrollment															
ii.	No. of children opted for Mid Day Meal															
iii.	No. of children attending the school on the day of visit															
iv.	No. of children availing MDM as per MDM Register															
v.	No. of children actually availing MDM on the day of visit															
vi.	No. of children availed MDM on the previous day.															
3.	REGULARITY IN DELIVERING FOOD GRAINS TO SCHOOL LEVEL: (i) Is school/implementing agency receiving food grain regularly? If there is delay in delivering food grains, what is the extent of delay and reasons for the same? (ii) Is buffer stock of one-month's requirement is maintained? (iii) Is the food grains delivered at the school? (iv) Is the quality of foodgrain good?	School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.														

4.	REGULARITY IN DELIVERING COOKING COST TO SCHOOL LEVEL: (i) Is school/implementing agency receiving cooking cost in advance regularly? If there is delay in delivering cooking cost what is the extent of delay and reasons for it? (ii) In case of delay, how school/implementing agency manages to ensure that there is no disruption in the feeding programme? (iii) Is cooking cost paid by Cash or through banking channel?	School level registers, MDM Registers, Head Teacher, School level MDM functionaries. SHG/ implementing agency.
5.	SOCIAL EQUITY: i) Did you observe any gender or caste or community discrimination in cooking or serving or seating arrangements? ii) What is the system of serving and seating arrangements for eating?	Observations / Probe/ interaction with the children.
6.	VARIETY OF MENU: i) Has the school displayed its weekly menu at a place noticeable to community, and is it able to adhere to the menu displayed? ii) Who decides the menu?	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks. Obtain a copy of menu.
7.	(i) Is there variety in the food served or is the same food served daily? (ii) Does the daily menu include rice / wheat preparation, dal and vegetables?	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks.
8.	QUALITY & QUANTITY OF MEAL : Feedback from children on a) Quality of meal: b) Quantity of meal: c) {If children were not happy Please give reasons and suggestions to improve.}	Observations of Investigation during MDM service
9.	SUPPLEMENTARY: (i) Is there school Health Card maintained for each child? (ii) What is the frequency of health check-up? (iii) Whether children are given micronutrients (Iron, folic acid, vitamin – A dosage) and deworming medicine periodically? (iv) Who administers these medicines and at what frequency?	Teachers, Students, School Record/ School health card
10.	STATUS OF COOKS: (i) Who cooks and serves the meal? (Cook cum helper appointed by the Department/VEC/PRI/Self Help Group/ NGO/Contractor) (ii) Is the number of cooks and helpers engaged in the school as per GOI norms? (iii) What is remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers and mode of payment? (iv) Are the remuneration paid to cooks cum helpers regularly? (v) Social Composition of cooks cum helpers? (SC/ST/OBC/Minority)	Observations and discussion with children teachers, parents, VEC members, Gram Panchayat members and cooks-cum-helpers.

11.	INFRASTRUCTURE: Is a pucca kitchen shed-cum-store: i) Constructed and in use ii) Scheme under which Kitchen sheds constructed -MDM/SSA/Others iii) Constructed but not in use (Reasons for not using) iv) Under construction v) Sanctioned, but construction not started vi) Not sanctioned vii) Any other (specify)	School records, discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.
12.	In case the pucca kitchen shed is not available, where is the food being cooked and where are the foodgrains/other ingredients being stored.	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, VEC, Gram Panchayat members, Observation
13.	Whether potable water is available for cooking and drinking purpose?	-do-
14.	Whether utensils are available for cooking food? If, available is it adequate?	Teachers/Organizer of MDM Programme
15.	What is the kind of fuel used? (Gas based/firewood etc.)	Observation
16.	SAFETY & HYGIENE: i. General Impression of the environment, Safety and hygiene: ii. Are children encouraged to wash hands before and after eating iii. Do the children partake meals in an orderly manner? iv. Conservation of water? v. Is the cooking process and storage of fuel safe, not posing any fire hazard?	Observation
17.	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION: i) Extent of participation by Parents / VECs / Panchayats / Urban bodies in daily supervision, monitoring, participation. ii) Is any roster being maintained of the community members for supervision of the MDM?	Discussion with head teacher, teacher, Parents, VEC, Gram Panchayat members
18.	INSPECTION & SUPERVISION: i) Has the mid day meal programme been inspected by any state / district / block level officers/officials? ii) The frequency of such inspections?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, VEC, Gram Panchayat members
19.	IMPACT Has the mid day meal improved the enrollment, attendance of children in school, general well being (nutritional status) of children? Is there any other incidental benefit due to serving cooked meal in schools?	School records, discussion with head teacher, teachers, students, VEC, Gram Panchayat members.

B. Any other issues relevant to MDM implementation

MI may give a maximum 2 page note, on any other issues, relevant to MDM implementation, not covered above.
