Mid-term Review of M. Venkatarangaiya Foundation's Programme on

'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India'

by

Centre for Budget and Policy Studies (CBPS)

Bangalore

5May, 2017

Executive Summary

The report presents a mid-term review of M.V. Foundation's (MVF) project on 'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India', funded by Sir Dorabji Tata Trust. The specfic objectives of the project are:

1. To ensure universal enrolment and retention of children in schools through a strategy of social mobilization and awareness building
2. To pilot a model of teacher led systemic change towards child friendly education
3. To document the process of change in collaboration with academic bodies, work on advocacy for taking the model to more regions
4. To provide support for higher education

The project, spread across four years (i.e., from 2014-2018), has been implemented in Mahbubnagar and Gadchiroli districts of Telangana and Maharashtra respectively, that are characterised by high militancy, poverty, civil unrest, neglect and backwardness Secondary data analysis shows that the two districts have adequate number of schools, but have lower literacy levels compared to the national average. High prevalence rates of child labour and child marriages have also been noted for Mahbubnagar. Against this MVF has planned a set of specific goals:

1. To enrol and retain at least 15,000 out of school children into schools particularly in select blocks/states in areas of civil unrest and areas of neglect and backwardness during the period of four years commencing October 2013 - ending September 2017.
2. To mobilise at least 300 children in 4 years through 3 Residential Bridge Course Camps to be run in various states.
3. To train at least 100 local community bodies including Gram Panchayats, SMCs and CRPFs to sustain the movement at the end of the project period.
4. To document the process of change in collaboration with academic bodies through baseline surveys, periodic review and final evaluation.
5. To pilot a model of teacher led systemic change towards child friendly education
6. To support 60 meritorious students to further their higher education

The current review was undertaken to:

i. assess the progress made by MVF against their planned activities;

ii.assess financial utilization patterns;

iii. understand the effectiveness of programme design in relation to contexts and constraints within which they were deployed;

iv. examine organizational efforts at monitoring; and

v. provide critical feedback against all these objectives.

Primary fieldwork was undertaken in the four blocks - Ghattu, Ieza, and Amrabad (in Mahbubnagar), and Dhanora (in Gadchiroli). Interviews and Focus Group Discussions with key stakeholders, including programme personnel and field staff (i.e., community mobilisers) of MVF, teachers, students and parents, and members of community bodies (i.e., Gram Panchayats [GP], School Monitoring Committees [SMCs], and Child Rights Protection Fora [CRPF]) were undertaken. In addition observations of classrooms, infrastructure and teaching-learning practices, especially in 15 schools identified by MVF under their 'Quality Improvement Programme' (QIP), and in MVF-run Residential Bridge Camps (RBCs) was undertaken. Data on children enrolled, retained and mainstreamed was collected from MVF and school records. In addition SMC and GP records of meetings were also analysed for the villages and schools visited to understand if there were any changes in the nature and functioning of SMCs and GPs post-MVF intervention.

Based on the data gathered, the impact of MVF's progrramme is discussed across three levels - the individual level, at the school (and larger education system) level, and at the community level. The three levels have been mapped on to the specific goals that have been identified by MVF for their project. The specific goals have been assessed with respect to whether each goal is 'on track', 'partially on track', or 'not on track'.[1]

Overall, MVF's interventions at all three levels appear to be 'on track'. At the **individual student level,** document review as well as field visitsshowed that identification of all Out-of-school students in the blocks has been completed; MVF mobilizers have been making regular visits to households of children out-of-school or 'at risk' for drop out, and have been motivating parents to send their children to school. However, repeated absenteeism, particularly in Telangana, and specifically in Ghattu and Ieza, due to continued employment of children as labour is a major concern. With respect to scholarships, distribution of scholarships was on track and it was found that majority of the students used the scholarship money to buy cycles. However, field observations show the need for a more rigorous selection criteria for granting scholarships to students.

At the **school level**, both initiatives by MVF to improve conditions of schooling and learning outcomes - that is through RBCs and the QIP is 'on track', and have paid off. RBCs and QIP to improve the quality of schooling, appear to be functioning well. During field visits RBCs were seen to be warm conducive spaces, providing students with adequate facilities, good food and good pedagogic inputs for learning. In QIP schools,

---

[1]Considering that this is a mid-term review, 'On Track' is defined as 50% or more of the target under the objective completed;   Partially on track is defined as 30-50% of the target for the objective as completed; and 'Not on track' asless than 30% of the target under the objective as completed.

teachers have received training in progressive pedagogic practices, and were implementing these. Children's committees were also seen to be functioning actively. However, one area of concern with respect to the QIP was with regards to tracking students' progress in terms of learning levels or outcomes. Another issue that also needed to be addressed at the school/education department level was the need to build more substantial linkages with the department in order for the QIP and other interventions by MVF to be successful.

At the **community level**, while the targets set to train community bodies by MVF are 'on track' in terms of the number of community bodies trained, it was observed that mobilization is an area that requires major strengthening. On the positive side, MVF's efforts at engaging the community have paid off in certain instances with major achievements such as enlisting the village purohit's help in preventing child marriages, community's efforts at petitioning the education department for filling up teacher vacancies, community monitoring of schools and teachers, etc. However, one important observation was that such achievements and widespread community awareness and engagement seemed to be a feature of the main panchayat village, or the village from where the mobilizer is drawn.

MVF uses the strategy of building support through influential members of the community, which is an important strategy to gain entry. However, a repeated suggestion given on the field was that there needs to be sustained engagement with parents in the community. Another critical area that requires attention is also training for community members, with a focus on building skills of negotiation, assertion, and interface with government departments and systems. Finally, a convergence between the various community bodies involved in child protection, as well as between the progress made within panchayat villages and habitation villages needs to be brought about.

An analysis of the financial utilisation statements showed that there had been a variance of over 20 per cent in budget and actual expenditure, in the first year only. The variance also seemed to a result of high programme costs.A significant observation was that this is partly a result of higher programme costs required for Maharashtra considering the geographical terrain, remoteness of villages and distances that have to be covered, which was also substantiated by field accounts of personnel.

In conclusion, there were several positive features of the project that could be identified from the field visits and secondary data, but at the same time there also exist areas that need to be further strengthened.

The positive features of the programme include:

a) the enlisting of local youth as volunteers which has contributed to their success as mobilizers not only take on ownership and carry on sustained work but it helps them build trust in MVF in the community.

b) The RBCs which have helped build children's interest in education as well as parents' confidence regarding their children's safety and development. Their intervention in RBCs as well as the quality schools have ensured that that out-of-school children and drop-outs are able to catch up with other children and perform adequately, with confidence and interest.

c) MVFs remedial materials and pedagogic interventions have been a huge success in not only improving children's learning levels, but also bringing about changes to the pedagogic practices of teachers in select quality schools.

On the other hand the specific areas that require additional attention include:

a. Planning community mobilisation initiatives more strategically - so that there can be a greater engagement with the entire community and parents specifically. Planning also needs to pay more attention to habitation villages as well. Community mobilization strategies may also have to be differently planned according to the specificities of geography and terrain.

b. Training for community bodies - this needs to be suitably modified/ and strenghtened to build skills rather than just knowledge or awareness regarding issues of child labour and educationfor the community. Gender sensitization training and gender sensitive training also needs to be included.

c. The QIP - this can be further strengthened if infrastructural and teacher shortages at the school level are addressed. This in turn requires more efforts towards at lobbying the education department. Further, more periodic teacher training and workshops involving teachers from QIP schools in conceptualising and discussing curricular practices and pedagogies,support for teachers in addressing everyday challenges that emerge during the course of implementation of the QIP, etc. is required.

d. Linkages with the education department - there is a need for MVF to build greater linkages with the state education department. This may require that a separate team be constituted simply to create an interface between the village/panchayat and the block and district level officials.

e. Scholarships - a more stringent criteria for scholarships in Dhanora needs to be developed.

f. Child Monitoring System (CMS) - finally, an online data management system to track each child individually is yet to be set up. This is very important, also for the QIP schools, in order to be able to be able to analyse the full impact of MVF's efforts on learning levels and learning outcomes for individual children, as well as to understand trends and cohort-wise effects of MVF's intervention and curricular support.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1.Introduction

Despite several old and well-established treaties and conventions on the prevention of child labour, such as by the United Nation's Convention on the Rights of Child (UNCRC) and International Labour Organisation (ILO), 150 million children continue to be employed as labour across the world (UNICEF, 2008). The minimum age for employment set by the ILO is 15 years for non-hazardous work, and 18 years for hazardous work. Yet, one in four children between five and 14 years are employed in work that is detrimental to their health and development (UNICEF, 2008).

Solutions to problems of child labourare challenged by both structural factors and cultural worldviewsthat allow for no easy resolution of the problem. For example, with respect to the former, economic and social policies that seek to make cheap, informal labour available, fail to support marginalised families with access to credit, and particularly fail to provide for good quality education at minimal costs appear to condone child labour (Rao, 2015; Reddy, 2010; Sanghera, 2010). The last factor has been pointed out to be particularly critical, as parents view schooling as an investment where the rate of returns both in terms of learning and an economically gainful job is measured against the time and efforts put in. Several national and international cases (e.g., Kerala, China, Brazil, etc.) have all proven that expansion of school systems, addressing issues of drop out and absenteeism and investing in mass education can have better effects on the problem of child labour than efforts at improving the enforcement of labour laws (Rao, 2015).

On the other hand, cultural conceptions of children's development that include the notion of work as central to children's socialization also pose certain challenges to addressing the issue. These cultural practices challenge the strict Western definitions of 'childhood' that have set up rigid boundaries between adult and child, work and education (Muriithi, 2016). Even in the India context, the importance of work to children's education has been emphasised within the Gandhian model of education. However, such models are challenged by prevalent conditions of economic and social inequalities that mark out certain children for labour, and make it question of economic necessity rather than a component of holistic development.

Thus, rather than being conceived as an intrinsic part of education or children's socialisation, child labour continues to be a rampant problem in India characterized by exploitative working conditions, bondage of labour and discriminatory practices on the basis of caste and gender. The World Bank (2000) reports that the incidence of child labour in India is as high as 6 crore, which is the largest as compared to any other country in the world (Rao, 2015).

While several policies and laws in the country seek to address this situation, child labour continues to be prevalent due to the loopholes and lop-sided planning of such policies. For example, while the law against child labour passed in 1986 prevented children below the age of 14 years to be engaged in work(), the National Policy on Education (NPE) 1986 created an avenue for non-formal education (Ministry of Human Resource Development, 1998). That is, it noted that working children and others (especially girls) who could not attend mainstream, formal schooling could avail opportunities of NFE, thus encouraging the practice of child labour (Sinha, 2015).

Given the fluid boundaries and vaguely explained sections of the 1986 Child Labour Act, it was later replaced with the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act 2016. The 2016 Act delineates two different age groups for the purpose of this regulation: 'children', who are under the age of 14 years and 'adolescents' in the age group of 14-18 years. According to the 2016 Act, a child below the age of 14 years is prohibited from any kind of work except being employed in 'family-based enterprises', provided the work does not interfere with his/her school education. Adolescents, as newly defined by the Act, are prohibited from engaging in a number of hazardous occupations as enlisted in the Act (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2016a).

Thecontours defined by the newly rolled out Act also appear to complement the other major law passed for children - the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE) 2009 (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2016b), for children up to 14 years. However, several contentions have still been raised with regards the new Act as the term 'family enterprise' is vaguely defined and leaves a lot of scope for its misinterpretation thus employing children in occupations that are hazardous to their health and hindering their education opportunities (Ganotra, 2016). Further, it has also been pointed out that allowing a child to work in a family-based enterprise also implies that children are trapped in their caste-based occupations and unable to utilize education as a tool for economic and social mobility (Ganotra, 2016).

Another concern raised is the contradiction between the 2016 Act for child labour and the 2009 Right to Education Act. Under the RTE clause 4, a child is entitled to complete his education even after completing 14 years of age. On the other hand, the Child Labour Act 2016 allows children above 14 years of age to be working in certain occupations. This contradiction between the two laws may 'push' the child out of the school into labour (Ganotra, 2016).

Thus, as pointed out the issue of 'child labour' is a complex one, and strategies to address it need to take into account multiple factors that make it inevitable as well as that indirectly promote it. Against this complex socio-economic and cultural context that has sustained the practice of employing children in various forms of work, despite legislations that have sought to do away with it, M.Venkatarangaiya Foundation (MVF) has undertaken efforts to eradicate the same. The current document presents a mid-term review of one of their projects - 'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable

Areas across Two States in India', funded by Sir Dorabji Tata Trust. After providing a brief account of the organisation (MVF) and methodology of this review study, the report will present the findings from the study based on secondary data and document analysis and primary field work carried across the four field sites in which the project is operational.

2. Organisation and Program Details

2.1 About MVF

Mamadipudi Venkatarangaiya Foundation (MVF) was established in 1981 as a research institution for issues broadly related to social transformation. Since 1991, MVF has been actively working specifically on the issue of child labour with most of its work focused on Andhra Pradesh. According to MVF, all individuals under 18 years must be viewed as a child and any child who is not in school is considered to be a child labourer by MVF. MVF's interventions are based on the philosophy that no child should be working and that all children should be in school.

MVF adopts an area based approach with the ultimate goal of making it a child-labour free zone. An area is either a geographically defined area or a politico-administrative unit. MVF focuses on both enrolled and out-of-school children and through its initiatives, withdraws children from work and ensures their enrolment in full time formal schools. MVF ensures the same through active community involvement by building capacity at the grassroots level institutions, training existing community bodies and creating new community-based institutions. MVF also has a tracking system that uses school records and age level data to check that the enrolled children complete their education up to 10th standard. MVF plans to convert this data into an online Child Monitoring System, which is currently under construction. MVF also engages with public institutions and the state bodies in order to eradicate child labour. In this way, MVF adopts a blanket approach encompassing stakeholders at multiple levels to achieve its goal of creating child labour free zones. So far, MV Foundation has worked extensively in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Chhatisgarh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu.

2.2 Details of the current project

The present study critically analyses MVF's project on 'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India'. The project, designed for four years, between 2014-18, has the following objectives:

1. To ensure universal enrolment and retention of children in schools through a strategy of socialmobilization and awareness building
2. To pilot a model of teacher led systemic change towards child friendly education
3. To document the process of change in collaboration with academic bodies, work on advocacy for taking the model to more regions
4. To provide support for higher education

Towards this, the following goals were worked out:

i. To enrol and retain at least 15,000 out of school children into schools particularly in select blocks/states in areas of civil unrest and areas of neglect and backwardness during the period of four years commencing October 2013 - ending September 2017.
ii. To mobilise at least 300 children in 4 years through 3 Residential Bridge Course Camps to be run in various states.
iii. To train at least 100 local community bodies including Gram Panchayats, SMCs and CRPFs to sustain the movement at the end of the project period.
iv. To document the process of change in collaboration with academic bodies through baseline surveys, periodic review and final evaluation.
v. To pilot a model of teacher led systemic change towards child friendly education
vi. To support 60 meritorious students to further their higher education

The focus of this project is on areas of civil unrest, neglect and backwardness in the states of Telangana and Maharashtra. Such areas are characterized by high levels of militancy, increased poverty rates, marginalized populations and prevalence of child labour. With this rationale in mind, MVF has limited its intervention to two districts, one in Telangana (i.e., Mahbubnagar) and one district in Maharashtra (i.e., Gadhchiroli).

In Maharashtra, Gadchiroli was chosen as a target area as it is an under-developed, tribal district. Moreover, there has been a strong presence of Naxalism in Gadchiroli which has led to constant disturbance in the area and seasonal out-migration. As a result, schools had been dysfunctional in the past, with increased incidence of teacher absenteeism. Students were also found to have been constantly migrating. One block in Gadchiroli, Dhanora, was particularly selected for intervention because of the increased presence of armed conflict there.

Mahbubnagar district in Telangana has been declared as one of the most backward districts of the country. This area is strongly characterized by loss of livelihood leading to constant migration of families in search of work. Moreover, the district has high rates of child trafficking and child labour because of the presence of BT. Cotton farms. Three blocks were chosen in this district: Gattu, Ieeja and Amarabad. Gattu and Ieeja were

located next to each other and have the lowest levels of literacy as compared to other blocks. Amarabad was targeted as it was a tribal belt with a large pool of natural resources,with a large marginalized tribal population.

From secondary data analysis, it can further be seen that literacy rates for the two selected districts are way lower than the respective state and national averages respectively (refer Table 1 below).[2] Female literacy rate across both the districts is lower than male literacy. This trend is consistent across the two years. However, there has been a greater improvement in female literacy rates between the two time periods of 2001-02 and 2014-15.

Table 1: Literacy Rates in Target Districts and State

	Mahbubnagar		Andhra Pradesh (undivided)[3]		Gadchiroli		Maharashtra	
	2001-02	2014-15	2002-03	2014-15	2001-02	2014-15	2002-03	2014-15
Male Literacy Rate	NA	66.3	70.9	75.3	NA	80.2	86.3	89.8
Female Literacy Rate	18	45.7	51.2	58.8	28.9	60.7	67.5	75.5
Overall Literacy Rate	29.6	56.1	61.1	67.1	42.9	70.6	77.3	82.9

Source: UDISE State and District Report Cards, 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2014-15; NA: Not Available

Table 2: Gross and Net Enrolment Ratios for 2010-11 and 2014-15

	Mahbubnagar		Andhra Pradesh (undivided)		Gadchiroli		Maharashtra	
	2010-11	2014-15	2010-11	2014-15	2010-11	2014-15	2010-11	2014-15
GER (Primary)	122.9	96.25	107	88.21	109.1	102.69	105.3	98.95
NER (Primary)	95.9	77.46	85.7	72.17	92.8	89.64	88.3	85.7
GER (Upper Primary)	80.3	70.26	83.9	79.47	94.8	87.24	92.3	98.82
NER (Upper Primary)	61.2	51.79	62	58.2	69.4	64.59	69.8	76.85

Source: UDISE District and State Report Cards for 2010-11 and 2014-15; GER: Gross Enrolment Ratio; NER: Net Enrolment Ratio

Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) indicates enrolment as a percentage of those who are eligible for that class. Net Enrolment Ratio (NER) indicates the age-appropriate enrolment at particular levels. The table presented above indicates a move towards

---

[2]District level analysis is being conducted as this data is not available at block level in the public domain.
[3]Since Andhra Pradesh was divided into Telangana and Andhra in June 2014, the state level averages for undivided Andhra Pradesh is being considered here

more age-appropriate enrolment in primary levels between 2010-11-2014-15, but a decline in age-appropriate enrollments at upper primary classes for the same period.

Since data on GER and NER is currently not available through online sources post-2015, it has not been possible to ascertain if there have been changes post-MVF intervention in the project districts which can at least be tentatively attributed to MVF's efforts. Thus, an analysis of GER and NER for districts in which MVF has intervened since earlier (since the 1990s and early 2000s) has also been undertaken.

Table 3: Trends in NER in districts with MVF intervention

District	Rangareddy		Nalgonda		Kurnool		Adilabad		Anantapur	
Year of MVF Intervention	**1991**		**1999**		**2000**		**2001**		**2004**	
↓Year	**NER (P)**	**NER (UP)**	**NER (P)**	**NER (UP)**	**NER (P)**	**NER (UP)**	**NER (P)**	**NER (UP)**	**NER (P)**	**NER (UP)**
2002-03	67.2	61.6	63.1	54.4	75.1	45	79.6	NA	65.4	NA
2003-04	72.9	50.6	60.8	33	78.5	41.4	83.5	54	68.2	46.7
2004-05	77	58.6	70.2	56.9	74.7	42.5	75.1	57	64.2	47.6
2005-06	100	73.2	80.3	63.3	87.1	46.5	89.9	67.7	73.3	53.5
2006-07	100	81.4	83.1	65.9	93.3	50.2	95.2	71.4	73.1	54.5
2007-08	100	85.9	83.2	67.9	92.7	55.2	98	70.6	76.1	56.4
2008-09	100	87.3	81.3	67.0	93.4	58.3	98.9	67.9	73.9	53.7
2009-10	100	96.2	83.7	65.2	94.9	59.7	92.1	61.9	73.8	53.8
2010-11	100	97.4	87.5	69.2	79.9	53.3	100	68.9	78.1	NA
2011-12	Child Population Not Available									
2012-13	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2013-14	98.8	70.9	82.6	63.4	81.8	54	91.9	62.1	78	56.7
2014-15	94.6	74.3	82.3	62.5	78.3	52.8	90.0	61.7	73.1	55.5

Note: DISE data for the period between1990-2000 is not available and thus could not be analysed for districts such as Rangareddy and Nalagonda. Further data after 2014-15 is still not available online.

Before undertaking any analysis of the trends, itis important to note that no direct or absolute correlations can be drawn between the trends noted from the table presented above, and MVF's intervention, as there could be several factors that could have affected these trends. Some of these may include introduction of new policy level changes such as Sarva Shiksha Abiyaan (SSA) in 2001, and Right to Education Act in 2009, along with the other changes brought about to the child labour policy during the same period. These policy level changes could have contributed to changes in enrollment not only through improvements in infrastructure and opportunities for schooling through

opening of additional schools, but also through enrolment drives undertaken by the state. Another important factor could be climatic changes and seasonal changes in patterns of agriculture that could have contributed to drop-out (due to migration and increased indebtedness in case of drought or failure of crops), or increased enrolment (during productive agricultural seasons). In addition data discrepancies that have often been identified with large data sets such as DISE itself could contribute to the particular trends observed.

Looking at Table 3, bearing these cautions in mind, what is most evident is the high degree of fluctuation in NER trends between 2003-2003 to 2014-15 for the MVF intervention districts. While overall there have been improvements in NER across the districts from 2002-03 to 2014-15, comparing the NER with the year of MVF's intervention in the district also does not seem to present any clear patterns, as NER rates fluctuate even in the post-intervention years. It appears however that NER rates have gone up for all the districts between 2004-2008, which can perhaps be attributed to the increased number of schools and infrastructure post-implementation of SSA. Another surprising consistent trend seen is the decline in NER between 2010-2011 and 2014-15, post-implementation of RTE. A final critical observation that has implications for MVF's work is regarding the long way that most disticts have to still go in achieving universal enrollments. Based on data for 2014-15, it appears that with the exception of Ranga Reddy district (in the case of primary enrollments), most other districts have at least up to 20 per cent of their child population not enrolled in age appropriate classes. Thus, sustained effort through community mobilisation and school preparation is important especially for districts such as Kurnool and Adilabad, which show one of the lowest NERs.

Table 4: Number of Government and Private Schools in the Target Districts, State and National Averages (2014-15)

		P	P + UP	P+UP+ Sec/HS	UP only	UP+ Sec/HS	Sec	HS	Sec+HS	Total
Mahbubnagar	**G**	2,618	592	11	0	648	-	-	-	3,869
	Pvt	433	479	0	0	354	-	-	-	1,266
	T	3,051	1,071	11	0	1,002	-	-	-	5,135
A.P. (undivided)	**G**	54,706	9,280	265	1	10,734	-	-	-	74,986
	Pvt	10,564	9,630	47	11	9,145	-	-	-	29,397
	T	65,270	18,910	312	12	19,879	48	4,083	11	108,525
Gadchiroli	**G**	1,163	420	18	6	15	-	-	-	1,622
	Pvt	59	116	7	0	123	-	-	-	305
	T	1,222	536	25	6	138	-	-	-	1,927
Maharashtra	**G**	45,007	21,392	185	62	736	-	-	-	67,382
	Pvt	7,848	8,871	512	42	11,853	-	-	-	29,126
	T	52,855	30,263	697	104	12,589	6,450	1,943	1,018	105,919
India	**G**	712,871	189,904	8,717	120,108	49,144	-	-	-	1,080,744
	Pvt	113,248	120,492	28,096	26,005	41,001	-	-	-	328,842
	T	826,119	310,396	28,096	146,113	41,001	37,961	11,136	21,988	1,400,822

Source: UDISE State and District Report Cards 2014-15

Note: P: Primary; UP: Upper Primary; Sec: Secondary; HS: Higher Secondary; G: Government Schools; Pvt: Private Schools; T: Total Schools. District level data for Secondary education and categorisation of secondary schools into government and private is not available in the reports by UDISE.

Looking at provisioning factors, in both current target districts, the number of government schools (primarily for elementary education) is almost three times the number of private schools. At the state level, the number of government schools is almost two times the number of private schools. Hence, it appears that lack of access to school education, at the elementary level, especially for those from lower economic strata may not be the prime factor for poor enrolment or drop-out in these districts and states. However, field visits indicate that in Gadchiroli, forest and hilly terrain, and lack of roads and transportation may hinder access despite the presence and availability of schools.

A larger concern, as seen from the secondary data analysis is the prevalence of child labour and child marriage that could be one of the few significant factors affecting children's schooling.

Table 5: Status of Child Labour in the Target Districts, State and National Averages for 2011

	Mahbubnagar	Andhra Pradesh (undivided)	Gadchiroli	Maharashtra	India
% of Main Workers in age group 5-14 years	4.76%	2.61%	4.83%	2.42%	1.68%
% of Marginal Workers in age group 5-14 years	1.86%	1.73%	2.42%	1.12%	2.22%

Source: Census 2011; Main workers: those who work for more than 6 months in a year; Marginal workers: Those who have worked for less than 6 months in a year
Census 2001 data for age-wise population is not available online. Hence, no comparison across years is being conducted here.

About 4.76 per cent of children in Mahbubnagar and 4.83 per cent of children in Gadchiroli, in the age group 5-14 years, were employed as main workers i.e. working full-time. This indicates a clear violation of Right to Education Act and Abolition of Child Labour Act. These percentages are almost double the State averages respectively. A higher percentage of marginal workers, especially in Gadchiroli, could indicate seasonal migration in search of work. These migrating children working as marginal workers might or might not be enrolled in schools where they have migrated. Hence, it is difficult to estimate whether these children are out of school or not.

Table 6: Status of Child Marriage in the Target Districts, State and National Averages for 2011 (0-14 years and 0-17 years)

	Mahbubnagar	Andhra Pradesh (undivided)	Gadchiroli	Maharashtra	India
% of Child Marriage in 0-14 years (Females)	0.97%	0.97%	1.15%	1.51%	1.02%
% of Child Marriage in 0-14 years (Males)	0.40%	0.47%	0.59%	1.04%	0.57%
% of Child Marriage in 0-14 years (Total)	0.68%	0.71%	0.86%	1.26%	0.78%
% of Child Marriage in 0-17 years (Females)	83.13%	85.66%	38.14%	55.32%	48.48%
% of Child Marriage in 0-17 years (Males)	11.75%	10.18%	5.04%	7.97%	8.38%
% of Child Marriage in 0-17 years (Total)	46.02%	46.70%	21.21%	30.27%	27.49%

Source: Census 2011; Census 2001 data for age-wise population is not available online. Hence, no comparison across years is being conducted here.

For girls in the age-group 0-17 years, the incidence of child marriage in Mahbubnagar is very high. Similarly, incidence of child marriage for girls in the age group 0-17 years in Andhra Pradesh (undivided) is also very high. Comparatively, in Gadchiroli and Maharashtra, the percentage of girls married in the age-group 0-17 years is comparatively low. This could be due to the dominance of tribal population in Gadchiroli with tribal communities not having practices of early marriages. Further analyzing this data for 0-14 years, it can be seen that less than 1 per cent of girls and boys in this age group, across both the target districts were married. This is a clear indication that high incidence of child marriage is prevalent for girls in the age-group 15-17 years, which could also be a contributing factor for lower enrolment of girls in secondary education, compared to boys across both states.

Against this context of high incidence of child labour / marriage, and physical constraints to schooling such as the presence of dense forest areas, lack of community awareness about the importance of education and lack of access to transportation, we now review the approach and strategies undertaken by MVF to ensure improved educational access for children from these two districts.

2.3 MVF's strategy

MVF's strategy focuses on strengthening the education system in order to pull children out of labour and enrol them in schools to complete their education. A number of activities are being rolled out as part of the project and community mobilization is at the heart of its implementation process. MVF aims to create a strong network of youth, community members, school teachers, parents and students with the community mobilizer at the centre of this process in order to achieve the larger goal of creating child-labour free zones.

As a representative from MVF, one block in-charge or BIC is assigned to each of the four target blocks. The process begins with the BICs conducting a village-level meeting by engaging the villagers on various social problems prevailing in their community. From these meetings, the BICs choose local youth from the villages for the position of the community mobilizer. One community mobilizer is selected for each Panchayat who is mainly expected to spread awareness regarding the importance of education amongst the community members. The mobilizer is also responsible for conducting extensive surveys in each village to work towards the enrolment and retention targets. They undertake household level surveys, where they enlist the total number of children in each household with their respective ages, as against the number of school going children. Thus they can estimate the number of Out of School Children (OoSC) and their ages and devise work plans accordingly. Following the baseline survey the mobiliser makes efforts to enrol / re-enrol the never enrolled/dropped out child by having discussions with the parents, teachers, and community members. Re-enrolment may take one of the two forms - those children that are recent drop-outs are directly enrolled into schools in the age-appropriate classes. Children who have dropped out many years ago are taken to MVF Residential Bridge Camps (RBCs) to be prepared for age-appropriate enrolment.

The residential bridge course camps are used as a means of lateral streaming for students to connect them to the curricula for the classes they have missed. The time spent by a child within an RBC before he/she is mainstreamed may vary based on the ability and age of dropout by the child but generally a minimum period of 6 months is preferred. Bridge material for the RBC has been developed in-house by the MVF team, and is organised in levels from entry level D to C, B and A (with A signifying the child's readiness to enter age appropriate mainstream schooling). Children progress through these levels before entering mainstream schooling. Assessments are conducted on a weekly and monthly basis in each subject, namely language, English and Mathematics. Subjects increase as children reach higher groups.

In addition to this, MVF also aims to achieve equitable student results in schools. Towards this end 15 schools have been adopted in Gattu and Ieeja under their Quality Improvement Programme (QIP) as a pilot program. Student's assessments were proposed to be conducted periodically to check their learning levels. The tests were to

be prepared by MVF and the more questions the child was able to answer meant for different grades, the more he/she was deemed to have been effectively taught.

On the basis of these results, a few steps were to be undertaken to specifically improve the quality of learning. Students were to be enrolled into remedial classes that were split into three levels: needs basic, needs improvement and ready for textbooks. The schools partnered with MVF were also to use the remedial tools in the RBC to be taught as a remedial class during the regular school day. This was seen as a good way to ensure that children were able to catch up with their classmates in the normal classrooms. An additional academic volunteer was to be appointed who would interface with the regular school teachers and sensitise them on the need to pay attention to absentees, undertake regular assessments (based on MVF assessment practices, identify the learning levels of students and maintain individual child portfolios. MVF academic volunteers would also help with regular teaching duties from time to time and were expected to organise a teachers' fora where teachers could come together to discuss issues with pedagogy, timetable, curricula etc. In addition, in ensuring that the school functions effectively, the MVF volunteer would also ensure that regular academic staff meetings take place and planning is undertaken effectively. Quality schools were also to work towards encouraging the formation of Children Management Committees (CMCs) which would be run by children to promote access to books and hygiene, etc.

Another small scale initiative at the individual level that was to be undertaken was that of scholarships. MVF was to provide scholarships worth Rs. 1500 per month per child to 30 students in Dhanora to continue their higher education (which is defined as class 9 and above, since RTE ensures that educational opportunities are available to every child till class 8). The process of selection of these students was to be carried out through a committee consisting of the Sarpanch, CRPF, Bal Samiti, local core groups and lecturers. Initially, 62 children's case files were given for the committee to choose from. From this list the children who worked on weekends, lived far away and had no money or support were chosen for the next round of interview with the group to arrive at a final list of 30 scholarship students.

3. Approach and Methodology of the Review Study

The current mid-term review of MVF's project on 'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India' was undertaken by the Centre for Budget and Policy Studies (CBPS), Bangalore, based on the request of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust. The objectives of the study were to

1. Assess progress against planned activities: This included an analysis of

    a. Communitycampaigns: (assess the process, reach and quality of selection of villages in the block, campaign coverage, campaign key messages, communication material and strategies, reported successes)

    b. Surveys and school mapping: (Study how surveys were planned and done, digitized, to what extent are they updated and tracked by the implementing team)

    c. Establishment of CBOs: (Assess the strategy for establishing CBOs – also the numbers, efforts taken to strengthen them and also the existing CBOs, support provided for advocacy, integration/communication with local bodies and if responsibilities are shared)

    d. Residential Bridge Course programme: (Assess the RBC for safety and hygiene provisions, appropriate study environment provided, training of RBC teachers, numbers reached, section of students and support provided to students for mainstreaming)

    e. Quality ImprovementProgramme: (Comment on the strategy for selection of schools in the selected GPs, program progress, review baseline and midline done by MVF, assess the efficacy and appropriateness of the teacher workshops and trainings on specific subjects done, examine the SDPs made for its quality, emphasis and involvement of SMCs)

    f. Scholarship program: (Assess the approach taken for selection of students, number covered, follow-up support given, how it helped and examine the gaps in implementation, if any)

2. Review of the Outputs and of the Outcomes against planned / reported

    a. Percentage of CBOs trained and strengthened on key messages, number of CBO members involved/reached beyond MVF volunteers, number of SMCs actively meeting, adequate representation to women in the CBOs formed, number of SMCs making SDPs

    b. Involvement of MVF team in pushing for or success in any of the following:rationalization of teachers, regular working of schools, anti-child

labour laws implementation, innovative solutions for teacher issues, seasonal hostels, number of schools where alternative teacher arrangements made by community/government

c. Impact of RBCs on drop-out children, number of children mainstreamed and nature of support provided after mainstreaming, demand for RBC enrolment in villages, average duration of the child in RBCs and whether this time has reduced and children are mainstreamed sooner, feedback and reflection on issues faced by drop-out children in Gadchiroli and in Mehboobnagar, need for changes if any in this program component

d. Impact of quality education program pilot on changes in teachers' teaching practices, creation of resource teachers, changes in school functioning, improvement in student learning outcomes

e. Impact of the disseminationefforts: Media coverage of the program, awareness about issues raised by these dissemination and campaigns, reach of the advocacy workshops on core issues being tackled at state / national level

f. Impact of the scholarships programmeon students' life and education

3. Examining financial utilization against the progress of activities and against planned activities: to examine how activities are planned and budgeted, whether federated planning helped in budgeting, are budgets reasonably adhered to, are subsequent budgets planned better with feedback, suggest ways of strengthening budgeting.

4. Examining the organisational efforts of monitoring &evaluation:(strategies/tools for the programmeand its effectiveness to address the issues that were faced in implementation / course correction)

5. Examining the design with consideration of the objectives in the context of local situations and constraints: (such as language, migration, movements and other socio-economic/political processes, policy environment including RTE and organisational vantage points)

6.Provide critical feedback based on the above analysis for course correction and suggestions for working towards sustainability

Since the programme works at the realm of the domestic space (home of the child) as well as within the community space, which includes the hostel/camp, school, and through community bodies such as the Gram Panchayat (GP), School Management Committee (SMC) and Child Rights Protection Forum (CRPF), the study tried to ensure that the voices of all the stakeholders are captured, as well as the dynamics of the multiple spaces that the programme operates at are observed and recorded.

While most interventions which form a part of the programme are uniformly operative across all blocks, and the overall system of intervention remains the same, some special

interventions are present exclusive to a block. For example, scholarships are provided only in Dhanora, while the teacher-led model of change / quality schools are present only in Ghattu and Ieza. Thus, our strategy of sampling to identify villages/GPs in which fieldwork would be conducted was selected to ensure that the programme and its interventions could be covered in its entirety. The following steps were undertaken to ensure a comprehensive and representative sample:

Step 1: Since the programme is implemented in two districts, it was decided to visit both these districts for field work. Within these districts, all the four blocks, where the programme has been operational was selected. This was critical to ensure that interventions like Residential Bridge Course (RBC), quality Schools, all stakeholders, community mobilisers, students receiving scholarships and active villages[4] could be covered.

Step 2: Within each block, the following criterion was utilized for selection of villages / Gram Panchayat:

a. Village / GP where the RBC is being conducted was selected in a purposive manner. RBCs are conducted in three blocks: Amrabad, Ieeja and Dhanora
b. Village/ GP where students from RBCs have been mainstreamed.
c. Village / GP where Academic / Social Mobilisers are working with local schools.
d. Village /GP where Quality Schools were present. Presently, 15 quality schools are being managed by MV Foundation's academic mobilisers across Ghattu and Ieja.
e. Village /GP where scholarship students were presently studying. These scholarships are currently being offered to meritous students in Dhanora.

Step 3: Based on the above criterion, villages/GPs were grouped as per the criterion mentioned above and their geographical location. Those villages / GPs that were located comparatively closer to each other were selected to facilitate field work within the limited time frame.

Step 4: Field team of M.V. Foundation was also consulted before finalizing the sample to ensure that these villages were not spread across far from the block and to ensure that travelling to these villages from the block headquarters would be feasible on a daily basis.

Based on the above steps, the following sample was selected for field work:

---

[4] Active villages were villages that were described as functioning independently following MVFs intervention with minimal external support.

Table 7: Details of Field Work Undertaken

Name of the District	Name of the Block	Name of the Village	Name of the GP	RBC	Students from RBC mainstreamed	Mobiliser	Quality Schools	Scholarship Students
Mahbubnagar	Amrabad	Balmoor	Balmoor		√			
		Amrabad	Amrabad			√		
		Mannanur	Amrabad		√	√		
		Achampet	Achampet	√	√			
	Ieeja	Ieeja	Ieeja	√	√	√	√	
		Uttahnoor	Uttahnoor			√	√	
	Gattu	Ghattu	Ghattu		√		√	
		Rayapuram	Ghattu		√	√		
Gadchiroli	Dhanora	Dhanora	Dhanora	√	√			√
		Chudiyal	Dhanora			√		√
		Chavela	Chavela			√		√
		Chicoli	Chicoli			√		√

Based on this selection, a list of schools where mobilisers work, Quality Schools, RBC students who have been mainstreamed (along with their present school details) and Scholarship students was generated from the master-list shared by MV Foundation for review on the field. Three teams of four members each were sent to the four study blocks. The same team covered Gattu and Ieeja because of their geographical proximity.

A stakeholder mapping was conducted and accordingly a detailed field work plan was chalked out. The stakeholders were from different levels – MVF functionaries from the state to the smallest unit of intervention – GP; other community functionaries like GP officials, CRPF members; school functionaries – SMC, teachers; home – parents of the child and the target beneficiary of the programme – children. The field work covered all stakeholders and all interventions of the programme. (See Appendix 1 for the details of field work undertaken.)

3.1 Tools used for data collection

1) Focus Group Discussion (FGD): individual FGDs were conducted with different stakeholders (i.e., SMC, GP and CRPF members, parents, teachers and students) to understand their responses to MVF's interventions and their standpoints with respect to children's education and labour. –FGDs are sensitive tools that allow for the natural flow of discussion, agreements and disagreements between group members, and allow the moderator to explore attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, ideas and group dynamics that emerge in the process of the discussion more fully. Each FGD was conducted for about 30-50 minutes depending on the group size. Lists of guiding questions for all stakeholders were prepared.

2) Consultations/discussions with MVF Staff – A one and a half days consultation meeting was held in the MVF office in Hyderabad. The meeting served as an introduction to the intervention, as well as a method to re-frame and finalize the study objectives, and for planning field work. These meetings helped in getting a macro picture of the entire programme from its inception to current day operations.

3) Classroom observations – Classroom observations were conducted to observe the general environment, teaching and pedagogic practices, particularly for the quality schools, as well as in schools where students had beenmainstreamed.An eye was also kept to check for special or any differential treatment meted out to mainstreamed students, and also to see how these students adjusted with the school environment. A classroom observation toolkit was prepared which had pointers for observations.

4) GP minutes observations – The GP meeting minutes present at the GP office were studied. This helped in understanding the periodicity of the meetings conducted,

participation levels from GP members belonging to diverse groups and the issues that were discussed and in turn prioritised. A checklist of pointers for observation was prepared.

5) SMC minutes observations - The SMC meeting minutes were studied. This helped in understanding the periodicity of the meetings conducted, participation levels from SMC members belonging to diverse groups and the issues that were discussed and in turn prioritised. A checklist of pointers for observation was prepared.

6) Attendance tracking of mainstreamed children- In order to check for retention of mainstreamed children, it was important to study the attendance records. Therefore an attendance tracker for one academic year was prepared.

Apart from the field work, a comprehensive review of secondary literature and data was conducted. In order to understand the context and setting in which the programme operates, a comprehensive secondary data analysis was undertaken. Data from DISE and Census 2011 was used along with data provided by MVF to map the status of primary education in the two study areas and blocks. To further understand the primary causes of out of school children and drop outs in the study area, we also analysed data on the prevalence of child labour and child marriage in the districts.

A one day training workshop at CBPS, Bangalore was organised to train all the members of the three teams. The following were the topics covered during the training-

1) About the study – Objectives
2) About the MVF intervention and stakeholders
3) Introduction to the field
4) Information on Right to Education and Gram Panchayat
5) Tools used for data collection
6) Protocols on Entry and Exit in the field – ethical and research parameters
7) Data Entry
8) Field Work plan

4. Analysis

This section presents the main observations that emerge from a close review of the documents (quarterly reports, budget sheets, baseline survey sheets, attendance sheets, details of enrolled and mainstreamed students, proposal framework and minutes of the meetings between CBPS and MVF held in the Hyderabad office) and indicators provided by MVF, as well as the primary fieldwork undertaken across the four blocks of Ghattu, Ieeja, and Amrabad in Mahbubnagar, and Dhanora in Maharashtra. The observations are discussed according to the three levels at which MVF was seen to be intervening - that is at the individual level, at the school (and larger education system) level, and at the community level. MVF's six objectives have been mapped against these levels and have been assessed to ascertain whether the individual objective are 'on track', 'partially on track', or 'not on track'.[5]

A. INDIVIDUAL

1. **Objective**: Enrolment
Process: A baseline survey of children in the age group of 0-18 years is conducted including their status of education (i.e. whether the student is attending school or has dropped out). The out-of-school children are then enrolled into schools and tracked. Students who have remained out of school for a long period of time are enrolled into RBCs and then mainstreamed into age-appropriate classes
Target areas: Ieeja, Gattu and Amarabad (Mahbubnagar)
Dhanora (Gadchiroli)

Table 8: Observations from Document Analysis: Enrolment

TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
Enrol 15,000 out of school children	PARTIALLY ON TRACK (33% of the target achieved)	1. Mainstreamed from RBC: 485 2. OoSC mainstreamed to schools: 4584	• Delays in the first year of implementation due to field-related issues. Delay in the programme is also reflected in the underutilization of their budget for Year 1. • The task of identifying OoSC is complete in all the target areas.

---

[5]Considering that this is a mid-term review, 'On Track' is defined as 50% or more of the target under the objective completed; Partially on track is defined as 30-50% of the target for the objective as completed; and 'Not on track' asless than 30% of the target under the objective as completed.

2.Objective: Retention

Process: Retention of all students in these schools is tracked through monthly monitoring of attendance. This is done for all the school children including the ones mainstreamed by MVF and the others.

Target areas: Ieeja, Gattu and Amarabad (Mahbubnagar)

Dhanora (Gadchiroli)

Table 9: Observations from Document Analysis: Retention

TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
Retaining 30,000 students in schools	ON TRACK	Total Schools being tracked across years: 333 Total Students tracked: 32,682	• For some months, attendance is 100% while for others it drops. For some schools, attendance improves over time while for some schools, it declines over time.

Observations from Field visits

- In all four blocks, in the schools visited students enrolled by MVF were seen to be present in school.
- Overall interest and motivation among children in these blocks to attend school has also improved due to other MVF interventions such as provision of shoes (an intervention that is not part of this project per se)
- However, within these schools repeated absenteeism after enrolment was also noted, with the reasons for this differing across the blocks. In KGBV Ghattu out of the 26 students enrolled by MVF, 14 had remained absent for over 5 days a month continuously. Three had dropped out and re-enrolled and two had dropped out and not re-enrolled. For KGBV Ieeja, out of 22 students enrolled by MVF, 19 had been absent for more than five days for a period of two months. Three students had dropped out and not re-enrolled.
- In Amrabad, at KGBV Mannanur, 16 out of the 24 students enrolled by MVF had remained absent for over 5 days during one or more months during the period observed. Two had dropped out and not re-enrolled. At Achampet ZPHGS, 4 of the 7 students enrolled by MVF had been absent for 5 days in one month for the period observed. The reasons cited for the same were health issues. Two students had dropped out. When attendance was taken at the RBC, it was found that 16 girls had been absent since Makar Sankranti in Mid-January. These students had gone home

during the festival and were expected to re-join only in the second week of February.

- At KGBV Dhanora, 7 out of the 20 students enrolled by MVF had remained absent for over 5 days for at least one month of the period observed.

- In Amrabad, ill health (particularly menstrual problems) seemed to be a major issue, while in Ghattu and Ieeja the major reasons seemed to be migration, work on the fields or care of siblings. The continued rampant presence of child labour was also noted by the field teams who saw children being brought back home after work in the evening in truckloads.

- In Dhanora however a different trend was noted. Willingness among parents to send children to school, as long as there was access to schools, was noted. The major reason for drop-out or absenteeism seemed to be poor quality of ashram schools in which children were enrolled, and difficult geographical terrains. Further, in Dhanora, it was mainly noted that children mainly dropped out at the secondary education stage due to lack of resources, and other factors such as transport and hostels to continue education.

- However, there were certain other concerns with respect to enrolment / retention that emerged through field work:
  - one observation made in Amrabad was that age-appropriate enrolments were sometimes not undertaken due to absence of age-appropriate residential schooling facilities. In such cases children were enrolled in higher grades and then retained for another year in the same class, as MVF felt that it was better to keep children in school rather than out-of-school for a year.
  - Retention numbers are reported for all children in school, and not just children who have been enrolled by MVF. While this can be considered to be positive on the one hand since it tracks all children in the block, it also leads to a conflation with regards to number of students retained, as many of these children may be those who continue to go to school even without any intervention. Thus, while we have marked the objective of 'retention' as 'on track' based on the documents shared by MVF, there is a need to disaggregate these numbers in order to show how interventions with children enrolled by MVF or 'at-risk' for drop out differ from other regular students.

3. **Scholarships**
   Objective: To motivate and financially incentivize students to complete their education
   Process: The scholarship students are selected by a committee consisting of the Sarpanch, CRPF, Bal Samiti, core groups and lecturers. Initially, 62 children's case files were given for the committee to choose from. From this list the children who worked on weekends, lived far away and had no money or support were supposed to have been chosen for the next round of interview with the group.
   Target areas: Dhanora (Gadchiroli)

Table 10: Observations from Document Analysis: Scholarships

TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
30-45 students	ON TRACK	45 students	• Vaguely defined criteria and arbitrary selection procedure • No systematic tracking of utilization of scholarship money

Observations from Field visits

- Interviews and discussions with various stakeholders (e.g., parents, GP members, SMC, students) all showed that access to secondary schooling in Dhanora was particularly restricted by the geographical terrain and lack of hostels.
- One of the prime ways in which the scholarship scheme has helped is by providing opportunities for students to address this problem through purchase of cycles. This has also improved attendance.
- Scholarship amounts were also reported to be used for other education related expenditures such as notebooks and stationery.
- While a cross-verification of student passbooks and MVF bank statements showed that scholarships were largely being provided on time, some delays in transfer of funds to students were noted in a few cases, which seemed to be due to delays on the part of cooperative banks in which students had accounts. One large gap in receipt of scholarship was noted between June-December 2015, for which amount was credited in January 2016 in full. This was explained by MVF block officials as due to delay in release of funds from the head office and Tata Trust itself.
- The major issue with regards scholarship seems to be the selection criteria. With no specific inclusion criteria for selection of students (and an exclusion criteria used instead), the distribution of scholarship in a fair manner seems an issue. Several scholarship students we met on field already had elder siblings who were completing graduation degrees, and it therefore seemed like the families might perhaps have some or the other means to ensure the continuation of their children's education. On the other hand we saw children from poorer circumstances (e.g., like in kutcha houses and depending on subsistence agriculture), but who were in upper primary schools, and had dropped out of school due to the poor quality of ashram schools. These observations seemed to point to a need to develop a more stringent inclusion criteria that specifically addresses the challenges to schooling observed in Dhanora - i.e., not just keeping in mind the difficulties faced in accessing secondary education, but also in the context of distance and terrain, and

poor quality of ashram schools becoming a concern for even completion of primary and upper primary schooling.

Discussion: Overall, MVF's interventions at the individual student level can be said to be 'on track', and bearing positive results. From document review as well as field visits, it was observed that identification of allOut-of-school students in the blocks has been completed; MVF mobilizers have been making regular visits to households of children out-of-school or 'at risk' for drop out, and have been motivating parents to send their children to school. Interest and motivation for schooling among children has also seemed to have increased due to other provisions made by MVF such as provision of school shoes. A quick survey during field visits with small groups of children also showed that mainstreamed children were able to perform grade-appropriately and regular school teachers also largely opined that mainstreamed students were able to catch up with regular students (with the exception of teachers from KGBV Ieza, who were unhappy with the mainstreamed students). Due to the paucity of time, specific tools to assess learning levels of all children mainstreamed could not be developed and learning assessments could not be carried out. However, the field team interacted with the students and asked them a few grade-appropriate related questions (e.g., in Mathematics to solve graph related problems to 9th std students; about concepts such as air pressure to 7th std students; etc).

However, repeated absenteeism, particularly in Telengana, and specifically in Ghattu and Ieza, due to continued employment of children as labour is a major concern. As we discuss later, a critical reason for this absenteeism also seems to be because parents take back children from schools once they are enrolled by MVF, for reasons of employment or festivals. This suggests a need for greater efforts at community mobilization, which as we discuss later, are still not adequate. It is perhaps also necessary for MVF to undertake a more holistic approach to addressing the situation taking into account structural factors such as food and income security that critically affect children's participation in labour. Thus, community mobilization may perhaps have to be broadened in ways that make communities aware of other opportunities (e.g., MNREGA) and rights (e.g., protection of wages) that can also help towards convincing the community of releasing their children for education.

Other structural factors such as poor quality of education, poor quality of ashram schools, poor quality of food offered in ashram schools and the lack of hostels also seem to be affecting retention in the case of Dhanora. In these cases, it is also important for MVF to engage with the regular school system and educational bureaucracy in improving the conditions of these schools, while also building the community's capacity in holding these schools accountable.

A final concern that needs to be addressed at the individual level is in terms of how retention figures are recorded. While it is commendable that MVF is making an effort to

track every child in school, there is a need to explain how different students (i.e., those who are already motivated to stay in school, and those at risk for drop out) are tracked and retained separately.

B. **SCHOOL**

1. **Residential Bridge Course Camps**
    Objective: Mainstreaming out-of-school children to their age-appropriate classes
    Process: The given objective is achieved with the help of residential bridge course camps. There are about 50-100 children per RBC with a minimum time of at least 6 months spent by each child in the RBC. All the students are divided into groups on the basis of their learning levels and each group has 15-25 students. When the RBC teacher believes the student can be transferred on the basis of the assessment results, he/she is mainstreamed into a formal school.
    Target areas: One all-girls RBC between Ieeja and Gattu and One all-girls RBC in Amarabad; Mahbubnagar
    One common RBC in Dhanora; Gadchiroli

Table 11: Observations from Document Analysis: Residential Bridge Course Camps

TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
• Enrol about 300 children across all 3 RBCs • Mainstream 250 children into schools	ON TRACK	• 257 students enrolled into RBCs • 247 students mainstreamed from Ieeja RBC, 127 students from Amarabad and 109 students from Dhanora RBC	• Enrolments from Dhanora RBC into mainstream schools also seem to be largely age inappropriate. This is perhaps because children enrolled in the RBC itself were largely older. • On an average, the number of students enrolled into RBCs each quarter is much larger than the number of students mainstreamed in the following quarter.

Observations from Field visits

- Overall the RBCs appear to be well functioning and students appeared to be extremely happy with the facilities provided.
- Students seemed to have a sense of belonging at the RBCs. In all three blocks, teachers and students shared a good relationship and many students had a close bond with the teachers.
- The girls at the RBCs look out for each other and they are happy with the food provided. Some girls even report that they are happiest at the RBC and in Ieeja RBC a girl said '*This hostel is very nice, if there are more children like us, they should be brought here as well*'.
- The teaching-learning approach and material in the RBC seemed to suggest the use of progressive pedagogic practices - e.g., approach to reading focused on identifying familiar words, and then using this to identify individual letters and letter combinations (rather than through the conventional phoneme-word approach). Flash cards, games, charts, and resource material for art was available and other materials such as simple, colourfully illustrated story books were used to develop linguistic abilities. Basic concepts in arithmetic were demonstrated using teaching-learning material, etc.
- Children also reported learning to be more interesting and understandable. A quick survey of some students mainstreamed and at the RBC also seemed to show that they were able to perform at grade level. As discussed above, while a formal learning assessment was not conducted to check for students' learning levels, quick interactions with students and observations of their reading, spelling and narrating abilities seemed to suggest that children were able to perform at the specific groups/levels at which they were placed in the RBCs. Some of the concepts checked for (according to the level at which students were) included basic science and social science topics such as regarding the colour of leaves, use of maps, understanding of basic mathematical concepts such as shapes, arithmetic operations such as multiplication and division, etc.
- With respect to facilities, each RBC was equipped with adequate facilities and the quality of facilities and food available was very good.
- Apart from academics, the RBCs have extracurricular activities which the students enjoy. They play sports like kabaddi, chess, carom, throw ball and have group activities as well.
- Children also reported the food at the RBC to be good, and rated it better than the food received at ashram schools / other schools (which was also one of the reasons they reported for dropping out of these other schools).
- While infrastructure at the RBC also appears to be largely adequate, at the RBC in Ieeja, it was noted that there was no compound wall. This was also an area of concern for parents interviewed as well. There was a barbed wire around the compound but it did not serve as adequate security. In Amrabad there were more requests for blankets from the students.

- While there were no specific classes for soft skills, from interactions with children we got to learn that children were provided opportunities for play (e.g., games such as cricket, badminton). Teachers and children read and discussed the newspaper and students were also provided additional story books for pleasure reading.

2. Quality Schools Initiative:

Objective: To create schools that ensure holistic development of the students through the creation of remedial coursework and student run activities.

Process: The schools are chosen based on various factors such as good student retention, qualified teachers, village support and infrastructural requirements. Initial assessments conducted by MVF showed that more than 70% of students were not able to grasp basic concepts in various subjects in these schools. Discussions with teachers suggested that the teachers did not believe the assessment. MVF were keen to show schools the reality and wanted teachers to see things as they were. As the RTE mandates that a student cannot be failed till the 8th grade, these students would carry on to the next grade. In three years, MVF has conducted 4 such assessments for students. The major problem was that of insufficient training in previous grades as a result of which, children are not able to cope with their class appropriate curriculum.

Thus, various stakeholders have been given training regarding both child rights acts and remedial coursework. MVF had been facilitating capacity building of the teacher community in all 15 government schools in both of these mandals. MVF believes that capacity building is necessary to ensure quality teaching and proper textbook transaction. Teachers were trained on how to interact with children in a more engaging, activity-based manner. The idea behind a teacher-led model of change is that the teachers should take ownership of the programme with support from administration at the mandal and district level.

MVF along with government school teachers during training conceptualised a remedial textbook called 'Nemilika' (in 1992-93, when RBCs were first started for Ranga Reddy district). These remedial textbooks are used by teachers in all quality schools. Based on the assessment, there are three levels for remedial learning. The first level is for students who are not able to grasp basic concepts itself, the second level is for those who have made considerable progress and are ready for assessment. The third level indicates that the students are ready to study from the regular textbooks. They have monthly tests to check the progress and weekly tests as well.Each child has their own portfolio and teachers use the portfolios to monitor the progress of each child.

Academic volunteers have also been appointed in these schools to aid in remedial coursework. The students are also given more involvement through the creation of

Children's Committees (CCs) that undertake a variety of activities from health and hygiene to cultural activities.
Target Areas: 15 schools in Gattu and Ieeja.

Table 12: Observations from Document Analysis: Quality Schools Initiative

TARGETS TO BE MET[6]	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS

15 schools to be absorbed into quality schools. Targets to be completed for these 15 schools set by MVF included:
• - Organizing and tracking children's data in the area
• Conducting programs to ensure children's attendance in schools and their retention
• Preparing schools to ensure age appropriate class norm
• Preparing schools to undertake tabulating basic competency profile of the children
• Preparing schools to organize children's portfolios
  • Preparing schools to undertake conducting reme instruction to children whoneed to be supported
  • Organizing children's committees like Library committee, cultural committee, education review committee and sports and games committee
  • Training SMCs in RTE and quality monitoring in schools
  • Facilitating schools in implementing CCE
  • Working with the school administration (block level Education officers) and orient them on implementing quality components of RTE
  • Preparing schools to ensure child rights in schools and making the
	ON TRACK	• Children's data has been collected
		• Programmes to ensure children's attendance have been conducted
		• Schools have undertaken testing
		• Remedial classes have begun for the children.
		• Children's portfolios are being maintained
		• Children's Committees have been created and they take part in co-curricular activities.
		• Training has been given to different stakeholders
			• While individual child portfolios are maintained physically, this has not been digitised.
			• Digital records give aggregate numbers school-wise and block wise, which make it difficult to track individual student's progress.
			• Hence it is difficult to make any observations about the impact of the QIP programme on learning itself

---

[6] Two of the targets set by MVF, on interfacing with block level administration and preparing schools in ensuring children's rights could not be observed

Observations from Field visits

- Remedial classes are held for students in the morning and normal classes are held during the second half. Students who are not attending remedial classes are given separate class work to work on during the first half of the day.
- Teachers are making use of these remedial textbooks and additional learning material. Teachers stated that the remedial textbooks with its illustrations worked very well for students who struggled with concepts. They found the textbooks much easier to teach than the regular coursework and felt that students were able to cope with the curriculum.
- Classroom observations also showed that teachers use flash cards and other TLM to engage students. Teachers engage with all children actively and children respond well to teachers. The teachers spend extra time with those who find it hard to cope and make use of the TLM available to make the classes more interesting. Children in the first grade were able to respond well to flash cards and did so with great enthusiasm.
- Classroom and homework records maintained by the teachers showed that the overall learning levels of students had improved. Students observed in different quality schools were able to recite prose and poems in English and Telugu both.
- Discussions with the teachers suggested that the teachers received training at the state level.
- Teachers are receiving support from the academic resource person. The academic resource person hired by MVF looks after the children's committees' activities, remedial classes and overall functioning of the programme in the schools. They even fill in for the regular teachers if they are absent.
- The Children's committees are functioning well, and children are very enthusiastic to be part of these committees and carry on activities with great interest. Walls of the schools are adorned with posters, poems, paintings made by the children as part of these committees.
- A teachers' fora, which has also been conceptualised as part of the QIP initiative has not fully taken off. The teachers' fora was to consistsof active teachers of government schools who will organise workshops to produce supplementary study material for children in need. While several of the teachers were involved in the initial planning and conceptualisation of the textbook, currently they are not conducting any extra workshops to address additional needs of students.
- Instead teachers have subject wise meetings to discuss issues and progress of children. Some of the school teachers had a forum organised at the mandal level. The teachers sometimes meet on their own informally to discuss issues that they may face.
- While the quality school intervention seems to be benefitting and engaging students, there are larger infrastructural and structural issues that need to be addressed. For example, in one of the schools, due to lack of space, two classes

were conducted in a small, single classroom, and due to high noise levels students were unable to concentrate properly.

- Another structural issue that needs to be addressed for the effective functioning of the QIP is the shortage of teachers. Most school teachers reported that they felt the schools were understaffed. As a result they are burdened with extra work. Initially, MVF faced resistance from teachers and teachers themselves reported that they found it hard to teach remedial material as well as regular coursework. Over time as they observed progress amongst the students, they have adapted it into their routine.

- To address this issue, 43 Vidya volunteers[7] have been hired by the schools to help with the teaching load and they have received training from the government on how to interact in the quality schools. However they have not been trained by MVF in remedial teaching. Only the old batch of Vidya volunteers received training for the same. The Vidya volunteers were mainly observed to be helping out with the regular syllabus, rather than the remedial syllabus.

- Another observation that emerged during field visits was that the burden on children also increased as they had to catch up with the regular portions after completing the remedial classes each day. One suggestion that emerged from teachers in this regard was that the remedial classes which MVF used to arrange during summer vacations may be a more viable option.

Discussion: At the school level, both initiatives by MVF to ensure retention of children in schools, and improve conditions of schooling and learning outcomes, can be said to have paid off. RBCs to prepare out-of-school students for mainstream education, as well as the QIP schools, to improve the quality of schooling, appear to be functioning well.During field visits RBCs were seen to be warm conducive spaces, providing students with adequate facilities, good food and good pedagogic inputs for learning. Students themselves reported that the atmosphere and teaching in the RBCs was good.In QIP schools, teachers have received training in progressive pedagogic practices, and have been implementing these; remedial classes have been started; and children's learning levels appear to have improved. Children's committees were also seen to be functioning actively.

However, one area of concern with respect to the QIP is with regards to tracking students' progress in terms of learning levels or outcomes. The lack of digitised data for individual students and the levels they have progressed through makes this difficult, andtherefore observations about the impact of the QIP programme on learning itself cannot be made.

---

[7]Vidya volunteers are contractual teachers appointed by the schools to compensate for the shortage of teaching staff

Another issue that also needs to be addressed at the school/education department level is the need to interface more substantially with the department in order for the QIP and other intervention by MVF to be successful. Advocacy or building linkages with the department is critical for both ensuring infrastructural concerns, teacher capacity-related issues, etc, as well as to ensure that support is received from BEOs / CROs at the ground level for the interventions made by MVF and the community. For across different stakeholders (i.e., MVF staff as well as community representatives), a common issue that was pointed out was that while changes were taking place at the local level, support for some of these initiatives were hard to obtain from the block level officers or district level officers of the education department. For example, in one of the villages visited in Dhanora, we found that community members had taken the initiative of filing a complaint against a head master of a local Zilla Parishad Upper Primary school, who was coming drunk to the school. While this had resulted in his dismissal, even after almost a year no new head master had been appointed to the school, which had resulted in other problems such as the School Development Plans (SDPs) and budgets for the school having no been planned and spent. Thus, support from the block and district level officials of the education department is critical if community interests and efforts must be sustained, or even for other issues such as ensuring adequate and regular training for teachers in the mainstream schoolto receive and support out-of-school children. Field visits largely showed that in all schools (not just QIP schools), support from higher levels (i.e., BEOs, CROs), etc was lacking.

C. **COMMUNITY**

2. **Sustainability**

Objective: Complete handover of all MVF's activities to the community bodies and members

Process: The community is strengthened by a series of intensive training provided to existing institutions such as the SMC, GP and CPC. According to MVF every village in the selected blocks are covered. MVF also creates a network of supportive institutions. Community mobilizers conduct household surveys to identify out-of-school children and devise work plans for enrolling/re-enrolling children to schools. Community organizers supervise the work of the mobilizers and visit villages on a daily basis to spread awareness and strengthen local community groups. A parallel volunteer-based committee, known as Child Rights Protection Forum is established that conducts community awareness campaigns using tools such as advertisements, rallies, melas, street plays, etc. CRPF also interfaces with a variety of stakeholders to arrive at solutions for the community. A block in-charge is also appointed from MVF for providing support at periodic review meetings at the cluster and mandal level. BIC also conducts the first-level meetings with the community and appoints the community mobilizer.

Target areas: Ieeja, Gattu and Amarabad; Mahbubnagar, Dhanora; Gadchiroli

Table 13: Observations from Document Analysis: Sustainability

TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
Train at least 100-150 community bodies	ON TRACK	• 839 local community bodies trained (240 SMCs, 129 GPs, 196 CRPFs)	• One BIC appointed for each block. • One community mobiilzer appointed for each Panchayat. • Although MVF targeted 50% of the mobilisers to be women, only 40% of them are females in the current program. • It is also unclear from the quarterly reports as to who is conducting the trainings for CBOsand thus difficult to point out the contribution of MVF in capacity building. Example: Many SMCs reported that training had been received from education department • Few initiatives have been made in Dhanora for community engagementin terms of trainings and campaigns,raising the question of whether this is due to proximity to the head office • No set mechanisms or processes phasing out and handing over the programs to the CBOs mentioned • Indicators of success in relation to community mobilisation include - leveraging SHGs where available or creation of Girl Rights Protection Camp where gender inequality is rampant,

			even when not planned for explicitly; - 300 post-cards were sent to the High court as part of the post-card campaign and the CM resulted in deployment of Vidya Volunteers; 85 in Amarabad, 127 in Gattu and 81 in Ieeja. - addressing the issue of child marriage by enlisting the village purohit in checking for age proof, organizing dandoras, conducting street plays, GPs are making it mandatory to register the age of the children before conducting marriages, etc. (please see annexure 4 for more details)

Observations from Field

- A common thread that emerged through all the discussions and field observations was the weak nature of the community mobilization techniques. MVF considers community mobilization as their vehicle of change, however, there are issues with the strategies they have adopted for mobilization.

- Observations and discussion with various stakeholders on the field seem to suggest that the SMCs and GPs have become more active in the schools following MVFs intervention. However, the degree of activity/interest varies from village to village.

- Regular visits to schools by SMCs and GP members were reported across several villages. However, a critical finding on field was also that not all SMC members were involved, and that usually it was the SMC Adhyaksha and Head Master who mostly participated in SMC-related activities.Further SMCs largely only continued to perform their monitoring roles. A review of SMC minutes largely showed that the discussions were largely focused on such as infrastructural problems and the Mid-day meal programme, while this was not converted into action many of the times. Only in Amrabad, the SMC and GP minutes seem to show a record of discussions about student enrolments and attendance and how to improve attendance and access to schools. In Dhanora the SMC minutes showed discussions on budget and expenditure related to cost of painting, getting borewells, etc.

- Further, it also seemed that MVF engages lesser with SMCs than they do with GP members. In Dhanora, most SMCs reported that they had received training from the education department and not through MVF.

- Further it also seemed that training provided to community bodies is limited, and only heads of these bodies receive direct training, with little trickle down of lessons to other members of the body or the community.
- A 'one-size-fits-all' policy is also adopted for training, wherein all community bodies receive similar kinds of training. While there is a need for convergence among the different community bodies trained (e.g., SMC, GP and CRPF), <u>training modules should be designed to highlight their specific roles and responsibilities</u>.
- Training is also largely focused on giving information about children's rights and legislations such as the RTE. However, there is no specific effort made to build capacity of the bodies to take on the responsibility of the programme independently once MVF phases out from the village/GP/ or block. For example, there is no effort to develop the community's capacity in independent thinking and problem solving of community issues, working the bureaucracy and administrative machinery in order to ensure their needs, etc. Thus, a high dependence on MVF to provide guidance ("marga darshan") was noted among the community bodies.
- A consequence of this perhaps was that in the "active" villages that were visited, the field team failed to note any sustained effort or awareness among community members with respect to actions and strategies being undertaken to ensure the continuation of MVF's programme and efforts to eradicate child labour and keep children in schools.
- Another major issue with respect to the respect to the community mobilization strategy adopted by MVF is its modus operadi of engaging mainly with prominent or influential members of the community to get their 'buy in'. These members then apply pressure on other members of the community. Individual parents of children out-of-school are also visited by the mobilizers. However this leaves the larger community untouched with respect to attitudinal change, as well as with respect to awareness of critical issues which is necessary if the programme must succeed and function independently.
- Thus, a repeated suggestion that emerged on field from several stakeholders, including teachers at mainstream schools, SMCs and GP members was also the need to have more regular interactions with all parents, through village level parent meetings. This is important as it was noted that several parents returned to take their children back home after they had been mainstreamed.
- Another issue with respect to community mobilization noted was the lack of convergence noted between the functioning of the SMCs, CRPFs and GPs, which could have beneficial effects.
- Another issue is also the <u>low representation of women in most of these committees</u>, and lack of specific gender-related training, or other training for empowerment of the both women members of these community bodies, as well as for women mobilisers and organisers of MVF themselves. This has serious implications for addressing gender-related issues related to education and health. MVFs mobilizers along with these bodies take care of an adolescent girls programme that addresses

issues faced by adolescent girls. In the absence of a female voice, decisions that are taken about the programme may not fully represent the needs of the girls.

Discussion: Community mobilization lies at the heart of MVF's programme. However, this is an area that requires major strengthening. On the positive side, MVF's efforts at engaging the community have paid off in certain instances with major achievements such as enlisting the village purohit's help in preventing child marriages, community's efforts at petitioning the education department for filling up teacher vacancies, community monitoring of schools and teachers, with the result that at least in one village in Dhanora, a head master has been dismissed for coming drunk to school; supplementation of mid-day meals through a community sustained vegetable garden in one village in Dhanora, etc.

However, one important observation was that such achievements and widespread community awareness and engagement seemed to be a feature of the main panchayat village, or the village from where the mobilizer is drawn. What is absent is a spread of knowledge and awareness among all villages in a panchayat (especially the habitation villages), and among all members of the community. Further, it was also noted through the document analysis that the number of awareness campaigns provided in Dhanora are much fewer than that for the other three blocks, raising the question of whether proximity to the head office was a factor responsible for this.

As discussed earlier, MVF uses the strategy of building support from the influential members of the community first, which is an important strategy to gain entry. However, this needs to be followed up by meetings and programmes organised at the whole village level, without assuming that the trained members of the villages will automatically take on the responsibility of training others in the village. In this respect a repeated suggestion that was given on field was regarding the need to engage more substantially with parents through regular parent meetings.

Another critical area that requires attention is also training for community members, with the content of these training needing to go beyond just building awareness or providing information. Trainings need to be, first, specifically catered to the local needs of the community and to the needs of specific community members (e.g., there needs to be gender sensitive training given, especially to female members of the community bodies, who currently seem to be functioning simply as nominal members of these communities). Further, training must be focused on specific skills - e.g., how to interact or work with the bureaucracy; what are the processes to petition the education department, what is its organization structure; skills for assertion, negotiation, conflict resolution, etc, without which MVFs plans to make communities independently take on the functions of child protection and monitoring seems to incomplete.[8]

---

[8]It must be noted that during subsequent discussions with MVF staff, it was mentioned that there were specific training modules that have already been prepared by MVF in

Finally, a convergence between the various community bodies involved in child protection, as well as between the progress made within panchayat villages and habitation villages needs to be brought. One mechanism to achieve the former would be to have regular inter-body meetings where members of the different bodies can discuss plans and achievements made by them. With respect to the latter, MVF had conceived of having members from all villages in a panchayat in the CRPF. However, in practicality this has perhaps been difficult for them, and has not been fully achieved. However, this is critical if all villages within a panchayat have to be equally benefited.

---

order to impart these skills. MVF staff informed us that the initial stages of training was designed to prepare the community for the later stages of in-depth training. However, since during field work training modules were neither shared with us, and since advanced stages of training had not yet been started with the community, we have been unable to ascertain this.

Table 14: Consolidated Matrix of Planned Targets and Targets achieved between 2014-2016

PROGRAM COMPONENT	TARGET TO BE MET	TARGET STATUS	TARGET ACHIEVED	COMMENTS	SUGGESTIONS
Enrolment	Enrol 15,000 out of school children	**PARTLY ON TRACK**	-Mainstreamed from RBC: 485 -OoSC mainstreamed to schools: 4584	The task of identifying OoSC is complete in all the target areas. Delays observed in the first year of implementation due to field-related issues which is also reflected in the underutilization of their budget for Year 1	Prepare a consolidated list that presents student level data and tracks their progress till the current status Focus on structural and systemic factors as well to increase student enrolments
Retention	Retain 30,000 students in schools	**ON TRACK**	-Total schools being tracked across years: 333 -Total students tracked: 32,682	For some months, attendance is 100% while for others it drops. For some schools, attendance improves over time while for some schools, it declines over time.	Define the retention rates of schools to differentiate between the students who are retained by MVF and those who are anyway retained by themselves.
Scholarships	Provide scholarships to 30-45 students	**ON TRACK**	-45 students	The selection procedure has vaguely defined criteria and arbitrary procedures. There is no systematic tracking of utilization of scholarship money.	Consider and roll out a scheme for providing cycles to all students Introduce a stronger inclusion criteria for short listing scholarship students

Residential Bridge Course camps	Enroll about 300 children across all 3 RBCs and mainstream 250 children into schools	**ON TRACK**	-257 students enrolled into RBCs -247 students mainstreamed from Ieeja RBC, 127 students from Amarabad and 109 students from Dhanora RBC	Enrolments from Dhanora RBC into mainstream schools seem to be largely age inappropriate. This is perhaps because children enrolled in the RBC itself were largely older. On an average, the number of students enrolled into RBCs each quarter is much larger than the number of students mainstreamed in the following quarter.	
Quality Schools Initiative	15 schools to be absorbed into quality schools	**ON TRACK**	-Schools have introduced assessment and remedial classes have begun for the children. -Children's Committees have been created and they take part in co-curricular activities. -Training has been given to different stakeholders	While individual child portfolios are maintained physically, this has not been digitized. The existing spreadsheets give aggregate numbers school-wise and block wise, which make it difficult to track individual student's progress, especially on learning levels.	Focus on structural issues such as increasing the number of classrooms, employing more teachers, etc. Create digitized databases to assess learning levels of students Garner more support from block/district level officials of the education department

Community mobilization	Train at least 100-150 community bodies	**ON TRACK**	-839 local community bodies trained (240 SMCs, 129 GPs, 196 CRPFs)	One BIC is appointed for each block and one community mobiilzers appointed for each Panchayat. Although MVF targeted 50% of the mobilizers to be women, only 40% of them are females in the current program. It is also unclear from the quarterly reports as to who is conducting these trainings and thus difficult to point out the contribution of MVF in capacity building. Fewer initiatives are conducted in Dhanora for community engagement raising the question of whether this is due to proximity to the head office. There are no set mechanisms or processes phasing out and handing over the programs to the CBOs mentioned. Indicators of success in relation to community mobilisation include: -leveraging SHGs where	Focus equally on habitation villages. Plan community mobilization strategies according to the geography and terrain. Build greater linkages with the education department Provide gender-specific training Design training modules such that specific roles and responsibilities are highlighted Engage more parents through village level parent meetings Conduct more inter-body meetings

				available or creation of Girl Rights Protection Camp where gender inequality is rampant, even when not planned for explicitly; -success of the petition and post-card campaigns for appointment of teachers in Ghattu and Ieza - addressing the issue of child marriage by enlisting the village purohit in checking for age proof	

5. Budget Analysis

The budget for the programme "Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India" had been drafted based on unit cost and proposed duration of the programme. Based on the half yearly expenditure (Table 1) and annual expenditure variance (Table 2) from the budget, it is evident that the programme faced various initial issues.

Table 15: Half-Yearly Expenditure for the Programme

		Half Yearly Expenditure in INR				
		April'14 to Sept'14	Oct'14 to March'15	April'15 to Sept'15	Oct'15 to March'16	April'16 to Sept'16
1	Salary (Personnel, Orgn & Admin)	6,065,149	9,424,725	9,863,645	10,988,782	10,834,327
2	Capital Cost	139,425	50,774	84,800	30,455	7,375
3	Program Cost	619,624	4,100,227	4,212,864	5,297,575	4,351,603
3.1	A.P.	503,876	3,060,838	2,856,674	3,468,211	3,191,861
3.2	Maharashtra	115,748	1,039,389	1,356,190	1,829,364	1,159,742
4	Overhead Cost	771,238	1,587,716	1,029,709	1,241,016	1,564,850
	Total Cost	7,595,436	15,163,442	15,191,018	17,557,828	16,758,155

Source: Compiled from Audited Expenditure Reports shared by MVF

Table 16: Year-wise Actual Expenditure against Budget

	Year 1 (April 2014 - March 2015)			Year 2 (April 2015 - March 2016)			Year 3		
	Budget in INR	Actual in INR	Variance (%)	Budget in INR	Actual in INR	Variance (%)	Budget in INR (April' 16 to March' 17)	Actual in INR(April to Sept 2016)	Variance (%)
1. Salary	19,960,063	15,489,874	22%	22,698,034	20,852,427	8%	24,064,047	10,834,327	55%
2. Capital Cost	200,000	190,199	5%	105,000	115,255	-10%	0	7,375	0%
3. Program Cost	8,895,500	4,719,851	47%	11,012,950	9,510,439	14%	10,614,998	4,351,603	59%
3.1 Andhra Pradesh	*5,863,000*	*3,564,714*	*39%*	*7,415,050*	*6,324,885*	*15%*	*7,000,553*	*3,191,861*	*54%*
3.2 Maharashtra	*3,032,500*	*1,155,137*	*62%*	*3,597,900*	*3,185,554*	*11%*	*3,614,445*	*1,159,742*	*68%*
4. Overhead Cost	3,195,600	2,358,954	26%	3,355,380	2,270,725	32%	3,523,149	1,564,850	56%
Total Cost	2,251,163	22,758,878	29%	37,171,364	32,748,846	12%	38,202,194	16,758,155	56%

Source: Compiled from Audited Expenditure Reports shared by MVF

In the first year of its implementation, there is more than 20 per cent variance between the budgeted amount and the actual expenditure, except the capital cost. This variance is much higher for the programme cost, especially for Maharashtra. This was also reflected in the field-level discussions.In Maharashtra, cluster organisers and block in charge indicated that they had faced initial hurdles in getting mobilisers. Presence of extremist groups and difficult terrain also made it difficult to access villages, especially those away from the block headquarters and in between the forest. Even in Andhra Pradesh, the cluster and block level organisers faced initial hurdles in starting the programme.This variance is much lower for the second year of implementation, except the overhead costs, indicating that they overcame the initial hurdles in the second year of implementation. High variance in the Year 3 is due to difference in the yearly budget and half-yearly expenditure compared.

Per unit cost for the budget heads indicates detailed planning for different aspects of the programme. However, within the programme cost, a lumpsum unit cost per child in the

Residential Bridge Course (RBC) is given. This amount excludes salary of RBC staff (teaching, non-teaching and camp-in-charge) but is expected to cover all children-related expense. The per child cost for RBC includes rent for the space and other overhead costs (electricity, water etc.), food for students and staff, stationary and materials for studying, cleaning materials for maintaining hygiene in the living space, medical expenses and any other emergency arising during the RBC duration. During field visits, students studying in RBC shared that one of the reasons for their drop-out was that food in the schools was not good. However, they were happy with the quality of food given to them in RBC. The RBCs were also maintained with cleanliness and had ample space. Students were also provided with products of personal hygiene. The infrastructure used was in decent condition and security was ensured. This indicates that the unit cost per child specified in the budget seems to be adequate for quality learning and living experience in the RBCs.

Field discussions in Gadchiroliindicated that due to the distance and remoteness of different villages, actual transport cost was much higher than the current budgeted amount. Presently, mobilisers were given a salary of Rs. 9,300 per month and Rs. 2,500 for transportation. But this amount was not sufficient, especially since mobilisers are expected to visit each village multiple number of times. Another issue that was noticed was delay in transfer of funds from the District office to the scholarship students. However, on reviewing the bank passbooks, it was noticed that this delay was external to the programme and primarily due to the account being held in a cooperative bank. Interactions with scholarship students indicated that they were utilizing these amounts for buying bicycles as the schools were at least 3-4 kms away, purchasing books and reference materials, especially for entrance examinations and stationary.

6. Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, MVFs programme on 'Ensuring Education for Children in Vulnerable Areas across Two States in India' can be said to be functioning well, but there are a few areas that can be further strenghtened. Some of these discrepancies perhaps emerge as a result of the disconnect between MVF's overall philosophy, which aims at addressing every child, rather than targeting specific child populations or numbers, and the manner in which this philosphy has been converted into targets for the sake of the project. There are several positive features of the programme that have contributed to its success. For example:

a. Enlisting local youth as volunteers has been one of the important factors for its success, as this has allowed MVF mobilizers not only to take on ownership and carry on sustained work, but also helped in building trust in MVF amongst the community. It was evident that communities had a huge sense of respect for MVF, during field visits.

b. MVF run RBCs have been a huge success in not only building children's interest in education, but also parents confidence regarding their children's safety and development. The RBCs provide a warm and loving environment to children, wherein they are able to gain adequate all-round development, even if it is for a short period of time. Further, a key observation about the RBCs is that they have become demosntration sites for other state and non-state actors working in the field of education. MVF has encouraged several other organisations in the field to visit the RBCs and has proved them with first-hand learning experiences to develop quality education initiatives.

c. MVFs interventions in the quality schools, as well as through the RBCs, have ensured that out-of-school children and drop-outs are able to catch up with other children and perform adequately, with confidence and interest.

d. In this regard MVFs remedial materials and pedagogic interventions have been a huge success in not only improving children's learning levels, but also bringing about changes to the pedagogic practices of teachers in these select schools. Teachers were also appreciative of MVF's bridge course and remedial material that has simplified teaching.MVF has also drawn from an earlier review of its work conducted in 2013, by Best Practices Foundation and incorporated some of these suggestions into their work. The table below summarises the recommendations provided by the Best Practices Foundation, based on their work in Nalagonda district, and MVF's efforts to incorporate these suggestions:

Table 17: Recommendations and Comments

RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS
Strengthen institutional capacities of communities and local bodies so that monitoring of schools and school management can be handed over to these institutions. Activating local governance is also a good strategy to work around the problems of child marriage and child labour.	There is an increased emphasis on the same by engaging village purohits, SHGs, etc. but there are no set procedures to hand over the processes to the community.
Focus more on leadership development, teacher motivation and skills than on children per se by capitalizing on MVF's experience in pedagogic training	Although teacher training programmes are being conducted, motivation is affected by structural issues such as lack of space and shortage of teachers.
Implementation of governance programmes for education so that educational administration at multiple levels along with teachers function effectively	Not observed
Networking strategies for bureaucratic action and lobbying with government is as essential as advocacy and networking at the grassroots level	Post-card campaigns and petitions are used for lobbying with the education department. However this needs further strengthening by training community on these skills as well.
A family centric approach and family counselling would be more effective to address child marriage issues	This has not been capitalized into at all.
RBCs can be used as sites for other activities besides bridge courses to reach out to other children	Other activities such as extra-curricular activities and children committees are being implemented. However, the space has still not been opened up to include other children who are not staying at the RBC. Facilitation of such interactions between regular school going children and teachers, and RBC children through activities may also be useful in preparing RBC children further to adapt to mainstream schools.

On the other hand there are specific areas that require additional attention. These include:

a. **Strategies of community mobilisation** - with greater engagement required at the all-community level; attention given to habitation villages as well; and training content being suitably modified to build skills, rather than just knowledge among community members. Specifically:

i. All community members, particularly all parents must be addressed.

ii. Trainings and awareness programmes must be conducted in habitation villages as well.

iii. Trainings must include specific abilities and skills to engage and negotiate with the education system.

iv. Gender sensitization training and gender sensitive training, that addresses the specific problems of women members of the CBOs must be given.

v. Community mobilization strategies may also have to be differently planned according to the specificities of geography and terrain. For example, considering the large inaccessible tracts of forest and mountainous land in Dhanora, a single mobilizer may not be able to cover all villages in a Panchayat regularly. Thus, this might require that two or more mobilizers be employed for a single Panchayat based on the terrain; or alternatively it may be useful to constitute the CRPF community in such a manner that members are drawn from all villages, and are given specific responsibilities for mobilization in their respective villages. That is, for Dhanora, members of the CRPF could be made responsible in a similar manner as the mobilisers, with similar kinds of functions, who could then meet at regular intervals and discuss progress for the Panchayat as a whole. However, this may mean that CRPF members are also incentivised in some manner in return for these services provided.

b. Strengthening of the QIP - The main challenges for the QIP seem to be infrastructural and resource shortages at the school level, and lack of reliable and consistent data at the student or school level with respect to learning levels. With respect to the former, stronger advocacy and linkages with the department need to be built, and the department needs to be convinced of investing in hte 15 identified schools as model schools. It is important to negotiate with the education department regarding closing the infrastructure and resource gaps in these identified schools so that the full potential of these models schools can be demonstrated, and an accurate cost-benefit analysis can then be undertaken with respect to inputs and outputs. This can then be used to guide state policy with respect to changes and investments it has to undertake in order to improve the quality of education.

With respect to the latter there is an immediate need to collate data accurately, by first fixing the unit of analysis (e.g., whether it will be a track of individual student records, month-wise; or school level data across subject and month, etc.).

Further, teachers in the quality schools have also not been involved in conceptual and other learning workshops after the initial workshop at the beginning of the project. Regular teacher workshops to support and mentor them, and allow for teachers' fora where everyday challenges and problems of teaching can be discussed and debated is important to sustain initial teacher development efforts that have been undertaken by MVF.

c. There is a need for MVF to build greater linkages with the state education department. This may require that a separate team be constituted simply to create an interface between the village/Panchayat and the block and district level officials. These members could perhaps be responsible for updating the block officials on action taken at the village level by the community at regular intervals and conveying and facilitating the petitions and requests made by the community to the block and district level officials.

d. There is a critical need also for MVF to engage with gender issues and provide gender sensitive training, building the capacity of women members of the community / community bodies to express their opinions and interests, organize CBO trainings on RTE specifically for women members.

e. A more stringent criteria for scholarships in Dhanora needs to be developed. On the other hand, since most students have used the scholarship amount for buying cycles, and since distance and terrain does have a major role to play in determining school continuation, a universal scheme to provide cycles to all upper primary/secondary school students, either with the help of state departments or other private donations could be considered. In this regard, it may be useful to interface with the tribal department or the social welfare department, which may be interested in facilitating such opportunities for tribal children to continue education.

f. Finally, a few discrepancies were observed with respect to the collection, storage and representation of data which are highlighted as follows. An key tool for tracking progress that was committed to by MVF was the Child Monitoring System (CMS) - an online data management software that would allow for the tracking of individual children. However, discussions at the head office revealed that this was still not in place, as there had been problems with obtaining vendors for the same, and problems with completion of project, even after identification of a vendor was made and initial work was undertaken on the same. However, getting the CMS on track is vital to manage a project of this large a scale and depth. The CMS can also help address the following data gaps that were noted during field work:

- With respect to calculation of enrolment and retention rates, the schools in each list kept changing each year. A consolidated list is needed (just as the

one existing in the case of OoSC) that presents student level data and tracks their progress till the current status. Records should also maintain the date on which schools were absorbed into the program.

- With respect to quality schools as well, the names of schools changed with each year. In the first phase, the assessments are done subject-wise and in the next phase, overall assessments are made. Thus there was no uniform pattern of assessing the students' progress level. Again, student level data was missing in these quality schools because of which the efficacy of remedial classes could not be studied.
- Although data was available with respect to students who got mainstreamed into schools, the date of joining the RBC was missing. Hence it was difficult to estimate the time spent in RBC by each student on an average.
- The excel sheets provided to CBPS were well-labelled but since they were sent in tranches, it was difficult to keep track of it. Instead, a single excel file can accommodate a number of sheets either program-wise or district-wise to map all the processes more systematically.
- The lack of digitised data for individual students and the levels they have progressed through makes this difficult, andtherefore observations about the impact of the QIP programme on learning itself cannot be made.

REFERENCES

Anugula N. Reddy, S. S. (2010). *School Dropouts or Pushouts? Overcoming Barriers for the Right to Education.* Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity. National University of Educational Planning and Administration. Retrieved 1 20, 2016

Ganotra, K. (2016, 8 27). Flawed Child Labour Law Amendment. *Economic and Political Weekly* (35), pp. 19-21. Retrieved 1 18, 2017

Ministry of Human Resource Development. (1998). *National Policy on Education 1986 (as modified in 1992) with National Policy on Education 1968*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India

Ministry of Law and Justice. (2016a). *The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. Retrieved from [http://www.prsindia.org /uploads/media/Child%20Labour/Child%20labour%20Act,%202016.pdf](http://www.prsindia.org/uploads/media/Child%20Labour/Child%20labour%20Act,%202016.pdf))

Ministry of Labour. (1986). *Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986*. Retrieved from http://labour.gov.in/sites/default/files/act_3.pdf.

Ministry of Law and Justice. (2016b). *The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India.

Muriithi, A.G. (2016). Child labour, schooling and the reconstruction of childhood: A case study from Kenya. In Lucy Hopkins and Arathi Sriprakash (Eds.), *The 'Poor Child': The Cultural Politics of Education, Development and Childhood* (pp. 65-83). Oxon, OX: Routledge

Raman, V. (2000, 11 11). Politics of Childhood. *Economic and Political Weekly* , pp. 4055-4064. Retrieved 1 14, 2017

Rao, D. C. (2015, April-June). Child Labour and Education in India. *International Journal of Academic Research, 2*(2(5)), 57-62. Retrieved 2 5, 2016

Sanghera, G. S. (2008, April). The 'Politics' of Children's Rights and Child Labour in India: A Social Constructionist Perspective. *The International Journal of Human Rights, 12*(2), 215-232. Retrieved 1 25, 2016

Sinha, S. (n.d.). Child Labour and Compulsory Education . In *Shaping the Future by Law: Children, Environment and Human Health*(pp. 83-88).

UNICEF. (2008). *The Child Care Transition. A League Table of Early Childhood Education and Care in Economically Advanced Countries*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre

APPENDICES

1:Details of Field Visit Undertaken

A. Field Schedule

Ghattu / Ieeja

	Time	Programme details
30-01-17	9.00 am -9.30 am	Travel to Gattu
	9.30 am -10.30 am	Meeting with organisers and mandal coordinator of Gattu
	10.30am -03.00 pm	Visit to PS Gattu, Interaction with teachers and children
		FGD with SMC members
		FGD with Parents, KGBV Gattu
		FGD with students, KGBV Gattu
		FGD with teachers, KGBV Gattu
	03.00 pm - 03.30 pm	Lunch
	04.00 pm -06.00 pm	FGD with CRPF members, PS Gattu
	06.00pm -06.30 pm	Travel to Ieeja Night stay
31-01-17	08.30 am - 09.30 am	Travel to Rayapuram
	09.30 am - 03.00 pm	FGD with Parents and students, PS Rayapuram
		FGD with SMC
		Interview with mobilizer
		FGD with GP members
		FGD with CRPF
		FGD with Teachers
	03.00 pm - 03.30 pm	FGD with Teachers, PS Gattu
	03.30 pm - 05.00 pm	FGD with mobilisers of Gattu at Baligera office
	05.00 pm - 06.00 pm	**Travel to Ieeja**
01-02-17	09.00 am -10.00 am	Meeting with organisers and mandal coordinator of Ieeja

Date	Time	Programme Details
	10.00 am -10.10 am	Travel to Uthanur village
	10.30 am- 12.00 am	FGD with SMC members
	12.00 noon - 05.30 pm	FGD with Gramapanchayat members
		FGD with Teachers
		Interview with mobilizer
		FGD with CRPF
		Visit to PS Uthanur, FGD with parents and children
	5.00pm 06.00 pm	**Visit to RBC, FGD with teachers**
02-02-17	9.00 am- 04.30 pm	Visit to PS Bharatnagar, FGD with CRPF
		FGD with SMC
		FGD with parents
		Interview with mobilizer
		Visit to RBC, FGD with parents
		FGD with mobilisers of Ieeja at the RBC
		FGD with RBC students
	4:30 pm -5.30 pm	Visit to KGBV,Ieeja, FGD with teachers and students
03-02-17	09.00 am - 12.30 am	Visit to KT Doddi, Interview with headmaster
	12.30 pm -02.00 pm	FGD with SMC and GP members, KT Doddi
	02.30 pm -03.00 pm	Travel to Raichur

Amrabad Mandal

Date	Time	Programme Details
30-01-2017	9:30 am -12:00 pm	Travel to Achampet
	2:00pm – 4:00 pm	Meeting with the Organisers and Mandal Coordinator
31-01-2017	8:30 – 9:00 am	Travel to Mannanur
	9:00 – 6:00 pm	FGD with SMC members
	"	FGD with GP members
	"	FGD with Teachers
	"	FGD with Students
	6:00 – 6: 30 pm	Travel to Achampet
01-02-	8:15 – 9:00 am	Travel to Amrabad

2017	9:30 am – 11:00 am	FGD with GP members
	11:00 am – 12:00 pm	FGD with SMC
	12:00 pm- 1:00 pm	FGD with CRPF members
	12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	FGD with Mobilisers
	1:00 pm – 1:30 pm	Lunch
	1:30 pm – 2: 30 pm	FGD with Parents
	2:30 pm – 3:00 pm	Travel to Mannanur
	3:00 pm – 3:30 pm	FGD with CRPF Mannanur
	3:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Travel to Achampet
02-02-2017	9:00 am – 9: 30 am	Travel to Balmoor KGBV
	9:30 am – 10: 30 am	FGD with Students
	10:30 am – 11:30 am	FGD with Teachers
	11: 30 am – 12:00 pm	Travel to ZPHS Achampet
	12: 00 pm – 1:00 pm	FGD with students
	1: 00 pm – 1:30 pm	FGD with teachers
	1:30 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch at RBC Achampet
	2:00 pm – 5:00 pm	Interaction with RBC children and FGD with Teachers
	5: 30 pm – 6: 00 pm	Rest and Freshen Up
	6:00 pm – 7:00 pm	Travel to Airport

Dhanora, Maharashtra

Date	Time	Programme details
30-01-2017	9.00 am -9.45 am	Travel Gadichiroli to Dhanora
	9.45 am- 12.00 am	Meeting with organisers and mandal coordinator
	12.00 -1.00 pm	Lunch at Dhanra
	1.00 pm - 3.00 pm	Meeting with Schalorship students
		Interaction with RBC children and Teachers in Dhanora
	3-00 pm -4.00 pm	Meeting with Mobilisers
	4.00 pm -5.00 pm	Travel to Gadichiroli
31-01-2017	8.30 am -9.30 am	Travel to Chevella/ Travel to Pushtola
	9.00 am- 4.00 pm	FDG with parents and children
		FGD with SMC members
		FDG with Gramapanchayat members
		Lunch at Dhanora
		FGD with CRPF

		FDG with teachers
	9.00 am- 12.00 am	Meeting with Scholarship Student
		FGD with CRPF (Pushtola)
		FGD with GP Members (Pushtola)
	4.00 pm -5.00 pm	Travel Gadchiroli
01-02-2017	8.30 am -9.30 am	Travel to Chicholi
	9.30 am- 12.30 am	FDG with parents and children
		FGD with SMC members
		FDG with Gramapanchayat members
	12.30 pm - 2.00 pm	Lunch at Dhanora
	2.00 pm -5.00 pm	FGD with CRPF
		FDG with teachers
		Visit to Darachi to meet parents of RBC students
		Travel to Gadchiroli
02-02-2017	8.30 am - 9.00 am	Travel to Chudiyal
	9.00 am - 01.00 pm	FGD with SMC members
		FDG with Gramapanchayat members
		FGD with CRPF
		FDG with teachers
	1.00 pm - 2.00 pm	Lunch at Dhanora
	2.00 pm -5.00 pm	Interaction with Chidren and teachers in Dhanora KGBV
		Interview with Mobilisers
	5.00 pm - 5.30 pm	Travel to Gadchiroli

B. Field Work Completed

Block	Village	GP	GP/Habitation/Village	What was covered	What could not be covered	Reason (why not covered)
Amrabad	Mannanur	Amrabad	H	a. **FGD with SMCs b. FGD with GP c. FGD with Teachers d. FGD with Students e. FGD with CRPF f. FGD with parents g. SMC checklist h. Attendance Checklist i. Classroom observations	GP minutes	Secretary had taken the book to court.
Amrabad	Amrabad	Amrabad	GP	a) FGD with GP b) FGD with SMC c) FGD with Mobilisers d) FGD with CRPF e) FGD with Parents f) FGD with Teachers g) SMC checklist h) CRPF checklist	GP minutes	Documents were sent to District Headquarters
Amrabad	Balmur	Balmur	GP	a) FGD with children b) FGD with teachers c) Attendance Checklist	NA*	NA

				d) Classroom observations		
Amrabad	Achampet	Achampet	GP	a) FGD with children	NA	NA
				b) FGD with teachers		
				c) RBC observations and Interviews		
				d) RBC Checklist		
				e) Attendance Checklist		
				f) FGD with Block and cluster officials – MVF		
Dhanora	Chudiyal	Chudiyal	H	a) GP meeting	Attendance register	Teachers were not present in class
				b) GP Minutes		
				c) SMC Meeting		
				d)SMC minutes		
				e) Parent/child interview with out-of-school child		
				f)BASS meeting		
				g) Student interview, including mainstreamed child		
				h)Teacher interviews		
Dhanora	Dhanora	Dhanora	Block HQ	a) FGD with organisers and block coordinator	Classroom observations at KGBV	Classes were over by the time we were able to get to KGBV
				b) Checking of bank book/ scholarship amount transfer		

				c) RBC classroom and facility observation		
				d) RBC FGDs with students and teachers		
				e)Separate discussion with students whose parents reported that they had run away from Ashram schools		
				f) KGBV interview with students (where majority students re-enrolled)		
				g) KGBV interview with teachers		
				h) Enrolment and Attendance records checked		
Dhanora	Chavela	Chavela	GP	a) Parent FGD	NA	NA
				b) GP FGD		
				c)GP minutes		
				d) SMC FGD		
				e) SMC minutes		
				f) BASS FGD		
				g) Teacher FGD		
				h) Children FGD		
				i) Mobiliser interview		

Dhanora	Chicholi	Chicholi	GP	a) Scholarship student and Parent FGD b) GP FGD c)GP minutes d) SMC FGD e) SMC minutes f) BASS FGD g)Teacher FGD h) Children FGD i) Mobiliser interview	NA	NA
Dhanora	Pushtola	Karwafa		Active village a) BASS b)GP	NA	NA
Dhanora	Karwafa	Karwafa		Cluster meeting with mobilisers	NA	NA
Dhanora	Darachi			Interview with parents of RBC students		
Gattu	Gattu	Gattu	GP	a) FGD with organisers and Mandal Coordinators of Gattu b)GP Minutes c)SMC Meeting d)SMC minutes e)Parents Meeting at Quality school f)Student interviews at quality school	GP meeting	GP members were not present for two days.

				g) FGD with teachers at quality school		
				h)Attendance/Enrolment Checklist (PS Ghattu and KGBV Ghattu)		
				i) KGBV interviews with Teachers		
				j) KGBV interviews with students		
				k) KGBV interviews with parents		
				l) Classroom Observations at PS Ghattu and KGBV Ghattu		
Gattu	Rayapuram	Rayapuram	GP	a) FGD with parents of PS Rayapuram (Quality school)	NA	NA
				b) SMC meeting		
				c)Interview with mobilizer		
				d) GP meeting		
				e) FGD with CRPF		
				f)FGD with teachers		
				g) FGD with students		
				h)FGD with Mobilizers (Ghattu)		
				i) Enrolment- attendance		

				checklist- PS Rayapuram		
				j) Classroom Observation- PS Rayapuram		
				k) SMC minutes		
Ieeja	Uthanur	Uthanur	GP	a) SMC meeting (PS Uthanur)	NA	NA
				b) FGD with teachers		
				c)GP meeting		
				d) Interview with Mobilizer		
				e) FGD with CRPF		
				f)FGD with parents		
Ieeja	Bharath Nagar	Bharath Nagar	Muncipal Corporation	a)FGD with CRPF	Interaction with students	It was a local holiday so the children were absent.
				b) FGD with SMC		
				c) FGD with parents		
				d) FGD with teachers		
				e)Interview with Mobilizer		
				f) Enrolment attendance checklist- PS Bharath Nagar		
				g) Classroom Observation		
Ieeja	Ieeja	Ieeja	GP	a) FGD with mandal coordinator and organisers	NA	NA

				b) FGD with mobilizers		
				c) RBC facilities observation checklist		
				d) RBC FGD with teachers		
				e) RBC FGD with students		
				f) RBC classroom observation.		
				g) FGD with RBC parents		
				h) FGD with teachers (KGBV Ieeja)		
				i) FGD with students (KGBV Ieeja)		
Gattu	KT Doddi	KT Doddi	GP	a)FGD with SMC	NA	NA
				b)FGD with GP members		
				c) FGD with CRPF		
				d) Interview with headmaster		
				e) Classroom Observation		
				f) Enrolment attendance checklist.		

2. Stakeholder Mapping, Sample Size and Tools used

State	Telangana and Maharashtra	Consultation with MVF Staff	3 Days in Hyderabad
District	Mahbubnagar and Gadchiroli	Consultation with MVF Staff	3 Days in Hyderabad
Block/Mandal	Amrabad, Gattu, Ieeja and Dharona	FGDs with block co-ordinators/in charge	4 FGDs
Cluster	MVF Clusters	FGDs with cluster co-ordinators/in charge	4 FGDs
GP	Amrabad, Balmur, Achampet, Chudiyal, Dharona, Chavela, Chicholi, Karwafa, Gattu, Rayapuram, Uthanur, Bharathnagar, Ieeja, KT Doodi	a) FGD with GP members b) FGD with CRPF c) FGDs with mobilisers d) GP minutes	a)8 FGDs b)6FGDs c)9 FGDs d) 6 observations
School and RBC		a)FGDs with teachers/HM b)FGD with students c)FGD with parents d)FGD with SMC members e)Facility mapping of RBCs f)Classroom observations g) Enrolment mapping h) SMC minutes and SDP	a)16 FGDs b) 12 FGDs c) 10 FGDs d) 10 FGDs e) 3 observations f) 7 observations g) 6 observations h) 8 observations

Source: CBPS field visit records (2017)

3. Tools

Tool A: FGD with SMC Members

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

School to which SMC belongs: **Village/Block:**

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

        No. of teachers / parents / local authority -

Full or partial strength of SMC present? :

1) **What is the role of SMCs in Schools?**

Note: The role of SMCs in school can be categorised under-

Monitoring functions - Ensuring the enrolment and continued attendance of all children from the neighbourhood in the school, monitoring the maintenance of the norms and standards including those for children with special needs in the school in conformity with the provisions of RTE, identification and enrolment of children with special needs and ensuring completion of elementary education, monitoring teacher attendance and absenteeism; ensuring proper implementation of mid-day meals and monitor all aspects of the MDM scheme.

Financial Functions – The SMCs are responsible for preparing an annual account of receipts and expenditure of the school. They need to estimate the financial requirements, i.e., undertake a budgeting exercise, in the school to fulfil all norms under RTE as part of developing

the School Development Plan (SDP). All schools are supposed to have a separate bank account and the Adyaksha along with the HM/teacher member are supposed to be the sole signatories of the account. The SDP is a document that would reflect the demands and the requirements to meet the demands or bridge the gaps in a planned manner. The SDP needs to focus on all aspects of the school, from entitlements of the child to infrastructure, and community mobilisation to teachers.

Grievance Redressal Functions - The SMCs are the first level of grievance redressal institution for teachers and for parents when it comes to fulfilment of the RTE norms. The SMC is responsible for bringing to the notice of the local authority any grievance related to the management of the school and compliance of RTE norms.

Probe more in order to assess if they know about these roles and how do they execute it.

2) **What is the composition of SMC?**

Note: The SMC is supposed to be an inclusive body with representation from parents in proportion to their social demographic composition in the village/school. Mothers form 50 per cent of the body. The body also has members from GPs, local educationist, HM/teachers and so on. This composition varies as per the local needs of the state.

3) **What is the process of SMC formation?**

Note: The process as mandated should be democratic and through elections. Keep an eye out for the process if it was selection or election. Who voted? Who was nominated? Who nominated? Was there any local power dynamics that is visible?

4) **How do MVF and SMCs converge to work together for the school? The role of MVF with regard to SMCs.**
    - Did SMC members know about the committee / their roles before MVF intervention?
    - Was the SMCs functioning regularly before MVF intervention? How frequently would they meet earlier?
    - What kinds of information did MVF give them about SMCs?
    - Does MVF continue to support the SMCs in any way?
    -What changes to the functioning of SMCs have come about post- MVF intervention?

Note: Important question, give it more time. Probe more in order to understand the process and how it operates.

5) **Has MVF engaged SMC members in any capacity building activities? Have these activities helped in any manner? If yes, how? If no, why?**

Note: Get information on the topics covered, format of the capacity building exercise – no of days, residential/non-residential?Where did it take place? Were all members engaged? Regularity of these exercises. Important question, give it more time.

6) **How often do the SMCs meet? What are the topics of discussion?**

Note: what is the general composition of the group that meets, do women participate? Are the topics discussed during these meeting different for male and female members? Is there difference in the topics discussed as per the social groups – SC/ST – General- dominant caste?

Note: Important question, give it more time. Probe more in order to understand the process and how it operates

7) **What are the issues /areas of concern for the SMC?**

Note: Pay attention as to who is talking about what issue – for example – women/Dalits might bring up issues that are different from upper caste men.

8) **How have the SMCs addressed these areas of concern?**

9) **Have they seen any changes in school education post MVF? What are these changes?**

Note: Pre and Post MVF – details. Important question take time.

10) **Suggestions/Feedback to make the MVF programme function/operate better**

Tool B: FGD with GP Members

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

GP/Block:

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

Full or partial strength of GP present? :

  8) What is the role of GP members in Schools?

 Note: All GPs are supposed to have a committee that works toward education. The GPs are also a part of the SMC. Probe more in order to assess if they know about these roles and how do they execute it.

  9) How do MVF and GP members converge to work together for the school? The role of MVF with regard to the GP.
      - Were there discussions about school related / child related issues prior to MVF intervention? How frequently would they meet earlier?
      - What kinds of awareness and information did MVF give them with regards to child labour, education, children's rights, etc?
       Does MVF support the GPs in any way?
      -Any changes within the GP post- MVF intervention?

Note:Note: Important question, give it more time. Probe more in order to understand the process and how it operates.

  10)   Has MVF engaged GP members in any capacity building activities? Have these activities helped in any manner? If yes, how? If no, why?

Note: Get information on the topics covered, format of the capacity building exercise – no of days, residential/non-residential? Where did it take place? Were all members engaged? Regularity of these exercises. Important question, give it more time.

11) **What are the key topics discussed in relation to children/education/school? How often do these topics come up during discussions? What kinds of decisions / actions have been taken in relation to these?**

12) **What are the issues /areas of concern with regard to school education for the GP?**

Note: Pay attention as to who is talking about what issue – for example – women/Dalits might bring up issues that are different from upper caste men.

6) **How have these issues been addressed?**

7) **Have they seen any changes in school education post MVF? What are these changes?**

Note: Pre and Post MVF – details. Important question take time.

8) **Suggestions/Feedback to make the MVF programme function/operate better**

Tool C: FGD with Teachers

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

School: **Village/Block:**   **Type of School: QP/RBC/Mainstream**

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

1) **Has MVF had any interaction with teachers in the school? When did the intervention (MVF) begin? How were they oriented?**
2) **How does MVF engage with teachers?**
3) **Has MVF engaged the teachers in any capacity building activities? Have these activities helped in any manner? If yes, how? If no, why?**

Note: Get information on the topics covered, format of the capacity building exercise – no of days, residential/non-residential? Where did it take place? Were all members engaged? Regularity of these exercises. What kinds of awareness about child rights, children's backgrounds does MVF give teachers to sensitise them about students' problems? Important question, give it more time.

4) **How has the MVF bridge course programme benefitted students**

Note: Probe to understand if students in the mainstreamed and quality schools are at grade appropriate levels, have been able to catch up with the other students in the class; whether they need any special support either academically or personally; whether MVF continues to support the students in any way; are there any special challenges in dealing with mainstreamed / RBC students;

5) **What is the kind of support and handholding that MVF provides teachers, if any?**

Note: How regularly do MVF staff visit? Is there any grievance redressal mechanism?

6) Have teachers fora been organised by MVF (in the Quality schools?)

Note: Find out information about how often these meet, what is discussed, how useful this is to teachers, whether it has impacted school learning / students in anyway

7) What are the issues /areas of concern for the teachers?

Note: Pay attention as to who is talking about what issue – for example – women/Dalits might bring up issues that are different from upper caste men.

8) Have they seen any changes in school education post MVF? What are these changes?

Note: Pre and Post MVF – details. Important question take time.

9) How has MVF contributed with regard to their work?

10) How does MVF work with the community (schools, parents, local authority/GP, SMC)? How does it enable them?

11) Suggestions/Feedback to make the MVF programme function/operate better

Additional questions for RBC teachers

12) Have they received any special training?

13) Do they know about the issues and reasons for drop out/Out of school children?

14) Their opinion on the bridge course curriculum delivery?

Note: Ask if they were consulted in curriculum making. How do they execute it? Do they have issues? How do they resolve it? Does their training help in executing this curriculum? Probe more.

15) What are the challenges of mainstreaming/retention?

Tool D: FGD with Students

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

School: **Village/Block:**

No. of participants: **Type of School**   **: RBC/QP/Mainstream**

Composition: No. of males/females -

1) For how long were they approximately enrolled in the MVF bridge course?
2) What were the facilities / provisions provided as part of the Bridge course?
3) How did they support them in learning?
4) Why had they not enrolled in school before?What were they doing before the MVF intervention? (e.g. working, looking after siblings, etc)
5) How did MVF convince their family to send them to school?
6) Has the MVF intervention helped them in anyway? (Probe for help with academic help as well as personal help)
7) Does MVF continue to support them in any way now that they are in school?
8) Are they able to cope up with school learning and keep up with other students? Do they have special difficulties? How do they manage these? Do they get support from teachers / MVF?
9) Have teacher attitudes changed (especially for the Quality Schools)? If yes, how? If not, do they face any form of discrimination within the school?
10) Have they noticed any difference in the school and how they experience school education post MVF?
11) Areas of improvement for MVF? Suggestion?
12) What are their future plans?

Additional Questions for RBC students.

13) When were they enrolled at the RBC?

14) How were they enrolled?

Note: Probe more into the process of identification, ask them as to how were they motivated to join, why were they outside school, what were the challenges that they faced? What is the kind of Support from home? What is the opinion of their family?

15) Are the facilities at the RBC adequate or not? What are the challenges? What are the positives?
16) What kinds of support are they given?
17) How are they coping with the curriculum? Any challenges?
18) How often do their parents / families visit? Or how often do they go home? Are there any challenges in managing home life/culture with school life/culture?

Additional questions for Scholarship students (Skip section for RBC students)

19) What is the selection process for scholarship students?
20) Since when are they getting the scholarships? Have they been receiving this amount regularly? Are there any delays? How is the money transferred to them?
21) How much do they get? What do they spend this money on? (It is mostly the parents who would take decisions on spending money, but probe) How has this helped them continue with education? What would have been the situation otherwise (if they had not got the scholarship amount)
22) How has their experience of school and education changed post MVF scholarship?

Tool E: FGD with CPC

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

Village/Block:

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

(If they are members of other committees / hold other positions, make a note of these too. Ex: teachers, SMC members, GP members, etc)

13)   What is the role of CPCs?

Note: Probe more in order to assess if they know about these roles and how do they execute it.

14)   What is the composition of CPC? Who is selected for the CPC?

Note: see if the committee is inclusive in terms of having representation from all stakeholders.

15)   What is the process of CPC formation?

Note: Keep an eye out for the process if it was selection or election. Who voted? Who was nominated? Who nominated? Was there in local power dynamics that is visible?

4)How often do they meet? Are they required to meet at any specific interval? Challenges related to organising these meetings? What are the topics of discussion?

Note: what is the general composition of the group that meets, do women participate?

5) **How do MVF and CPCs converge to work together for the school or bring changes within the community?** Note: Important question, give it more time. Probe more in order to understand the process and how it operates.

6) **Has MVF engaged CPC members in any capacity building activities? Have these activities helped in any manner? If yes, how? If no, why?**

Note: Get information on the topics covered, format of the capacity building exercise – no of days, residential/non-residential? Where did it take place? Were all members engaged? Regularity of these exercises. Important question, give it more time.

7) **What are the issues /areas of concern for the CPC?**

Note: Pay attention as to who is talking about what issue – for example – women/Dalits might bring up issues that are different from upper caste men.

8) **What kind of convergence do they have with other institutions and functionaries?**

Note: Institutions like other CSO operative locally, educational functionaries like BEOs, CRPs, the larger community at the village and so on.

9) **Suggestions/Feedback for improvement of the intervention by MVF.**

Tool F: FGD with Parents

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

School (if all parents are drawn from one school) / Village/Block:

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

      Social category -

1) First probe about how many children they have, if all are going to school. If not why?
2) Do they consider education for their children important? Yes/No and Why?
3) Do they consider mainstream education relevant? Do they think this will be helpful in the future? How? Are there others in the community who have benefitted from education?
4) Do the parents know about MVF? How did they get the information?
5) What is the role of MVF? How does it help?
6) Were their children going to school prior to MVF's intervention (for re-enrolled students)? In not, why? What has changed now, if they are sending their children after MVF intervention
7) Are there other children in their village / community not going to school? Why? Has MVF tried to intervene with them? Have they told MVF about these children or have they tried to intervene with these children?
8) Have they undergone any sensitization training? How were they oriented into community mobilization?
9) Have their noticed any difference in the schooling system post MVF?
10) Do the parents meet to discuss issues related to the school? What are the issues that are discussed?
11) What kind of say do they have in the functioning of the school? Are their opinions taken?
12) Any suggestions for improvement in the intervention by MVF?
13) What are their plans for their own children?

Note: Probe differently for boy and girl child.

Tool G: Interview with Community Mobilizers

Date: **Time/Duration of discussion:**   **Facilitator:**

Village/Block/Cluster details:

No. of participants:

Composition: No. of males/females -

(To be used for cluster level mobilizers also. For cluster level meetings, note down all the villages the mobilizers are from)

1) Background Profile of the Mobilizer
   a) Name:
   b) Age:
   c) Caste:
   d) Name of village :
   e) Name of schools he/she is working with:
   f) Date of joining:
   g) Selection process:
   h) Highest Educational Qualification:
2) What is community mobilization?
3) What is their role as community mobilisers?
4) What areas do they regularly intervene in? (e.g., school related; child marriages; child labour; ensuring participation of SMCs/GPs; building awareness on child rights at the community level; etc)
5) What kind of capacity building have they received? Topics covered? Format of the training? Number of days? Regularity of the training?
6) Were the trainings effective in terms of building their capacity?

Note: might need probing – ask them to relate the trainings to their roles, take examples from that and ask how the trainings contributed.

7) What are the challenges of community mobilization and engagement?

Note: Probe in terms of the community dynamics, issues in convergence and so on , and how these are addressed. How MVF supports them in their day-to-day work and with these challenges

8) What kind of support system do they have for challenges and grievances?
9) Any suggestions for improvement of the intervention by MVF?

Tool H:Checklist for SMC Minutes

Date: **Time:**   **Field Investigator:**   **Field Supervisor:**

School: **Village:**   **(Block:**   **)**

School size:

Type of School: Quality School / Mainstreamed schools (Tick appropriate)

Period for which records were observed: from _____ to _____

Instructions:

1. School Management Committees (SMCs) have to meet at least once a month

2. Observe minutes of SMC meetings one year (2016), or for whatever period records are not available. If records are not available for 2016, indicate for which periods the minutes have been observed

3. Fill the response column appropriately

Sl No.	Questions to Check	Responses
1.	No. of members	
2.	Composition (no. of males and females)	
3.	Composition (by social category)	SC: _____ ST: _____ OBC: ___ Others: _____
4.	Composition (no. of parents, teachers, members of local authority, others)	
5.	How were SMC members appointed?	
6.	How often are SMC members re-elected?	
7.	No. of times they meet in a year (if irregular,	

	mention dates for meeting for one year)		
8.	Do all members attend meetings regularly? If not, mention who are the members who seem to be most often absent?		
9.	**Issues**	**Category of Issues**	**Action Taken**
10.	Other remarks		

Note:
1. School related issues are related to infrastructure, mid-day meals, provision of textbooks, uniform, compliance with RTE norms, etc
2. Child related issues concern student enrolments, drop out, absenteesim, child labour, child marriages, etc
3. Teacher related issues concern teacher strength and vacancies, teacher qualifications, absenteeism, etc.
4. Discussion on budgets and expenditures must focus on how financial planning and accounts has been carried out

Tool I:Checklist to check GP minutes

Date: Time: Field Investigator: Field Supervisor:

Village: (Block:)   GP:

Period for which records were observed: from _____ to _____

Instructions:

1. Gram Panchayats (GP) meet at least twice a year

2. Observe minutes of GP meetings from the start of project period in 2014 up to current period (2016), or for whatever period records are available.

3. Fill the response column appropriately

Sl No.	Questions to Check	Responses	
1.	No. of members		
2.	Composition (no. of males and females)		
3.	No. of times they meet:		
4.	**Issues**	**Category of Issues**	**Action taken**
5.	Other remarks		

Note: Look for the following themes with regards school / child related issues

a. Discussions on Enrolment and Retention of children ; Out of school / drop out children or those who are regularly absent

b. Discussions on teachers / teacher absenteeism / qualifications / teaching practices / attitudes, etc

c. Discussions on school infrastructure / mid-day meals / text-books / uniforms / scholarships, etc

d. Discussions on school development plans / school management committees

e. Discussions on child labour

f. Discussion on child marriages

Tool J:Mainstreaming / Retention Checklist

Date: **Time:**   **Field Investigator:**   **Field Supervisor:**

School: **Village:**   **(Block:)**

Type: RBC / Quality / Mainstreamed (Tick appropriate)

Instructions:

1. For each student name provided, check in the school attendance register, to check if the named child has been attending school regularly in the last academic year (from the re-enrolled date)

2. Check to see if it is age-appropriate enrollment (i.e., check for age of child and class enrolled using the MVF student list)

3. For each month, if the child has been absent for 5 days continuously, mark 'A'

4. If the child has been absent for 45 days continuously (i.e., one and half months), mark 'D'. If the child has been re-enrolled again after a gap, then mark the date of re-enrollment after drop-out (D), in the remarks column

5. Check with HM / In-charge if there are other students in the school who are at risk for Drop Out or have not been attending school regularly. Fill in details for those children also in the remaining rows provided

Sl No.	Name	Class	Date re-enrolled	Age approp enrolment (Y/N)	June 2016	Jul 2016	Aug 2016	Sep 2016	Oct 2016	Nov 2016	Dec 2016	Jan 2017	Remarks / reasons for absenteeism / drop out
1													
2													

Tool K: Residential Bridge Camps Checklist

Date: **Time:**   **Field Investigator:**   **Field Supervisor:**

Name of School: **(Block:)**

Sl. No	Items	Responses	Comments (on quality / quantity)
1.	No. of children		
2.	No. of teachers		
3.	Composition of students (category)	SC: _____ ST: _____ OBC: ____ Others: _____	
4.	Teacher qualifications		
5.	Other school staff present		
6.	Type of buildings	☐ Kuttcha ☐ Pukka (all-weather) ☐ Semi Pucca	
7.	No. of classrooms		
8.	No. of students per class/group/level		
9.	Are classrooms well-ventilated?		
10.	Are there different teaching-learning material in the		

	classrooms (e.g., charts, models, books, etc)		
11.	Pedagogic practices used		
12.	Teacher attitudes towards children / learning		
13.	Is there a library / books for children?		
14.	Are there separate living spaces (other than classrooms?)		
15.	How is the living space organised?		
16.	Are there usable toilets in the RBC?		
17.	No. of toilets		
18.	Is there a provision for Drinking Water in the School?		
19.	What is the source of drinking water?		
20.	Is there electricity in the building?		
21.	How many meals are provided?		
22.	What is provided as part of the meals?		
23.	Is there a playground / play material / sports equipment?		

24.	Other non-academic inputs given to children		
25.	Are there any wardens present in the facility?		
26.	What is the number of male and female wardens?	Male: _____ Female: _____	
27.	What are the security facilities available? (Eg: Compound wall, Security guards, etc.)		
28.	Other Comments		

Tool L: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TOOL

Date: **Time:**   **Field Investigator:**   **Field Supervisor:**

School: **Village:**   **(Block:)**

Type: RBC / Quality / Mainstreamed (Tick appropriate)

S.No	Classroom Observations	Response (Y/N)	Comments
1.	Teacher engages all children actively		
2.	Teacher provides special support to slow learners / children with difficulties		
3.	Teacher provides special support to children who are mainstreamed		
4	Classroom environment is rich with teaching learning material such as charts, models, posters, play material, etc.		
5	Children are seen to express their thoughts and ideas and clarify their doubts		
6	The teacher builds an environment in the class in which children participate in activities and discussions.		
7	Teacher is not seen to discriminate against any child.		
8	Teacher uses various kinds of bridge material and other teaching learning resources (e.g., dictionaries, charts, pictures) while teaching		

Year-wise details of meetings and trainings held

1. Amarabad mandal

Village level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	391	134	116	141
2	GP	172	54	77	41
3	CRPF	354	112	135	107
4	CC	21		21	
5	KBS	214	56	83	75
6	Youth	250	141	47	62

Mandal level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	7	1	3	3
2	GP	2	1	1	
3	CRPF	5	1	2	2
4	CC				
5	KBS	2		1	1
6	Youth	2		2	

Mandal level trainings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of trainings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	4	2	1	1
2	GP	2		1	1
3	CRPF	2	1	1	
4	CC	1			1
5	KBS	2		2	
6	Youth	1	1		

2. Ieeja

Village level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	341	220	60	61
2	GP	226	108	71	44
3	CRPF	241	70	99	72
4	CC	65	35	30	
5	KBS	268	110	97	61
6	Youth	181	144	3	34

Mandal level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	7	2	2	3
2	GP	3		2	1
3	CRPF	11	2	5	4
4	CC	11		9	2
5	KBS	11		9	2
6	Youth	-		-	-

Mandal level trainings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of trainings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	4	1	2	1
2	GP	1			1
3	CRPF	7	1	5	1
4	CC	--			
5	KBS	2		2	
6	Youth	--			

3. Gattu

Village level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	367	141	79	147
2	GP	286	112	80	94
3	CRPF	474	210	132	132
4	CC	63	0	27	36
5	KBS	233	90	62	81
6	Youth	516	154	173	189

Mandal level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	11	01	04	06
2	GP	04	01	02	01
3	CRPF	13	02	03	08
4	CC	08	02	04	02
5	KBS	07	0	03	04
6	Youth	08	01	03	04

Mandal level trainings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of trainings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	01	01		
2	GP	01			01
3	CRPF	01	01		
4	CC	01			01
5	KBS				
6	Youth				

D. Dhanora Village level meetings/trainings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	335	96	117	122
2	GP	125	41	55	29
3	CRPF	165	40	53	72
4	CC	95	8	48	39
5	KBS	59	13	12	34
6	Youth	57	25	23	9

Mandal level meetings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of meetings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	11	4	5	2
2	GP	9	2	4	3
3	CRPF	11	4	4	3
4	CC	7	2	4	1
5	KBS	10	3	5	2
6	Youth	5	2	3	0

Mandal level trainings year wise (2014-2016 Dec)

S.No	Stake holders	Total No of trainings	2014-15	2015-16	2016 -Dec 2016
1	SMC	11	5	5	1
2	GP	4	0	4	0
3	CRPF	4	1	3	1
4	CC	1	0	0	1
5	KBS	1	0	1	0
6	Youth	2	0	2	0

Details of campaigns undertaken:

A. Amarabad				
Campaigns	No of Campaigns	No of villages	No of participants	Type of participants
Rallies and group motivations	96	52	16500	MRO,MPDO,SI,CDPO,ICDS Supervisors MEO,CWC,Political Partiec,CRPF,Yoth,IKP,ANM,NGOs,SMC,Village Level Officers and All Departments
Post card campaign	1	30	2000	CRPF,SMC,GP,Yoth,Political,Ex.MLA,ZPTC,MPTC,School Childrens
Street plays	3	3	850	Village Level All Groups
Cotton seed campaigns	3	11	350	SMC,CRPF,GP,YOth,SchoolTeachers,Womens Group and SI,MEO
Campaigns against Child marriage	2	40	5513	MRO,MPDO,SI,CDPO,MEO,CWC,Political Partiec,CRPF,Yoth,IKP,ANM,NGOs,SMC,Village Level Officers
Any other …	4	4	1600	Women (RDT), Health staff (World Vision), Village Public
Campaigns	No of Campaigns	No of villages	No of participants	Type of participants
Rallies and group motivations	96	52	16500	MRO,MPDO,SI,CDPO,ICDS Supervisors MEO,CWC,Political Partiec,CRPF,Yoth,IKP,ANM,NGOs,SMC,Village Level Officers and All Departments
Post card campaign	1	30	2000	CRPF,SMC,GP,Yoth,Political,Ex.MLA,ZPTC,MPTC,School Childrens
Street plays	3	3	850	Village Level All Groups
Cotton seed campaigns	3	11	350	SMC,CRPF,GP,YOth,SchoolTeachers,Womens Group and SI,MEO
Campaigns against Child marriage	2	40	5513	MRO,MPDO,SI,CDPO,MEO,CWC,Political Partiec,CRPF,Yoth,IKP,ANM,NGOs,SMC,Village Level Officers

Any other ...	4	4	1600	Women (RDT), Health staff (World Vision), Village Public

B. Ieeja

Campaigns	No of Campaigns	No of villages	No of participants	Type of participants
Rallies and group motivations	152	34	7500	G.P.,SMC,CRPF,YOUTH,CHILDRENS ,PARENTS
Post card campaign	1	3	350	G.P.,CRPF,SMC,YOUTH Students & Teachers
Street plays	1	30	1500	G.P.,CRPF,SMC,YOUTH,POLICE DEPT.POLITICAL LEADER,OFFICIALS,IKP,ICDS.
Cotton seed campaigns	1	8	160	G.P.,CRPF,SMC,YOUTH
Campaigns against Child marriage	45	15	675	G.P.,CRPF,SMC,YOUTH,POLICE DEPT.POLITICAL LEADER,OFFICIALS,IKP,ICDS.
Palle Vikasam Govt.Programme	15	10	1500	MRO,MPDO,MEO,SPECIAL OFFICERS,ALL GOVT DEPTS.GP.CRPF.SMC.& YOUTH

C. Ghattu

Rallies and group motivations (at a large scale)	01	26	7621	ZPTC, MPP, MRO,MEO, MPDO, SI, ICDS, AWW, Asha workers, Revenue Department, Panchayath Raj Department, CRPF, SMC, G.P, Youth, KBS
Rallies and group motivation at Village Level includes Campaigns against Child marriage	63	43	1260	CRPF,SMC,G.P,Youth, Parents
Post card campaign	01	24	2866	ZPTC, MPP,Teachers, CRPF,SMC,G.P, Youth, MAhila Groups, Parents, Childrens
Street plays	01	24	7271	ZPTC, MPP,MRO,MEO,MPDO,SI,ICDS,AWW,Asha, Revenu Department, Panchayaht Raj Department.CRPF,SMC,G.P,Youth,KBS

Cotton seed campaigns	01	15	1258	CRPF,SMC,G.P,Youth,KBS
Praja sadhassu	01	Mandal	600	DEO, DSP,DRDA-PD, ICDS, RDO, ZPTC, MPP,MRO,MEO,MPDO,SI,ICDS,AWW,Asha, Revenu Department, Panchayaht Raj Department.CRPF,SMC,G.P,Youth,KBS

D. Dhanora				
Campaigns	No of Campaigns	No of villages	No of participants	Type of participants
Rallies and group motivations	92	157	2549	BASS,GP,SMC,Youth,Parents, Mahila, Teacher , Children
Post card campaign	NO			
Street plays	NO			
Cotton seed campaigns	NO			
Campaigns against Child marriage	2	2	12	BASS,GP,Parents
Any other … specify				